

cies, one of which culminates in something like banqueting dogs and the other in something like starving men.

An astute professor of mystification economics — F. Spencer Baldwin, to wit—puzzles the readers of the Boston Globe of September 25 with the assurance that in modern society there is not work enough for all. He thinks that "in general, the supply of labor tends to outrun the demand for labor"! If he had said "in special instances" instead of "in general," he might be supposed to be of "sound and disposing mind and memory;" for the supply of hat-makers, for instance, might at a particular time, in a particular place and under special circumstances, outrun the demand for hats. But to say that the supply of all labor tends to outrun all demand for labor, that beats the riddle-makers. Isn't every laborer also a demander? and does he offer labor in excess of his own demand for labor? Surely nobody offers work for work's sake; he offers work for what work will bring to him in products of work. How, then, can it be true, that "in general the supply of labor tends to outrun the demand for labor"? Didn't Prof. Baldwin say this in order to make his riddle harder to guess? Or is he really so absorbed in the scholastic notion that laborers are naturally one class of men and demanders another, as to be insensible to the fact that under the unobstructed natural laws of human life, individual or social, labor and demand for labor are reciprocal activities.

THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—SPIRITUAL CONSIDERATIONS.

In a recent editorial on the essentials of marriage (p. 405), wherein we distinguished marriage itself from marital contracts and ceremonials, we ventured the suggestion that marriage love, which must in all cases be abiding in its nature, may nevertheless cease in some cases to be abiding in fact. This suggestion was made with reference to temporal

marriage only. No conflict of opinion regarding a future life was intentionally invited, and therefore no reference was made to the possibility of what may be called eternal, in contradistinction to temporal, marriages.

That phase of the subject, however, ought not to be ignored. While those of us who reject the idea of the eternity of human life will of course reject the idea of the eternity of marriage, those of us who believe in the eternity of the one can hardly doubt the eternity of the other. The idea of eternal life once adopted, its conjugal corollary cannot be lightly put aside. In some form, the characteristic human relationship which unites the masculine and the feminine principles, and which in this life we call marriage, must be characteristic also of the life beyond.

Upon the assumption, then, that the goal of human life is not the grave, but that life persists eternally and is characterized throughout by the marriage relation, we should expect, according to the logic of the editorial referred to above, to find this difference (of degree rather than kind), between eternal and temporal marriages, namely, that whereas temporal marriages, while in their nature abiding for the temporal life, may not be abiding in fact, eternal marriages must be abiding eternally both in their nature and in fact.

In the temporal environment, where human character is in the making, the conditions that produce marriage unity — complementary masculine and feminine qualities of individual character — are subject to fundamental alterations. Consequently, temporal marriages may or may not be eternal. Whether the character qualities actually do alter in particular cases so as to destroy marriage unity may seldom be known; whether particular marriage relations have ever possessed eternal qualities, may also be uncertain. For our world is one of twilight and much illusion, where the trend of character-building may alter without always seeming to, and where, without altering, it may often seem to be different from what it really is. In these circumstances no one can

assert of particular marriages that they are or are not eternal. The most that can be asserted of them, with reference to the possible eternity of marriage, is that they are dramatizations of the eternal marriage idea.

As was argued in the preceding editorial, they must be cemented by love abiding in its nature, for that is of the essence of the marriage idea. Yet the natural abidingness of this love is limited, so far as man is capable of judging, by the limitations of temporal life; and, owing to the character-changes in our character-building world, though the love be in its nature abiding for life, it may nevertheless terminate sooner in fact.

But upon the hypothesis of eternal life, greater completeness of marriage may be assumed. The eternal marriages that must logically belong to a state of full spiritual consciousness, would naturally be genuine in inception and endless in duration. In such a state there would be none of the illusions of this preparatory existence. Neither would the parties to an eternal marriage experience any fundamental alterations of character. Such character as they had formed in their character-building period, the period of their earthly embodiment, would persist, not without development yet without essential alteration.

This is surely a logical inference from the idea of individual immortality. For it is the individual character, and not the natural body nor a nebulous essence, that can be supposed to have immortal identity; and the character being once formed, and being released from its physical mold by the dissolution of the body, may reasonably be expected to develop thereafter along the general lines of its formation.

The unifying conditions of marriage-love being thus eternally abiding, the love they generate must be eternally abiding also. Eternal in its nature, it must continue to be eternal also in fact. The resulting marriage can therefore never come to an end.

To those of us who believe in the eternal life, how is it possible to escape that conclusion, in substance, regarding eternal marriage?

It is of the essence of the idea