

LINCOLN, NEB., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 2 1895.



ENTERED IN THE POST OFFICE AT LINCOLN AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY

THE COURIER PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.

Office 217 North Eleventh St.

Telephone 384

W. MORTON SMITH Editor and Manager
SARAH B. HARRIS Associate Editor
WILLA CATHER Associate Editor

Subscription Rates—In Advance.

Per annum	\$2.00
Six months	1.00
Three months	50
One month	20
Single copies	5

OBSERVATIONS

The daily newspapers are constantly casting about for "reforms" to advocate. In nine cases out of ten they pass by those things that should be taken up and discussed, and content themselves with puerile vapors on subjects so remote that the people have utterly no interest in them. The *Journal*, for instance, discusses "trans-atlantic subjects," and pl. ads for reform in English politics, and leaves unnoticed abuses and wrongs right at its door that have a vital interest for its constituency. But the *Journal* would much rather write leaders about Englishmen or Portugese than talk about things and people here at home. There is no danger of offending the Englishmen and the Portugese. Discussing home affairs might make somebody angry. The *Journal's* policy, as is well known, is conciliation.

There is one shameful practice that calls for the attention of all who are interested in the welfare of humanity, the morality of society. This may let the *Journal* out. But it might do something, and that active afternoon paper, the *News*,—surely it could find no better outlet for the righteous indignation it is so fond of exploding. I refer to the vicious abuse of the law governing divorce. THE COURIER has on many occasions voiced the feeling of protest and indignation that all proper-minded persons feel at the divorce outrages that are daily committed in this state,—in Lincoln. Some recent happenings in this city and elsewhere serve to bring the subject to public attention once more, and I hope it may be possible to awaken a sentiment, in this city at

least, that will be an effective protest against the species of degradation that the judges of our courts do not seem disposed to restrict.

Divorce is in most states so easily obtainable that it has come to be an encourager of crime. Husbands and wives find in the modern divorce court a medium of exchange for partners of whom they have tired, and the exchange is accomplished with so much facility that a premium is placed on marital infidelity. The divorce court is really a mart where the wife brings a husband who no longer pleases her fancy, and exchanges him as she would an old lamp, for a new one, where the husband, who wants a partner more in accord with his latest mood, drags his wife who is no longer new, and procures an official license to barter for one more to his liking. The divorce court, as it exists in Lancaster county, and in nearly all sections of the country, makes a mockery of the holy sacrament of marriage. The church binds together "until death do part." The divorce court tempts men and women to break their vows. The minister says, "be faithful each to the other." The judge of the divorce court says, "leave your husband or your wife if you are not suited or have a later fancy, and come to me, and get a permit to try it over again." This is not exaggeration. I believe an investigation would prove that in fifty per cent of the recent divorce cases in this county either the husband or the wife was preparing to re-marry at the time the suit was brought, and that proceedings were instituted for that purpose.

A. F. Leiss, a merchant in this city, becoming infatuated with a young woman in his employ, prevailed upon his wife to obtain a divorce, representing to her that he would continue to support her. September 23 a divorce was granted.

Sunday's *Journal* contained the following announcement:

A. F. Leiss and Miss Lou Harlow were married by Mr. Cook, justice of the peace, in the parlors of the Grand hotel, Council Bluffs, Ia., October 26.

The divorce, though asked for by Mrs. Leiss, was prompted by Leiss for the sole purpose of enabling him to marry again. A wife is deserted for a new favorite and left helpless and alone. And the courts encourage this sort of thing. The Leiss incident is only one of a large number.

In the *Journal* of Tuesday appeared the following from the *Owassa*, (Mich) *Evening Argus*, of October 24:

Last evening Mrs Cora Whited was married to Lawrence P. Gould at the residence of the bride's father, William Richards, on North Mulberry street. No guests but the family witnessed the ceremony, which was performed by Rev. W. B. Matteson.

Gould is the man who was divorced

from his wife within a couple of months, and left this city under a cloud.

There are many cases within recall where re-marriage has followed within a month, and often in a few days. The law in this state prohibits a divorcee to re-marry until six months have elapsed since the granting of the divorce. But it is an easy matter to avoid the law. All that is necessary is to go to an adjoining state. In commerce it is not always permissible for a person to avoid the intent of the law by resorting to a process in another state; but in this matter of divorce and re-marriage a person may laugh at the law by simply passing the boundary line of the state. In New York the court in granting divorces frequently imposes a prohibition against re-marriage for a term of years. The divorcee at once goes into another state and marries again, setting in defiance the court's decree.

The other day Amelie Rives Chanler got a divorce from her husband because they were not able to "accommodate themselves to each other." It was common report that the recent Vanderbilt divorce had for one of its objects the speedy re-marriage of one of the parties, a report that may be speedily confirmed. One day last week Mabel Yznaga was divorced from her husband, the decree being secured in South Dakota. The press dispatches throw the following light on this case:

In 1893 rumors came from across the water that the Yznagas were not happy together. But these were only rumors, and though people looked wise and shrugged their shoulders, that was all that could be said until February, 1894, when Mabel arrived in this country, leaving her husband in Rome. This was "confirmation strong as holy writ," and the gossips were delighted. When the season came she went to Newport, and there met Count Bela Zichy, jr., a Hungarian nobleman, aged 27 years, whom nature has favored freely. They were much together during the season, became deeply attached to each other, and, according to rumor, at the close of the season she informed her husband of her tender feeling toward the young foreigner and suggested to him that in view of this fact, and the other incident that his company had become distasteful to her, they could not live together longer. That being the case, this guileless young society queen added naively that it would be a good idea for him to allow her to procure a divorce. Mr. Yznaga, being somewhat of the world worldly, agreed to this, it is said, and even gave assurance that he would make no opposition to any suit with that object in view which she might institute.

It is said that Count Zichy was with Mrs. Yznaga in Yankton during the required six months residence, under an assumed name.

Mrs. Langtry is getting a divorce for the avowed purpose of marrying Sir Robert Peel.

And here is an interesting case: LACON, Ill., Oct. 25.—Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Strawn of Lacon, something like

twenty three or twenty-four years ago, were married in this city, and lived happily together for a number of years. Then they quarreled over some trifling matter and were divorced. As time passed the two remembered each other's better qualities. Leroy made love to his former wife, was accepted, and after a short courtship the two were made one again. Then came another misunderstanding, followed by a second divorce, and now they have been married for the third time. The groom is 48 and the bride 43 years old.

The list might be extended indefinitely. If this sort of thing is to continue the marriage rite might about as well be abandoned altogether. When husbands and wives change partners at will, marry and re-marry, get divorced because they cannot accommodate themselves to each other, go into court with a divorce petition in one hand and a new candidate for matrimonial favor in the other, it seems to me that a condition closely approaching the "free love," advocated by Victoria Woodhull is at hand. Both the marriage and the divorce are a mockery. Either can be so readily obtained that ties are disregarded, and men and women are encouraged in viciousness.

In this county there is absolutely no bar interposed to these marital jugglers. The judge receives an application for divorce one minute and writes the decree in the next. There is no investigation, no delay. And the vicious are eager to take advantage of the privileges or licenses here dispensed. The court becomes an enemy to the marriage state, a promoter of infidelity, an instrument for the furtherance of immorality. There is urgent need of a revision of the divorce law, and a change in judicial practice. This is one of the most important subjects now before the people, and it deserves prompt attention. The ministers, like the newspapers, are on the lookout for something to reform, and I would suggest that they take up this subject of divorce. The churches could do a good deal in arousing sentiment on this question.

Since the death of ex-United States Senator C. H. Van Wyck, he has been generally eulogized by the press, republican papers as well as those of populist inclinations paying tribute to this remarkable man. Within the last two years Van Wyck was made the subject of numerous discussions in THE COURIER, and despite the flattering remarks now made upon him by other republican newspapers I am not disposed to recall anything that has been said in these columns. Death did not change the character of this man. He had many good qualities. He was open hearted, generous, benevolent, and to a certain extent, patriotic, but he was an arrant demagogue. In late years especially, he catered to popular prejudices and made a generally ridiculous exhibition of himself. Van Wyck in his long career rendered valuable ser-