

Dr. Dike then stated that 20 per cent of the divorces were based on adultery, 16 on cruelty, 33 on desertion, 4 for drunkenness, 8 for neglect to provide. But he says that a special study of 29,865 cases in twelve different States showed that 20 per cent were directly or indirectly attributable to liquor. In 70 counties of 12 States 68 per cent of the applications for divorce were granted. The duration of marriage before divorce occurs is nine years. The Doctor recommends some uniform national scheme of divorce. He thinks that under the present system innocent parties are defrauded, children rendered illegitimate, inheritance made uncertain, and actual imprisonments for bigamy growing out of divorce and re-marriage.

Cardinal Gibbons follows with a scathing indictment of our divorce system, which he says is destroying marriage, breaking hearts, wrecking homes and ruining souls. He says the Catholic must answer the question, "Can divorce from the bond of matrimony ever be allowed?" with an emphatic No. And for this answer his reason is "*Thus saith the Lord.*" The wisdom of this is apparent, he says, from the present social condition of the United States. Divorce made the first inroads into the integrity of ancient Greece and Rome, and in the latter place women were not ashamed of licentiousness, until finally a nation built on family purity crumbled into rottenness. He calls divorce Christian polygamy and parallels it with Mormon polygamy to the advantage of the latter. Here is what he says:

"We are filled with righteous indignation at Mormonism; we brand it as a national disgrace and demand its suppression. Why? Because, forsooth, the Mormons are polygamists. Do we forget that there are two species of polygamy—simultaneous and successive? Mormons practice without legal recognition the first species; while among us the second species is indulged in, and with the sanction of law, by thousands, in whose nostrils Mormonism is a stench and an abomination. The Christian press and pulpit of the land denounce the Mormons as an adulterous generation, but too often deal very tenderly with Christian polygamists. Why? Is Christian polygamy less odious in the sight of God than Mormon polygamy? Among us, 'tis true, the one is looked upon as more respectable than the other. Yet we know that the Mormons, as a class, care for their wives and children; while Christian polygamists but too often leave wretched wives to starve, slave or sin, and leave miserable children a public charge."

He says the Catholic marriage is grounded on Mark x, 11, 12; Luke xvi, 18; 1 Cor. vii, 10, 11. No divorce, but a separation, is granted for adultery, with no right for either party to marry again.

The Cardinal then quotes from his namesake, the author of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," to show that divorce was destructive to happiness and virtue. He quotes also from Prof. Woolsey and from John Taylor Coleridge, and then says: "Divorce as we know it began when marriage was removed from the demand of the

church; divorce shall cease when the old order shall be restored. Will this ever come to pass? Perhaps so, after many days."

Bishop Potter of the Episcopal Church follows next. He refers his readers to the Church "Digest of Canons," 1887, to the reports of discussions in the diocesan and general conventions, and to the public opinion of the clergy and laity. He says divorce is very rare in his church. It is little wonder this is so, if a candidate has to hunt through all the literature the bishop refers to on the subject of divorce. By the time canons, discussions and public opinion were searched the prospective divorce seeker would be more fit to grace the funeral baked meats than the marriage festival.

The bishop seemed to feel his own inconsistency in dwelling on church authority for divorce, when his church don't hold marriage sacred. Article XXV says: "Matrimony is not to be counted for a sacrament of the Gospel." Yet the first section of canon 13 and the "Form of Solemnization" affirm that "if any persons be joined together otherwise than as God's Word doth allow, their marriage is not lawful." The bishop's article abounds in inconsistencies of this kind. However, he says that divorce is granted for adultery, and remarriage permitted to the innocent party.

He also says that according to the last general convention the Mosaic law still obtains in the church, and then again he says that the doing away of circumcision also does away with the Mosaic law. For stupidity, incoherency and opaqueness, the Bishop beats Duns Scotus himself. But then the Episcopal is not a church. It is a kind of reflex of the Anglican, and the Anglican according to Macaulay is a compromise between Rome and Calvin, between Luther and Henry the Eighth. Properly speaking, the Bishop is a prelate in a church that don't consider prelacy a divine institution.

Col. Ingersol follows in his usual flappedoodle style. His mushy sentiment and windy logic show themselves quite prominently in this article. He says by way of disparagement that "the early Christians regarded prosperous people as the children of mammon, and the unfortunate, the wretched and the diseased, as the favorites of God," but he does not say who were the prosperous people in those days. Were they the men who gained wealth by conquest and spoliation, or were they the millionaires who got wealth by dishonesty and fraud, and who spent it in libertinism and licentiousness? As to regarding the sick and weakly the favored of God, surely he would not have Christians do as the Greeks did, and as some savage nations still do—put the sickly and weakly to death. Why, the essence of early Christianity was its superior humanization, the effort to suppress the worldly and selfish in the individual. And that is what all the great thinkers of today are trying to do, though they ignore much that is at present orthodox. It is against

the brutality which destroys the sick and weak that Matthew Arnold, Thomas Carlyle, John Ruskin, Herbert Spencer and hundreds of others have written book after book.

Col. Ingersol says a good deal about what is not found in the Bible about family and domesticity and so forth. The Bible gives a code of morality which if observed will lead to education, refinement and happiness; yet this wise philosopher grumbles because we do not get pictures of the homes of the apostles, and scientific theories and speculations. He might as well grumble because God does not give us in addition to reason and intellect, a house and lot, five acres and a mule. He says the celibacy of the early Christians is an indication that marriage was despised. The fact is celibacy was not a practice of the early Christians. It first originated in Spain, and gradually extended itself until it prevailed all through the Latin branch of the Catholic church. Today the two great divisions of American Christians are Protestant and Catholic, one with a celibate priesthood, the other a married priesthood. In view of the demoralization existing in both, the celibate is to be preferred. For instance, when Father Moyesant ran away with Mike McDonald's wife, the father left no wife and children behind, and only one family, that of the injured husband's, was ruined. When the five hundred preachers in Protestant sects, who annually run away with other men's wives, do so, they injure double the number, viz., their own families and those of the husbands. If they were celibates the evil would be only one half.

The Colonel further talks about marriage as a civil contract, and yet he wants this contract so that it can be broken by whim or caprice. The buying of a mule is a contract, but when the mule gets old or broken one cannot demand his money back from the former owner. The Colonel indulges in a lot of flummery, but after all really says nothing about divorce.

Every sensible man will admit that there are reasons in many cases why divorce should exist, but it should be controlled by some governing authority, and among religionists by their church. Efforts should be made to smooth over difficulties, and teachers and spiritual directors might with advantage be consulted before the hasty disruption of a family is effected. In this case it is not entirely what the Bible says or does not say; it is man's own internal inspiration acting in accord with the light and guidance of his superiors in counsel and wisdom.

The Cardinal has 10,000,000 followers in the United States. He says divorce does not exist among them. Bishop Potter has a few followers also. Divorce, he says, is rare among them. Then this throws all the divorces among a section of the American people, and if the divorce statistics are correct, among this section a most extensive system of polygamy and polyandry both must prevail.

JUNIOR.