

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-

port me in 1904, the hands of those will be strengthened who shall make war upon the Republicans in 1908. The present attitude of the national Democracy is an impossible one. They will be driven from it beyond all doubt. Four years from now the Belmonts, Gormans and Hills should be put into the Republican camp, where they belong. The real Democrats will return to their Kansas City and Chicago platforms. In some honorable way the Bryan Democrats must act with us; the cause demands it; duty requires it; patriotism exacts it; to the success of true Democracy it is indispensable. To preserve an organization of resistance to the plutocracy, to show them that they cannot play their selfish games quite so easily as they had imagined, to make them feel that there is life in the people yet to form a nucleus around which the betrayed people may rally, we make this struggle.

The Republican situation in politics is the most disturbing in Wisconsin. Since the decision of the highest court of that State in favor of the La Follette, or "half-breed" faction of the party (p. 425), the "stalwarts" have been under pressure from the Republican national committee to abandon their opposition to La Follette. In consequence the "stalwart" candidate for governor, Samuel A. Cook, promptly resigned. But the "stalwart" State committee, unwilling to withdraw their ticket, have named ex-Gov. Edward Scofield to take Mr. Cook's place and Scofield has accepted. They name their faction the "National Republican Party." The Republican national committee has now ignored the "stalwart" State committee and formally recognized the La Follette faction. But the "stalwarts" have decided to continue the fight.

At the county primaries for Milwaukee on the 7th, the La Follette faction was completely victorious. It will control the county convention by a safe majority and take over the county organization which has heretofore been controlled by the now defeated "stalwarts."

In Massachusetts on the 7th the Republicans nominated Gov. John L. Bates for governor, against whom, on the same day, the Democrats nominated William L. Douglas. The tariff issue is uppermost in this State, with

reference especially to reciprocity with Canada, both parties advocating reciprocity. The Republicans ask for "reciprocity treaties with foreign countries, and especially with Canada and Newfoundland, upon such terms and conditions as will secure an enlargement of our foreign trade, for the common benefit of our principle, wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistently with the principles of protection." The Democrats demand reciprocity in hostility to the system of protection, which they hold responsible for trusts and the unwholesome prosperity of "the huge industrial giant, otherwise known as 'infant industries.'"

The Republicans of Rhode Island nominated Charles P. Utter for governor on the 12th; and on the same day the two Republican factions of Delaware agreed upon a fusion ticket with Preston Lea (anti-Addicks) for governor, and Isaac T. Parker (pro-Addicks) for lieutenant governor.

One of the straws in the currents of organized labor, disclosing a tendency toward political action, was the report of Mr. Barney Cohen, as president of the Illinois Federation of Labor, at its opening session at Aurora on the 11th. In this report Mr. Cohen urged a political programme by saying:

The question of the unemployed man is the question to be solved. It is the question that must be solved. . . . Now there is only one place a man can live and obtain food, clothing and shelter and be a free man, and this place is the land. He is a land animal, and land is necessary to his existence. But land is monopolized and the institution of land monopoly has become so firmly entrenched in common thought by 300 years of habit, that it can be better attacked through reform in taxation than by direct assault. If the values of this monopoly were absorbed by direct taxes upon it its evils would soon be destroyed.

Fortunately the way is open to organized labor in this State of Illinois to make that kind of attack, and to make it effectively and at once. At the election this fall, three questions are to be voted upon under the public policy referendum law. The third of these relates directly to the subject under consideration. It is as follows: "Shall the State legislature submit to the voters of the State of Illinois at the next following State election an amendment to the State constitution which will enable the voters of every county, city, vil-

lage or township of the State of Illinois to adopt such system of assessing and levying taxes as the voters of any such county, city, village or township may determine?" This is right in itself. The people of every locality should have power to levy their own taxes in their own way. The proposition should command the support of every one who believes in home rule and government by the people. Organized labor, therefore, ought to do all in its power to secure votes at the coming election for this non-partisan home rule measure.

After it has been recommended by referendum, more pressure will be needed. The legislature must then adopt and submit to the people the necessary constitutional amendment. So I hope to see you instruct your legislative committee in the event of a majority this Fall in favor of this proposition, to secure from the legislature the proposed constitutional amendment. I would further suggest that the labor organizations of the State be urged to devote their energies to securing the adoption of the amendment by the voters of the State. When that shall have been accomplished every locality will be at liberty to select its own method of taxation, and organized labor can then secure taxes destructive of land monopoly in every community in which it can influence local sentiment.

With active work this can be accomplished within a short time, and the New Zealand system of exempting labor and taxing land monopoly for local purposes can be in full operation in a number of our localities. This is a line of work that can be prosecuted at once and with reasonable expectation of early benefits. . . . I can well understand the difficulty of securing the desired legislation, or in fact much of any real labor legislation from legislators so largely influenced by the employing and privileged classes, and a thorough consideration of this matter convinces me that labor must play a dual role in the future in its own interest. In the first platform of the American Federation of Labor, adopted at Pittsburg, Pa., in 1881, it was declared to be one of the objects of the organization "to secure legislation favorable to the interests of the industrial classes," and the same thought has been expressed in countless trades union platforms ever since, as well as being a part of our own constitution.

But we are a little too slow in living up to our own declarations. It seems to me that a little more activity in this direction can do no harm and may be productive of a great deal of good, and I would therefore recommend that you consider the advisability of taking immediate steps, after January next, to organize politically as well as economically throughout the State, so as to force legislation favorable to us at the earliest possible time. The political feature can be separated from the trades