

Ford Hall Folks

FKF 4

No. 1

A MAGAZINE OF NEIGHBORLINESS

VOLUME II NUMBER 2

NOVEMBER 2, 1913

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE FAMILY OF THE FUTURE

By EARL BARNES*

FELLOW STUDENTS: The subject with which we are dealing tonight is probably the most difficult that could be brought before a mixed audience. I suppose the very formulating of the question would gravely disturb most of the conservative people who are not

here. (Laughter.) Even we who are here must all of us feel a real anxiety concerning the good judgment and taste and reticence with which this subject should be presented. Certainly the speaker feels the need of your sympathy and forbearance, for this is one of the most crucial

and most important of questions. Many imagine that in such a discussion we may be inclined to abolish the family. Every movement is supposed to threaten the destruction of the family—socialism, syndicalism, woman suffrage. But institutions are practically never accidents. When you get large numbers of people organized in some form of effective self-expression, through a long period of time, that institution was not formed for the sake of making the motions to form it. There is something behind it. Ford Hall, for instance, succeeds where others fail because of an elemental need, a fundamental hunger, for knowledge and worship. All institutions go back to

each other. When two co-operate in the deep intimacies of personal life, then only we have a real fulfilment of life. Individual romantic love could not be destroyed by changing the sex ideas of everybody in the United States. Bishop Vincent, founder of the Chautauqua, said, speaking of his wife and of the women in any man's life, "They make us or they unmake us." For a child that I loved I would wish just this: a happy and continuous marriage.

There are three very serious defects in the institution we call marriage. 1. It lacks a sound foundation in the scientific truth of the modern world. Like all other institutions it tends to blend in with related institutions:—relation with the church makes it a sacrament, with the state a contract, with professional advancement a financial arrangement. But it is without relation to the scientific beliefs of well-being; it has no eugenic conscience. Individuals have this, but not the family. In 200 years people will refuse to believe that the state sanctioned and the church solemnized marriages that meant almost certainly imbecile or otherwise defective children. We must change this whole conception. The marriage of a broken-down old blackguard and a young, healthy girl is an infamy. (Applause.)

2. The family as it exists today secures the subordination of woman to the family group in a way that is absolutely unjust. (Applause.) I marvel that women will marry, unless they are so much in love that they think the man is different from all others. Think of the difference between the life of a married woman, tied to the home and the children, and of a married man, out in the world. The woman is at a tremendous handicap of narrowing circumstances. In this partnership, as in all others, property is important; it is the body in which the soul must live. Shaw says: "The greatest of all crimes is poverty." The married woman has no body for her soul—no goods—no money. The partnership to begin with is one of full participation, but she gets nothing out of it. She may eat more, have more clothes, than the man, but she is poor while she has no property of her own. She has no vital relation to the power that lies in money. Go into almost any farmer's or artisan's family and you will find today pure and simple feudalism of the vintage of 1750. (Mr. Barnes illustrated this point by the story of his own grandmother, who put \$700 into the partnership when she married, but in the end got only a third life interest in *his* estate.) I know two men who make soap. One stays at the factory; one goes out, but they share equally in the profits. We have got to change the family on this fundamental base of the relation of the man and woman to it. It is going to be very hard to change—it is almost impossible for a woman to feel that her husband's property is her own, even when that arrangement is made, and it is even harder for a man to make the arrangement. We should provide legally that money possessed at the time of marriage, or gained later by inheritance, should remain individual. A woman should not take any of the man's money at mar-



Earl Barnes.

THE LITTLE GIRL AND THE PUSSY CAT

By Burgess Johnston

Instead of a prayer, Mr. Coleman read the following poem, because it breathes forth the real spirit of the Ford Hall Meetings:

Said a little girl to a pussy-cat:
"It's jolly to make you play!

S. Wise of
ject this time
" Dr. Wise
the country to
has long been
g the Jewish
critic of men
he has just re-
the Old World,
of Palestine and
ainst their own
d-letter night at



so fortunate as
f Mr. Coleman
h appeared in
ooking forward
ker for the last
MACFARLANE,
cFarlane's topic
k." and he him-



Earl Barnes.

be presented. Certainly the speaker feels the need of your sympathy and forbearance, for this is one of the most crucial

and most important of questions. Many imagine that in such a discussion we may be inclined to abolish the family. Every movement is supposed to threaten the destruction of the family—socialism, syndicalism, woman suffrage. But institutions are practically never accidents. When you get large numbers of people organized in some form of effective self-expression, through a long period of time, that institution was not formed for the sake of making the motions to form it. There is something behind it. Ford Hall, for instance, succeeds where others fail because of an elemental need, a fundamental hunger, for knowledge and worship. All institutions go back to some such hunger. This is the bed-rock on which the family is based.

We are educable at all only by reason of certain hungers, desires, driving impulses in our lives. The person who is tremendously hungry on all sides of his nature you can teach anything. The person who is not hungry at all is a fool. Idiots have no hunger except for food; a man like Leonardo da Vinci is hungry for so many things that this hunger drives him to greatness. Hungers must find their fulfilment through group activities.—The most powerful of these hungers is that of sex, which starts early in life, and after puberty is the dominant force. It transforms the physical appearance; it develops physical and mental secondary sex attributes. Our art and literature today are impregnated with sex feeling. It is vastly more than a biological instinct. To describe a highly perfect man today, one would have to use many words descriptive of sex characteristics. We are not going to destroy all this by tinkering with the family. The kind of family I am discussing is that of a man and woman who love each other and the children born of that love. The unit must be, not a man or a woman, but a man and woman who love

financial arrangement. But it is without relation to the scientific beliefs of well-being; it has no eugenic conscience. Individuals have this, but not the family. In 200 years people will refuse to believe that the state sanctioned and the church solemnized marriages that meant almost certainly imbecile or otherwise defective children. We must change this whole conception. The marriage of a broken-down old blackguard and a young, healthy girl is an infamy. (Applause.)

THE LITTLE GIRL AND THE PUSSY CAT

By Burgess Johnston

Instead of a prayer, Mr. Coleman read the following poem, because it breathes forth the real spirit of the Ford Hall Meetings:

Said a little girl to a pussy-cat:

"It's jolly to make you play!

How soft you purr when I stroke your fur,

And your claws are all tucked away!

I love you ever so much for that,"

Said a little girl to a pussy-cat.

"But oh, there's a terrible thing I've heard,—

That brings great sorrow to me:

You killed a poor little baby bird

That lived in our apple-tree.

You can't be dear to me after that,"

Said a little girl to a pussy-cat.

"O, little maid," said the pussy-cat,

"You are gentle and kind, they say,

To bird and beast, but didn't YOU feast

On chicken for lunch today?

And aren't there feathers upon your hat,

O, little maid?" said the pussy-cat.

"Oh, I'll be I, and you'll be you,

As long as this world shall be.

If you'll be as good as you can for you,

I'll try to be good for me.

So let's be friends, and agree to that,
O, little maid!" said the pussy-cat.

may eat more, have more clothes, than the man, but she is poor while she has no property of her own. She has no vital relation to the power that lies in money. Go into almost any farmer's or artisan's family and you will find today pure and simple feudalism of the vintage of 1750. (Mr. Barnes illustrated this point by the story of his own grandmother, who put \$700 into the partnership when she married, but in the end got only a third life interest in his estate.) I know two men who make soap. One stays at the factory; one goes out, but they share equally in the profits. We have got to change the family on this fundamental base of the relation of the man and woman to it. It is going to be very hard to change—it is almost impossible for a woman to feel that her husband's property is her own, even when that arrangement is made, and it is even harder for a man to make the arrangement. We should provide legally that money possessed at the time of marriage, or gained later by inheritance, should remain individual. A woman should not take any of the man's money at marriage, either; the present arrangement creates a bribe to legalized prostitution. But all money earned by the husband and wife from the time of their marriage should be common money, split in two in the middle. That is the law in Idaho, and will be the law all over the country when we have woman suffrage. I don't want women to have money to spend or to keep—they have that now—but to own, to have a body in which to work out their own souls.

3. In 200 years, again, who will believe that men and women once had to live together when they did not love each other? Love is the only justification for marriage. If people live together without love, what have we but prostitution of the body? An Englishman can procure an injunction for the restoration of marital rights—and that is legalized rape. Such a situation is wrong, it is wicked; and some day we shall straighten it out. You will say: "Do you mean to stand for free divorce? It is the destruction of the family." You cannot destroy the family. All you can destroy is some of the broken limbs on the tree. In the meantime we are afraid of divorce. In the past 20 years there have been over a million di-

(Continued on Page 4.)

*The speech and the questions and answers reported by Miriam Allen de Ford.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Q: Aren't the ministers of the gospel responsible for marrying people without finding out whether they are fit to be united?

A: Those connected with an institution must play the game in accordance with its rules. You cannot expect a minister to break away from his institution and go out as an individual.

Q: Do you believe in the celibacy of the clergy?

A: Celibacy was once believed to be a virtue. A perfectly fair-minded man would say that celibacy in a well-organized, healthy man or woman, barring deep emotional catastrophe behind him, is a crime. (Applause.)

Q: Is not this question of eugenics really a question of the conservation of the race?

A: Yes; thank you for putting it that way.

Q: What is going to be the effect on the family of the future if the woman takes an economically independent stand and earns money?

A: I should have removed the possibility of that question. I don't want her to do that except as she is doing it now. I want her to be paid for what she is doing.

Q: By changing present economic conditions would you not bring about more successful marriage?

A: Not without changing men's ideals also. Of course, economic conditions today place a large premium on late marriage, for people are unwilling to start where their parents did.

Q: What is your opinion of "Damaged Goods?"

A: It raises the question of teaching sex morality through pathology. In general, teaching by false syntax is bad. Personally, I deprecate pathological teaching.

Q: Is not much marital infelicity due to the transference of love from a Platonic to a physical plane?

A: So far as I know, love in its highest manifestation between men and women is most secure when it has a deep and strong animal basis. But it must also have a

state opportunity for and compulsion of cure.

Q: Would not the introduction of sex hygiene in public schools bring about good results?

A: Sex hygiene is now being introduced in every sort of educational institution. Personally, I think that in a time when the public mind is greatly disturbed, if you do exactly right you'll do a lot of wrong. The responsibility should lie with the parents; but you can educate parents only by educating the new generation. It is a difficult problem.

Q: In case of divorce, which parent should have the child?

A: That is a matter for individual judgment, but the other parent should have full opportunity to see it frequently.

Q: What are the cause and remedy of prostitution?

A: We will not know until after the Rockefeller Institute has completed its investigations. I should like to ask: Why do men patronize prostitutes? (Applause.)

Q: Should a man remarry when his wife dies, after having borne him children?

A: In spite of the indissoluble power of love, this depends entirely upon the subjective state of the man after his wife's death.

Q: Must there not be a change in the public conscience with reference to the relations of the sexes before these evils can be overcome in the individuals?

A: In other words, must we not eliminate the double standard? Today we must have absolute equality; some day we shall understand and adjust better masculine and feminine characteristics.

Q: How can people be healthy today when the food is not pure? (Applause.)

A: That is not my problem.

Q: How do you reconcile the problems of eugenics with the all-important relation of love?

A: Perfectly. All we are proposing to do is to cut out the unfit marriages. The work is negative. Then we will allow free play to romantic love among the fit.

I do not know why those who do not assume the responsibilities of parenthood should not bear an extra burden.

Q: Is knowledge of sex moral power?

A: Is knowledge of any particular thing backing for moral conduct in that thing? A wide knowledge of the fundamental facts of sexual hygiene and expression would lift group conduct everywhere.

Q: If men and women love each other for their good qualities before marriage, and after marriage find those qualities different, who is to blame?

A: Why should anybody ask that we should always reach the right conclusion? They are both to blame.

Q: Is not Alfred Russell Wallace, in "Social Environment and Moral Progress," right in opposing 'eugenics' because the female today concentrates on property instead of on the qualities of her mate?

A: Of course. (Applause.) The thing will only be corrected when the general public recognizes that as prostitution.

Q: What does love constitute? (Laughter.)

A: The questioner is even younger than he looks. All I can say is that nobody on earth can explain, but that you will find out. (Laughter and applause.)

Q: Is Platonic friendship possible between young men and women?

A: It is an extremely dangerous experiment. (Applause.)

Q: What do you think of intermarriage between people of different races?

A: It is one of the most important scientific problems now before thoughtful men and women, and we have no definite knowledge bearing upon it.

Q: What do you think of trial marriages with a three-year limit?

A: I have offered something vastly better than that—a marriage carefully guarded, to be carried on as long as it is a real marriage.

Q (Mr. Sagerman): How is love possible with poverty?

A: There is demonstration of the fact everywhere. Love does not depend upon a purse.

Q: What do you think of legislation with reference to vasectomy?

A: In some cases restricted sterilization is desirable.

Q: Is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of prostitution?

Miss Follett, workers of the last Sunday night Ford Hall

On the platform Secretary Dillorchester, N. H., are greatly interested in establishing in their own. They call out just how well will be others in same errand, in is to serve as t

It was a wonderful night to note that which men and other, discussed family life. It sounded through very rare privilege in earnest to me

There were for the Ford Hall in spite of the time was given ability of inaugural classes for those day evenings. In this sort, especially our constituency vice. Messrs. Frank kind bore the br Messrs. Sullivan appointed a committee forward and re the Folks.

Those of you one of these see the Ford Hall are missing. W Hall, Ford Build the consideration

public catastrophe behind him, is determined. (Applause.)

Q: Is not this question of eugenics really a question of the conservation of the race?

A: Yes; thank you for putting it that way.

Q: What is going to be the effect on the family of the future if the woman takes an economically independent stand and earns money?

A: I should have removed the possibility of that question. I don't want her to do that except as she is doing it now. I want her to be paid for what she is doing.

Q: By changing present economic conditions would you not bring about more successful marriage?

A: Not without changing men's ideals also. Of course, economic conditions today place a large premium on late marriage, for people are unwilling to start where their parents did.

Q: What is your opinion of "Damaged Goods"?

A: It raises the question of teaching sex morality through pathology. In general, teaching by false syntax is bad. Personally, I deprecate pathological teaching.

Q: Is not much marital infelicity due to the transference of love from a Platonic to a physical plane?

A: So far as I know, love in its highest manifestation between men and women is most secure when it has a deep and strong animal basis. But it must rise above that basis. (Applause.)

Q (Mr. Victorson): Can we eliminate an age-old evil by a quarter century of legislation? Must it not be eliminated just as slowly as it was implanted?

A: I am not very ardent after legislation. We are laying a foundation in public opinion which may in time express itself in legislation with benefit. But it does not require as much time to destroy as to build up. See the quickness of the change from monarchy to democracy.

Q (Miss Rogolsky): In calling poverty a crime, would you take into consideration the fact that many great men were poor and many rich ones worth nothing?

A: It is an American belief that poverty is the recipe for greatness. In fact greatness in poverty means only an unusual escape from a harmful background. Great men are not produced from nothingness.

Q: Do you believe in trial marriage? If not, what remedy is there?

A: No; I want to make marriage more difficult, not easier. My remedy is all I have said tonight. (Applause.)

Q: How would you relieve those who are unfit for marriage by disease, but who could be made well if they had sufficient financial means for treatment?

A: One of the principles of eugenics is insistence on the wiping out of disease, by

with only be corrected when the public recognizes that as prostitution.

Q: What are the cause and remedy of prostitution?

A: We will not know until after the Rockefeller Institute has completed its investigations. I should like to ask: Why do men patronize prostitutes? (Applause.)

Q: Should a man remarry when his wife dies, after having borne him children?

A: In spite of the indissoluble power of love, this depends entirely upon the subjective state of the man after his wife's death.

Q: Must there not be a change in the public conscience with reference to the relations of the sexes before these evils can be overcome in the individuals?

A: In other words, must we not eliminate the double standard? Today we must have absolute equality; some day we shall understand and adjust better masculine and feminine characteristics.

Q: How can people be healthy today when the food is not pure? (Applause.)

A: That is not my problem.

Q: How do you reconcile the problems of eugenics with the all-important relation of love?

A: Perfectly. All we are proposing to do is to cut out the unfit marriages. The work is negative. Then we will allow free play to romantic love among the fit.

Q: Would not compulsory state cure of disease encourage immorality?

A: What we have got to do is to segregate syphilis as if it were smallpox.

Q: Does the love which precedes marriage follow marriage, or aren't the children the cause of the bond that exists between married people?

A: You can't have married happiness based on nothing but duty to the children.

Q: Is it not necessary for the soul and body of the individual to be in perfect harmony before marriage?

A: The period of courtship determines very largely the spiritual qualities of the new generation.

Q: If the man and woman share the income, how will you allot the expenses of the home and the upbringing of the children?

A: Manage it just like any business. Pay the running expenses of the business first and share the rest between the partners. (Applause.)

Q: How about the large number forbidden to marry who yet have sexual instincts? Are they not dangerous to society?

A: It is a difficulty; that is all I can say. They are still more dangerous perpetuating their kind.

Q (Mr. Brown): How about a tax on old bachelors and old maids? (Laughter.)

A: Seriously, the man or woman who rears young children in a community should have certain advantages given him.

Q: What does love constitute? (Laughter.)

A: The questioner is even younger than he looks. All I can say is that nobody on earth can explain, but that you will find out. (Laughter and applause.)

Q: Is Platonic friendship possible between young men and women?

A: It is an extremely dangerous experiment. (Applause.)

Q: What do you think of intermarriage between people of different races?

A: It is one of the most important scientific problems now before thoughtful men and women, and we have no definite knowledge bearing upon it.

Q: What do you think of trial marriages with a three-year limit?

A: I have offered something vastly better than that—a marriage carefully guarded, to be carried on as long as it is a real marriage.

Q (Mr. Sagerman): How is love possible with poverty?

A: There is demonstration of the fact everywhere. Love does not depend upon a purse.

Q: What do you think of legislation with reference to vasectomy?

A: In some cases restricted sterilization is desirable.

Q: Is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of prostitution?

A: It is true it has made marriage late by driving women into public life.

Q: When a woman's economic position is such that she accepts the first proposal for a home, how can you give her suggestions about eugenics, and waiting six months to make up her mind?

A: That is another difficulty. It does not strike directly at the problem.

Q: Do not economic conditions make ideals, rather than vice versa? Was it not economic conditions that made possible the former making of marriages for children by parents?

A: Economic conditions cause all the miseries of life. But man's volition can do something even then.

Q: Is it not against human nature for one man to love one woman all his life, and vice versa? (Laughter.)

A: I believe that monogamy with the freedom I am advocating would be more the rule than it is now. There is a bond between married people which grows with their living together.

Q: Isn't modern science responsible for the great number of degenerates who fill our institutions?

A: I don't see any connection.

Q: If there is love between man and woman, won't the property issue sink into the background, and the woman think it not necessary that she have property?

(Continued on Page 4.)

same errand, including is to serve as the ch

It was a wonder night to note the pe which men and wor other, discussed the family life. There sounded throughout. very rare privilege, in earnest to make t

There were forty-f the Ford Hall Folks in spite of the nasty time was given to a bility of inaugurating classes for those who day evenings. It is this sort, especially a our constituency, wo vice. Messrs. Foster kind bore the brunt o Messrs. Sullivan and appointed a committe forward and report the Folks.

Those of you who one of these semi-o the Ford Hall Folks are missing. We me Hall, Ford Building, the consideration o means for advancing Then we take supper twenty-five cents ea half hour. Our next for Sunday, Nov. 23 terested in the Ford come. Just send wo Ford Hall that you proper provision can

Have you noticed t questions asked? T stereotyped sort; raj jest and pertinency. ual resource of no m

The courage and consciousness so ma who does his share of an impediment in most of us is very st. all face our difficult does, if we could completely as he doe ress we might make.

Our sunny Italian has an awful strug when he attempts t but he generally ma he is driving at. I when he pointed o that if some of us w would look as foolis he seemed to appear

AS IT LOOKS TO ME

By GEORGE W. COLEMAN

Director of the Ford Hall Meetings

Miss Follett, one of the leading social workers of the city, thought the meeting last Sunday night was about the biggest thing Ford Hall has yet done.

* * *

On the platform last Sunday night were Secretary Dillon of the Y. M. C. A. of Manchester, N. H., and two fellow-citizens, who are greatly interested in the movement to establish in their own city a forum like ours. They came down especially to find out just how we do it. Next Sunday there will be others from Manchester, bent on the same errand, including the gentleman who is to serve as the chairman of their forum.

* * *

It was a wonderful thing last Sunday night to note the perfectly natural way in which men and women, strangers to each other, discussed the intimate relations of family life. There wasn't a false note sounded throughout. It was an evening of very rare privilege, and everyone was dead in earnest to make the most of it.

* * *

There were forty-five at the gathering of the Ford Hall Folks last Sunday afternoon, in spite of the nasty weather. Most of the time was given to a discussion of the possibility of inaugurating mid-week educational classes for those who attend Ford Hall Sunday evenings. It is believed that a work of this sort, especially adapted to the needs of our constituency, would render a great service. Messrs. Foster, Goldberg and Schnittkind bore the brunt of the discussion. With Messrs. Sullivan and Miss Smith, they were appointed a committee to carry the matter forward and report at the next meeting of the Folks.

* * *

Those of you who have never attended one of these semi-occasional gatherings of the Ford Hall Folks do not realize what you are missing. We meet at 3.30 in Kingsley Hall, Ford Building, and spend the time in the consideration of practical ways and means for advancing our whole enterprise. Then we take supper together at a cost of twenty-five cents each, and have a social half hour. Our next meeting is scheduled for Sunday, Nov. 22.

About four hundred copies of the magazine were sold in the hall last Sunday night,—the best yet, Mr. London says, but we need to make it five hundred. We have over sixty names on the regular subscription list, but we ought to have two hundred.

* * *

Mr. Carthy, the rugged-looking gentleman with the white flowing beard, is as full of sunshine as ever this season, but happily the thunders of applause do not delay his questioning as they did last season.

* * *

Already there are twenty enrolled in the chorus, and they had their first rehearsal last Sunday at half-past six. Mr. Gutterson is a past master at this sort of work; it is worth something to sit under his instruction, not to mention being sure of a good seat every Sunday night in Ford Hall.

* * *

"What does love constitute?" asked the young questioner. A very dear woman said to me, as we left the hall together, "The very word 'constitute' means held together, and love is the thing that holds together the life of a man and woman." But as the speaker well said, the young man will be quite likely to find out all about it very soon.

* * *

Is modesty a vice or a virtue? Should men wait for political office to seek them instead of scrambling for it? Do we wait for a business job to discover us, or do we go out after it? Is it immodest to have your picture appear in the newspaper? Then why isn't it immodest to stand up and face a great congregation of people?

When I was a young reporter I got a very striking lesson on the subject of modesty which has remained with me to this day. My chief sent me to the home of one of Boston's greatest preachers to get an interview with him and secure a copy of his portrait. It was at a time of great excitement over a school question, and the great man had taken a conspicuous part in the public discussion of it.

He made so much of a fuss over refusing to let me have his portrait for publication (a copy of which, without much difficulty,

could have been secured in another way) that my great admiration for him was turned into disgust and I left him with a very strong inclination to advise him whenever he faced his great congregation ever afterward to preach to them with a veil over his face and thus save from all harm his tender, delicate sense of modesty.

Maybe I was wrong, but I felt intuitively that it was mock modesty that made a public man fuss about allowing his portrait to appear in a newspaper. And I made up my mind then and there that while I would never seek personal publicity, neither would I run away from it when it came my way in the regular course of the work in which I was engaged.

A man or a woman who is doing things that concern or interest the public has no good reason for refusing to meet them face to face in the public print. Modesty consists not alone in declining to call attention to one's self, but also in not refusing a just and reasonable demand on the part of the public for a closer acquaintance.

Real modesty consists in being unconscious of one's self. In that state of mind, with your vision fixed on some object above yourself, you can modestly do or leave undone a great many things which might very properly be characterized as grossly immodest with a different thought behind them.

In our questionnaire at Ford Hall Sunday evenings we do not allow questions to be sent to the platform in written form, and one very important reason for that is that the man or woman's personality expressed by their presence adds so very much to the significance of the question. In a similar way a printed portrait helps you to understand a little better the individual about whom you are reading. Isn't it natural for a man's face to go wherever he goes, and so if he himself gets into the newspapers, why shouldn't his face keep him company?

C. Herbert Smith, of Bangor, Maine, writes:

"Several years ago I was a regular attendant of your Sunday night meetings. They were the one thing I missed most when I left Boston. They did much to change my trend of thought. It developed in me a strong desire to understand other people and their problems, and I know I take a more sympathetic interest in everything and everybody than I otherwise would have.

"I happened to be in Boston last Sunday night and heard John Graham Brooks, and enjoyed him immensely. Since I cannot attend the Ford Hall meetings (I have been

in spite of the fact that the time was given to a discussion of the possibility of inaugurating mid-week educational classes for those who attend Ford Hall Sunday evenings. It is believed that a work of this sort, especially adapted to the needs of our constituency, would render a great service. Messrs. Foster, Goldberg and Schnitkind bore the brunt of the discussion. With Messrs. Sullivan and Miss Smith, they were appointed a committee to carry the matter forward and report at the next meeting of the Folks.

Those of you who have never attended one of these semi-occasional gatherings of the Ford Hall Folks do not realize what you are missing. We meet at 3.30 in Kingsley Hall, Ford Building, and spend the time in the consideration of practical ways and means for advancing our whole enterprise. Then we take supper together at a cost of twenty-five cents each, and have a social half hour. Our next meeting is scheduled for Sunday, Nov. 23d. Anyone who is interested in the Ford Hall Meetings is welcome. Just send word to Miss Crawford at Ford Hall that you are coming so that proper provision can be made in advance.

Have you noticed the improvement in the questions asked? There are fewer of the stereotyped sort; rarely do they lack both jest and pertinency. They reveal intellectual resource of no mean order.

The courage and the utter lack of self-consciousness so manifest in our brother who does his share of questioning in spite of an impediment in speech that would cow most of us is very stimulating. If we would all face our difficulties as resolutely as he does, if we could all forget ourselves as completely as he does, how much more progress we might make.

Our sunny Italian friend from Florence has an awful struggle with the English when he attempts to get in his questions, but he generally makes us understand what he is driving at. Do you recall the time when he pointed out with great difficulty that if some of us were in his native city we would look as foolish to his compatriots as he seemed to appear to many of us?

quite likely to find out all about it very soon.

Is modesty a vice or a virtue? Should men wait for political office to seek them instead of scrambling for it? Do we wait for a business job to discover us, or do we go out after it? Is it immodest to have your picture appear in the newspaper? Then why isn't it immodest to stand up and face a great congregation of people?

When I was a young reporter I got a very striking lesson on the subject of modesty which has remained with me to this day. My chief sent me to the home of one of Boston's greatest preachers to get an interview with him and secure a copy of his portrait. It was at a time of great excitement over a school question, and the great man had taken a conspicuous part in the public discussion of it.

He made so much of a fuss over refusing to let me have his portrait for publication (a copy of which, without much difficulty,

Ford Hall Folks

Edited by Thomas Dreier.

PUBLISHED weekly by the Ford Hall Associates, whose work is to create, assemble, and distribute ideas that will help men and institutions grow more helpful in serving society, and which will promote "peace on earth, good will toward men." It is the official publication of the Ford Hall Meetings, which are held, under the direction of George W. Coleman, every Sunday evening during the months of October to May, in Ford Hall, Ashburton Place, Boston, Massachusetts. All business communications should be sent to Miss Mary C. Crawford, Treasurer Ford Building, Boston, and all communications intended for the editor to The Thomas Dreier Service, University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

by their presence adds so very much to the significance of the question. In a similar way a printed portrait helps you to understand a little better the individual about whom you are reading. Isn't it natural for a man's face to go wherever he goes, and so if he himself gets into the newspapers, why shouldn't his face keep him company?

C. Herbert Smith, of Bangor, Maine, writes:

"Several years ago I was a regular attendant of your Sunday night meetings. They were the one thing I missed most when I left Boston. They did much to change my trend of thought. It developed in me a strong desire to understand other people and their problems, and I know I take a more sympathetic interest in everything and everybody than I otherwise would have.

"I happened to be in Boston last Sunday night and heard John Graham Brooks, and enjoyed him immensely. Since I cannot attend the Ford Hall meetings, I am very glad to subscribe for your paper."

SEARCHLIGHTS.

By George W. Coleman.

Here is a book of human-interest essays that breathe forth neighborliness, good-will, and understanding of the problems of every-day folks. Mr. Coleman has put much of himself into these 182 pages. The edition is limited. PRICE, 75 Cents, Postpaid.

THE THOMAS DREIER SERVICE,
University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

BRUNO MFG. CO.

Established 1892

Parfumerie Francaise, Powders, Creams, Hair Tonics of fine quality. Perfumes worth \$3.00 per ounce, \$1.00. Those worth \$1.00, 50c. We sell from a dram to a gallon to you at wholesale. Call on us.

21A TEMPLE ST., BOSTON, MASS.
Back of State House, 2 minutes from Ford Hall.

JUST OUT!

The Romance of the American Theatre

By MARY CAROLINE CRAWFORD

(Secretary of the Ford Hall Meetings.)

This book about plays, playhouses and players has, also, a chapter dealing with the social drama of our own day. Sixty illustrations.

For sale at all book-sellers. Price \$2.50.

GATHERED ALONG THE TRAIL

By THOMAS DREIER

JAKE BROWN & SONS.

JAKE BROWN owned the general store at the crossroads, and was the father of three sons whose chief business in life, judging by the time invested in it, was to disagree with one another. When they were not helping their father wait on customers they were quarreling among themselves. Jim could never make a statement without arousing the anger of either Sam or Bill, and if by any chance Bill said something which met with the approval of Jim, Sam was sure to bring in a minority report with much heat and profanity.

One doesn't have to know much about business to see clearly that this quarreling did not add to the efficiency of the sales force. The father determined to put a stop to it. He talked with the boys, scolded them, begged them for the sake of the business to quit. But talking to them did no good. Each son insisted that his point of view was the right one. No argument had power to bring about a change for the better.

One day Jake called the boys to him and said: "I have placed a new sign on the front of this store. I want you to look at it and tell me what you think of it. Jim, I want you to go across the road and look at it from that point. You, Sam, go down to the right about fifty yards and tell me how it looks from there, while Bill will go down the left road the same distance. I don't want you to look at the sign until you get to the places I have indicated. Then, after you have written down what the sign tells you, come back here and report."

The sons did as they were told. When they returned the father asked Sam what the sign had told him. "The sign," answered Sam, looking at his paper, "reads: 'Ivory Soap.'"

"You're a liar," shouted Bill, "it reads, 'It floats,' and I can prove it."

"You're both liars, and your eyes are on

Ford Hall is one of those magic devices whereby the sons of Jake Brown are enabled to see more than one thing in the economic and religious world. In Ford Hall men and women are taught to treat with tolerance the views of all neighbors, just as Jake Brown taught his sons that three men may see three different advertisements on the one sign.

THE PERSONAL TOUCH.

By Carrie G. Barr.

Among the many beneficent influences of Ford Hall meetings is the democratic atmosphere of the place, and this pleasing impression is very noticeable at once upon entering the hall.

During the meetings which I have attended I have had the chance to become well acquainted with many persons that I could not have met so often anywhere else, and this opportunity has given me a clearer insight into the human conditions of life which has been a great education to me—education which is not to be found in academic instruction or in book lore.

Among the cosmopolitan audience, there are many clear-thinking people who have strong and original ideas; many people come to these meetings who are gifted in many ways; often there are those who are repressed, with no outlet to their beliefs and ideals, and in these meetings they receive an inspiration which uplifts them and helps them to make life better for them.

ADVERTISING IN FORD HALL FOLKS.

The Ford Hall Folks Magazine is to devote a part of its space to advertising. This innovation is simply a means to help meet the necessary current expenses of the publication. The many improvements innovated and contemplated have increased the cost to publish the magazine.

Sunday, Nov. 9, at 3.30 P. M., Dr. Edward Breck on "The Wild Pets of the North Woods."

Sunday Commons: Sunday, November 9th, at 3.30 P. M., Huntington Hall.

School Voters' League: Ford Hall, Saturday, November 8th, at 10.45 A. M., Frank A. Parsons on "Ethics and Aesthetics of Dress." 50 cents.

School of Social Science: Monday, November 3rd, at 8 P. M., "What Shall We Do with the N. Y., N. H. & H.?" by James M. Swift (Rep.), Hustis Lewton (Prog.), John McCarty (Soc.), Roger Sherman Howar (Dem.), and George Rower, Jr. (Soc.). 10 cents.

THE FAMILY OF THE FUTURE.

(Continued from Page 1.)

divorces in the United States. These divorcees are to some extent socially ostracized, as having broken sex relations to life. So it is not a problem as to starting something, but as to completing it. We have in this country 76 divorces to each hundred thousand people; in England they have two. But in England divorce is a difficult luxury; they have just as many separations as we. Divorce is greatest in a new country—in the State of Washington, not in Nevada or South Dakota.

Divorce does not spring from sudden impulse—46 per cent. of the divorces in the United States are applied for three years after separation. Less than one-half the divorced persons remarry within a year. Divorce is tragic for the children, but it is worse for children to be brought up in the presence of a man and woman who do not love each other. (Applause.) Sometimes divorce is desired by only one party. That is one of the tragedies of the soul that have always gathered around that force of sex. But surely if a woman loves a man who does not love her, or vice versa, the wisest thing to do is not to marry if they are not married, and to stop being married if they are.

There is one safeguard to both marriage and divorce. I should like to see marriage made vastly more difficult than it is—placed upon a eugenic base. I should like to see a law causing all men and women

ter.
One day Jake called the boys to him and said: "I have placed a new sign on the front of this store. I want you to look at it and tell me what you think of it. Jim, I want you to go across the road and look at it from that point. You, Sam, go down to the right about fifty yards and tell me how it looks from there, while Bill will go down the left road the same distance. I don't want you to look at the sign until you get to the places I have indicated. Then, after you have written down what the sign tells you, come back here and report."

The sons did as they were told. When they returned the father asked Sam what the sign had told him. "The sign," answered Sam, looking at his paper, "reads: 'Ivory Soap.'"

"You're a liar," shouted Bill, "it reads, 'It floats,' and I can prove it."

"You're both liars, and your eyes are on the blink," shouted Jim at the top of his voice, "the sign says, 'J. Brown & Sons,' and if you'll step out in the back yard I'll lick both of you to prove it."

"No, you won't prove it by fighting in the back yard," the father said quietly. "We will, however, step into the street and we will prove that Jim is right."

So they walked across the street and looked at the sign. Sure enough, "J. Brown & Sons" stared them in the face.

"Come," invited the father, "we'll go down to the right and see what we shall see."

What they saw was what Sam told them they would see.

And when they went down the left road they found that the sign really did offer them the words "It floats."

"Now," said the father, as they walked back to the store, "I've got the drop on you fellows at last. You needed this lesson. Come, let us look at the sign."

They looked at the sign and found that it was one of those patented specialties which are so constructed that they contain three signs in one, and that it did contain all that the three sons said they found on it.

"This simple little lesson," the father continued, "ought to teach you that three men can look at the same thing and yet see three things. It all depends upon the viewpoint. What is true of this sign is true of nearly everything in the world. Learn to look through the other fellow's eyes and you'll find mighty little in this world that will cause you to waste your time in quarreling."

education which is not to be found in academic instruction or in book lore.

Among the cosmopolitan audience, there are many clear-thinking people who have strong and original ideas; many people come to these meetings who are gifted in many ways; often there are those who are repressed, with no outlet to their beliefs and ideals, and in these meetings they receive an inspiration which uplifts them and helps them to make life better for them.

ADVERTISING IN FORD HALL FOLKS.

The Ford Hall Folks Magazine is to devote a part of its space to advertising. This innovation is simply a means to help meet the necessary current expenses of the publication. The many improvements innovated and contemplated have increased the cost to publish the magazine.

One-half a page—consisting of 15 spaces—1 inch in height and 2½ inches in width, is the maximum space which will be given over to advertising at any one time.

One dollar an inch is the price.

For information regarding advertising space apply to JACOB LONDON, Ford Building, Boston, Mass.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

(Continued from Page 2.)

A: Will not a man who loves a woman be willing to let her have all the property?

Q (Mr. Ewing): Isn't it true that a great deal of unhappiness in married life is due to uncongeniality because one grows mentally more than the other?

A: That is why I want equal opportunity for the woman. She has got to keep up the pace with the man. You are quite right.

OTHER MEETINGS

Lowell Institute: Huntington Hall, Monday and Thursday, November 3rd and 6th, at 8 P. M., Prof. Kirsopp Lake on "Primitive Christianity." Wednesday, November 5th, at 5 P. M., Prof. G. H. Palmer on "George Herbert."

Boston Public Library: Tuesday, Nov. 4, at 8 P. M., D. O. S. Lowell on "The Elements of Esperanto"; Thursday, Nov. 6, at 8 P. M., Horace P. Salmon on "Rhodesia";

Nevada or South Dakota.

Divorce does not spring from sudden impulse—46 per cent. of the divorces in the United States are applied for three years after separation. Less than one-half the divorced persons remarry within a year. Divorce is tragic for the children, but it is worse for children to be brought up in the presence of a man and woman who do not love each other. (Applause.) Sometimes divorce is desired by only one party. That is one of the tragedies of the soul that have always gathered around that force of sex. But surely if a woman loves a man who does not love her, or vice versa, the wisest thing to do is not to marry if they are not married, and to stop being married if they are.

There is one safeguard to both marriage and divorce. I should like to see marriage made vastly more difficult than it is—placed upon a eugenic base. I should like to see a law causing all men and women to present certificates stating that they are not in possession of communicable disease. I should like to see all marriages made a matter of advertisement for six months in the public records. I say six months, because that would give relatives and friends time to look up records; would allow transient passions to cool, and would sometimes provide other aid which would prevent marriages for financial reasons.

First, make marriage more scientific. Then put the woman on a basis of absolute equality with the man, with the same freedom and the same responsibilities, the same opportunity to be of individual significance in herself; for you must go afield to bring something back to your mate, not simply stand still to be loved. Finally, when the marriage fails, put it aside. The man and woman who have failed here will inevitably be discredited, just as if they had failed in a business relationship, if the whole thing has full publicity. And then, when these things are true, we will be able to clean up the mass of people who live today under the shelter of pity. Prostitution flourishes in our midst because we are sorry for people unhappily married and say nothing about their misdemeanors. Let us get rid of all this subterfuge and put the whole thing on a frank basis of candor. We will never do that until we realize that the fundamental relationship underlying marriage is love, and love, and love, and that no family can persist unless it rests on a foundation of indissoluble love.