

John S. Crosby and Mrs. Crosby, Mrs. Goldzier, Charles O'Connor Hennessy and his wife and Lincoln Steffens. Some were from nearby, others from far away, many I have known these many years and am amazed to see growing grey, and all with one accord were doing honor and giving encouragement to the man who has been for years distinctively the political pioneer of the movement to which Henry George gave voice.

Some of us are so bewitched with the vision of brotherhood which George opened our eyes to, that we are apt to despise the commonplace method he proposed for realizing it. Others of us are so enthralled by his simple and common sense method, that we forget the vision it aims to realize. But Tom L. Johnson has kept a steady hand on the method without losing sight of the vision, and a steady eye on the vision without resolving it into a dream.

L. F. P.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### THE DIVORCE QUESTION.

South Portland, Me.

In Chicago recently Archbishop Falconio was quoted as saying: "I consider the prevalence of divorce the greatest of this country's evils, and I consider the misuse of wealth by the brainless rich, who promote divorce and other evils, the greatest menace to the United States."

I will not concede to any man that divorce is evil. Webster defines divorce as "A legal dissolution of the bonds of matrimony, or the separation of husband and wife by a judicial sentence." Before there can be any divorce, then, there must first be marriage, and what is marriage? A few might answer, "Heaven;" but some would surely answer "Hell," therefore, I think we had better take Webster's definition again: "Marriage is a contract, both civil and religious, by which the parties engage to live together in mutual affection and fidelity till death shall separate them. Marriage was instituted by God himself, for the purpose of preventing promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, for promoting domestic felicity and for securing the maintenance and education of children."

The religious contract contains this clause: "Whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder." It is God, then, who joins them, the man and woman together. And who and what is God? After years of study and thought I believe that God is love, nothing more and nothing less. Not the silly passion of the boy and girl, or the lustfulness of grosser natures, but the love that holds the world together; the love of the mother; the trusting love of the child; the love that will suffer even death, willingly, for the object of its affection; the love that sends men and women to the slums to help their lowly brothers and sisters; love for nature, beauty and worth. That is God, the power that moves us, that rules us, and makes us marry. Happiness is Heaven, and Love is God.

Then if Love is God and God is Love, and the people whom he has joined together renounce him, for when they cease to love each other they cease to

see God in the question, Love and God are no longer in the contract. It is no longer marriage as God planned; then why the horror of divorce? Rather should they have a horror of living together, people who no longer have a marriage contract. As to "domestic felicity," let us see what "domestic felicity" really means. We will try Webster again: "Felicity, happiness, or rather great happiness; blessedness; appropriately, the joys of heaven." With the contract broken, for when there is no longer "mutual affection," that part of the contract is void, where does "domestic felicity," "the joys of heaven," come in? That part of the contract looks cracked, to say the least.

When there is no love, no God, in the contract, it is shameful for people to live together; it is the lowest kind of life; nothing can excuse it. It is not divorce, but marriage with wrong intention, that is evil. Divorce is the golden key that opens the prison doors for many poor helpless creatures. Divorce should be as free as marriage. Those who are honorable, the men and women who really make marriage the holy institution that God intended it to be, will stay married. For the rest, give them the chance, honorably and legally, to try again; and don't make of them the low creatures that all good men and women despise.

Divorce should be had for the asking. Under present laws the party or parties desiring divorce must commit a crime to obtain it; and that is the only evil in divorce—the difficulty in obtaining it.

And now we come to the last part of the marriage contract, "the maintenance and education of children." Children are not necessary to complete happiness in married life, but when they do come, they are one of "the joys of heaven." Children born of marriage where love comes and stays through all the years of life, do not need our consideration. The love that gives them life will provide for them. It is the little creatures where the marriage contract is broken that claim our attention. Sometimes when the love for the husband or wife or even both has gone, the love for the child remains, and that child is often well provided for.

The court granting the divorce should see to the "maintenance and education of children." If the parents cannot provide for them in their divided state, then the government should. I have come to this conclusion since reading of Ex-President Roosevelt's talks on race suicide. If the government desires increased production of any sort, and those talks would lead us to believe it did, it ought to be willing to take care of it when the demand is supplied. It surely ought to be willing to take care of all helpless American Citizens, unable to care for themselves. There are National Soldiers' Homes, why not National Children's Homes?

ANNIE H. QUILL.

+ + +

Tell me, O Cow, with tranquil air,  
Feeding in pastures green,  
Why is it that you always wear  
An attitude serene?  
No indigestion mars thy dreams,  
No cramps provoke thy cries.  
"It is," the knowing Cow replied,  
"Because I Fletcherize." —Life.