

## What is a BROKEN HEART WORTH?



**Charles I. the Monkey for Whose Death Its Owners Asked \$2,000,000 Damages.**

THE charming Baroness Ursula Barbara von Kallnowsky, of Vienna and New York, has set a new price upon broken hearts. By her suit against James Hurley, a wealthy St. Louis contractor and clubman, she has sent quotations on fractured loves rocketing skyward. Two and a half millions, in vulgar bourgeois figures, \$2,500,000, is the value she places upon a heart no longer whole.

By this claim she causes Miss Daisy Markham, the London actress, to bow her head in humiliation, for Miss Markham asked and received only a paltry quarter of a million for her broken heart. The son of an earl gave it to her, too. From which, although it is the record verdict, we must conclude that Miss Markham's bruised affections are, for some reason not readily apparent, worth but one-tenth those of the German Baroness. And the heart was given to the wealthy Marquis of Northampton, too.

The question arises: What is a broken heart really worth? How can its injuries be standardized?

Merely commercial minds are also sorely puzzled by the fact that while the English court placed so high a rating on a maiden's heart and while a German noblewoman raises the ante ten times, the largest equivalent granted for a whole human life, which certainly includes a completely disabled heart, was that awarded Mrs. Katrina Trask for the death of her husband, the late multimillionaire, Spencer Trask, \$60,000.

This verdict did not, however, deter the owners of the trained monkey, Charles I., from asking \$200,000 for their loss by his death.

Again, a jury gave six cents to his parents for the killing of a college youth, and another New York jury granted one woman \$25,000 for the loss of her leg. But while a Judge across the Hudson River refused to permit any damages to be paid for the same sort of loss, saying that the remarkable modern efficacy of cork legs must be taken into consideration.

One baby's life was rated at \$7,500, another was deemed to be worth the expenses of burial, \$150, and a third, according to the Judge, had absolutely no pecuniary value.

An actress has received \$7,250 for an injury to her eye that robbed her of easy facial expression, and a milliner was refused \$2,000, although her shoulder was so scarred by an accident that she could no longer wear a décolleté gown. Her shoulders, by the way, were unusually beautiful.

This confusion of ratings suggests that we need a standardization of human values, including broken hearts, and raises the question why a heart is accounted of more worth than a leg, why spurned affections bull the market, while the loss of an eye or a leg bears it. Why is love worth more than life? Why are an actress' dubious affections of more commercial value than a rich philanthropist's life? And why should a titled lady get \$2,500,000 for her fractured heart while a woman who lost both arms and both legs in a railroad accident received only \$50,000. The Baroness' heart will be good hereafter for all practical purposes, while the other woman's members were not.

The Baroness Kallnowsky's logic of the situation, a friend says, is this: It is much better to be dead than to have been robbed of your heart's happiness, for without happiness life is less than nothing.

"The Baroness says this false and elusive Mr. Hurley is her first love. That in itself is a possession beyond price. A girl's first love is better than a widow's second or a divorcee's sixth. The Baroness believes that she is allowing Mr. Hurley to escape lightly with the payment of two and a half paltry millions. We believe that if this broken-hearted noblewoman secured actual justice he would forfeit all his fortune to her and go to prison for the rest of his life, there to meditate on the sin of fickleness. The Baroness has a title and at Wiesbaden high social position. These, too, have their value. Is not the heart of a Baroness worth more than that of a shop-girl? Certainly.

**The Baroness Ursula Demands \$2,500,000 from a St. Louis Millionaire---The Record Price Paid Is \$250,000 and the Record Price for a Whole Life Only \$60,000.**

"The price of hearts depends also upon the wealth of the person who has stolen and undervalued it. Mr. Hurley is very rich. You comprehend?"

Yet the heart of Mrs. Susie Merrill, who achieved unpleasant notoriety in the second of the Harry Thaw trials for murder, was the subject of a jest by a jury. Her affections were rated at nothing, and she received it. She was awarded nothing.

The price of hearts fluctuates as crazily as do wild-cat stocks in a panic on Wall Street. It depends on how great is the aggregate of sentiment in the breasts of the jurors and how keen is their vision of beauty. Seekers for monetary value for their heart bruises know this, else why do they want to tell their own story in court, why wear their most becoming gown and hats, their most enhancing furs, and why look straight at the jury every minute of the trial?

The human exhibit is of enormous value

Highest Price Paid for a Broken Heart	\$250,000
Lowest Price Paid for a Broken Heart	Nothing
Highest Price Paid for a Human Life	\$60,000
Lowest Price Paid for an Adult Human Life	\$.06
Highest Price Paid for a Leg	\$25,000
Next to Lowest Price for a Leg	\$1,000
Lowest Price for a Leg	Nothing
Highest Price for Eyes	\$20,000
Lowest Price for Eyes	\$50
For Baby's Life	\$10,000
For Baby's Life—No Pecuniary Value	Nothing
For Loss of Money—Asked, \$200,000; Received	\$25,000
For Loss of Human Kidney—Received	\$14,000



**Miss Daisy Markham, the English Actress Who Got the Record Verdict of \$250,000 for Her Broken Heart.**

In suits for damages. Six-year-old Rosalie and Minna Geller, chubby, round-eyed, pathetic in their black hats and coats, undoubtedly won for their mother, the widow of a street car conductor, the award of \$6,000 for their father's life.

A jury in making awards is often guided by the testimony of witnesses. In the case of Bertha Westbrook Reid, the actress wife of Hal Reid, the playwright, for injuries sustained in an automobile collision of her automobile with that owned by Albert Plaut, a theatrical manager testified: "A man can have any kind of a face and succeed. But an actress should have a comely face. At least, it must not be scarred or maimed."

The jury agreed with Mrs. Reid that because one eyelid was so stiffened from the injury that she could no longer adequately convey the illusion of joy, grief, love, hate or any other emotions she should be consoled by a goodly sum from the purse of the owner of the impulsive automobile. Mr. Plaut was required to pay her as compensation for the discolored eyelid and sundry facial scratches and bruises \$7,250.

Miss Edith Ferguson, once an actress, now a milliner, was deeply humiliated when an accident caused a long, dark, irregular scar on the satin-like skin of her shoulder.

"I shall always have to wear a high-necked gown," she lamented. "For the hardship I want \$2,000." The suit is pending. It will depend upon the jury, and in part upon the Judge.

A jury secured from the Metropolitan Street Railway Co. \$7,500 for the life of a child destroyed by a car. Mrs. Bridget Nugent received \$10,000 because her infant son had been killed by the injection of impure virus in vaccination. These cases, respectively of New York and Philadelphia, are in striking contrast with the judgment of Judge Gunners, of New Jersey, who set aside a verdict for \$5,000 for the life of an infant, saying that grief did not count in the law and that a child's life had no actual commercial value.

Justice Gildersleeve set aside the ver-

dict granting Mrs. Charles MacDonald \$12,000 for the loss of her twelve-year-old son and told her she would get nothing unless she consented to receive \$7,500.

One baby, by the "courtesy of the court," was conceded to be worth his burial expenses, \$150.

The lowest value ever placed upon adult life was what a jury awarded Charles B. Morris in a suit against the Metropolitan Street Railway Company for the loss of his son, who was a college sophomore. The jury valued the young man's life at six cents.

The New England judicial conscience set to work upon the problem of awarding what Miss Gertrude M. Garity's hands were worth. Miss Garity, a pretty young stenographer, sued for the loss of both of them. Grasping a chair with one hand, she had turned on an electric lamp with the other. Her hands were so severely burned

that both were amputated. The sight of the young woman shorn of the power to earn her livelihood either affected the hearts or consciences or influenced the judgment of the jury to the extent that it granted her ten thousand dollars less than the value placed upon Spencer Trask's life. For the loss of her hands and for the sufferings inflicted by the company's negligence the Connecticut Light and Power Company and the Southern New England Telephone Company were forced to pay her \$50,000.

Notwithstanding the attitude of Jersey Justice, "grief does not count and a child has no pecuniary value," the long battle waged for little Ida Herlich was successful in the courts. The child was five years old when she fell from a trolley car in Newark. The wheel ran over her arm. The family sued the company in the Circuit Court. That court estimated Ida Herlich's right arm at \$10,000. The railway, declaring the price was excessive, carried the matter to the Supreme Court, which set aside the verdict. The counsel for the child's parents appealed and the Court of Errors and Appeals finally indorsed the action of the Circuit Court.

By the time she received the \$10,000 Ida had grown to be almost a young woman, as is evidenced by her reply when she was asked what she would do with the money: "Why, I'm going to get married with that."

The same judge on the same day adjudged Elsie Super's right eye, which had been accidentally knocked out by a broomstick, to be worth \$50, and three fingers severed from William H. Preston's hand in a dyeing and finishing plant \$987.

When Justice Pound, in the Supreme Court of New York, upheld the verdict of a lower court in the case of Stephen Roberts vs. the Niagara Falls Hydraulic Power and Manufacturing Company a value was placed upon a kidney for the first time in the courts of the State. Roberts was hurt in the collapse of a scaffold on the bank of the Niagara River near the Falls. A kidney was crushed and had to be removed. Roberts asked \$50,000 for the missing kidney. The court heard the market in missing kidneys to \$14,000.

Yet a man who lost his reason through injuries received through an accident for which the New York City Railway was responsible, received only \$600 more than

the man who was minus a kidney. Kidneys, therefore, in the eyes of the court crowd minds in value.

Upon two points alone the courts, despite their vagaries, seem fairly to agree. That is, that a life is less precious than a limb. And that a broken heart is worth more than anything else that's broken.

One day in the New York courts recently Mrs. Mary Hogan, a widow, was offered \$7,000 in lieu of her husband's life. Morris Meyerowitz and his father together received \$21,000, which they divided, because of their respective loss through an accident. Young Meyerowitz had lost his leg and his father had lost his services. They were valued respectively at \$11,000 and \$10,000. Henry Godfrey, who lost his arm while in the discharge of his duty as a brakeman, received \$20,000.

Better that a man be killed than that he be rendered unfit for labor would seem to be the logic of the courts. But no logic is apparent in its rating of hearts incapacitated from loving again for the first time.

Perhaps the pleading of Baroness Ursula Barbara Kallnowsky's attorney will clear the fog induced by the courts. Meanwhile would it not be well to attempt a standardization of values of the parts of the human body, including the heart?

## Bernard Shaw and the Dramatic Critics.

MR. GEORGE BERNARD SHAW, who with G. K. Chesterton are the two most brilliant writers in England to-day, has written another play. Mr. Shaw has a fine contempt for dramatic critics, who are mostly men he thinks who couldn't possibly write an acceptable play and over and over again have demonstrated the fact that they don't recognize the elements of a successful play when they go to a "first night." They abuse plays that turn out to be tremendous popular successes and they approve and applaud plays which live scarcely a week. The exposure of this low order of intelligence of the critics has incensed the British critics.

In fact, Mr. Shaw once took the trouble to write a play making fun of the critics. In this play he showed that there are no rules or measures or standards for weighing a play. Every critic is guided, he showed, by his own personal opinion, and the more stupid or biased the individual, the more worthless the criticism.

But the open-minded and presumable intelligent dramatic critic of the Weekly Bystander of London calls for fair play, and in the current number of his paper criticizes his brother critics thus:

"We drew attention last week to the constant 'belittling' in the Press of Mr. Bernard Shaw, and the adoption toward him by the critics of an attitude of prejudice.

Last week saw the production of his 'Great Catherine' at the Vaudeville. I am not, myself, criticising the play this week, but shall look in at leisure, and probably do so next. Meanwhile, it is interesting to test the theory of 'prejudice' by a glance at the criticisms that have appeared. What kind of play is it that draws forth such diametrically contradictory notices as those I quote below?

"Most Hilarious."  
"Here we find Bernard Shaw in his most hilarious infectious, irresponsible, and farcical mood—scoffing without offence, being obvious without afterthought, a rollicking writer of farce."—Daily Express.  
"Not Good Shaw."

"If he (Mr. Shaw) intends to write many more farces like 'Great Catherine,' life as a critic will not be tolerable."  
"Not a trick of old-fashioned farce was left unused. Mr. Shaw has even gone to

Shakespeare for many of those tricks. . . . Frankly, 'Great Catherine' is not good Shaw."—Daily News and Leader.

"Roars of Laughter."  
"A very clever, funny play with really shrewd strokes of character, and sharp bits. Truly amusing play. Caused roars of laughter."—Westminster Gazette.

"The Ayes Had It."  
"What made some shriek with laughter left others unmoved. The piece never once got the whole audience at its back, and the laughter undoubtedly fell off during the last two scenes. The reception was favorable—that is to say the 'Ayes' had it."—Morning Post.

"Most Amusing Farce."  
"The bill at the Vaudeville Theatre was bounteously enriched last night by the addition of a farce in four scenes by Mr. Bernard Shaw. . . . Mr. Shaw, writing at the top of his form, has composed a most amusing farce."—Pall Mall Gazette.

"Poor Fooling."  
"On the whole it is poor fooling; the jester is in feeble mood and the only thing that is really good is Mr. Shaw's attempt

to treat one of history's scandalous characters in a manner that would not bring color to the cheek of an Early Victorian spinster."—The Globe.

"High Jinks Long Drawn Out."  
"There was much laughter last night. But on the whole one came back to the feeling that Mr. Shaw might have made more out of that particular historical milieu than a repetition of the Britannia joke plus-high jinks rather long-drawn-out. The Empress's toe tickled the Captain's ribs a little too often, and to tickle our ribs Mr. Shaw's toe hardly suffices."—The Times.

"Very Little One."  
"It is a very little one, this new play of Mr. Shaw's. It lasts only a trifle more than an hour, and that is more than long enough."—The Telegraph.

Does "Great Catherine" amuse the public (as per the Express, Westminster, Pall Mall, and Times), or does it not (as per Daily News, Morning Post, Globe, and Telegraph)? These critics are paid, presumably, to have their opinions, but surely whether a play is laughable or not is a matter of fact, not of opinion, and even dramatic critics ought to have sense enough to know that much.

**The Baroness Ursula Barbara Von Kallnowsky Who Thinks Her Broken Heart Worth \$2,500,000.**

