

A BROADER LIFE FOR WOMEN.

Extracts from an article in the Independent of July 9, 1903, by Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman.

But just as the man, howsoever well pleased with his family and home, needs something more, so does the woman, equally well pleased, also need something more. Both are citizens of the world as well as members of the family, both need the largest general relations of life as well as the smaller personal ones.

It is not true that love "is of man's life a thing apart—'tis woman's whole existence." It is nobody's whole existence. It is a vital part of everybody's existence, beautiful, natural, sweet, indispensable—but not all. Here we have a large common ground of explanation for much of the unhappiness in marriage so general in our life to-day; under which women suffer most, and for which men are most blamed. The woman suffers most in an unhappy marriage, because she has no other life from which to draw strength and practical consolation. She may try to drown her trouble in religion—and religious monomania among home-bound women is painfully common—or she may seek consolation in "society," in excitement, and amusement.

But a man has his work to take pleasure in, to take pride in, to gratify ambition, to obtain profit, to fill out the varied wants and impulses of his nature. He has the world as well as the woman, and with them both gets on more comfortably. She has only the man. He is the world to her—or she thinks he is; and she makes him miserable as well as herself, by trying to drag out of one never so worthy man the satisfaction which a human creature can only find in full human life. We shall have far happier marriages, happier homes, happier women and happier men when both sexes realize that they are human, and that humanity has far wider duties and desires than those of the domestic relations.

A wise fulfillment of these broader social relations will make a far more healthy and reasonable woman, and a healthy, reasonable woman will not expect of any man alive that he be to her lover, husband, friend and world.

It appears somewhat strange that two sentences so unlike as "Nigger in the wood pile," and "Sugar in a Congressman's vote," should contain the same number of words.

G. T. E.

THE LIFE OF RELIGION THE DEATH OF THE CHURCH.

Portions of a sermon delivered at the Vine street Congregational church, Cincinnati, by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

There will be no policemen in Heaven, and no churches. Both institutions are born of the imperfections of society, and must disappear together.

There was a man, a prophetic soul, named John, who dreamed a dream; saw a vision of the heavenly city. In the twenty-first chapter of Revelation we read that, at least in two respects, this was a most remarkable vision.

First as to the location of this city. It was not in the clouds. It was on the earth. He did not see people ascending to Heaven. He saw Heaven descending to the people.

"And I, John, saw the holy city coming down from God out of Heaven."

He did not see the people going to dwell with God. He saw God coming down to dwell with them.

A remarkable thing about this heavenly city, as seen by John, was the absence of any church. "And I saw no temple therein." Society is to be redeemed and earth made heavenly, not by the building of costly churches and the nursing of religious institutions, but by the diffusion of the spirit of true religion through the mass. This is a bold thought. We think of the multiplication of churches and the growth of organized religious activity as signs of progress. In a measure, this is true. Yet there is also truth in the paradox which was suggested by John's churchless Heaven. A progressing society means a vanishing church.

In the beginning the church was everything. In the end, it will be nothing. The church is to die that the world may be saved.

In a recent election in Ohio the church was successfully appealed to to defeat an amendment which had for its object the removal of a constitutional obstruction to reform in taxation. The argument was that some future legislature might put church property on the tax duplicate. The financial interests of the institution were placed above society's liberty to make progress. The church lost that opportunity to die for the world.

It is often said that if the church would take a bold stand on the right side of the great struggle that is now being waged between popular liberty and the power of monopoly, it would fill its pews and make itself strong with the multitude. This is not true.

The most successful churches, from the institutional point of view, are the churches where monopoly worships, or those where superstition runs high. The more rational and concrete and courageous the preaching, the weaker the church.

It is an opinion of mine, from which many noble-minded men will dissent, that we have in the pulpits of to-day, many gifted preachers, but few prophets. The church does not strike the deepest chords of modern life. The mighty hopes which are beginning to stir in the hearts of men are not inspired by pulpit eloquence. It is not to the hosts that burn incense in the temple, but to a few humble men in the street, that the evangel of our day has come, proclaiming to the weary and heavy-laden glad tidings of great joy.

To those who sit in the darkness a light is breaking; the light is the dawn of a wonderful faith; a faith that humanity is gathering strength for a mighty forward impulse; and that after the impending storm is past, the rose of equality will bloom and blossom on the deserts and plague-spots of earth; and the harvest-songs of brave men, and the lullabys of free women and the laughter of welcome children will mingle in a new wondrous anthem of praise to the God of Liberty and Truth. Is this Gospel proclaimed from our pulpits? How much more glorious it is to preach the truth than to build a church!

A STORY OF HOTHOUSE BANANAS.

The Hon. John Sharp Williams, the new minority leader in Congress, is making his Republican opponents uncomfortable whenever he rises to speak, which is quite often. In his rattling speech on Cuban reciprocity he said in part:

Protection, Mr. Chairman, is a system of taxation whereby many are robbed in order that a few may be hotheaded by legislation into artificial prosperity. As a supplementary definition, protection is a system of taxation whereby capital and labor are deflected from naturally profitable pursuits and enterprises into channels of naturally unprofitable pursuits and enterprises. And, as a corollary, the method whereby they are deflected is by the enactment of laws forcing the consumer to pay to the artificial hotheaded enterprises a higher price than with a free commerce the consumer would have to pay. . . .

That brings me, Mr. Chairman, to my favorite banana theory. There is in the United States, I suppose, one hundred acres of land where bananas can be grown in the open air, and yet I could, were I the legislating body of this coun-