

It is this spirit of militarism, the glorification of brute force, and this alone, that has kept woman in political, legal and economic bondage throughout the ages, and there is still enough of it remaining in our enlightened twentieth century to make the idea of woman's participation in public office and public life a thing to be scoffed at by the majority, ridiculed and opposed.

It was not any manifestation of superiority of the masculine mind that first threw the chains of political serfhood around one-half of humanity; it was merely the fact that in the dark ages of the world's history brute force, i. e. militarism in one or another form, reigned supreme. Where brute force was lord, woman with her differently constituted muscular development was considered an inferior being simply because she did not bear arms.

It was not that she could not fight, but that instinctively, even in the "dim red dawn of man," prehistoric man felt that giving life was greater than taking it; and woman, as the giver of life, was to be kept back from the possibility of unnecessary physical danger.

From this feeling, become n-thinking and uncomprehended tradition, grew the idea that woman was inferior in bodily strength, and could not bear arms; and therefore was an inferior being.

Nineteenth century man, as far as he began to think at all, began to understand that brute force was not everything, began to find it necessary to discover another reason for woman's political and legal position; and thus was born the legend of woman's inferior mentality.

Medieval man was far more honest in his brutal "Only man, who bears arms, can have a voice in the affairs of his country's politics." Medieval man was consistent, too, and excluded even that part of the male population that did not bear arms from public estimation and from public affairs. Modern man has grown more enlightened with respect to his own sex, but enough of militarism still lingers to make very hard the path of the woman struggling for legal, polit-

ical and economic rights for her sex.

The wonder is that so many, even of these women, do not understand the point of view born of the traditions of centuries of militarism that still opposes them in the solid front of the unthinking conservative mass.

While the military ideal holds sway in our modern world, woman suffrage and the attainment of full legal and political rights for women will remain a Utopian dream. The military state is the state in which woman has no place; the military mind is the mind that sees in woman only a drudge or a toy, and gives her the one right only to existence—the possibility of bearing sons who will in time become soldiers.

Women may work for the improvement of their minds, they may open schools for their sex, they may make their way in art, in commerce, in the professions, they may prove in a thousand ways their fitness to take part in public life; but it will avail them little so long as one vestige of the tradition and the point of view born of militarism remains in the civilized world. The military point of view is that of contempt for woman, of a denial to her of any other usefulness than that of bearing children.

This is not an exaggeration, for although the military mind, being an anachronism in our modern world, must of itself be illogical, it has certain instinctive forms of thought which are born of strictly logical reasoning.

The most cursory survey of civilized nations to-day will prove the truth of this. The inferior position of women in Germany is not by any means due to a lack in the mentality of the German woman, nor to a lack of educational facilities for either sex in a country justly proud of its magnificent school system. It is simply and solely due to the fact that at present the "nation of poets and thinkers" has for a time sold its birthright of mental pre-eminence for a mess of pottage—military glory and rampant imperialism.

What is it that has made the American woman the admiration of all civilized nations, the envy

of her sisters elsewhere? She was not sent down fresh from Heaven in her present state, nor did she spring full-grown from the head of Jove. She was the daughter of mothers born in the military-ridden states of Europe. But now she is the product of several generations of freedom from the military idea. This, and this alone, has given her a measure of freedom beyond that attained by women anywhere else.

Let American women think seriously on this matter of war and peace, on this question of imperialism and militarism. If our nation should by any unfortunate but highly improbable combination of circumstances take her place amid the army-ridden, land-stealing "world powers" it would mean much more to the American woman than a succession of wars that would bereave her of her loved ones, or send them back to her crippled or afflicted with loathsome disease. It would mean for American woman as a sex the loss of much she has gained by her happier circumstances of the past two centuries, and it would place the goal of perfect political and legal equality she still desires, far, far out of reach in a cloudland which even the most hopeful could scarcely vision.

American woman's being what she is, is our greatest safeguard against the evils that appear to threaten us; but the trouble is, the American woman is what she is only instinctively and unconsciously as yet, and there are far too many of her in the ranks of those who look upon these threatening evils as something good to be desired.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—POLYGYAMY AND "FREE LOVE."

Whether or not we concede the eternity of human life, and therefore the eternity of marriage, there is no reasonable escape from the conclusion that the essential principle which must constitute eternal marriages if they do exist (p. 421), points to the essential principle of temporal marriage. The mystical is here paralleled by the sensuous. Look upon the nature of marriage as we may, whether as continuing upward and inward to the heart

of the great spiritual mystery, or as comprising only the personal and social phenomena that are strictly within the sphere of scientific observation, yet there is no difference in principle. In this world of sense and time, as in the super-sensuous and eternal world, marriage is constituted (p. 405) neither by ephemeral affections nor by contractual ceremonials, but by the reciprocal love, unifying in its tendencies and abiding in its nature, of one man and one woman.

If marriage be so regarded, polygamy is not a variety of marriage. The idea of marriage love between one man and several women is excluded by the expressed condition that marriage love is reciprocal between one man and one woman.

But a question may properly arise. Why the dictum as to one man and one woman? Why not one man and several women?

A little reflection will show, we think, that the definition of marriage in monogamous terms is not an arbitrary dictum. It is a logical conclusion from the premise that marriage love must in its nature be unifying.

In contradistinction to love that does not unify, such as friendship love, the love that does unify may be likened to chemical combinations in contradistinction to mechanical mixtures in physics. Friendship love only aggregates; it does not combine. Consequently it results only in association, not in union, and cannot make marriage. Marriage love must be a love that combines, coalesces, unifies.

Such love is possible only between persons of opposite sex. Between men only, or between women only, the unifying love of marriage is as impossible as electrical attraction between the same poles of a battery. Their love is the aggregative love of friendship; it is not the combining, coalescing and unifying love of marriage. Both the masculine and the feminine elements in marriage love are incomplete in themselves. Each needs its complementary element in order to constitute marriage.

This obvious principle of marriage has its physical analogue in the function of race reproduction.

For the complementary qualities of marriage love, which give to our language such endearing words as "husband" and "wife," may be said, and without mysticism, to be analogous to the physical qualities which give to the language such related words of endearment as "father" and "mother."

It seems superfluous to urge the consideration that marriage love must be sexual, that the complementary and reciprocal qualities indispensable to it do not belong to any kind of love which persons of either sex may have for others of the same sex. Yet the legitimacy of polygamous marriage (and polyandry is of course within the same principle) depends upon ignoring the logic of that most obvious consideration. If it be true that the unifying love of marriage subsists only between persons of opposite sex, does it not follow that marriage is naturally monogamous?

Even if it were conceded that in polygamous relationships each wife might love the common husband with the unifying love of marriage, and that the common husband might love each of his wives with the same kind of love, there would nevertheless be no marriage of all the members of that group; because there could be no unification of the group as a whole. The wives, being of the same sex, could not have the unifying love of marriage for one another.

The love that makes polygamous relationships, produces not a combination but an aggregation. However unifying, even in its heterogeneity, the love of the husband for all his wives and theirs for him may by any stretch of the unbridled imagination be supposed to be, the love of the wives for each other can at best be only the federative love of friendship. Polygamous relationships are no more marriages than a rhyming dictionary is poetry.

Concede that marriage love is the love which in its nature unifies, and you concede the monogamous principle.

Similar considerations are applicable to those marriage (or non-marriage) doctrines that are distinguished as "universal love," "free love," etc.

Strangely enough, the term "free love" has very unpleasant connotations. It has come to imply licentiousness; and the description of anyone as a "free lover" is equivalent to a denunciation of him as bestial. But no one can conceive of love that isn't free. Although tyranny may force men and women to do many things against their will, it cannot force any one to love another. All genuine love is free love.

The bestial connotations of "free love" are largely attributable, no doubt, to the idolatrous mind, which ignores the essence of things and lays all stress on superficialities—forgets the spirit while worshipping the symbol. But advocates of "free love" themselves have contributed no small share to the unpleasant significance of what ought to be one of the cherished terms in the vocabulary of marriage. They also have been led into doing it by concentrating their attention upon symbols instead of substance, upon form instead of essence. In their defiance of certain external forms of the marriage relation, they have neglected to distinguish marriage itself; and in consequence of this confusion they have assumed, in appearance at least, an attitude of hostility to the most sacred thing in human life.

When "free love" philosophies are honestly probed for the truth there may be in them, they will be found to rest upon more or less confused concepts of the idea of brotherly love. While some of them are utilitarian, formally denying the doctrine of brotherly love as a moral law, they nevertheless oppose marriage as strongly upon grounds of the utility of individual freedom as others do on grounds of brotherliness. For the purpose of this discussion they may be grouped with those that accept the doctrine of brotherly love as a moral or spiritual law.

The latter oppose marriage (not the contract alone but marriage itself), as unspiritual because hostile to the spiritual law that we must love all as ourselves—not one man or one woman, but all men and all women. This position depends really upon a verbal double meaning. The spiritual love of each for all, which makes for human brotherhood, is a radically different thing from the spir-

itual love which unites one man and one woman in marriage. Universal love and marital love are similar only in name.

Universal love does, indeed, extend from and to both sexes; but it does so only in the negative sense of ignoring sex distinctions. Being that love of each for all and of all for each, men and women, friend or enemy, which is inculcated by religious precept, it is the love that stimulates the sense and spirit of universal justice. In its nature, therefore, it is the same whether it flows reciprocally between persons of opposite sex, or between persons of the same sex.

Not so with marital love, the accidental similarity of name nevertheless. Marital love is that force which, whether we recognize it as spiritual or class it as sensual, so combines the human masculine and the human feminine parts of the human being as to constitute the human unit.

Latin forms of speech may possibly serve the purpose here of greater definiteness of expression. Universal love, the spiritual love of each for all and all for each, comprises that sense of justice which serves to federate the "homo," thereby forming society; but marriage love is the love that constitutes the "homo" by unifying its complementary parts, the "femina" and the "vir." The "homo," or unit of mankind, is really neither a man nor a woman, these being only the complementary parts. The true human unit is a man and a woman made as one (p. 405) by marriage.

This oneness is produced by the reciprocal sexual love that unifies complementaries — individuals who are complementary not only physically but also in their character-building tendencies. To think of marriage love as identical with brotherly or neighborly love in their spiritual sense, is to confuse different ideas through similarity of names. To infer from the spiritual or brotherly law of universal love that the reciprocal love of husband and wife, if exclusive, is selfish, and therefore unbrotherly and unspiritual, is to fall into one of the traps which lie in wait for minds that refuse or neglect to distinguish essential differences.

This criticism of the spiritual

philosophies that oppose marriage as selfish and unbrotherly, is appropriate also to the utilitarian philosophies which reject it as invasive and inexpedient. They confuse essential differences—differences which in the last analysis are very similar to those just indicated. Observing no essential difference, they make no clear distinction, between the general social federation of men and women and the marriage union of one man and one woman.

It does not follow, necessarily, that the same person may not be more than once genuinely married. Whether death or divorce clears the way for successive marriages remains to be considered. The emphasis at this point is confined to the question of promiscuity. It does not seem to us that promiscuity is natural. Whether in any of the unconventional forms of so-called "free love," which treat the most intimate sexual relation as an incident of ephemeral passion; or in the institutional forms of polygamy or polyandry, which substitute a harem or a hive for the home; or in the numerous prosti-tutional forms, which set up few claims to legitimacy,—promiscuity is not marriage. Though enjoined by the civil power and sanctioned by church authority, these relations would be marriage relations only in form. They could not be marriage itself. Marriage itself, let the outward form or symbolism be what it may, exists only when one man and one woman are united by reciprocal love abiding in its nature.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Oct. 13.

Usually, at the present stage of a Presidential campaign, excitement is at its highest; but in the one which is to end in less than four weeks, there has been no excitement, nor are there as yet any indications that there will be. Some meetings are being held and some speeches made, but there is no enthusiasm on either side. The most notable campaigning on the Democratic side is that of William J. Bryan, who has left Nebraska and Missouri to make an eight-day

tour of 52 appointments in Indiana, beginning on the 12th.

Thomas E. Watson's letter of acceptance as the Presidential candidate of the People's party was published on the 10th. Its spirit with reference to the present campaign may be inferred from the following extracts:

When two great political parties have, in turn, governed a country and have between them brought about unsatisfactory conditions, it is but natural that a third party should arise. . . . Much abuse has been heaped upon me because more time was devoted by me to denunciation of Parker than of Roosevelt. The reason is obvious enough. Roosevelt is a straight-out Republican, who declares boldly for Republican principles, defiantly defending existing conditions. To attack him is a short, easy job. He is so conspicuous and stationary a target that no one who wished to take a shot at him could possibly miss the mark. He is not in ambush; he is behind no "blind"; he stands out in the open; and he says to his enemies: "Here I am—a Republican who stands pat on all existing conditions; if you want a fight come on!" . . . Mr. Roosevelt will get Republican votes and no others. He is not seeking the support of Bryan Democrats upon false pretenses. He is not playing a confidence game on the Negro question. He is not attempting to win Jeffersonians by a sham adherence to Jeffersonian principles. In short, there is no danger that Jeffersonian democrats will vote for Roosevelt upon the assumption that he is a Jeffersonian democrat. There is no danger that Roosevelt will get a single vote to which I, as a Jeffersonian in principle, am entitled. With Mr. Parker it is different. He is not a Jeffersonian democrat, yet he seeks to secure the support of Jeffersonians. If he would speak out plainly and tell the people that he is in principle the same thing, practically, that Roosevelt is, the Bryan Democrats would fall away from him by the million. . . . The chosen advisers of Mr. Parker are the men who led for the trusts and corporations when the taxpayers were looted during Cleveland's second administration. From Gorman, who reeks with the foulest trust legislation of the last 20 years, to Carlisle, who wrote the sugar schedule at the dictation of the sugar trust, down to Olney, who in effect advised the too-willing Cleveland to send the United States army to the Pullman Palace Car company in Chicago, the notorious old band of boodlers are there. What may be expected of them if Parker is elected can be guessed by those who remember the carnival of class legislation which rendered forever infamous the second administration of Grover Cleveland. . . . To the extent that the opponents of Republican principles sup-