

is whether we shall have a republic or an empire. If the south was held in the Union by force it must be remembered that the people were held as citizens and not as subjects. The people of the south have their members of congress, their senators and their presidential electors, as well as their local self-government; they share in the destiny of the nation and in the guarantees of the constitution. The administration wants to hold the Filipinos under the flag but outside the constitution—they are to be subjects, amenable to our laws, not citizens who participate in the making of laws. The south suffered from carpet bag rule; it knows what injustice can be wrought by an irresponsible government administered from without and it can guess what sort of treatment will be accorded the Filipinos. The people of the south know something, too, of the race question which we already have, and their experience teaches them that it is not wise to add another race question of still greater magnitude. The editor of the Telegraph would do his people a greater service if he would join with the democrats of the north in saving from overthrow the principles of a republic. The dangers of the present are too serious to permit us to quarrel over things which took place a third of a century ago.

### Herron Attacks Marriage System.

Prof. Herron has committed an unpardonable sin—he has attacked the marriage system. So long as he confined his efforts to the amelioration of social conditions his motives were respected whatever criticism may have been directed against his methods or his theories. But when he rebels against a marriage system which requires a husband to care for his wife and perform a father's duty, he forfeits public esteem. In his letter to the Congregational church, replying to an invitation which had been extended to him to join in calling a council to inquire into his ministerial standing and church membership, he took occasion to condemn the entire system of marriage as immoral and blasphemous. The following extract is sufficient to set forth his views on the subject:

"I do not believe that the present marriage system is sacred or good. It rather seems to me the destruction of the liberty and love and truth which make sacred and worth while. If love and truth are the basis of morality, then a marriage system which makes one human being the property of another, without regard to the well-being of either the owned or the owner, seems to me to be the very soul of blasphemy and immorality.

"The family founded on force is a survival of slavery and one of the expressions of the slave principles on which our whole slave civilization is built. It is made of the superstition which thinks it good for human beings to own each other and good for the race to have all the sources and tools of life owned by the few who are strong and cunning and unscrupulous to possess them."

Mr. Herron made no defense to the suit for divorce instituted by his wife, and in his letter he announced his purpose to marry a Miss Rand (whom he has since married). He is not the first man to become alienated from his wife by falling in love with another woman, but he differs from others in attempting to exonerate himself by assailing the most sacred human institution. He endeavors to spiritualize and

idealize a new attachment which is neither spiritual nor ideal. It is only charitable to suppose that he loved his first wife when he promised to love and care for her; it is only charitable to assume that this love was present when his home was blessed with the children whom he now abandons. But he allowed his heart to stray away from his own home to the home of another; he allowed an acquaintance to usurp his wife's place in his affections. He calls the new attachment "comradeship," but that does not sanctify or excuse his conduct. So far as the evidence shows his wife was a comrade before his affections were withdrawn and did what she could to continue the comradeship. He deliberately chose to repudiate his marriage vows, and now, rather than admit that he has fallen from the path of honor and uprightness, he cries out against domestic virtue and conjugal happiness.

Marriage is not slavery; neither the husband nor the wife owns the other. They are joint occupants of earth's holiest tenement. One may so act as to forfeit the confidence of the other and it may be even wise, under some circumstances, for them to separate, but such exceptions do not justify a wholesale condemnation of the marriage system. The christian home is not a prison; there is room enough and freedom enough in it for the development of all that is pure and noble. Its character would not be improved by a free and frequent change of partners. Children should be protected from the results of a "freedom" which would lead to the disruption of the family every time a person appeared who seemed to husband or wife more congenial than the other.

According to Prof. Herron's theory, the highest virtue is to live the truth—to be one's self. He says:

"Civilization, with its network of falsehood and suspicion, of retribution and revenge, is a sort of world conspiracy against the soul's integrity and individuality. Yet the right of a single soul to fully and freely express itself, to live out and show forth all the truth about itself, so that it need have within itself no hidden things, but be naked before the universe and not be ashamed, is infinitely more important than the whole fabric of civilization."

There are times when to be without a sense of shame indicates an absence of conscience.

It is not sufficient that one should reveal his inmost self to the world; if that were all the vilest sinner could become a saint by confessing his wickedness. Something more is necessary; there should be repentance and works meet for repentance. It is more important that one improve himself than that he exhibit himself; it is more virtuous to resist temptation than to boldly admit having yielded to it. The marriage system will survive this attack, as it has survived others, but Mr. Herron will not add to his usefulness by the position which he has taken.

### Is Watterson a Plagiarist?

THE COMMONER is indebted to one of its readers for calling attention to the similarity between Mr. Watterson's definition of a statesman and the views expressed by Hon. Preserved Doe in the Bigelow papers. Mr. Watterson says: "He is no statesman who

has not learned to detach his policies from his visions." Mr. Doe presents the same idea in verse when he says:

That truth, to dror kindly in all sorts of harness,  
Must be kep' in the abstract—for come to apply it,  
You're apt to hurt some folks' interists by it.

And folks don't want Fourth o' July t' interfere  
With the business consarns o' the rest o' the year,  
No more'n they want Sunday to pry an' to peek  
Into wut they are doin' the rest o' the week.

A ginooine statesman should be on his guard,  
Ef he must hev beliefs, not to b'lieve 'em to hard;

No, never say nothin' without you're compelled to,  
And then don't say nothin' that you can be held tu,  
Nor don't leave no friction—idees layin' loose  
For the ign'ant to put to incend'ary use!

Of course the language is sufficiently different to protect Mr. Watterson from the charge of borrowing the phraseology with which he clothed his idea, but the idea itself is so like Mr. Doe's conception of statesmanship as to suggest that both drew their inspiration from a common source, even if the former did not imitate the latter. It is bad enough if Mr. Watterson originated the idea—what shall we say of him if he borrowed so poor a definition without giving proper credit?

### No Third Term.

President McKinley has issued a statement completely setting at rest the discussion of a possible third term. He says:

"Executive Mansion, Washington, June 11.—I regret that the suggestion of a third term has been made. I doubt whether I am called upon to give it notice. But there are now questions of the gravest importance before the administration and the country and their just consideration should not be prejudiced in the public mind by even the suspicion of the thought of a third term. In view, therefore, of the reiteration of the suggestion of it I will say now, once for all, expressing a long-settled conviction, that I not only am not and never will be a candidate for a third term, but would not accept a nomination for it if it were tendered me.

"My only ambition is to serve through my second term to the acceptance of my countrymen, whose generous confidence I so deeply appreciate, and then with them to do my duty in the ranks of private citizenship.

"WILLIAM McKINLEY."

The field is now open for a new candidate and already a number of names have been entered. The third term discussion served a useful purpose, however, in that it brought out the fact that the imperialistic sentiment rampant among republican leaders is ready to override traditions as well as the constitution. Congressman Grosvenor was the last prominent man to espouse the third term idea before the President put a quietus upon it. He not only declared it time to "demolish the fiction" that there should be no third term, but went so far as to slander Washington. His interview reads:

"McKinley is personally the most popular president we have had in a long time, and he has certainly most creditably performed the duties of his high office. I think it is time, furthermore, to demolish the fiction that there is an unwritten law established by Washington that no president of the United States may accept a third term. The facts are, as any student of the times may dis-