

their own. An instance in point is the comment of the London Speaker, the leading liberal party review and one of the ablest weeklies of Great Britain, upon Mr. Bryan's Chicago speech of January 8, in which he said (page 633) that he was now "a private citizen, with excellent prospects of remaining such," and did "not desire to be embarrassed by being placed in the attitude of a candidate for any office." The Speaker of January 26 assumes that this speech was a resignation by Mr. Bryan of "the standard of the party which he has borne with so much courage through two disastrous campaigns." Since British parties have their chosen leaders, who remain such until they are displaced or resign, the Speaker appears to infer that Mr. Bryan's relation to the democratic party of the United States is of that character, and that in consequence of his defeat as a candidate he has formally resigned as a leader. But that is not at all what he has done. He has simply declared, with characteristic modesty and deference to others, that he has no personal ambitions to promote. No one doubts that he would accept another nomination if called to it. And that he will be called to it, unless the call goes to some new man whose democracy is of the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln quality as distinguished from that of Buchanan, is certain. Such a man as ex-Senator Towne may be called to the front in 1904. In that event no one will support him more heartily than Mr. Bryan. But the day of the pro-slavery democracy is at an end, and men whose democracy is merely "historic" cannot supplant Mr. Bryan in democratic leadership. Others are not anxious to.

Representative Sprague, of Massachusetts, is reported to have called off a dinner to which he had invited the members of the District of Columbia committee, because one member of that committee, Representative White, of North Carolina, is a colored man. The other members could not bear the thought of sitting at the

same table with this negro, though they do manage to sit in the same committee room and in the same representatives' hall with him. As dinners are private affairs, we have no disposition to criticise either Mr. Sprague or his congressional associates who sent their regrets. Everybody has the right to choose his own company for dinner. But we may be permitted a word about the underlying motive in this case, since it involves so evidently not a question of personal congeniality, but one of democracy. It is safe to say that none of these men would have declined had Congressman White been white without though black as the heart of Satan within. His morals would have cut no figure. It is certain, too, that none of them would have sent their regrets because the dinner was to be cooked and served by negroes. Personal contact with a negro at dinner, therefore, was not the basis of their objection. Consequently, the reason for their action must have been not the character of the man, nor the fact that he was a negro whose presence at dinner might excite their disgust, but the equality of the association. They were aristocrats, not democrats.

EXACTING PAY FOR WORK.

Few things are more common than the notion that there is something sordid about men who preach for pay. The allusion is usually to preachers of conventional religion, but it frequently applies also to apostles of vital truths who from time to time bring messages into the world. In its more general form this notion condemns preachers of truth who exact pay for preaching, upon the theory that the truth should be free and that he who charges for preaching it thereby discredits both himself and his cause. Since that view of the matter is not confined to scoffers, but is seriously and sincerely accepted and propagated by the elect, it demands thoughtful consideration. Is it, then, the duty of preachers of truth to preach without pay?

At the outset, in making this in-

quiry, the distinction between preaching truth and making truth known, must be recognized. It is one thing to conceal truth as occasion for imparting it occurs, and quite a different thing to devote persistent labor to its exposition and propagation.

A blacksmith, for instance, who had awakened to a consciousness of some moral or economic or religious truth, the acceptancy of which would augment the happiness of mankind, might be censurable if he refused to make it known. In fact there would be no danger of his refusing. All the impulses of his nature would make him proclaim it. His neighbors would need no thumbscrews to force him to deliver his message, though they might at times wish for lockjaw to make him hold his peace. And as with the blacksmith, so with men of all vocations. We may at once concede that it is the duty of everyone to make known the truths that come to him; and, for the sake at least of directness of inquiry, that it is a duty which if neglected entitles others to complain of the breach. In a word, we may agree that the revelation of truth without money or price is a universal duty; at the same time protesting, however, that the point is unimportant, since human nature is so constituted that this duty is self-executing.

But it does not follow that he who sees a truth must quit his regular vocation, or even trench upon its demands, to devote himself to preaching that truth without pay. He is under no obligation, for the breach of which others may justly complain, even to surrender his leisure hours to this work. That he may make such work his play, refusing remuneration, is too obviously true to call for more than passing mention. It is also true that he may be under a spiritual obligation to the great Revealer of all truth, who has intrusted him with a message to the world, to drop his nets and become an unpaid fisher of men. But, clearly, if he has any duty to work without pay for the propagation of his truth, it is not a duty in any such sense as involves a corresponding right on the part of his fellow men to complain if he refuses to do the

work or if he exacts pay for doing it. And that is the determining point. When we criticise preachers for exacting pay for preaching, we imply not that they are false to their direct personal obligations to God (for this is none of our business), but that they are false to their obligations to us.

It will hardly be insisted that any such obligation really exists, and we may pass on to other considerations.

By dint of a little probing we shall find that no one really expects preachers of truth to devote themselves to their cause literally without pay. It would be absurd to expect that, whether as matter of duty or otherwise. Even preachers of truth must have food and clothing and shelter. And if the truths they proclaim are to gain listening audiences they must live as well as their auditors are accustomed to live. The real question is not whether they shall preach for pay. It will be acknowledged that they must have pay. The question is whether they shall exact pay for their work, as other men do for theirs, or shall subsist precariously upon the proceeds of miscellaneous beggary—that is, upon what is given them as charity for their support, as distinguished from what is paid to them as hire for their work.

The right of preachers to adopt the beggary plan, no one is at liberty to dispute. One may express doubts of its effectiveness in this age, may refuse to drop pennies into the outstretched hat, or may hold aloof from all that pertains to it. Only as it is commended as something which all of us ought as preachers to adopt or as supporters of preachers to approve, has anybody the right to protest. But when it is so commended then there is occasion for an exercise of that self-executing duty which consists in proclaiming truth without pay.

No regular work ought to be done without the exaction of regular and adequate pay. This is a social law which cannot be systematically violated without disturbing the social equilibrium. Systematic violation by means of force exerted against

workers, produces slavery as an institution; systematic violation by means of generosity on the part of workers, produces beggary as an institution; and either institution impoverishes the worker and pampers the idler, thereby doing an injury to both. When preachers devote themselves to preaching without exacting pay—all the pay that their work is worth to those at whose instance it is done—they encourage unwholesome mental states.

There is no difference, in the economics of it, between the preacher's vocation and other useful employments. If it were a duty of preachers to work without regular and adequate pay, then it would be the duty of choirs to sing and of organists to play without regular and adequate pay. It would also in that case, be the duty of the sexton to care for the church without regular and adequate pay. And, going back of these examples, it would be the duty of religious masons and carpenters to build churches, of religious lumbermen and quarrymen and miners to procure materials and of religious transporters to carry them—all without definite or adequate pay. For these workers are in those connections but coadjutors of the preachers in the labor of conserving such truths as churches have to offer.

Precisely so with preachers of other than ecclesiastical truths. When they devote themselves to the exposition and dissemination of those truths, they become, literally in the economic sense, laborers in that field. They are workingmen as truly as blacksmiths are, and the problem of their livelihood is precisely the problem of his; namely, to get an equivalent for what they give and to give an equivalent for what they get. The fact that he helps to shape one variety of truth into horseshoes while they help to shape other varieties into sermons, or essays, or books, or lectures, or speeches, or poems, or pictures, or songs, makes no economic difference. The laborer who devotes himself to writing desirable books or essays or poems, to delivering desirable lectures or speeches, to painting desirable pictures, or to making desirable music, is as worthy of his hire as are the laborers who manufacture

the paper and ink and type of which books are constructed, the buildings in which lectures and speeches are delivered, the canvas and pigments that make paintings possible, or the instruments from which the musician evolves his harmonies. All this work is cooperative, and one of the cooperators can no more justly or wisely be relegated to mendicancy than the others.

There is a difference, to be sure, between exacting pay for work, and working for the purpose of exacting pay. The preacher or writer, including teachers of all kinds—and including, for that matter, the workers in every field—who works merely for the sake of pay, is not a true worker. He lives for himself alone, and for the lower part of himself at that. Useful work is, as the adjective implies, work which on the whole is done not only for the sake of the worker but also for the sake of others. But this question of being a worker merely for the pay, brings up the individual motive and, therefore, concerns only the individual. Another has no right to judge him. The motives of his actions may raise an issue between himself and his creator; they raise none between himself and his fellow men.

The strong feeling against exaction of pay for preaching which prevails among the more idealistic agitators for social regeneration may well proceed from the disordered conditions that legalized monopolies engender. From confusing exaction of pay for privileges with exaction of pay for work, to hoping for the total abnegation of pay, is an easy transition of thought. Pay for preaching naturally stands out prominently in this programme of communism; but all exactions of pay are regarded as sordid, unbrotherly and spiritually degrading; and consistently so, for if it is sordid to exact pay for any kind of regular work, it is sordid to exact pay for any other kind.

Whether or not this concept that exacting pay for work is unbrotherly really results from considering social conditions without discrimination between the effects of monopoly and those of competition, it certainly is not the result of

any balanced inquiry into the nature of things.

Reflect a moment upon it.

Exchange of work is the law of social existence. This is a proposition which no one will dispute.

As exchange becomes unbalanced, so that some get more than they earn, while others earn more than they get, society falls into disorder. Neither is that proposition open to controversy.

The social problem, therefore, is how to secure an approximate equilibrium of exchange at which the work that each does for others shall be approximately equal in usefulness to the work that others do for him.

Obviously, that equilibrium cannot be approached by means of slavery. Slavery takes forcibly from workers for the benefit of idlers. Neither can it be approached by creating monopoly, which is essentially a form of slavery—a subtle form, but slavery none the less.

Can it, then, be approached by some voluntary mode of working regularly and mutually for one another without exacting regular and fair exchanges? Possibly. Whoever denies it assumes a power of foreknowledge which no human mind possesses. A world is conceivable where each will work faithfully to help fill up a common storehouse, drawing from the storehouse only what he needs. In that case, though some would get more than they earned and others would earn more than they got, each would act voluntarily and none could complain. But if it is an unwarranted assumption of foreknowledge to deny such a possibility, it is still more unwarranted to assert it. So far as human experience throws any light upon the question, a fair adjustment of work under such communistic conditions is possible only in societies where each is bound to all by religious inspiration and obligations. A single black sheep in the flock makes havoc with the adjustment.

It is consequently reasonable to infer that the communistic method of distribution will not secure an approximately equitable adjustment of work exchange in society at large unless each member of society comes under the influence of the religious im-

pulse—of the impulse, that is, which obliges him to love his neighbor equally with himself. There is a possibility, of course, that this condition, too, may result from communism. But at the present stage of development, he who denies it has the better of the issue, upon the circumstantial evidence.

Now, when we consider the effectiveness in maintaining a just equilibrium of distribution, which the exacting of pay for work produces to the extent that its operation is undisturbed by legalized monopoly, we may fairly ask an explanation, a more rational one than has yet been put forth, of the necessity, in the interest of equity and brotherhood, of trying to adopt a method which cannot operate justly unless all whose interests it involves become just. To work without exacting pay is to refer the question of equity in distribution to the least just. What equitable necessity is there for that, when exacting pay for work refers the question of equity to the mutual agreement of the two persons who are necessary to every exchange and who are the only persons capable of judging its equities?

To the fair operation of that method of exchange only one thing is necessary. It is the abolition of monopoly, of every privilege created by law which directly or indirectly gives to one person in a trade an advantage over the other.

The urging of communistic ideals regarding obligations to work without exacting pay, instead of urging the abolition of monopoly, is therefore very like dreaming away the hours when active and sane agitation is imperatively needed, as if they were the listless hours of that drowsy place where it is always afternoon. Whatever ideal of social reform may be ultimately realized, the first rational movement must be the clearing away of obstructions to the exchange of work upon the basis of exacting pay. Though the time may come when each will put into a common storehouse according to his abilities and withdraw from it according to his needs, he being himself the judge of each, the time that has now come de-

mands that each shall put into the storehouse the equivalent of what he takes out.

NEWS

Reference to the map of South Africa is necessary to a clear comprehension of the week's military movements in that region, which have been important. Turn first to the Transvaal district lying east of the railroad from Johannesburg to Pretoria, and bounded on the north by the railroad from Pretoria to Lourenzo Marquez and on the south by that from Johannesburg to Durban. As stated in our report of last week (page 696), Lord Kitchener began early in the month a great offensive movement in this district, which was designed to sweep the Boers out of the eastern Transvaal. Seven British columns, moving eastward in wide, fan-shaped order, and keeping in constant communication with one another, were to drive everybody before them and to denude the country of everything that might serve to support Boer troops. On the 6th these columns occupied Ermelo, a point about midway between the railroads. Though the resistance is described by Lord Kitchener to have been slight, he reports very heavy Boer casualties, and a British loss of 24 killed and 53 wounded. Gen. Botha, he says in his dispatch of the 9th, is retiring eastward, before the seven British columns, with a force of 7,000 men, and the movement has "thoroughly upset all the" Boer "calculations and created a regular panic in the district."

Turn now to the Orange Free State. This is the region of De Wet's operations. At the time of our last report, Kitchener's advances placed De Wet to the north of Thabanchu, which lies almost due east from Bloemfontein. But in his dispatch of the 9th he indicated his belief that De Wet was going westward, across the north and south railway line to the south of Jagersfontein road, which is 75 miles or more below Bloemfontein. A hard fight had taken place on the 31st, in which the British were distinctly worsted by De Wet, who thereby made good his southerly movement into Cape Colony. The British had set a trap for him. Seven columns, one of which was commanded by Maj. Crewe, another by Col. Pilcher and a third by Gen. Knox, had started out from