

without strife or vainglory, that the only rivalry should be a generous rivalry in good works.

Concerning Plagiarism

It is often difficult to harmonize the charity which rejoiceth not in iniquity with the justice which refuses to condone it. We are as little able to sympathize with the spirit of a clergyman who rushes into print with an indictment of a brother clergyman for having preached another sermon as his own, as we are to understand the spirit of the offender who destroys his own self-respect and hazards his good reputation by offering to his people as original the sermon of a minister whom he would not receive into his pulpit. The public exposure which has overtaken the Rev. Dr. D. Parker Morgan, of the Church of the Heavenly Rest, of New York City, might be suffered to pass without comment by this journal, were it not indicative that pulpit plagiarism is a more common sin than we had imagined. In this particular case the offense is somewhat aggravated by the plea which is offered in palliation. It would be legitimate for a tired minister to take into his pulpit another man's sermon and announce to his congregation that he would read it to them in lieu of one of his own; but to offer his fatigue as his excuse after the plagiarism has been detected indicates a moral obtuseness of perception which we may hope is rarely experienced, as it is rarely seen.

The more one studies ethical questions the more he becomes convinced that it is difficult, if not impossible, to draw sharp moral lines. Morality inheres in the spirit rather than in the deed. It is difficult to say what is plagiarism and what is not. Indeed, what is plagiarism in one may be an unconscious act of memory in another; and the same apparent act be commendable in one and condemned in another. The essence of plagiarism is dishonesty. It is a sin of vanity, sometimes commingled with intellectual laziness. The plagiarist desires applause for a service which he has not rendered, for a work which he has not wrought. Any and every attempt to pass off upon others as original what has been borrowed is dishonest. Speaking broadly, any use of the forms of another's thought, the method of his expression, the rhetorical dress, is plagiarism. But one may also be a plagiarist if he takes another's thought and robes it in language of his own. If his conscious endeavor is to induce his readers or his hearers to believe that he has thought out what others have given to him, he is guilty of dishonesty. Of course, all public teachers borrow their thoughts from one another, or from teachers of the past. Truly original thinkers are very rare. Truly original thoughts, even in the original thinker, are very rare. All that most of us do at any time, all that any of us do most of the time, is to take the thoughts of others and by meditation make them our own, revitalize them, and then reproduce them. In writing, when we are conscious of our indebtedness to another, it is comparatively easy to acknowledge the debt by a footnote, parenthetical reference, or quotation-marks. In spoken address this is not so easy, and the public speaker, intent upon producing a moral impression on his audience, will often hesitate to deflect their attention from the truth to a consideration of its original author by an interpolated parenthesis. He whose self-respect prevents the desire to seem to be what he is not; he whose pride of character, not to say his moral principle, makes decoration in another's plumes abhorrent to him, never need fear falling into the sin of plagiarism. He may use the current coin of the intellectual realm without fear. He who is con-

scious of desiring popular applause, he who is even willing to be called greater, wiser, or better than he is, cannot take too much heed lest he fall; cannot be too careful to give public credit for the thoughts, as well as the forms of expression, which he has consciously borrowed from others. And, however hard it may be to say it, it is nevertheless true that he who uses another man's thoughts as though they were his own, that he may procure an undeserved reputation by passing them off as his own, is as truly dishonest as the man who filches a purse from the pocket or a loaf of bread from the bakery, and in some respects is the worse of the two. The man who does this even in a moment of weariness, and under an apparent constraint of necessity, brings reproach not only on himself but on his profession.

The Best Always

A very characteristic story of Mr. George William Curtis was lately told in "The Bookman." The narrator was discussing the question of public speaking with Mr. Curtis, and that distinguished and charming speaker gave some reminiscences of his own early experiences on the platform. He said, among other things, that when he found he was likely to be called upon to make public addresses he went to a speaker of some local reputation and asked him for hints. This gentleman told him, in the first place, never to fear his audiences; a speaker, he said, ought to hold himself superior to his audience. "I did not know much about speaking then," said Mr. Curtis, "but I knew by instinct that that was fatal advice. I reversed it. I have always made it a point to respect my audiences thoroughly; for I have believed that a great number of those who listened to me could speak as well as I if they had had the same opportunities of education on the platform." This story illustrates a quality in Mr. Curtis which his audiences never failed, consciously or unconsciously, to feel and recognize. His perfect courtesy toward those who listened to him was not assumed; it was a part of the man's nature, and it secured instant response. It won the confidence of audiences, and it gave the speaker a way of access which would not have been open to a nature less sincere and less respectful of the nature of others. It was characteristic of Mr. Curtis that he not only treated his audience but the occasion and the theme with the highest possible respect. He never fell below his own highest level by any lack of attention or any failure to treat with proper reverence a real opportunity. He always put his best work and expressed his best self in whatever he attempted to do.

The fallacy which Mr. Curtis detected in his early adviser is a fallacy which wrecks a great many men. There is no greater fallacy than the assumption that a man can measure accurately the value of an opportunity, that he can determine how much or how little truth and excellence he ought to give to an audience. These are beyond the knowledge of the wisest man. There is but one safe course, and that is always to do one's work in the best way and to put one's best powers into every form of activity. The speaker who discriminates between a small audience and a large one, who is careless and slovenly if he has a few people before him, and who puts forth his best effort only when he has a crowd, has not learned either the moral or the intellectual value of speaking. He shows his ignorance of the fundamental law of art and of life, and, sooner or later, his violation of that law will react in his own loss of power and of the confidence of those to whom he appeals. In every occupation there is but one safe rule, and that is always to do one's best.

Some of the Rights and Wrongs of Labor and Capital'

By an Employer of Labor



ARGUE as they may, neither philosophers, theologians, economists, publicists, politicians, nor demagogues can establish, on grounds of pure reason, a theory of inalienable rights which will stand the strain of application. The most palpable example of the discrepancy between principle and practice may be found in the adoption, as the basis of our National life, of that tenet of the French *doctrinaires*, condensed by Jefferson into the thrilling aphorism, "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." For though the proposition seems to be a truism, yet when it was accepted as the fundamental principle of our liberties, negroes were held as slaves in every one of the united revolting colonies, and to-day no Chinese laborer may enter the country, and no Chinaman, be his social and intellectual status ever so high, may be enrolled as a citizen. In speaking, therefore, of rights and wrongs, relative and not absolute terms are used; for though there is an absolute rule of right and wrong, when it comes to be applied to practice amidst the bewildering complexities of life and the shifting conditions of progressive eras and changing methods of trade, there is fair ground for honest difference of opinion as to its application. He is a bigot who is not amenable to argument and conviction, and is not willing to admit that his views may be open to doubt.

In this very arena of capital and labor there are good men and true arraigned on opposite sides, but they hold obstinately to their contradictory opinions. Both cannot be right. Neither, probably, is entirely and altogether right. There is right and wrong on both sides. Were the leaders less wedded to abstract theoretical axioms and conclusions, more diffident of their own judgment, and more willing to weigh with unbiased minds the arguments of their adversaries, and put themselves in their opponents' place, the first long step would be taken towards the reconciliation of their differences.

If we review the field of human industry, we need not search far ere we detect the movement of the economical forces which have led to the modern conflict between capital and labor. There have been in the past agrarian revolts, and revolts of the poor against the rich, and of the oppressed against his oppressor. There have been trade and workmen's combinations. Under the Trade Guilds the workers in various handicrafts, masters and men, united to maintain prices, and to fix wages, and protect themselves against home and foreign competition. Insensibly, however, the Guilds became associations of powerful masters against their weaker employees, and these assumed a more or less offensive position. But the antagonism was not acute. There were also great corporations in the centuries preceding our own—such as the Hudson Bay Company, and the East India Company in England, and the Compagnie des Indes, and John Law's Mississippi scheme, organized in France to develop its North American colonies. But these were exceptional associations, organized for exceptional purposes, and operating under special charters. Not till the introduction of steam displaced hand labor, and the universal application of steam-power to all the arts and industries of civilized man increased indefinitely man's capacity of production, was there any need

for a Joint Stock Companies Act, and not till capital had thus combined was there an exciting cause of Trades-Unionism, as we understand it to-day. To steam is in no small degree due the extension of the suffrage in England and other great industrial countries, which are thus brought into close contact with universal suffrage here. Thereby the legislative power has passed largely into the hands of the working classes, certain severe laws against conspiracy have been repealed, and modern trade-unionism has been legalized. It would be unfair, however, to attribute the relaxing of penal statutes and the greater freedom of both political and economical combinations solely to the compulsion of votes. This same more intimate intercourse of country with country and closer contact of class with class, effected by steam, has created a keener feeling among mankind of kinship and brotherhood than ever existed before, and has thus strengthened the bonds of humanity. It is easy to argue to the contrary, and to accentuate the argument by many a sad illustration; but it is not so easy to show what a monstrous agency for strife steam would be, had not these higher and holier impulses taken wider and firmer hold of the human conscience.

Gradually, under the influence of steam, the workshop, where master and man worked side by side and educated apprentices to fill their places, gave place to the factory, in which the master became merely the directing agent, and the workman the hireling, not his associate. And, now that the steam-driven carriage and the steam-propelled ship well-nigh obliterate distance, and convey the raw material of manufacture from the uttermost parts of the earth, the factory has become endowed with capacity of expansion often beyond the resources of the individual owner. To enable him to respond to the demand, he offers to share his business with others who contribute capital only, and not skill. Thus his factory, which has grown out of a workshop, becomes a huge manufacturing enterprise, supported by hundreds of shareholders who know absolutely nothing of the processes of manufacture carried on, and take no part in the business management. This the shareholders delegate to the board of directors, who in most instances know as little of the technical details of the operations carried on within the mill or mills as do those whose money they administer. They, in their turn, therefore, shift the active administration upon a manager; he even, as the field of his duties expands, is obliged to relegate some of his functions to departmental agents, who alone come into contact with the men, and who, having been generally workmen themselves, are too often lacking in tact and consideration. And so the distance widens between the real employer, the capitalist, but nevertheless the lineal descendant of the master workman who owned his own shop and used his own tools, and the actual operative—the lineal descendant of the skilled mechanic or dextrous handicraftsman, who formerly shared the shop and some of the trade secrets and business confidence of his employer.

Side by side with, in fact as a necessary consequence and as necessary a cause of, the growth of the corporate factory system, has sprung up another group of great corporations, whose business is to supply our cotton spindles, our flouring-mills, and our great iron and steel foundries with the fuel and raw material of manufacture. Few individuals possess wealth sufficient to build a transcontinental line of railroad or to equip a fleet of steamers to circumnavigate the globe. The wealth of many, handled by a few men of supreme business capacity and technical training, can alone successfully accomplish the feats of constructing and operating these stupendous enterprises. Whether this wealth should be the wealth of the whole community, forcibly levied as a tax by the Government, which would administer it for the good or evil of all; or the wealth of a comparatively small number of the community, voluntarily intrusted to a board of directors, is the real point in dis-

¹ A second article on this subject by the same writer will soon be published in The Outlook. The author of these articles has been the president of a railroad, the organizer and chief support of a large Governmental institution, and is now the president of a corporation employing a thousand people. Ably seconded by his stockholders, he has built up an ideal village. There are a free school, a free library, and free medical attendance. There is no "free rum," however, and the fine hospital counts no "dipsomaniacs" among its patients. There is a company store in the town, but no one is compelled to trade there, and so cheap and excellent are the goods that no other stores have been able to compete. There has never been a strike among the people who serve this Company.