

mit of a rational proportion between the life of personal affections and passions, and the active life of the two individuals functioning as members of society, with the broader relations this would make possible. Because of the necessity of hiding their relations, and the consequent exciting effect upon the passions, of the mystery thus involved, and because of lack of opportunity for mutual work together in their social world,—this secret relation assumes undue proportions and is not normal in its effects.

So it is not a fair test of married life, and any little reaction of one against the other easily results in an estrangement. The unduly close, or abnormally distant relations of the couple, of necessity, lead to magnification of annoying incidents, so that too great a demand is made on human self-control, just because there lack the thousand little daily bonds to weigh in the balance. It is impossible for two people to live together without some moments of estrangement, and mutual giving up and self-control is required, even in an ordinary friendship.

Then again, we are all inheritors of our past; no matter how much we may think we are emancipated from old traditions and beliefs, we are unconsciously influenced by them, and under certain circumstances easily revert to them as an excuse for our weak inability to live up to our advanced ideas. A man may think he believes in a "free woman," and yet, after the first enthusiasm of his affection has passed, he easily leaves her because his traditions do not sanction her actions and his inherited social conscience exonerates him from blame, as does his social world. It is easy for him to think that "legally" he owes her nothing, since he has been accustomed to measure right and wrong by civil law.

Moreover, the union of a man and woman only becomes absolutely complete and perfect when their oneness becomes incarnate in a child of their love. Then, too, the mutual self-sacrifice for the child gives a strong common interest, and creates sympathy between them in spite of some slight personal incompatibility. In our present society the reason for secrecy in probationary arrangements is to save the couple, or particularly the woman, from almost absolute social isolation, and in case marriage does not follow, to protect the woman from the future of a social outcast. The above facts demand that the couple forego this culminating and most chastening experience of life together, and so the probationary period is not a fair test. If we had a "free society," these objections would be removed, and a couple might work to-

gether openly and lead a normally balanced life. But granting this, if separation should take place after a child is born, what a wrong to the child, for no state, no impersonal protection (which of necessity becomes perfunctory in its duties), could make up to the human soul for the love and tenderness of father and mother. No one who loves, and who knows the needs of a little child, could for one moment bear the thought of a state rearing of children. If that means simply that the state bears the expense, while the mother nurtures and trains the child, the injustice would not be so great, but even then it would lose much from the lack of the father's influence, too. The parents ought to share the great responsibility of educating the human life which is a part of them both.

But, be society what it may, there is a deeper and unanswerable reason why temporary marriages are not best. Every true woman feels physically and spiritually bound to her first love (and there is natural law back of this); he is always enshrined in the holy of holies of her heart. She may pull the veil tight and almost forget the presence there; she may even love another honestly and live happily and usefully with him, but more often her whole life is bound up and limited by the first all-absorbing passion of her life.

We have only to interpret the evidence of great fictions and of history, to realize the truth of this. Certainly it has a meaning for the advocates of great freedom in love, if they will but see it. Though the fundamental objections to experimental marriages come from the point of view of the woman, since man is so often lacking in paternal instinct, and one might say, always lacking in the instinct of fidelity; yet a man can only reach a high development through consideration for the general good of individuals, and of society. If these are all militated against by probationary marriage, he should be willing to deny himself somewhat.

Men should remember that the ones to champion a cause are not those who lose nothing by it, and whose natural tendencies may even be indulged under its high-sounding mottoes. Any great movement for the general good must take its rise from those who have everything to lose personally, before we can feel that the cause is for the world's advancement. The saviors of society have ever found that they must lose their lives to save their souls. We are all our "brothers' keepers."

The young lawyer is a necessity but frequently, like necessity, he knows no law.—Philadelphia Record.

THE MIRSKY REGIME IN RUSSIA.

An editorial published in the Springfield Republican of November 25, 1904.

It would be by far too daring a parallel if one were to compare the first national assembling of the representatives of the zemstvos, or provincial assemblies, in Russia with the convening of the states-general of France in 1789, which was the initial step in the French revolution. The conditions in the two countries are not the same, and the Russian national assemblage of the representatives of the zemstvos will be by no means a body having the political and traditional status of the states-general of France. Yet, allowing for all important differences, it is impressive to note certain points of similarity in the two cases.

France had been ruled by a despotic monarch for generations when Louis XVI. found his government beset with grave difficulties, especially financial ones, and confronted by an increasing discontent and poverty of the people. All schemes for removing the embarrassments of the government and alleviating the burdens of the masses having failed, the king, as a last resort, convened the states-general, consisting of the representatives of the three estates, or orders of citizens, which had not been in session since 1618. The essential point for one to grasp is that after generations of absolutist rule, a break-down of autocratic government had taken place, and in that emergency the autocrat turned back to the representative idea of government, or to the people, for help in carrying on the state. When the states-general was convened, no one realized what the consequences would be; no one dreamed that within five years the autocratic monarch would have been displaced by a republic of a democratic type. The convening of the states-general came too late for an orderly period of change and reform; but that fact need not obscure the point that in its distress, under the unbearable burden of government, the autocracy was finally forced to stretch out its hands toward the people.

The political parallel between the France of Louis XVI. and Necker and the Russia of Nicholas II. and Prince Mirsky must be found, if at all, therefore, in the fact that in the later emergency and distress, if not the actual breakdown, of an autocratic government the despot again shows a tendency to turn toward the people. It is not necessary to exaggerate the difficulties of the present government of Russia: in view of its financial credit in inter-

national money markets and its vigor in carrying on a great war 6,000 miles distant from the imperial capital, there is no reason to think that the government of Nicholas II. is sunk to any such decrepitude as was that of Louis XVI. Yet who can doubt that the domestic and foreign difficulties of the Russian autocracy have brought about the liberal policy of which Prince Mirsky is now the personal embodiment, by the will of his imperial master?

In a sense, the recent national assemblage of the presidents of the zemstvos, under the diffection of the minister of the interior, was more revolutionary than was the mere act of the reconvening of the states-general of France, for the national gathering of the zemstvos has never taken place before. The historical importance of the gathering may easily be overestimated, and its ultimate results may prove deeply disappointing, for its business is to be of a comparatively parochial nature, but how much significance the bare event may possess in the minds of Russian reactionaries is seen in their intense opposition. They, at least, seem to appreciate the gravity of initial steps, however timid they may be. We can only surmise the bitterness of the struggle over this matter that has raged around the emperor, but the reports from St. Petersburg can hardly have been overdrawn. After the assassination of Alexander II. his plans for developing the self-governing powers and functions of the zemstvos were thrust into the background and the extreme reaction against liberal ideas has prevailed substantially from that day to this. The present czar could not support the ideas of his new minister of the interior, the successor of the extreme reactionary Plehve, without encountering fierce opposition in the bureaucracy. Of that we may be sure. The very character of the issue raised against the gathering by the conservatives, therefore, tends to transform what might have been relatively an unimportant event into one of the uncommon magnitude. The world, if not too skeptical, may now discern in this assemblage of the presidents of the 38 zemstvos of Russia, for the consideration of some of Russia's internal affairs, a hopeful step toward the decentralization of the government and the introduction of a more liberal, if not a representative or constitutional, regime.

Few things are more improbable than that Russia will suffer from a violent revolution in government, like that in France over a century ago. True, there

are writers and observers who press the parallel between the two autocracies to that point—in anticipation—but when one considers the comparative helplessness nowadays of undisciplined mobs or levies against governments in the acquirement and use of the complicate modern material of war, a successful uprising or rebellion in a popular cause against the Russian autocracy seems beyond the range of probability. And so, if there is any basis of hope in Prince Mirsky's cautious liberalism, whose effects were so interestingly described in the Associated Press dispatches from St. Petersburg last week, the outcome will be orderly and evolutionary rather than violent and revolutionary.

That the czar has been moved to call Prince Mirsky to his side and to support his progressive policy is due, no doubt, largely to the complete failure of reaction and oppression under Plehve, who was murdered, to the growing difficulties of the government in peace and war, at home and abroad, and to the odium, almost world-wide, which envelops the Russian autocracy in Christendom and which the present war has strikingly revealed. It is not a fantastic idea that the Japanese are doing more to reform Russia than everything else in the world. In any event, whatever the cause, whatever the result, the czar deserves credit in the minds of impartial people for not plunging to still farther extremes of reaction after the assassination of Plehve. Instead, he did an act of high statesmanship in summoning a cautious and enlightened liberal like Prince Mirsky to the great post of minister of the interior and in allowing him to inaugurate a new domestic regime in Russia.

Teddy's knowledge of the Constitution is like that of the boy who was asked if he had ever gone through algebra. He replied: "Yes, but it was in the night-time, and I didn't see much of it!"—Macon Telegraph.

"You are an hour late this morning, Sam."

"Yes, sah, I know it, sah."

"Well, what excuse have you?"

"I was kicked by a mule on my way here, sah."

"That ought not to have detained you an hour, Sam."

"Well, you see, boss, it wouldn't have if he'd only have kicked me in dis direction, but he kicked me de other way!"

—Yonkers Statesman.

Doctor's Wife—Aren't you going to take your instrument case?

Doctor—No; the patient is a plum-

ber. I'm going to send back for the instruments and charge him for the time.—San Francisco Star.

INDURATED FOOLISHNESS.

Vested rights is our special weakness. If any shadowy, fictitious claim can be tortured into a vested right we will sit up nights to defend it, and pay the cost of riveting it onto our frame forever.

Vested rights—there is no such thing.

Any right that can't stand alone, sturdy and naked before the world, without the wrapping of parchment

shrouds to hold it together from total collapse

—a right like that is no right at all, but rather a vested wrong.

The older it is and the mustier, the more we cherish these vested

rights

of paying somebody tribute.

Which again is the sign of the

cheerful chump.

—Goodhue County News, of Red Wing,

Minn.

BOOKS

THE LIFE OF TENNYSON.

The toll and wear of daily life sometimes almost overwhelm the best of us. We try to keep up a brave front. We preach good cheer to ourselves, and have it preached to us. It is the healthy fashion. But all of us who are honest with ourselves know that there are times when the burdens of life and the pettiness of environment weigh heavily. At such times what we need is to be lifted into a higher atmosphere. We need the subtle influence of souls who have been where we have been, and know that, however deep the valley, the strongest have passed hither and thither across it, and never lost faith that they could find again the path that leads to the heights. Such passings through the valley and findings of higher paths are the main story of all true and great biographies. And therefore it is that such books, next to a living friend, become at times our best companions. They are always ready. We may open them at any moment and get into the best society that the world has seen.

Some such feeling Andrew Lang must have had when he wrote his noble sonnet upon Homer's matchless biography of Ulysses:

"Men turn, and see the stars, and feel the free

Shrill wind beyond the close of heavy flowers,

And through the music of the languid hours

They hear like ocean on a western beach

The surge and thunder of the Odyssey."

This life of Tennyson by his son Hallam (Macmillan Co., 2 vols.), is a book that one may turn to at any moment and pass at once into high company—a company not of fictitious rank and worth, but of great ones who have looked at