

with luminous lights, glorious bounties, which are dispersing the darkness conducive to unity and uprooting in harmony.—M. G. H.

ADVISES FREE LOVE.—Some of the regulars in The Public Forum have over and again spoken of the "laws of nature." I take it for granted that they know what they are speaking about. Though none of them ever explained what those laws are. As for me, I never knew quite right what a "law" of nature is, since I don't think there is any such thing. And I am ready to prove it at any time. Those, however, who consider themselves subject to those so-called laws of nature are invited herewith to accept a proposition. I wish to take up the subject of marriage.

Almost all people are more or less dissatisfied with our existing marriage laws. I propose to serve those people by making another law that will suit everybody. I am not very well satisfied myself with the existing law and therefore am going to help you in the manufacture of another. Here is my "law."

Marriage is the voluntary cohabitation of a man and a woman with the purpose of sexual intercourse. No license nor ceremony in any one form shall be necessary to get married. The marriage is automatically dissolved by the voluntary parting of either party in marriage, and no obligation whatsoever shall rest upon either of them. If neither of the parties, whether in cohabitation or separated, wishes to care for their children the community shall care for the latter. In the latter case, no obligation whatsoever shall be laid upon the parents for the maintenance of those children.

You may smile for a minute. After that, just be as serious as I am. I want to defend this "law" of mine. It isn't really a law, it is rather a statement. There is nothing prohibited nor binding in it. One may call it an assurance of the absolute lib-

erty of the people in handling their own purely personal matters. Are the friends of nature and her "laws" in favor of it, and, if so, have they any amendments to make?—Max Man.

WHAT DOES FREEDOM MEAN?

—Modern constitutions guarantee the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right of assemblage and many other things nearly related to these rights. But when we come to find out just the meaning of this kind of freedom we find that its exercise depends either upon the opinion of the police on duty at the time or upon the opinion of the judge who happens to be called upon to say whether we are exercising our rights or are violating the law.

Of course, our freedom must be controlled by the equal freedom of each other man, which is at times difficult to define. It would seem that orderly street meetings at points where street traffic is not obstructed might come under the head of equal freedom, but in the minds of some administrations such meetings must not go to the point of criticising the powers that be or the justice of the existence of present institutions.

The police are to blame. The judges on the bench are not to blame for restricted freedom. The privileged ones of the earth are not all to blame. They are doing what they think is right. Privilege is to most of us a natural thing. It is in our opinion unfortunate that all of us cannot be benefited by privilege, but it must not be disturbed. Fate may land us in a soft spot.

Ignorance of the truth blinds the way to the establishment of freedom. Many of those who feel the oppression of misdirected police power do not know what they want, and those who revel in the luxury of special privilege do not realize that even the stern repression of discussion is no protection for them.

Luxury has banqueted time and time again in the history of the