



Mrs. Jennie Emmet French has just been granted a divorce from William Barton French, and under the terms of settlement her allowance will be \$62,000 a year.

BY HELEN HOFFMAN.

OPPONENTS of divorce and all divorce laws will be gratified to note that the cost of alimony has reached the \$100,000-a-year mark and may go even higher. They will be inclined to agree that when the cost of a divorce, which generally includes alimony, reaches a prohibitive figure, then divorces will go quite out of style.

The \$100,000-a-year divorce settlement was not attributed, however, to the leniency of a sympathetic divorce judge. Instead it was due to the liberality of the husband in the case. Following the newly established society code of making a handsome settlement upon the wife from whom the courts were expected to part him, he made her an allowance of \$100,000 a year, thereby breaking all records in the alimony line.

And now comes the announcement that Mr. and Mrs. William Barton French have been divorced and that under the terms of the divorce settlement she will have an annual allowance of \$62,000 to live on. There have been other generous divorce settlements in recent months, all tending to a belief in the existence of a social code which provides for a more liberal treatment of divorced wives in the matter of alimony than the law prescribes.

As the Frenches have been married only four years, it was a great shock to society to learn of the divorce, for the young couple were great favorites in the smart social circles in which they moved.

Chivalrous Husbands.

But what surprised society even more was the chivalrous attitude taken by the young husband toward the beautiful young woman who had cast him off.

The young wife, who before her marriage was Miss Jean Emmet, belonged to a socially important family, though not rich.

Young French is wealthy, and in discussing the divorce, he spoke affectionately of his wife, and he said he had generously provided for her. At the time of their marriage four years ago he said he settled \$500,000 on her, the income from which would give her an annual income of \$50,000, and this she will have so long as she does not remarry.

Under the divorce settlement he said he settled an additional \$12,000 a year on the young wife who would have no more of him. His small daughter, he said, he would care for independently of the sum given to his wife.

Surely nothing could be more generous than such an allowance of \$62,000 a year from a man whose wife had written him to their marital partnership.

No young man wooing the idol of his love could have shown in finer terms his admiration and affection than young French showed his divorced wife.

Why do men treat their wives so generously, society has been asking. Is it from a sense of pride? Is it that they wish to have the world think of them as generous protectors of their ex-wives, or does some lingering feeling of tenderness inspire such motive, as well as perhaps a desire in many cases, to try to make up in cold cash for any grievance or any wrong that an angry wife may have felt she suffered?

At any rate, whatever the motive is, it is a well-established fact in fashionable society that wives fare better at the hands of their husbands than they would ordinarily at the bench of justice, which, to the wife, most often, means the divorce court. Many judges have in scathing terms scolded the applicants for heavy alimony, claiming that a woman who desires release from a husband is no longer entitled to his support.

Justice Charles L. Guy of New York in discussing an extraordinary divorce case, said: "If marriage is a

lottery, we should not make the capital prize a luxurious alimony. A wife who elects to cancel the marriage contract under which she has certain recognized obligations as well as rights, must not expect to enjoy all the benefits of a happy and successful married life. She is not entitled to a life of ease and luxury without equivalent obligations. The law accords her reasonable and proper support for the station in life which she, as a married woman has occupied and based largely upon her former husband's resources, but she is not entitled to any fixed percentage of his income for life."

Many judges throughout the country whose days are occupied with listening to marital discords, voice similar opinions to Judge Guy in the question of alimony.

Not only judges, but leading feminists as well, have scored the alimony taker, and now with full political enfranchisement, should women come to sit on the bench, the woman alimony applicant would likely fare even worse at the hands of the court than she does at present. Crystal Eastman Benedict, a leader among feminist speakers and writers, echoes the opinion of her colleagues when she declares: "Alimony is not thought of by a real feminist. The whole purpose of the feminist movement is to get rid of the parasite woman."

But, of course, in such matters, even the feminist movement is not apt to control or influence a change, so long as hubby, who can afford it, desires to see his divorced wife kept in com-

fort, if not in luxury, and thus reflect his generosity and, it might well be noticed in many deplorable cases, perhaps his forgiveness for the woman who has suffered to put him out of her life.

As extraordinary as the generosity of young French was that of Lyman B. Kendall, whose sum of alimony paid to his wife recently, made most alimony payers look mean and niggardly. Aside from property valued at \$4,500,000, Mr. Kendall allotted to his wife an annual income of \$100,000 as long as she lives, and with this he gave his very good wishes for her happiness.

After being married some years the Kendalls drifted apart, according to his statement, because he preferred the quiet life of his stock farm in Virginia, while she delighted in New York society. Kendall made his fortune after he married his wife, and therefore felt, no doubt, that she was entitled to some of it even though they chose to go their separate ways after it had accumulated.

Vast, indeed, are some of the sums paid to beautiful women who canceled their marriage contract with a divorce.

Perhaps the largest sum of alimony ever paid outright, was that settled on the former Mrs. John Jacob Astor, when she divorced Colonel Astor. This sum amounted to \$10,000,000. Mrs. Astor is living off this generous income in England today, where she recently took on a title by marrying Lord Ribblesdale.

New York society some years ago,

The High Cost of Alimony

Here's the Shocking and Expensive Solution Society Is Finding for the Problem of Mismatched Marriages.



The former Mrs. John Jacob Astor, now the bride of Lord Ribblesdale, who received \$10,000,000 from Colonel Astor when the divorce settlement was made.

gasped when it was learned that many allowance of \$36,000 a year, since then alimoners have set a new Howard Gould had awarded an all to his wife at their separation, but pace, and with recent fortunes given

H. G. WELLS, WRITER OF FICTION, NOW TURNS PEN TO HISTORY

Napoleon Described as Most Illuminating Figure, but Adventurer and Weakling.

A MARVELOUS and fascinating book is H. G. Wells' "Outline of History."

Speaking of the end of the French revolution, he says: "The ebb of this tide of revolution in the world, this tide which had created the great Republic of America, and threatened to submerge all European monarchies, was at hand. It is as if something had thrust up from beneath the surface of affairs, made a gigantic effort and spent itself."

He gives, with rare vision, the cause of this failure, not the excellence of the new ideas, but the fact that "men were unprepared for the creative opportunities this clearance gave them."

In other words, to reform mankind

you must not only give them a new idea, but must prepare their minds to receive it.

He accurately diagnoses our present industrial ferment. For the French revolution was at the bottom an attack on privileges and property, "but," he adds, "even now this criticism of property is still a vast and passionate ferment rather than a science."

"And now," he says of Napoleon, "we come to one of the most illuminating figures of history, an adventurer and a wreck."

Against the background of confusion and stress and hope, this strained and heaving France and Europe, this stormy and tremendous dawn, appears a dark little archaic personage, hard, com-

passionate, unscrupulous, imitative and neatly vulgar."

Of how France welcomed him he says: "The public was in that state of moral fatigue when a strong and honest man is called for, a wonderful, impossible healing man who will do everything for everybody."

Napoleon, however, had "Julius Caesar rather than Washington in the back of his mind."

The Corsican had a rare opening of destiny. "Now surely here was opportunity such as never came to man before. Here was a position in which a man might well bow himself and serve God and man to the utmost."

Napoleon was capable of no such high emprise. Instead of measuring up to his fate he "could do no more than strut upon the crest of this great mountain of opportunity like a cockerel upon a dunghill."

Here follows one of the most vivid and piercing descriptions of all literature. "The figure he makes in history is one of almost incredible self-conceit, of vanity, greed and cunning, of callous contempt and disregard of all who trusted him, and of a grandiose aping of Caesar, Alexander and

The record-breaking alimony received by the divorced wife of Lyman B. Kendall gives her an allowance of \$100,000 a year for life.

to ex-wives, Howard Gould's allowance, by comparison, is quite small. Mrs. W. Gould Brokaw's divorce created quite a stir in New York society a few years ago, when it was learned that a \$30,000-a-year allowance went with it, but society does not gasp any longer over such comparative trifles.

Divorce Among the Ancients.

Sharing the profits of a long married life, was no doubt what William Ellis Corey believed to be the right thing, when he gave his wife \$1,000,000 and then shortly after married Mabelle Gilman, the one-time chorus girl. Mr. Corey, who rose from a laborer to the presidency of the United States Steel corporation, no doubt recognized the faithful service and loyalty of his helpmeet in making his great stride in the industrial world, and amassing thereby a considerable fortune.

But according to the Rev. Samuel A. P. Milner of Chicago, divorces are as old as the human race, for in making investigations and translations from Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions, he says he learned from these that divorce was a common occurrence during the reign of Hammurabi about 2300 B. C. "Having been granted a divorce," he says, "a man would pay liberal alimony to his wife and publish the information that should anyone marry the divorcee he would not object."

Charlemagne, which would be purely comic if it were not caked over with human blood. "Untilas Victor Hugo said in his tremendous way, 'God was bored by him,' and he was kicked aside like a corner to end his days, explaining how very clear his water blunders had been, proving about his dismal hot island shooting birds and squabbling meanly with an underbred sailor who failed to show him 'proper respect.'"

Perhaps the best thing in Mr. Wells' picture of Napoleon is his explanation of the Napoleon cult. "Since his time his name has been one of the utmost reassurance of doubting men, to the business man hesitating over a more than shady transaction, to the clerk fingering a check that can be easily altered, to the trustee in want of ready money, to the manufacturer meditating the pros and cons of adulteration, to thousands of such people the word 'Napoleon' has come with an effect of decisive relief. 'We live in a world of would-be Napoleons. Half the cells of our jails and many in our madhouses are St. Helens. He was the very embodiment of that saint clear, self-centered common-sense without sentiment or scruples, that struggles with our fester better nature, that may ultimately destroy mankind.'"

—Copyright by Central News Photo Service.