

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

of immortality that the human body is merely an appropriate covering for the human soul in the material environment in which its primary work is done. What submarine armor is to the diver while he works beneath the surface of the sea, such in principle is the body to the soul during the period of its character-building on earth.

Those who hold that belief maintain that human motive and human thought, and all else that goes to constitute the soul, or real man, survive his casting aside of the material body. To such as these, whatever their religious affiliations, the idea, or at least a feeling, must sometimes come—though they may ignore or even condemn the logic of it—that there is truth in the theory that the unifying love which constitutes marriage may possibly abide eternally, and that therefore perfect marriage may be an eternal relationship which is more or less faithfully expressed or dramatized by temporal marriage.

The impression we are trying to convey is that the idea is more than a speculation. Upon the hypothesis of eternal life, flowing from an omniscient and beneficent Creator, and in view of indisputable facts as to sex distribution, it is by no means irrational to infer that there is somewhere a wife for every man and a husband for every woman; that is that there exists in every feminine soul the potentiality of eternally-abiding love for some masculine soul, and in him the potentiality of reciprocally abiding love for her. Upon the same hypothesis, and in harmony with the same inference, those eternal mates must somewhere, sometime, somehow, be attracted to each other and exist forever after as one being—as one being in fundamental motive and thought, though distinctly individual in modes of expression.

If death is indeed a dreamless sleep, then there is truly no rationality in this thought about marriage. But neither, in that case, is there any rationality in the fact of human life. A being whose impulses are progressive, whose powers are creative, whose intellect is expansive, and who has

somehow acquired a moral sense, yet who ends it all in dreamless sleep, in a few years if he be considered as an individual, or a few centuries if he be considered as a race, is inexplicable.

His genesis cannot be rationally accounted for without assuming him to be an expression of some indestructible center of intelligent and beneficent force. His annihilation cannot be rationally accounted for without denying to that force both beneficence and intelligence. If human immortality is not, then there is no reason for human mortality.

But if the mortal does take on immortality, immortality itself would be unreasonable without what we call marriage. For the masculine and the feminine principles are no more truly characteristic of the body, than of those human qualities which are the immortal ones if any are. Feminine thought differs from masculine thought, feminine affections from masculine affections, feminine character as a whole from masculine character as a whole. But these differences, like sex differences of the body, are not antithetical; they are complementary. Masculine and feminine thought and affections must coalesce to constitute human thought and affections; masculine and feminine character must combine to constitute human character.

If, then, these qualities survive the mortal life, and individuality persists in the complete spiritual state, how is it possible to avoid the conclusion that marriage is as characteristic of that state as of this, and that all human kind will come to be perfectly mated? Celibacy is abnormal even in this imperfect life. Even here, where the spirit is contracted in its bodily mold, marriage is the great epoch and its joys the crowning joys of existence. How perfect, then, must the joys of marriage be beyond the mortal veil! How perfect, that is, if human life is indeed a rational fact, and we are not mere vapory forms of matter nor the puppets of a malicious intelligence, but spring from a beneficent as well as intelligent force whose laws pervade the spiritual as well as the physical universe.

In their temporal environment,

men and women are moved by affectional impulses, often erratic but always instinctive, which repel or attract, and so bring about selective unions which are either eternal marriages or expressive of the marriage impulse. Although there be no possibility of determining as to any one of these unions that it is or is not eternal marriage, that need raise no difficulty with reference to the problem of marriages for time as distinguished from those for eternity. Though the love which abides eternally be necessary to constitute the one, the love which abides for life (or which, at any rate, is of that nature) may reasonably be considered as constituting the other. And inasmuch as it is temporal marriages we have to deal with in this world, we need for ordinary practical purposes to be solicitous only about the marriage unions that are constituted by the love which is in its nature abiding for life.

Abiding love for life may, indeed, be regarded as expressive of the principle of abiding love for eternity; and temporal marriages, with all expressions, contracts and ceremonials of marriage, as consequently reaching back to the idea of eternal marriage. It is, perhaps, a vague recognition of this sequence that really gives to temporal marriage unions their profoundly sacred quality. Though these unions may be imperfect in the present life, though they be not actual marriages in the profoundest or most abiding sense, they may, none the less, be the natural symbols of eternal marriage and its temporal substitute.

If perfect marriage be impossible of realization during the character-making period of life, in a world where the greatest and most abiding realities are manifest to the physical senses only through moving pictures or dramatic representations, then the manifestations of abiding love which we observe in temporal marriage may very well be phenomena representing that eternal love which is inseparable from the most perfect marriage. The marriage union of one man and one woman, produced and cemented by love abiding in its nature for life, may be a genuine temporal marriage; it may be as truly such as the union of two fundamental

ly complementary characters, masculine and feminine, produced and cemented by love abiding in its nature for eternity, is a genuine eternal marriage.

Whoever denies the idea of the eternality of human life cannot be expected to adopt any of its corollaries. For the sanctity of marriage he would doubtless demand considerations which he regards as more substantial than these, to him, mystical and therefore nebulous speculations. That demand we shall hereafter try to meet. These suggestions are especially for readers who believe in the reality of the life beyond. If there is such a life, if it is individual, if it is an evolution from the Intelligence and Beneficence which sustain this life, then individual marriages of eternally complementary characters must be its crowning glory. In that case, this eternal ideal of marriage must be reflected in temporal marriages. To believe in the ideal of marriage eternal, is the better to understand its expressions in marriage temporal.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

##### NEW YORK.

New York, Oct. 4.—The prevailing impression among the Democratic politicians of New York is that the nomination of Judge D. Cady Herrick for Governor on the Democratic ticket, has entirely obliterated the factional feeling that has threatened the success of the national ticket at the polls.

The selection of Prof. Duncan Campbell Lee as chairman of the State convention and the nomination of Francis Burton Harrison for lieutenant governor are evidence that the leaders of the Democratic party recognize the importance of infusing young blood into the Democracy, as each of these gentlemen has just passed the age of 30. Prof. Lee was a formidable candidate for the lieutenant governorship, but was shunted into the permanent chairmanship to make way for Harrison. The nomination of the latter was made to appease Tammany, although Harrison can hardly be classed as an unqualified Tammany man. No doubt the strong factor in determining the eligibility of his selection was the fact that he has wealth back of him. He is a son-in-law of Charles Crocker, one of California's multi-millionaires, and there is no doubt that he will cheerfully respond to a heavy campaign assessment.

The outlook for the Democratic state

ticket is much brighter than it is for the national ticket. It is generally conceded that Gov. Odell has committed a serious political blunder in making himself the target for the Democratic shafts rather than the nominee of the head of the State ticket. The Republicans have a decided advantage in having a superb organization throughout the State, while their antagonists have practically no organization outside of Greater New York. The election of Herrick and Harrison will stimulate organization and will no doubt result in the building up of a machine throughout the State that will force David B. Hill to keep faith with himself in his campaign pledges.

The uncertain quantity that will decide the result in this State is the up-State floating vote, which is conceded on both sides to be more than 35 per cent. of the vote outside of Greater New York and Buffalo. In 1896 and 1900 the Republicans controlled this corrupt vote practically on their own terms, but it is generally conceded that there will be a heavy competition for it this year. With such a skillful politician and manipulator as W. F. Sheehan there is little doubt that a corruption fund can be raised and distributed where it will effect results without passing through the hands of the treasurer of the national committee. Sheehan and Collen are the attorneys for the Brooklyn Rapid Transit company, which controls all the elevated and surface lines except one small system in Brooklyn.

A significant feature of this campaign is the close alliance of the great traction magnates of the country with the Parker campaign committee. While Sheehan, the trusted and confidential representative of Judge Parker, dominates the Brooklyn system, Thomas F. Ryan, a member of the national executive committee, is one of the largest traction magnates of the country. He is, and has been, associated with Whitney, Widener, Elkins and Dolan, who control the entire systems of several of the larger cities as well as those of New York and Philadelphia. Then there is August Belmont, who controls the elevated systems and the new subway of Manhattan. This trio of railway magnates are practically in control of the Parker campaign.

If Bird S. Coler had a machine organization behind him it is possible that Herrick would suffer at the polls in retaliation for the party treachery which defeated Coler two years ago. It is openly charged that a combination between Judge Herrick, whose residence is in the Albany district; ex-Senator Murphy, of Troy, and Smith M. Weed, of Clinton county, a millionaire protectionist and a heavy owner of iron mining land, defeated Coler. The fact that the defection in the Democratic vote in these three districts was greater than Odell's plurality in the State gives strong circum-

stantial evidence that the allegation has foundation.

The renomination of Robert Baker, which was made last night without a contest, as the Democratic candidate for Congress in the Sixth district of New York, marks a distinct advance of single tax influences in the Democratic party. While Mr. Baker was not elected as a single taxer, yet in his canvass two years ago, on the floor of Congress, in public addresses, as well as in newspaper and magazine articles, he has made it clearly apparent that his ultimate goal is the single tax. In fact, so much has this been kept to the front, that some of his friends, equally devoted to that cause, have at times protested against so much prominence being given to that subject because of its not yet being a political issue; but he has maintained at all times that he is in politics solely to promote single tax doctrines.

When he made his race two years ago he was practically alone in the conviction that he could be elected. Although the district is normally Republican the result vindicated his judgment. He is confident now of again carrying the district if the right kind of campaign can be carried on.

In addition to the cart-tail meetings which were found to be so effective in 1902, it is now necessary to place his record in Congress in the hands of every voter in the district. For over a year the work of distributing literature through this district has been intelligently prosecuted. He has positive evidence that this work has produced good results and he deems it essential to continue the work along this line.

The new literature that should besent out will not be frankable and will entail a heavy outlay for postage. It is generally believed here that Baker's friends throughout the country, recognizing the importance of his reelection, will come to his aid in contributions for campaign expenses. A strong factor that will contribute to his success is the host of friends he has throughout Greater New York outside of his district, who will bring a strong personal pressure to bear on their friends and acquaintances who reside in his district.

The following notices from two of the most conservative dailies of New York, commenting on Baker's renomination, are an indication that he has gained for himself a reputation as a Representative that such papers are compelled to recognize. He is at least no mediocre Congressman:

From the New York Evening Post October 4—

The renomination of Robert Baker in Brooklyn was a triumph of the radical Democracy over McCarrenism. Mr. Baker's explosive methods have not always been taken seriously on the floor of Congress, but they secured his election in a normally Republican district. If he will concede more to the traditions of "the greatest deliberative body," he has the chance to become a very useful member.