

after the election Mr. Warner made this declaration:

As to reorganization of the Democratic party, it strikes me that what is most needed is organization from the voters up, in the good old democratic way. If that is had there would not be left enough of the lately beaten machine to obstruct it. If it is not, there is not enough of that machine to be worth repair. Personally I believe that the issue Democrats are best agreed upon and can best make is that of government of the people, by the people and for the people, against government of trusts, by trusts and for trusts. This means repeal of tariff taxation and the adoption of a more equitable system; it means government control, or rivalry, as fast as any necessary of life becomes a private monopoly; it means, first of all, stopping private railroad monopoly in inter-State commerce; it means that just as government a century since assumed the carriage of letters, it shall now take control of its postal service, including carriage, and so extend it as to provide for most of what is now controlled by private express monopoly.

One of the gratifying results of the recent election is the evidence it furnishes of progress in discriminative voting. Whether the discriminations were wise is not the point; the fact that they were made is the encouraging thing. In the home of Tom L. Johnson, for instance, although the county returns a landslide plurality of something like 34,000 against the Democratic national ticket, it reelects Robert C. Wright as auditor by a plurality of 2,598. Not the least significant thing about this result is the fact that Mr. Wright is well known to be a single tax man. He is, in fact, one of the ablest supporters of that idea in the country; and for several years, both in office and out, he has been at Johnson's right hand in promoting his movement for radical revenue reform.

While the discriminative vote has not depended wholly upon the true Australian ballot system, its manifestations have been most marked where that system is established. In Massachusetts, for instance, there is no "straight" voting. Every candidate must be voted for by putting the cross against his name. Largely as a

consequence of this, although Mr. Roosevelt carries Massachusetts by 85,000, Mr. Douglas, the free trade Democratic candidate for governor, wins by 35,000. One of the most urgent duties of every honest legislature where "straight" voting, this "bosses'" device, is allowed, is to abolish it at once. Not alone does it facilitate "straight" voting by those who wish to vote "straight," which is not objectionable; but it deters discriminative voters from "scratching," lest they may make their ballots defective, which is not only objectionable but highly so. If any voter is to be facilitated in his voting, at the expense of inconvenience to others, it is the discriminating voter who uses his judgment and conscience, and not the "straight" voter who is as a rule the mere tool of a "boss."

A significant news paragraph from Syracuse, N. Y., has been obscured by the more exciting news of the elections. According to this paragraph, which we take from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 8th, a tramp has been rewarded in a remarkably indicative manner, under the circumstances, for returning a considerable amount of lost property. We quote:

As a reward for having saved the New York Central \$15,000 by picking up valuable jewelry and personal effects and turning them in after the Western express had been wrecked at Lock Berlin, near Lyons, on September 24, Charles Casey, a "bobo," then walking the tracks, has been given a good job as freight brakeman in the Central yards at Dewitt.

That paragraph is significant for several reasons, some of which we shall state in interrogative form. Is work so scarce that jobs at freight-braking are given and accepted as rewards of merit for exceptional honesty? Has opportunity to earn a bare living at laborious and dangerous work become so great a boon? Then where is our boasted prosperity and why do we rail at the tramps as idlers? Think it over.

The independent newspaper is a feature of the time. But there

are different breeds. The newspaper that stands for principle regardless of party is independent; so also is that paper "independent" which holds out for the heaviest or the most respectable bribe.

THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—MARRIAGE.

In the series of editorials of which this is the last, we have thus far considered the general subject with reference principally to its more notable problems.

In doing so we first distinguished marriage itself, or natural marriage, from the conventional symbols or contract declaratory of the natural marriage relation (p. 405), concluding that all marriage problems must be determined in the last analysis, not by considerations respecting conventional marriage, which are necessarily superficial, but by considerations respecting marriage itself—a relationship so obviously an institution of natural and not of human law.

Next we paused to speculate upon the probability of spiritual elements in the marriage relation (p. 421) which might give an eternal quality to marriages—a speculation which can not be without practical value to all who accept the idea of human immortality.

Polygamy and "free love" were then considered (p. 437), with reference to the principles of natural law already disclosed.

After that, the remarriage of a party to a former marriage upon the death of the other party (p. 452) was brought to the test of the same principles of natural law, and approved.

In preparation for a discussion of the divorce problem, marriage ceremonies (p. 468) or conventional as distinguished from natural marriages, were then examined and their importance affirmed.

The last but one of the editorials preceding the present, approved liberal divorce (p. 484) simply as a decree of nullification and regardless of remarriage; and the one immediately preceding this final one advocated freedom of remarriage after divorce (p. 499), on grounds of expediency with reference to conventional mar-

riage and of morality with reference to natural marriage.

We have now to consider the marriage relation apart from the shadow of divorce possibilities.

Marriage itself, which is constituted by the harmonious union of one man and one woman through reciprocal love abiding in its nature, is a natural human relationship. It is as natural as motherhood and fatherhood, to which it is Nature's condition precedent.

On the physical or animal plane of human life, this is too obvious to require elucidation. The intimate physical union without which procreation is impossible furnishes its own demonstration of its own indispensability to fatherhood and motherhood. Describe that relationship as only the expression of a momentary animal impulse if you will, yet the fact remains that even then Nature is seen to declare for monogamy, for unity, for reciprocity, for affection, and in many ways to suggest the idea of abidingness.

But man does not live upon the physical or animal plane alone. Though we brush aside all thought of human immortality as an idle speculation, we cannot escape the obtrusive natural fact, a fact in the domain of human nature, that man possesses moral as well as physical qualities.

You may say, if you will, that moral qualities are nothing but modes of the physical; as, for instance, that the impulses of human marriages are only poetizations of animal matings, and that the impulses of human motherhood are the same affections in kind as those of the dam for her cub. Nevertheless, none can deny that human action is often determined by disinterested love of another than one's self or one's own, and by devotion to ideal standards of right and justice. Nor does it make any difference if such love and devotion be characterized as impulses originating in the physical, or as mere phases of selfishness. We do not get away from the essential thing by changing its name or surmising its origin. The crucial facts themselves remain. Men and women do act from motives of love for others than their own. They do have regard for equality of rights,—even if temptations to be selfish

often pervert their conduct with reference to the principle of equality, even if temptations to falsely appear unselfish often distort their perceptions and their expressions of that principle. They do set up and support moral ideals. Where they get those ideals, or whether the ideals are perfect, is immaterial. The determining facts are that they set them up, and that their tendencies are altruistic. Everyone is conscious of moral impulses to which he often yields,—impulses to turn from selfish comforts and interests, even to the extent of sacrificing his own life, in order to maintain humanitarian standards. These facts prove, not necessarily that human life has a moral origin, to be sure; but incontestably that it advances upon a moral as well as upon a physical plane, in response to unselfish as well as selfish impulses, and with reference to altruistic as well as egoistic natural law.

Possibly some of the lower animals have exhibited identical traits. Let him who believes this believe it; it does not affect the question. If any of the lower animals do exhibit moral traits, then those animals, too, live on a moral as well as a physical plane. But whether animals live upon a moral plane is not to the point. The point is that man indisputably does live upon such a plane. Regardless of whether it may or may not be so with any of the lower animals, man is clearly both a physical and a moral being.

It is this moral quality that transmutes what might otherwise be the indiscriminating sexual attractions of man's animalhood into those indescribably tender and chaste affections, and those subtle human harmonies, which give to genuine marriage its distinctive character in the apprehension of all those multitudes who experience its satisfactions and foster its unities.

The secret of marital happiness is only suggested or crudely symbolized by that union of sexual opposites in which mere animal or physical mating consists. Since man is an animal, physical union is indeed one of the conditions of human marriage; but inasmuch as he is more than an animal, there are other and higher and equally

indispensable conditions. Not only are mankind masculine and feminine physically in their bodies, as are the lower animals, and mentally in their modes of thought, as also are the lower animals though in lower degree; they are also masculine and feminine morally in the modes of their altruistic affections. And just as sexual duality physically may bring together one man and one woman, in obedience to procreative animal impulses, so may sexual duality on the mental and moral planes, bring together that man and that woman, complementaries in moral and mental character as well as in physical form, in obedience to mental and moral procreative impulses. It is this complemental union of sexual opposites on all the planes of human life, mental and moral as well as physical, that constitutes human marriage and distinguishes it from animal mating. Such unions are centers of vigorous family life, and out of them the race not only multiplies but advances.

Procreation, however, is the secondary and not the primary object of marriage. It is only the result of a certain kind of life; it is not that life itself. The essential quality of the marriage relation is companionship—the most intimate companionship conceivable—physically, mentally, morally. It is a companionship which can only exist between complementaries. As key to lock, such is the companionship of marriage. If it exist on the animal plane alone, it will be only bestial; but if it flourish also on the mental and moral planes, it will be human, harmonious and sacred.

Are not these suggestions confirmed by psychological considerations? It must be evident to all who reflect upon their own experiences and observations, that the masculine mind is distinguished for what is often colloquially though not very appropriately called judgment. We say of a man that he acts with good judgment or with bad judgment, meaning that he is a wise man or an unwise man, as the case may be—and this regardless of his learning. Not so with the feminine mind. That a woman's reason is "because," has passed into a good-na-

tured joke. Very seldom do we find ourselves weighing in women what in men we call judgment. We say of a woman that her perceptions are keen or otherwise, but not often that her judgment is good or bad. Individual women are usually thought of, not as having good or bad judgment, nor as being endowed primarily with wisdom. The distinctive feminine quality, as usually observed, is affection. Although women as well as men are acknowledged to possess intellectual qualities, these appear to be subordinate to their confiding affections; whereas with men, although they as well as women are seen to be endowed with affectional qualities, these appear subordinate to their wisdom, or intellect—or, as it would ordinarily be expressed, to their judgment.

Nor are these observations mistaken. They are defective only in that they are incomplete. Superficially, the normal marriage relation may be described, not inaptly even if metaphysically, as a union of masculine intellect with feminine affections, coupled with a transverse union of feminine intellect with masculine affections, wherein the masculine wisdom is superior to the feminine and the feminine affections are superior to the masculine. But that is true only superficially and with reference to what we curiously enough call "practical" in contradistinction to "moral" concerns.

When observation goes beyond the superficial, or purely "practical," it discloses a reversal of those relative superiorities. At times of great stress, especially if the stress relate to the deeper experiences which every mature man and woman undergoes in some degree and at some time, it is not the masculine mind that rises preeminent in wisdom and judgment, nor the feminine that seems superior in confiding affections. What man is there, for example, who, at some crisis of his soul, in the presence of an overwhelming temptation or in the midst of a terrible experience resulting from error of judgment or crookedness of conscience, who has not beheld with wonder and unwonted affection, a woman's judgment rise out of her affections and tower above his own judgment, even as at such a crisis

his affections seem more alive than hers? And when the crisis is over, has he not with equal wonder seen this unusual feminine judgment collapse, and the usual feminine affection resume its accustomed sway? That this is true must be known to every man with a record of soul-trying experiences, which he has shared confidently with a good woman between whom and himself the natural union of genuine marriage has subsisted.

It is hardly reasonable to think of these unusual manifestations as abnormal. Is there not a better explanation? May it not be that in the deeper, the more intensely moral or more spiritual concerns of life, the intellectual qualities of the wife and the affectional qualities of the husband exchange places of relative superiority? Yet, if that be so, then what more natural than the inference that perfect marriage would consist in a complete equilibrium of feminine affections and masculine intellect with masculine affections and feminine intellect, each individualized yet all in harmonious union?

This idea of sexual opposites may be carried into the realm of the spiritual, where it serves to explain analogically the character and motive of creation. In the words of a thoughtful theologian (Charles H. Mann, in "Psychiasis"), "it is because God and man are opposite to each other in their attributes, and not because man is inmosty divine, that their conjunction is of such surpassing sweetness." In elaborating the same subject this author writes: "The very essence of divine love, that which impelled God to create, and that which thence constitutes the very substance of all genuinely heavenly love in whatever degree or form manifested, is that it should love some one out of self. To find one's self inherently sufficient unto himself, is to the spiritual man death. To love others, and thus to have the ends and purposes of one's life in the neighbor, is the warp and woof of every love that is heavenly. It is the very end of creation. All true spiritual blessedness consists in a union in love with others. The differences in the nature of those who are the constituent parts of

such a union are the very ground of the blessedness. This is illustrated in all forms of neighborly charity, and is in its height shown in the ultimate form of human personality which is dualistic, male and female; and whose very summit of blessedness is provided for in the heavenly union of these differing parts—that is, in marriage. In his relation to God, therefore, man realizes the blessedness of his own life, not by finding himself to be in his own self-sufficiency God (God forbid!) but by conjunction with Him; and God at the same time realizes the end of his love by union with man."

Believers in the spiritual, whatever their church affiliations or non-affiliations, cannot but recognize the exalted sacredness of marriage when thus considered as the type in human society of God's relations of love to all human kind. Not only does nature teach its purity through the instincts of those animals that suggest purity to the imagination; but its sacredness is emphasized in its natural symbolism of God's relation to man.

To recognize this exalted sacredness, however, is not necessary for our present purpose. It is enough to perceive that marriage is a sexual conjunction, not merely on the animal plane of life, but also on the moral. To perceive that, is to feel the human dignity of the position of husband and wife, and the consequent dignity of fatherhood and motherhood. It is to distinguish the human mother from the animal dam. It is to acknowledge the naturalness of monogamous marriage and to realize the natural abidingness of the marriage union. It is to understand that marriage is an expression of a natural law which ramifies the universe of matter and morals, but finds higher expression nowhere else within mortal ken. If that is not a sacred thing, what can be sacred?

Whoever looks upon natural marriage in that reverent way can hardly fail to experience an increasing respect for its symbol—conventional marriage. For it is by this symbol that the marriage principle is made to appear concrete.

That there are those capable of appreciating abstract realities

without the aid of symbols we do not dispute. But most persons appreciate abstract principles better when they are concretely represented. Patriotism is a principle; we represent it concretely with a flag. Religion is a principle; we represent it concretely with church worship. Good will is a principle; we represent it concretely with terms and forms of politeness. Natural marriage is a principle; we represent it concretely with conventional marriage.

All useful concretions may indeed be abused. Sentimental regard for a flag may obscure the patriotic principle; idolatrous regard for church worship may make a travesty of the religious principle; and beneath polite forms of courtesy hatred may take the place of good will. So with marriage. Devotion to conventional marriage may become so idolatrous as to degrade natural marriage. But the possibilities, or even the actualities, of abuse of anything prove nothing against the value of its uses.

Without attempting an exposition of the usefulness of conventional marriage, let us refer to one use which may possibly prove suggestive of many others. In the natural order, marriage takes place at an early age. If it be a genuine marriage each party is influenced by the principle of marriage love. Yet neither is mature in thought, and both are incapable of analyzing or understanding this principle. They only feel its force. But by contemplating the symbol of conventional marriage they gradually grow into a full appreciation of natural marriage. The symbol is then of no more importance than their wedding clothes. But at the beginning it was of tremendous importance. It created an appearance, a projection, a concretion of the natural marriage principle which was moulding their lives together into a dual life unified, and so it served to prevent the possible death of their marriage love in its infancy.

For it is no more in the natural order that marriage love should die in infancy than that children should. When children die, we know that some abnormality in their structure or environment has cut them down prematurely. This is true also of marriage love.

When it dies prematurely, preventable causes have killed it. Some of these causes are in our time prevented by means of conventional marriage. Possibly all of them might be if conventional marriage were kept in its place as a symbol and never allowed to usurp the place of marriage itself.

Though there were no other reason for conventional marriage, this reason alone would justify it. Think of the dangers peculiar to the infancy of married life, and say if conventional marriage has not a useful function.

Some marriages may end for the paradoxical reason that they have never begun. There may have been no marriage love to start with, but only selfishness allied with sexuality, or with family pride, property interests, solicitude for economic support, or something else either wholly alien or only partly related to the marriage principle. These are not genuine marriages and no conventional forms can make them so. The sooner they end in appearance as well as in fact the better. To perpetuate them in form is sacrilege in principle.

Other marriages may begin genuinely but end prematurely. Though they have marriage love to start with, the marriage love may die. For these marital disasters there is in every case a cause that may be discovered and possibly removed.

Idolatry of conventional marriage is one cause. It tends to make the symbols appear as shackles. Let conventional marriage grow irksome, and marital love is assailed in its most vital part.

Another cause is authoritative dominion, usually on the part of the husband. It has a correlative cause in jealousy, usually on the part of the wife. No marriage love can long survive either cause. The husband who rules his wife will soon kill their marriage love not only in her but in himself. The wife who allows jealousy to enter her heart will not only lose her husband's love for her, for which she supposes she is solicitous, but she will lose her own for him.

Another and most subtle cause of the premature death of marriage love is diversity of interests.

Interests cannot grow apart and the lives remain together. There can be no mental and moral companionship in mental and moral separation. Marriage love cannot flourish where the husband is devoted to his business or his club and the wife to society and her home. This is far from implying that home is not the wife's sphere. What is implied is that the home must also be the husband's sphere, and that his business and other interests must also be his wife's, if their marriage love is to live. Masculine and feminine functions go hand in hand through all departments of activity. It was once supposed that women have at any rate no military function; but now we know the value of the feminine element even there. There is no exception. In the home, in society, in the club, in the atmosphere of business, unless the masculine and the feminine elements are in them all, the wife tends to grow into an old maid and the husband into an old bachelor—into persons, that is, with the intellectual and the affectional sides of their nature unbalanced. For it is a narrowed life and not the absence of marriage ceremonies that makes a man a bachelor or a woman an old maid. Unmarried persons may in great degree avoid this intellectual and affectional narrowness, and so escape the old maid and old bachelor state though single; but married persons can hardly escape it if their intellectual and affectional interests flow apart. The more perfect the association of husband and wife in every sphere of the activity of either, the more wholesome and vigorous, in the very nature of things, must their marriage love become.

For the prevention of marital disasters, the clergyman who officiates at conventional marriage ceremonies occupies a position of tremendous influence. Here is the point, rather than in making paganistic demands for strict divorce laws, where he can serve the holy cause of marriage best.

When a couple ask him to perform this ceremony for them, they do so either to be conventional or because they recognize more or less vaguely a religious element in marriage which they wish to ex-

press by religious symbols. In either case his opportunity is the same. He cannot forbid the marriage if he thinks it false, but he can advise regarding it. He can say to them in effect: "You alone can pass judgment on the legitimacy of this marriage, but I am enough in doubt to ask you to postpone the ceremony. If you believe you are indeed marital partners, go to a civil magistrate and declare your conventional marriage. But I advise you to reflect—for a day, a week, a month—and then return to me." This might not prevent unhappy marriages, but it would elevate the general regard for marriage, and whatever does that tends to prevent unhappiness in the marriage relation. It would, moreover, have a very strong tendency to dignify the religious ceremony in public estimation.

Or, and this might well be by far the more usual thing, such a clergyman upon performing a marriage ceremony could give advice which if it were done without cant would head off many a cause for the premature death of marriage love. He could, for instance, advise the young man and the young woman to say to each other, at least once or twice or thrice every day, not only in the honeymoon but throughout life, and no matter what petty irritableness might intrude: "I love you!" This phrase could not make love where love was not. That is true enough. Neither could it resuscitate love where love had died. But it would preserve and stimulate the living marriage love and thereby guard the marriage from the subtle advances of indifference, something as deadly to marriage love as diphtheria germs to babes. Indifference asphyxiates and kills. The daily reiteration of some such phrase of endearment, would moreover tend to create and foster that spirit of cooperative equality the absence of which is to marriage love an insidious enemy.

Marriage cannot be quite complete while its environment is imperfect. So long as women are not economically independent, other influences than marriage love will create and regulate marriage unions. It is only as women are bread winners, that they can

enter into marriage free from all considerations of the necessity of being provided for, and simply in response to the promptings of marriage love. So long, also, as men are in a struggle for a livelihood—a struggle which seems to be intensified rather than modified by the wonderful advances in methods of producing supplies, and which must therefore be due to maladjustments in the apportionment of results,—just so long will other influences than marriage love affect their attitude toward marriage. The economic factor is an important one in connection with marriage. But it has far reaching problems of its own and cannot be here discussed. Let us simply observe that the economic factor in the marriage problem does not affect marriage among the poor alone.

Given equality of economic opportunity for men and women, each according to their natural functions, masculine and feminine—but according to those functions naturally, and not by standards that make washtubs feminine and lead pencils masculine tools—and, whether among rich or poor, marriage would approximate its ideal of partners in business, chums in amusements, equal parents in the home, equal citizens in the state, cooperative companions everywhere and in everything.

The whole subject of marriage is embraced in the single phrase, "cooperation in equality." Where this principle of the marriage relation is observed on all its planes, no marriage originally genuine can lose its virtues. It will grow onward toward perfection, and all within its influence will feel its beneficence and charm.

For cooperation in equality implies the subjugation of self out of love for another; and subjugation of self by each marital partner with reference to the other, produces and maintains an equilibrium like that state of ideal justice which would prevail in society at large if each individual were to cultivate a spirit of unselfish respect for the rights of every other. As we should then have no wars, no race animosities, no parasitical classes, no poverty, no crime, so in the domain of marriage we should have no marriage

problems. Whenever and wherever selfishness is subdued, Nature rules with a sensitive hand.

Very intimately related, too, is the function of marriage in subduing selfishness to the character of society as a whole. As genuine marriage softens and subdues the selfish spirit of marital partners toward each other, so does it intensify the purposes and broaden the field of the unselfish life. True marriage is the kindergarten of the regenerating soul. From it proceeds all manner of unselfish righteousness, and upon its moral fruitfulness society depends for the ultimate reign of justice and peace.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Nov. 17.

Election returns (p. 503) are still incomplete, and probably no full reports will be available until they appear in the political almanacs of the coming year.

The vote of Illinois (p. 503), unofficially reported, is as follows for the Republican and the Democratic candidates for President and for Governor:

	Rep.	Dem.	Rep. p.u.
President	630,068	332,608	297,460
Governor	630,429	339,525	290,904

For purposes of comparison we insert similar tables of the vote of Illinois for 1896 and 1900:

	1896	Rep.	Dem.	Rep. p.u.
President	607,130	464,523	141,517	
Governor	587,637	474,256	113,381	
	1900	Rep.	Dem.	Rep. p.u.
President	597,985	503,061	94,924	
Governor	580,198	518,966	61,232	

In Pennsylvania the unofficially reported vote for President, as compared with that of 1900, is as follows:

	Rep.	Dem.	Rep. p.u.
1904	820,312	335,600	494,712
1900	712,665	424,232	284,433

As the press reports from other States give only estimated pluralities and not total votes, they are of little more use for comparison than the original telegraphic reports.

The third party vote (p. 504) is as yet hardly noticed in the reports in any detail. In Massachusetts it was as follows for Presidential candidates as compared with the Presidential vote in the same State in 1900:

	1904	1900
Socialist	12,678	9,505
Socialist Labor	2,669	2,599