

cipal of his debt has been paid off. How absurd, then, are the boasts, one of which comes recently from the bureau of statistics at Washington, that the United States holds a place at the head of the exporting nations. It is essentially a boast that the United States leads the world in sending out more wealth than she gets in.

"AM I MY BROTHER'S KEEPER?"

It is with no intention of preaching a pious sermon that we quote these familiar words from Genesis. Yet there is within them a truth which might vitalize any sermon.

This truth is especially valuable now. Though wealth is abundant and wealth-producing power emulates omnipotence, it must nevertheless be confessed that degrading poverty and the more degrading fear of poverty are distinguishing characteristics of civilized life. Instead of lifting all to better conditions of opportunity, man's triumph over the forces of nature enormously enriches a few at the expense of the rest. It has done little to increase the comforts of the toiling masses even absolutely, but much to diminish their comforts relatively; and their industrial independence it has positively destroyed. The gulf between riches and poverty has not been filled in; it has been widened and deepened and made more a hell than ever. So dreadful is the poverty of our time felt to be, that it has inspired all of us with fear of it; with a fear so terrifying that many more good people than would like to acknowledge their weakness look upon the exchange of one's immortal soul for a fortune as very like a bargain. Such unwholesome circumstances make men ask of one another with growing eagerness: "Am I not my brother's keeper?"

Three answers to the question may be heard.

There is the answer of Cain as the slayer of his brother. It comes from those strenuous mortals who, denying that their brother has rights, acknowledge no duties toward him. They answer prompt-

ly and sharply: "No! I am not my brother's keeper. Let him prove his right to survive by surviving. The law of the universe is neither mercy nor justice; it is power."

Another answer is in spirit like the first; but instead of being strenuous it is hypocritical. It comes from professional philanthropists and their parasites, and from statesmen who seek conquest in the name of humanity; men who, while denying that their brother has rights which they are morally bound to accord, profess an obligation of charitable duty toward him. In oily phrase they answer: "Yes; I am my brother's keeper. It is my pious duty, a burden from which I must not shrink, to do him good and regulate his life."

The third answer like the second is affirmative. But it is not hypocritical, nor is it inspired by sentiments of conventional philanthropy. It comes from devoted men and women. Seeing and often sharing the impoverished condition of multitudes of willing workers in a society where wealth abounds and may be multiplied indefinitely, and attributing this impoverishment to industrial competition, they conceive of sacrifice for the brother as an ever present and normal duty, and forecast an industrial regime from which competition shall have been excluded.

The social ideal of the third class may be expressed in the familiar though much abused formula: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs." But this familiar formula is not to be interpreted in the familiar wooden way. To each according to his needs does not necessarily mean to each according to his selfish desires. It may just as well mean to each according to what is necessary for his greatest usefulness. And in some form of phrase or other, such is the interpretation which most if not all believers in the formula put upon it. The essential idea is not selfish getting but unselfish giving, not greed but sacrifice. But that ideal does not bear examination any better than its opposite.

Sacrifice is as far out of equilibrium in one direction as greed is in the other. Not sacrifice, but competition, is the law—and it is a law, a natural law, a law of human nature, an expression of the law which governs all human activity, namely, the law that men seek to satisfy their desires, be they good or bad, in the easiest known way—that is the law which furnishes the only rule whereby industrial equilibrium can be produced and maintained so long as the sentiment of self-interest in measurable degree persists in the world. Competition, if free and not made jug-handled by legislative schemes for resisting it, would maintain that equilibrium. It is truly, as some one has expressed it: "God's law of cooperation in a selfish world."

With competition free, everyone in normal mental and physical health who produced in proportion to his ability would share in proportion to his needs. For when we consider the principle of the interchangeability of labor, no healthy man's needs can exceed his ability to produce. His desires may, but not his needs. We have heard useless and luxurious people say they were born to be served, and under a self-sacrificing regime there would be no way of telling whether they might not be right. The queen bee is useful in the hive; why not they possibly in society? But free competition would furnish an infallible test. If that prevailed, they would be served in the degree that they rendered service, neither more nor less. To reflect at all upon the principle of the interchangeability of labor is to see that the relationship of ability to needs is held in equilibrium by free competition. While, for illustration, a hatmaker might not be able to satisfy his legitimate needs as to shoes with his ability as a shoemaker, he would be able to do so with his ability as a hatmaker, provided exchange were unrestricted. So a philosopher, a preacher, an actor or a teacher might fall very far short of satisfying his needs as philosopher, preacher, actor or teacher, if he had to make the needed things themselves; but if he were really useful to his brethren

in his own vocation, he would have no difficulty in satisfying those needs in full proportion, by exchanging his labor for theirs. His income of service would be in proportion to his expenditure of ability, and that is the industrial equilibrium. It is interference with competition, not competition itself, that unbalances industry and brings about social conditions which give plausibility to the theory that we ought to work for one another regardless of a return of work.

That theory is fundamentally unsound. "He who will not work neither shall he eat." This correlative of the golden rule, which commands not sacrifice but reciprocity, is good gospel. And whether we become our brother's keeper in the philosophical way upon the principle of giving without getting, or become so in the spirit of conventional philanthropy, we lead on to the same goal. By making ourselves our brother's keeper in the sense of relieving him of his individual responsibilities, we pursue a course that must inevitably eventuate in our invading his individual liberties by some device or other of organized paternalism or industrial militarism. He who adopts a policy of perennial sacrifice for his brother man, of sacrifice as a normal social principle in contradistinction to sacrifice in abnormal circumstances, has but taken the first step in that policy of repugnant philanthropy which begins with doing our brethren good and culminates in regulating their lives.

Sacrifice is not brotherhood. There are circumstances in which it is neighborly. There are emergencies when it is noble. Conventional philanthropy itself has noble aspects. Not so, however, with sacrifice as a universal rule. At its best it implies a benevolently inverted conception of the laws of social life; at its worst it is a form of unmixed selfishness. The principle of sacrifice is not a principle of brotherhood. Self-love sacrifices; brotherhood is just.

Even the story of Cain, to which advocates of sacrifice recur, pro-

claiming as its moral that we are our brother's keeper—even that old story, coming down to us from the childhood of the race, coincides with the golden rule of the Nazarene in identifying brotherhood with reciprocity, with justice, with correlated rights and duties, and not with officious or sacrificial care-taking.

We need not approach the story of Cain in superstitious or pious mood. Wholly apart from the reverence that imputes a sacred character to everything between the lids of the Bible, this story is worthy of serious thought. As with so many of the old stories and so few of the new, it contains a share of elementary truth. This is the truth to which we have alluded as of especial value in our era of agitation against social maladjustments. The truth it embodies is the very reverse of that which it is often lightly supposed to teach. The truth it does teach is that man is not his brother's keeper.

Disappointed at the cold reception of his offering to the Lord, and envious to the point of deadly hatred of the affectionate reception of his brother Abel's, Cain murdered his brother. The Lord knew he had done this murder. Cain knew that the Lord knew it. He knew, too, that there was no defense. By murdering Abel he had invaded one of Abel's sacred rights—his right to live. It was not a question of neglected charity which his brother could not righteously demand, not a question of withheld philanthropy to which his brother had no moral claim, not a question of refusing to sacrifice himself or part of himself for another to whom the sacrifice would have been a gift. It was a plain case of wronging his brother in respect of a right which his brother could morally assert. His delinquency had reference to no fanciful conception of duties divorced from rights. He had violated his duty because and only because he had assailed the right of another.

Conscious of the wickedness of his crime, Cain resorted to tactics which have ever since been common with his kind. Especially are

these tactics in vogue with the men of our day who have much to say for duties, artificial duties, and have only a sneer for natural rights. He made a false appeal to a true principle.

"Am I my brother's keeper?" he asked triumphantly, when interrogated with the question which implied and which he knew to imply the Lord's knowledge of his crime. "Am I my brother's keeper?" The question called for a negative. None other could have been given by a God of justice, who is no respecter of persons. Cain was not his brother's keeper. Had he been his brother's keeper he must have been his brother's master. The terms are interchangeable. So at bottom are the ideas for which they stand. God makes no man the keeper of other men. Individual freedom is as plainly a divine command as is walking with the feet or eating with the mouth.

The law to which Cain appealed would have been his perfect defense to any accusation but injustice. But to that accusation it was no defense. Though charged with no duties as the keeper of his brother, he was charged, as are all men, with the duty of respecting his brother's rights. It was because he had disregarded that duty that Cain was driven forth with the mark upon his brow.

Such is the lesson which the Cain and Abel story has for the lords and masters and philanthropists and reformers of all lands. "Am I my brother's keeper?" No! With emphasis, no! Not more than Cain to Abel is any man his brother's keeper. But as upon Cain respecting Abel, so upon every man respecting every other, is laid the duty of conserving his brother's rights. There is no normal duty of charity, no normal duty of sacrifice, no normal duty of regulating a brother's life, no normal duty of serving him without expectation of fair service in return, no normal duty of any kind toward any man except in correlation with some absolute right of his. Our brother has a right to live; therefore, it is our duty not to kill him. He has a right to labor and ac-

accumulate the products of his labor as private property; therefore, it is our duty to let him labor and not to steal from him. And when these and kindred rights are subject to the power of organized society, as they are now, it is our duty as best we can so to use our influence as to prevent that injustice, through the operation of social institutions and laws, which it would be our duty as individuals to avoid.

The true gospel of social regeneration is this: "I am not my brother's keeper; I am bound to respect and conserve my brother's rights." That is the gospel that will regenerate. No other will. It is the gospel of justice, and justice is the predominant law of brotherhood.

NEWS

Though the news from South Africa is still strained through Lord Kitchener's censorship, it is this week somewhat fuller than it has been recently. The indications are that Kitchener, with his immense invading force, has been thrown upon the defensive. He is calling in his garrisons from the interior towns, where they are exposed to the raids of the ubiquitous Boers, in order to strengthen the military points along his line of supplies. The announcement of this move on his part followed his report of a simultaneous attack on the 7th upon his garrisons at Belfast, Wonderfontein, Nootgedacht, Pan and Wildfontein, along the Delagoa railway, a battle front fifty miles long. The attack was beaten off, but the British lost at least 29 killed, 53 wounded and 72 missing. The Boers are reported to have "poured a murderous cannon and rifle fire into the British positions" for four hours. Smaller engagements have been fought to the south and west of Pretoria and in the region of Johannesburg. Nothing has been learned of the movements of Gen. De Wet since the battle of Lindley, reported last week. The progress of the Boer invasion of Cape Colony is still wrapped in mystery. There are rumors, however, that it has advanced as far as Clanwilliam, within 85 miles of Cape Town. Official recognition of Lord Kitchener's serious plight takes the shape of an an-

nouncement from the London war office, made on the 15th, that 5,000 additional troops, most of them mounted, are to be enlisted for South African service.

By way of sequel to the story of last week (page 632) that Gen. Kitchener had influenced a Boer meeting at Pretoria to send a peace committee out among the Boers urging them to surrender upon the faith of his conciliatory speech, it is now reported that three members of this committee have been captured and punished by Gen. De Wet. As the story runs, one of the three, a British subject, was first flogged and then shot, and the other two were let off with a flogging. The story is not confirmed; and, in view of the reports that nothing has been heard of De Wet's movements since the battle of Lindley, it is extremely doubtful.

A committee of the Afrikaner party of Cape Colony—Messrs. Hofmeyer, Merriman and Sauer—is about to appear in London to protest against the subjugation of the Boer republics and to complain of the invasion by the Chamberlain-Milner regime of their own guaranteed liberties. Mr. Merriman sailed from Cape Town on the 16th.

Of the situation in China there is no news except that the Chinese plenipotentiaries, Li Hung Chang and Prince Ching, have signed and affixed the imperial seal to the joint note (see page 600) of the powers. They received instructions on the 12th from the imperial Chinese court to do so without making any objection. The seal was obtained by Prince Ching from the "forbidden city" in Peking, permission having been obtained from the Japanese who are on guard at that point. After its use for the purpose in view it was returned.

Sporadic fighting in the Philippines continues, but the dispatches again promise early peace. Gen. MacArthur reports officially the surrender on January 11, in Iloilo province, island of Panay, of Delgado, the Filipino commander-in-chief, with 4 officers, 21 men, and 14 rifles; and predicts other important surrenders soon. In his opinion "organized armed resistance in Iloilo province, Panay," is at an end. On the 10th, 652 out of the

original 1,150 men of the 37th volunteer infantry sailed for home on the transport Sheridan. The reports have it that of the remainder, 130 stay in Manila, a majority having secured employment at \$75 a month. The casualties of the regiment are put at 28 killed and 90 wounded. A printing establishment at Manila, charged with publishing seditious matter, was on the 11th confiscated; and on the 10th 30 Filipino residents of Manila were deported to the island of Guam.

The American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of the current official reports given out in detail at Washington January 16, 1901, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported from May 16, 1900, to the date of the presidential election, November 6, 1900.....	100
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period.....	468
<hr/>	
Total deaths to presidential election	2,415
Killed reported since presidential election	22
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period.....	117
<hr/>	
Total deaths	2,554
Wounded since July 1, 1898.....	2,382
<hr/>	
Total casualties since July, '98....	4,936
Total casualties to last week.....	4,922
Total deaths to last week.....	2,540

It is reported that Dr. Apaciblo has gone to London from the United States to replace Agoncillo as the Filipino representative; and there are rumors that Agoncillo has been ordered by Aguinaldo to go to Hong-Kong for the purpose of directing operations there, but refuses to go. Sixto Lopez, who is putting his countrymen's case before the American public, appeared on the 13th before the Henry George association at Chicago. He was accompanied by Thomas T. Patterson, of Brisbane, Australia, who spoke at length and effectively as Lopez's interpreter.

Decisions by the U. S. supreme court may be looked for soon on constitutional questions raised by the colonial policy that sprang out of the Spanish war and of which the subjugation of the Philippines is part. One decision of the group was handed down on the 14th. It