

FHF 4

Ford Hall Folks

A MAGAZINE OF NEIGHBORLINESS

VOLUME II NUMBER 24

APRIL 4, 1914

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE ECONOMIC ASPECT OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE*

By JOHN COWPER POWYS

IT was a little dangerous to introduce my lecture by that particular tune ["That March of the Men of Harlech"]. It has an exciting effect upon the Celtic mind. I think the racial question is so interesting, and lies behind so many of our greatest problems. If this is an exciting hour in the City of Boston in regard to my subject, you know it is a yet more exciting hour in my own country. (Applause.) No one coming from Britain, no one with Celtic blood, can feel calm tonight of all nights in the world. In regard to this subject, as in regard to all race counts for much more than either politicians or sociologists have allowed. As I look through an audience as inspiring as this one, I am very curiously aware of so interesting differences of race among you—Slavonic, German, Hebrew, Latin. I believe, myself, that a great deal of the temperamental sympathy and temperamental antagonism that I and I suppose many other speakers seem fated to produce come from race. I have a shrewd suspicion that a certain strain of blood, which for obvious reasons I shall not name, when it exists in an abundant degree, is almost driven out of its senses by my arguments. If any such are here, I hope they will leave quietly, and their places will be taken by those of a very different race.



We are going to begin with the economic aspect of the woman question.

and stir up the deepest waters we can get our hands and missiles into.

At the present hour I consider the most important rôle a man can play is the rôle of asking embarrassing questions. I should like to have on my tombstone: "He asked uncomfortable questions." It would prove that I was what I aspired to be. The men who ask such questions are agitators, and agitators may be unscrupulous men of action or visionary dreamers, but they must be antinomian skeptics. The world of intellect, heroism and love would come to an end without agitation. We must have it, psychological, physiological, and, above all, spiritual. You will say: "But these people do nothing but excite others. They are not very brave themselves, they are extremely lazy, and they find it easier to talk than to earn their own living in a respectable way." My friends, there are other things in the world besides respectable citizens, and no race of human beings earn their living to more admirable effect from the point of view of angels and devils and gods, of our children's children's children, than agitators. (Applause.)

God knows I draw back—I dare not say all that I think. How many speakers, lecturers, and ethical leaders dare do that? But sometimes, when there is a sort of electricity abroad, as there seems to be in this hour, strange things are said. In those moments, when you drive an agitator into a corner, and you may hope for a rippling of the waters—and that is what we want.

We want unscrupulous men of action. There are plenty of people to talk and write, but the people who have achieved and changed things have nearly always been men of action, and have cried out, as did Oliver Cromwell, "Take away that bauble!" We want visionary dreamers. They are men without fear, and fear is the enemy without which the world would reorganize itself tomorrow. And we want absolutely cold-blooded skeptics, who analyze and an-

moon. And when they come to deal with our theories and categorical imperatives they grow so weary that even irony runs in an exhausted stream. You know that look, my masculine friends, with which your opinions are received when you announce them in a peculiar tone! (Laughter.)

It is to the irony of women that I appeal. The leaders of the suffrage movement are not lacking in humor, but it does not always appeal to their opponents. It is the humor of martyrs, the wit of courage. It is because they understand the secret of life, that life refuses to be put in any category. They understand growth, that evolution is organic, that it is perpetual change, and that we men, with our ideas of objective truth, are simply shutting ourselves up in laboratories and making squares and circles on blackboards: We are changing, and we are part of the change. The thing analyzing and the thing analyzed are one. The great flux goes on, and we in the midst of it analyze what is about us and what we ourselves are fated to be.

Women, by being near the flow of life, by being the true creators, through the magic of the life force, of the world that is to be, understand certain things better than men do. And they understand, though they are too wise to put it into words (and I take a fiendish delight in betraying them here) that in no sphere are there any absolutely fixed or eternal principles. I know the pain this is to many persons hearing me. But there are relative truths only. We come here to a very crucial and dangerous beginning. Still it is necessary to begin at the bottom even of a quicksand. Surely every one of you men has noticed and wondered at the extraordinary lack of moral sense in the woman nearest to you. Women in this respect are right. The strange, unscrupulousness we note in the best women is their wisdom and clairvoyance.

How does this bear on the economic aspect of woman suffrage? Well, there are



try. (Applause.) No one coming from Britain, no one with Celtic blood, can feel calm tonight of all nights in the world. In re-

gard to this subject, as in regard to all, race counts for much more than either politicians or sociologists have allowed. As I look through an audience as inspiring as this one, I am very curiously aware of so interesting differences of race among you—Slavonic, German, Hebrew, Latin. I believe, myself, that a great deal of the temperamental sympathy and temperamental antagonism that I and I suppose many other speakers seem fated to produce come from race. I have a shrewd suspicion that a certain strain of blood, which for obvious reasons I shall not name, when it exists in an abundant degree, is almost driven out of its senses by my arguments. If any such are here, I hope they will leave quietly, and their places will be taken by those of a very different race.

We are going to begin with the economic aspect of the woman question. I am so anxious to say at the very start that it is necessary in this matter to bring everybody in; therefore I am going to make an attempt to express my racial feeling, and bring in even the gentlemen to whom I have just made reference. In order to do this, a certain amount of diplomacy is necessary—even a certain amount of Macchiaevellianism. Having said that, I am anxious to approach my subject in the following manner: There are three kinds of people essential in this world—unscrupulous men of action, visionary dreamers, and antinomian skeptics. If you try to conceive the world without these three, you will understand how utterly we should be lost. Of course, my friends the enemies are saying, under their breath: "Yes, your three,—unscrupulous men of action, in other words, criminals; visionary dreamers, in other words, madmen; antinomian skeptics, in other words, free-thinkers and free-laughers." A happy end of beginning to a lecture upon the great woman question! But in all these matters it is necessary to go to the bottom

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

try. (Applause.) No one coming from Britain, no one with Celtic blood, can feel calm tonight of all nights in the world. In regard to this subject, as in regard to all, race counts for much more than either politicians or sociologists have allowed. As I look through an audience as inspiring as this one, I am very curiously aware of so interesting differences of race among you—Slavonic, German, Hebrew, Latin. I believe, myself, that a great deal of the temperamental sympathy and temperamental antagonism that I and I suppose many other speakers seem fated to produce come from race. I have a shrewd suspicion that a certain strain of blood, which for obvious reasons I shall not name, when it exists in an abundant degree, is almost driven out of its senses by my arguments. If any such are here, I hope they will leave quietly, and their places will be taken by those of a very different race.

God knows I draw back—I dare not say all that I think. How many speakers, lecturers, and ethical leaders dare do that? But sometimes, when there is a sort of electricity abroad, as there seems to be in this hour, strange things are said. In those moments, when you drive an agitator into a corner, and you may hope for a rippling of the waters—and that is what we want.

We want unscrupulous men of action. There are plenty of people to talk and write, but the people who have achieved and changed things have nearly always been men of action, and have cried out, as did Oliver Cromwell, "Take away that bauble!" We want visionary dreamers. They are men without fear, and fear is the enemy without which the world would reorganize itself tomorrow. And we want absolutely cold-blooded skeptics, who analyze and analyze and analyze, and are prepared to discuss everything that exists, and ask embarrassing questions about every single one of our actions, our preconceptions, our principles and our ideas. And they also know no fear.

While men are habitually cowards, women, in love, in war, and in devotion, have never known a moment's fear, once they are really possessed. They have always tended to go straight to the limit, and I rejoice in their courage. (Applause.) All these agitators have had devoted women friends. Women knew them and recognized them. And women as women are more profoundly skeptical in all convictions, principles, and prejudices and moralities than the most extreme antinomian man that you could ever discover. Good women are much more skeptical than wicked men. Do you realize that women are wise with that subtle, intuitive, rythmical wisdom of the earth, of nature, the music of the spheres, and that they go straight in a clairvoyance, a strange occultism, to the point, whereas men, with their logic and reason, go around it across it and sneak around life;—but women follow life as the ocean follows the

that we men, with our ideas of objective truth, are simply shutting ourselves up in laboratories and making squares and circles on blackboards. We are changing, and we are part of the change. The thing analyzing and the thing analyzed are one. The great flux goes on, and we in the midst of it analyze what is about us and what we ourselves are fated to be.

Women, by being near the flow of life, by being the true creators, through the magic of the life force, of the world that is to be, understand certain things better than men do. And they understand, though they are too wise to put it into words (and I take a fiendish delight in betraying them here) that in no sphere are there any absolutely fixed or eternal principles. I know the pain this is to many persons hearing me. But there are relative truths only. We come here to a very crucial and dangerous beginning. Still it is necessary to begin at the bottom even of a quicksand. Surely every one of you men has noticed and wondered at the extraordinary lack of moral sense in the woman nearest to you. Women in this respect are right. The strange, unscrupulousness we note in the best women is their wisdom and clairvoyance.

How does this bear on the economic aspect of woman suffrage? Well, there are no ultimate and fixed principles in any sphere at all. Then why is it that so many among us perpetually appeal to these as if they were real? I am not speaking of religion now. It is possible for a man of any religious faith whatever still to understand this. For faith, to be faith, must be in something that does not appear, and in what seems impossible. But we have a right to be Macchiavells of skepticism in regard to ultimate questions in ethics, politics, and in the great economic aspect of the sex question. We have a right to analyze everything, and we must do it. I am so anxious to make everybody here ask himself the most embarrassing question he can possibly ask. Take the conviction nearest to you, and ask yourself: What would it be like if it were not true, if the opposite were true? We have had enough of repeating the same old catch-words. We are slaves of catch-words and slang phrases. "Liberty!" "Justice!" We have turned liberty and justice into muttons and weak tea. Liberty and justice, if they are worth anything, are worth being paid for with blood.

Is it not possible that we have been

(Continued on Page 2)

THE QUESTIONS

Q: If a new party forms in England by a coalition of the Liberals and the Laborites, under the leadership of Lloyd-George, will the prospect for women be brighter?

A: Yes, I certainly think so.

Q (Miss Crawford): Whom do you consider the most distinguished feminist in England today?

A: There are so many, and each takes a different aspect of feminism. I would say Wells, but he has got frightened and started explaining. I would say Shaw, but he always leaves out the important element of romance. The man who best understands women, I should be inclined to say, is Joseph Conrad.

Q: Is free love opposed to true Christianity?

A: No, most certainly not. It has even been practised by true Christians.

Q (Mrs. Gallup): What is your present attitude toward the militants?

A: Still sympathetic, but wholly from the outside.

Q: What is your opinion of the Anarchist criticism of woman suffrage?

A: I am so sorry to say that I am ignorant of the latest phases of their criticism.

Q (Mr. Fascia): Would it not be better if all prejudices were removed, and men lived as brothers?

A: I should like to have my revenge on some people first. I do not think we shall ever eliminate the fighting quality.

Q: What are the prospects of getting from the single to the double track in this generation?

A: As soon as the Irish question is settled I believe we shall see a great movement toward it in England.

Q (Mrs. Sodderman): Do you expect the collapse of the present English government?

A: Certainly not.

Q: Would you give the vote to women on account of their inalienable right, or for

THE ECONOMIC ASPECT OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

(Continued from Page 1)

fooled? I sometimes think our masters, the unscrupulous men of action, are arranging it that we should talk a great deal about liberty and justice, and meanwhile they cut out our hearts. You can go on talking about liberty and justice to the end of the world, and not a single thing will change; and our business is to change a great many things. Therefore we must ask embarrassing questions. We must ask if there are in the world any such things as liberty and justice. We assume that they are written in the Milky Way, in the system of things. They are not. We assume too much. They are written only in our own blind brains and foolish hearts. They are words.

What do we really find? That we are at the parting of the ways. What else do we find? Progress?—that ridiculous ideal of the market-place! It does not matter what we do, we say, the great purpose will triumph, because evolution will look after it. But suppose evolution is careless, diabolical, and cares not a jot for all our morality? What then? Suppose the human race has for two thousand years gone in the wrong direction? We must ask: Is it a good thing to have woman suffrage, and why? Why is the economic aspect of woman suffrage more important than any other? First of all, suffrage—what is suffrage? The right to vote. It implies a ten-millionth part in the national palaver, mostly of fools. We vote, and the supposition is that the people we vote for go there, and the further supposition is that when they are there they do what we want them to. Neither of these suppositions is true, of course. We must ask: Is representative government played out? Is the party system of government outworn? Has the point been reached where our taste is a little sick of them? If it has, and I discern indications that it has, what does it matter whether or not women get the vote, when in a little while men also are going to lose it?

If this be so, what should we substitute for the vote? Personally, I should substitute a sort of universal referendum by

repeat these catch-words, and think all is well because we are broad-minded and believe in liberty and justice. Our broad-minded catch-words are air and wind and dust when it comes to the real pinch, and the pinch is the economic pinch.

What makes woman a slave today is the economic condition which prevails. (Applause.) If a woman is dependent on a man, for all practical purposes she is his slave. When you come down to bed-rock in this matter, you find that this is quite literally true. We must eat and drink first of all. The two prime purposes of life are food and the propagation of the race. The economic question is an animal, scientific, physiological question. It is the question that occupied the minds of grandpapa and grandmama and the hairy cave-man. We may talk and talk, but behind liberty and justice and everything else, you get these two great economic and sexual necessities—having food and having children.

Since the economic aspect of woman suffrage is the really important thing, what would happen if you gave women the vote? I am coming to a part of my subject that interests me more than any. A certain number of people are afraid that if you made every woman the equal unit of society with every man, and made that unit the person and not the head of the family, every kind of catastrophe, moral and otherwise, would come about—free love the least of them. In certain quarters the word "feminism" is supposed to be synonymous with "free love." Read your dictionary! Don't think, though, that I am afraid to talk about free love, or about anything else. Everything ought to be discussed. Now, here you want to make the woman the equal unit of society with the man, and quite obviously the first step in that direction would be the endowing of motherhood. Anybody who thinks the endowing of motherhood would lead to free love is right in one sense, because love would be free between the individual man and woman, and you would get the ideal monogamistic state. Do you think there is any beauty in being bound together when one is a slave and the other a victim? No, motherhood must be a profession, and ought to be paid five times as much as any other. (Applause.)

Mr. Jonah R.
Mr. E. H. M.
Wollaston.

Budget and Appr.

Mr. R. G. M.
Everett, Ch.
Mr. George V.
line Street,
Miss Elizabeth
Street, Bos.
Miss. Freda
Street.
Mr. D. F. La.
Mr. J. J. S.
Roxbury.
Mr. J. S. Lor

Municipal Affairs

Mr. Arthur C.
Chairman.
Mr. W. C. E.
Mr. M. T. R.
Mr. John H.

City Planning.

Mr. George
wealth Av.
Mrs. E. D. F.
Miss Freda
Mr. Henry S.
Mr. D. F. L.
Mrs. L. B.
Avenue, B.
Mr. R. G. M.
Everett.

Immigration.

Mr. Henry
Boston, Ch.
Mr. Maurice
Mr. Julius J.
Miss Ida G.
Mr. Frank F.
Mr. George
Avenue, F.
Mr. M. T. R.

Education.

Miss Miriam
Miss Helen
Grove Hs.
Mr. Isaac J.
Mr. Louis S.
erett.
Mr. H. L. G.
Mrs. Jno. J.
Roxbury.

Q: Is free love opposed to true Christianity?

A: No, most certainly not. It has even been practised by true Christians.

Q (Mrs. Gallup): What is your present attitude toward the militants?

A: Still sympathetic, but wholly from the outside.

Q: What is your opinion of the Anarchist criticism of woman suffrage?

A: I am so sorry to say that I am ignorant of the latest phases of their criticism.

Q (Mr. Fascia): Would it not be better if all prejudices were removed, and men lived as brothers?

A: I should like to have my revenge on some people first. I do not think we shall ever eliminate the fighting quality.

Q: What are the prospects of getting from the single to the double track in this generation?

A: As soon as the Irish question is settled I believe we shall see a great movement toward it in England.

Q (Mrs. Sodderman): Do you expect the collapse of the present English government?

A: Certainly not.

Q: Would you give the vote to women on account of their inalienable right, or for expediency?

A: There are no inalienable rights; there are only what we get by fighting.

Q (Mr. Margolis): Would it not be better to try to think clearly instead of labeling ourselves Socialists or Anarchists?

A: One person is never so strong as many united for one cause. Where would Napoleon be without his army?

Q: Since where women have the vote immorality is dwindling, does it not make of priests and preachers and rabbis political Anarchists when they oppose woman suffrage?

A: I don't like the assumption that political Anarchists are necessarily immoralists.

Q (Mr. Harbour): How do you account for the opposition of so many intelligent women to woman suffrage?

A: I believe it is a certain atavistic subtlety of feeling which makes them shrink from the shock of a transitional period. They dread the dust and sweat and blood of the arena. You will find the same sort of thing in extremely refined artists like Matthew Arnold.

"Greatness lies not in being strong, but in the right using of strength; and strength is not used rightly when it only serves to carry a man above his fellows for his own solitary glory. He is greatest whose strength carries up the most hearts by the attraction of his own."—Henry Ward Beecher.

...nd? That we are at the parting of the ways. What else do we find? Progress?—that ridiculous ideal of the market-place! It does not matter what we do, we say, the great purpose will triumph, because evolution will look after it. But suppose evolution is careless, diabolical, and cares not a jot for all our morality? What then? Suppose the human race has for two thousand years gone in the wrong direction? We must ask: Is it a good thing to have woman suffrage, and why? Why is the economic aspect of woman suffrage more important than any other? First of all, suffrage—what is suffrage? The right to vote. It implies a ten-millionth part in the national palaver, mostly of fools. We vote, and the supposition is that the people we vote for go there, and the further supposition is that when they are there they do what we want them to. Neither of these suppositions is true, of course. We must ask: Is representative government played out? Is the party system of government outworn? Has the point been reached where our taste is a little sick of them? If it has, and I discern indications that it has, what does it matter whether or not women get the vote, when in a little while men also are going to lose it?

If this be so, what should we substitute for the vote? Personally, I should substitute a sort of universal referendum, by which each government should be ruled in a highly centralized manner for a period of, say, ten years, by an oligarchy of officials chosen by the dictator, the Napoleon, elected by the universal referendum. These officials would have absolute power. They would make of men an industrial army, governing entirely by tyranny. And the nation would be one great trust, and Socialism would have come. (Applause.)

Really and truly, the economic aspect of woman suffrage will never be shelved and done with as decided until we have Socialism. Women will never be really free or have justice until Socialism is established. (Applause.) The conditions are such that for economic reasons, given the system as at present it exists, it is impossible that women should be paid as they deserve to be paid, and should take their place as they must take their place in the industrial action of the world. Why must we have the economic aspect of suffrage discussed? Do you not know that all our talk, all our philosophies, all our books, all our parliaments and voting, depend upon the economic situation, and that not all the legislation in the world can change the economic situation? Only economic pressure can do that, and economic pressure demands force behind it. Now suppose a man should arise who was an unscrupulous man of action, a visionary dreamer, and an anti-monian skeptic; and then the thing would be done. But it will never be done while we

two great economic and sexual necessities—having food and having children.

Since the economic aspect of woman suffrage is the really important thing, what would happen if you gave women the vote? I am coming to a part of my subject that interests me more than any. A certain number of people are afraid that if you made every woman the equal unit of society with every man, and made that unit the person and not the head of the family, every kind of catastrophe, moral and otherwise, would come about—free love the least of them. In certain quarters the word "feminism" is supposed to be synonymous with "free love." Read your dictionary! Don't think, though, that I am afraid to talk about free love, or about anything else. Everything ought to be discussed. Now, here you want to make the woman the equal unit of society with the man, and quite obviously the first step in that direction would be the endowing of motherhood. Anybody who thinks the endowing of motherhood would lead to free love is right in one sense, because love would be free between the individual man and woman, and you would get the ideal monogamistic state. Do you think there is any beauty in being bound together when one is a slave and the other a victim? No, motherhood must be a profession, and ought to be paid five times as much as any other. (Applause.)

I really do not care very much what making woman the equal of man will lead to. What are you afraid of? Think that out, and you will find that there is a little tincture of purely animal meanness in your fear. Have you no trust in women? Do you think all the world would run amuck in an orgy of licentiousness? That is an insult to your mother, your sister, your wife. Of course we know women, we who love them, far better than that. They would see to it themselves that there would be something very different. (Applause.) The people who associate feminism and free love are either humbugs or rascals. They are the people who support and frequent brothels. They know that brothels would be closed, and women workers would no longer be driven on the street by insufficient wages. They do not want that to happen, and so they cry: "Free love! Free love!" and all the fakirs cry with them. (Applause.) No, women would prevent that orgy; and surely you do not think you can have an orgy like that without them!

As a matter of fact, it may turn out that the vote is not the most important aspect of the woman question. It may be more important to be a feminist than a suffragist, and it may even be that no one can be a suffragist in the logical sense without being a feminist too. Now, there are certain among you who, having read Strindberg and Nietzsche and Dostoevsky and are inclined

(Continued on Page 4.)

City Planning.

Mr. George B. Gallup, 728
wealth Avenue, Boston, Cl
Mrs. E. D. Foster, 41 Huntin
Miss Freda Rogolsky, 357 C
Mr. Henry S. Victorson, 15
Mr. D. F. Ladd, Wellesley.
Mrs. L. B. Noyes, 146 Ma
Avenue, Boston.
Mr. R. G. McKerrall, 41 Mar
Everett.

Immigration.

Mr. Henry S. Victorson, 15
Boston, Chairman.
Mr. Maurice Casper, 39 No. 1
Mr. Julius J. Shapiro, 115 Sal
Miss Ida Goldberg, 19 Aubur
Mr. Frank Holiver, 83 Chambe
Mr. George E. Rower, Jr., 42
Avenue, Roxbury.
Mr. M. T. Rush, 3 Bowdoin S

Education.

Miss Miriam Allen deFord, 98
Miss Helen Veasey, 28 Shaft
Grove Hall, Dorchester.
Mr. Isaac Isaacs, 36 Allen S
Mr. Louis Simons, 164 Union S
erett.
Mr. H. L. Greene, 104 Belvidere
Mrs. Jno. J. Sullivan, Weld S
Roxbury.

Housing.

Mr. William C. Terry, P. O. E
Boston, Chairman.
Mrs. Carrie G. Barr, 15 Joy Str
Mrs. Eva Hoffman, 125 Leveret
Mrs. E. D. Foster, 41 Hunting
Mr. George B. Gallup, 728
wealth Avenue, Boston.
Mrs. A. L. Rienzi, 171 Everet
Allston.

Health.

Mr. Elmer Eldridge, 14 Harva
Brookline, Chairman.
Miss Gertrude S. Cohen, 44a Jo
Mr. David Simpson, 3 Fairlee S
Somerville.
Mr. Samuel Segall, 15 Blossom
Miss Anna V. Eldred, 4 Kears
nue, Roxbury.

Play and Recreation.

Mr. J. S. London, Y. M. C. A.
Chairman.
Miss Ida S. R. Goldberg, 19
Street, Boston.
Miss Anna V. Eldred, 4 Kears
nue, Roxbury.

ch-words, and think all is
are broad-minded and be-
and justice. Our broad-
ords are air and wind and
mes to the real pinch, and
economic pinch.

woman a slave today is the
ion which prevails. (Ap-
woman is dependent on a
actical purposes she is his
u come down to bed-rock in
find that this is quite lit-
must eat and drink first of
prime purposes of life are
opagation of the race. The
on is an animal, scientific,
estion. It is the question
ie minds of grandpapa and
the hairy cave-man. We
alk, but behind liberty and
rything else, you get these
mic and sexual necessities—
i having children.

onomic aspect of woman suf-
ally important thing, what
you gave women the vote?
a part of my subject that
ore than any. A certain
ple are afraid that if you
oman the equal unit of so-
y man, and made that unit
not the head of the family,
atastrophe, moral and other-
ne about—free love the least
certain quarters the word
supposed to be synonymous
e." Read your dictionary!
ugh, that I am afraid to talk
e, or about anything else.
ght to be discussed. Now,
to make the woman the equal
y with the man, and quite
first step in that direction
adowing of motherhood. Any-
ks the endowing of mother-
d to free love is right in one
love would be free between
man and woman, and you
ideal monogamistic state. Do
e is any beauty in being bound
one is a slave and the other
motherhood must be a pro-
ght to be paid five times as
ther. (Applause.)

ot care very much what mak-
equal of man will lead to.

Mr. Jonah Rabinow, 99 Myrtle Street.
Mr. E. H. McIntosh, 247 Beale Street,
Wollaston.

Budget and Appropriations.

Mr. R. G. McKerrall, 41 Marie Avenue,
Everett, Chairman.
Mr. George W. Coleman, 177 W. Brook-
line Street, Boston.
Miss Elizabeth Hunter, 36 Hancock
Street, Boston.
Miss Freda Rogolsky, 357 Charles
Street.
Mr. D. F. Ladd, Wellesley.
Mr. J. J. Sullivan, Weld Street, West
Roxbury.
Mr. J. S. London, Y. M. C. A., Boston.

Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Arthur O. Taylor, Box 3507, Boston,
Chairman.
Mr. W. C. Ewing, 987 Washington St.
Mr. M. T. Rush, 3 Bowdoin Street.
Mr. John H. Guttererson, P. O. Box 134.

City Planning.

Mr. George B. Gallup, 728 Common-
wealth Avenue, Boston, Chairman.
Mrs. E. D. Foster, 41 Huntington Ave.
Miss Freda Rogolsky, 357 Charles St.
Mr. Henry S. Victorson, 15 Court Sq.
Mr. D. F. Ladd, Wellesley.
Mrs. L. B. Noyes, 146 Massachusetts
Avenue, Boston.
Mr. R. G. McKerrall, 41 Marie Avenue,
Everett.

Immigration.

Mr. Henry S. Victorson, 15 Court Sq.,
Boston, Chairman.
Mr. Maurice Casper, 39 No. Russell St.
Mr. Julius J. Shapiro, 115 Salem Street.
Miss Ida Goldberg, 19 Auburn Street.
Mr. Frank Holiver, 83 Chambers Street.
Mr. George E. Rower, Jr., 451 Walnut
Avenue, Roxbury.
Mr. M. T. Rush, 3 Bowdoin Street.

Education.

Miss Miriam Allen deFord, 98 Tyler St.
Miss Helen Veasey, 28 Shafter Street,
Grove Hall, Dorchester.
Mr. Isaac Isaacs, 36 Allen Street.
Mr. Louis Simons, 164 Union Street, Ev-
erett.
Mr. H. L. Greene, 104 Belvidere Street.
Mrs. Jno. J. Sullivan, Weld Street, W.
Roxbury.

Housing.

Mr. William C. Terry, P. O. Box 3347,
Boston.

Mrs. J. J. Sullivan, Weld Street, W. Rox-
bury.
Mrs. A. L. Rienzi, 171 Everett Street,
Allston.

Labor.

Miss Louise A. Grout, 154 Newbury
Street, Boston, Chairman.
Mr. Peter E. Timbley.
Mr. Simon Robinson, 34 Temple Street.
Mr. K. F. Lindblad, 67 Sudbury Street.
Law School, 14 Ashburton Place.
Mr. G. G. Mills, P. O. Box 53, Water-
town.
Mr. George E. Power, Jr., 451 Walnut
Avenue, Roxbury.
Mr. Clarence Marble, 179 Vine Street,
Everett.

Judiciary.

Mr. Herbert P. Ware, care of Adams &
Glynn, 30 Court Street, Boston, Chair-
man.
Mr. J. J. Freedman, 106 Union Park
Street, Boston.
Miss Bessie Kisloff, care of B. U. Law
School, 11 Ashburton Place, Boston.
Mr. Irving L. Hoffman, care of B. U.
Law School, 11 Ashburton Place, Bos-
ton.
Mr. Louis Chandler, 28 School Street.

Transportation.

Mr. Clarence Marble, 197 Vine Street,
Everett, Chairman.
Mr. D. F. Ladd, Wellesley.
Mr. H. L. Green, 104 Belvidere Avenue.
Mr. Samuel P. Levenberg, 23 Browning
Ave., Dorchester.
Mr. J. S. Ballou, 53 State Street.

To Investigate Credit Unions. (Special.)

Mr. Leonard Martin, Chairman, Anti-
Saloon League, 344 Tremont Bldg.
Mr. Leo B. Kagan, 24 Traverse Street.
Mr. K. F. M. Lindblad, 67 Sudbury St.

Ways and Means.

Mr. James P. Roberts, 141 Milk Street.
Mr. J. S. Ballou, 53 State Street.
Mr. Leo B. Kagan, 24 Traverse Street.
Mr. George B. Gallup, 728 Common-
wealth Avenue, Boston.
Mr. D. F. Ladd, Wellesley.
Mr. Samuel P. Levenberg, 23 Browning
Avenue, Dorchester.
Dr. Jacob T. Pollock, 212 Chestnut St.,
Chelsea.

Publicity

Mrs. George B. Gallup, 728 Common-
wealth Avenue, Boston, Chairman.
Mr. George W. Coleman, 177 W. Brook-

LAST WEEK'S TOWN MEETING.

Friends of our efficient sergeant-at-arms
will be sorry to hear that he has been ill,
although in spite of his illness he attended
Town Meeting as usual on Thursday. Mr.
Ladd, who has been appointed assistant
sergeant-at-arms, was also present at the
last meetings, his Thursdays, as well as all
his other evenings, having been taken by
the soup kitchen.

* * *

Another one of our members to whom our
sympathy must be extended is Mr. Rower,
who is ill with appendicitis. Mrs. Foster,
too, has been tired out by her work in the
soup kitchen, but we hope that a good rest
now will bring her back to her usual
strength and activity.

* * *

The preliminary report of the committee
on city planning on a municipal lodging-
house is the finest possible example of the
kind of work our committees are doing. Mr.
Gallup and his committee have been work-
ing for three months on this bill, Order No.
1. They have been in correspondence with
municipal lodging-houses all over the coun-
try. They have done practical investigat-
ing, some members of the committee even
spending the night in various 25-cent lodg-
ing-houses in Boston so as to understand
thoroughly their workings and their defi-
ciencies. They have collected a scrap-book
of clippings and publications on the subject
that is permanently valuable. The report,
recommending a hotel, industrial shops and
a municipal farm, shows the result of such
preparation. The Town Meeting has still
another reason to be grateful that Mr. Gal-
lup is one of its citizens.

* * *

The soup kitchen has been closed, since
the city is ready to tear down the building
for the widening of Avery street. The men
are still desperately in need of food, clothes
and shelter, but most of all of employment
by which they can earn these things. At
present the employment department is being
continued under Mrs. Foster's care at Mor-
gan Memorial, and anyone knowing of op-
portunities for work, especially hotel, farm
or day-laboring jobs, will confer an ines-
timable benefit by sending word to her to
that effect.

* * *

The Junior City Councils, of the City
History Club, of which Mr. Allen is director,
is to hold a New Voters' Rally in Faneuil
Hall on the afternoon of April 19th. Gov-

Mr. Henry S. Victorson, 15 Court Sq., Boston, Chairman.
Mr. Maurice Casper, 39 No. Russell St.
Mr. Julius J. Shapiro, 115 Salem Street.
Miss Ida Goldberg, 19 Auburn Street.
Mr. Frank Holiver, 83 Chambers Street.
Mr. George E. Rower, Jr., 451 Walnut Avenue, Roxbury.
Mr. M. T. Rush, 3 Bowdoin Street.

Education.

Miss Miriam Allen deFord, 98 Tyler St.
Miss Helen Veasey, 28 Shafter Street, Grove Hall, Dorchester.
Mr. Isaac Isaacs, 36 Allen Street.
Mr. Louis Simons, 164 Union Street, Everett.
Mr. H. L. Greene, 104 Belvidere Street.
Mrs. Jno. J. Sullivan, Weld Street, W. Roxbury.

Housing.

Mr. William C. Terry, P. O. Box 3347, Boston, Chairman.
Mrs. Carrie G. Barr, 15 Joy Street.
Mrs. Eva Hoffman, 125 Leverett St.
Mrs. E. D. Foster, 41 Huntington Ave.
Mr. George B. Gallup, 728 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston.
Mrs. A. L. Rienzi, 171 Everett Street, Allston.

Health.

Mr. Elmer Eldridge, 14 Harvard Place, Brookline, Chairman.
Miss Gertrude S. Cohen, 44a Joy Street.
Mr. David Simpson, 3 Fairlee Street, W. Somerville.
Mr. Samuel Segall, 15 Blossom Street.
Miss Anna V. Eldred, 4 Kearsarge Avenue, Roxbury.

Play and Recreation.

Mr. J. S. London, Y. M. C. A., Boston, Chairman.
Miss Ida S. R. Goldberg, 19 Auburn Street, Boston.
Miss Anna V. Eldred, 4 Kearsarge Avenue, Roxbury.

Ave., Dorchester.

Mr. J. S. Ballou, 53 State Street.

To Investigate Credit Unions. (Special.)

Mr. Leonard Martin, Chairman, Anti-Saloon League, 344 Tremont Bldg.
Mr. Leo B. Kagan, 24 Traverse Street.
Mr. K. F. M. Lindblad, 67 Sudbury St.

Ways and Means.

Mr. James P. Roberts, 141 Milk Street.
Mr. J. S. Ballou, 53 State Street.
Mr. Leo B. Kagan, 24 Traverse Street.
Mr. George B. Gallup, 728 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston.
Mr. D. F. Ladd, Wellesley.
Mr. Samuel P. Levenberg, 23 Browning Avenue, Dorchester.
Dr. Jacob T. Pollock, 212 Chestnut St., Chelsea.

Publicity

Mrs. George B. Gallup, 728 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Chairman.
Mr. George W. Coleman, 177 W. Brookline Street, Boston.
Mr. J. S. London, Y. M. C. A., Boston.
Mr. A. D. Skelding, Boston Post.
Mr. Wm. V. Bottom, 121 St. Stephen St.
Miss Freda Rogolsky, Peabody House.

Citizenship.

Mr. H. L. Greene, 104 Belvidere Street, Boston, Chairman.
Mr. George Weitzer, 100 Brighton St.
Miss Turner.
Mr. Frank Holiver, 83 Chambers St.

To Investigate Unemployment. (Special.)

Mr. Arthur O. Taylor, Box 3507, Boston, Chairman.

"Let us believe in the great mass of the people—not because they are intellectually clever, not because they are independent thinkers, but because in the long run the safest and sanest safeguards of national character are to be found not in the subtle jugglery of the mental attitude of the few, but in the sound, sane feeling laid down in the fundamental character of the great mass of the nation."—Prof. George E. Vincent.

a municipal form, showing the preparation. The Town Meeting has still another reason to be grateful that Mr. Gallup is one of its citizens.

* * *

The soup kitchen has been closed, since the city is ready to tear down the building for the widening of Avery street. The men are still desperately in need of food, clothes and shelter, but most of all of employment by which they can earn these things. At present the employment department is being continued under Mrs. Foster's care at Morgan Memorial, and anyone knowing of opportunities for work, especially hotel, farm or day-laboring jobs, will confer an inestimable benefit by sending word to her to that effect.

* * *

The Junior City Councils, of the City History Club, of which Mr. Allen is director, is to hold a New Voters' Rally in Faneuil Hall, on the afternoon of April 19th. Governor Walsh is to be the speaker of the day. All persons interested are invited to attend this meeting, which is receiving the co-operation of the Town Meeting among other organizations.

Bill No. 35, equal suffrage. Referred to committee on judiciary. In committee.

Bill No. 36, seriousness in meeting. Referred to committee on immigration. In committee.

"The effort to prohibit all combinations, good or bad, is bound to fail, and ought to fail; when made, it merely means that some kind of the worst combinations are not checked and that honest business is checked. Our purpose should be, not to strangle business as an incident of strangling combinations, but to regulate big corporations in thorough-going and effective fashion, so as to help legitimate business as an incident to thoroughly and completely safeguarding the interests of the people as a whole."—Theodore Roosevelt.

THE STORY OF GEORGE BREWSTER GALLUP.

By Mary C. Crawford.

It helps you to understand George Brewster Gallup to know that he writes poetry. Some of his serious verse has been very highly praised by critics who know good work in this field; and, though he says little about this verse-writing, one feels the poet behind the advertising man whenever Mr. Gallup talks his favorite theme, city planning. To this man city planning means bringing the Holy City down to earth—"making His Kingdom come," in the striking phraseology of the world's greatest prayer; to a sermon he once heard preached on the text, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven," Mr. Gallup dates his spiritual rebirth into this passion of his life.

George Brewster Gallup is of the purest Puritan strain so far as his family is concerned. He doesn't bother much about this, for he is a democrat with a big D, but he says it strengthens his sinews to remember it when he is fighting, against great odds, to make this world a fit place for children to be born into. For that to him is the whole meaning and purpose of "city planning": the elimination of the inhumanities and barbarities of cities as we see them today. He once wrote for the leading paper of a city not a thousand miles from Boston a series of one hundred and fifty articles which covered the whole field of city planning as we now know it. And yet this science had not then been given a name. It was his idealistic enthusiasm for a more perfect city that first drew him and George W. Coleman together. What this has meant to the Ford Hall Meetings I need not say.

Mr. Gallup was born in a little town near Albany, New York, and served his newspaper apprenticeship as reporter on the Albany Argus. Then he became interested in library work and helped to organize the first State Library Association of which Melville Dewey was president. Somewhat later he was called to a newspaper position in another New York city where, at that time, capital and labor were engaged in deadly combat. The vision of what the city might become if these two opposing forces were made to work together smote Mr. Gallup with mighty force, and he began to try

THE ECONOMIC ASPECT OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

(Continued from Page 2.)

to take a very cynical view of certain aspects of women's character and personality—of the sex. There is no use in denouncing these people. There is no use in shutting the mouth of any thinker by personal abuse. Everything must be discussed, and every opinion aired. These people would say: "The whole movement is an indication of a biological degeneracy. It is not because women have become more intellectual that the change has been brought about, but because men have become more feeble, and are in a pathological state of neurotic degeneracy. Because of their general lack of virility, they take a kind of perverted pleasure in being trampled upon and cruelly treated by women." I rejoice, therefore, whenever I see a magnificent, clear-eyed prize-fighter in the ranks of woman suffrage. I would strongly persuade all baseball and football and cricket players to join the cause, and above all to go in the processions.

It is true that Strindberg has exposed the parasite woman, and the vampirish and cannibalistic aspect of women, which is in all, even the best of them. You can see it in the unscrupulousness of mothers, and the horrible cannibalism of parents who live by draining the strength of their children. But I come to a still more subtle point. Some people in their hearts hold with Nietzsche that what we want is a dramatic and exciting world, and that women make it so, but that in order that they may do so they must be dangerous. This is an important philosophical aspect of woman suffrage and the feminist movement. I know some people think that women, when they have economic equality, will become uninteresting, horribly eugenic, badly dressed lathe and plaster drabtags. Why should I argue with these people? Well, suppose I hid in my heart of hearts a sneaking, lurking sympathy with them? I understand their little emotions upon this matter. But if you think that the dangerousness of women will come to an end because of their equality you are grievously mistaken. If there is dangerousness in women which makes them at once so perilous and so dev-

thing is of God it will prevail." And if it be not of God—well, go ahead and stamp it out if you can. If God is in it, you cannot oppose it. And if there be no God, it is our affair; take the reins, be gods yourselves and use your will.

It is absolutely necessary that in all these controversies we keep not only clear heads, but light hearts. Why cannot suffragists and anti-suffragists even meet at an afternoon tea without quarreling with each other? We ought to remember that we are all, after all, men and women together—brothers and sisters—and all in a great darkness. We really and truly know very little as to the purpose and will of the Invisible Ones behind it all. A kind of crepuscular dawn may be emerging, but it is not very much. We are all groping and fumbling and feeling our way. Why, then, should we turn upon one another and spit out our vitriolic abuse as if we belonged to different planets, instead of being poor human beings, all condemned alike to die? Since life is short, let us be content to go together like good philosophers, and while we analyze and dissect everything in the skeptic's and agitator's way, let us be magnanimous and honorable opponents. A good war is what we want, but we must play the game fairly.

The economic aspect of woman suffrage, you see, really means that in the future men and women will work together. It seems to me that for the first time in evolution women as women have become conscious of what it means to be a woman from the point of view of psychic and intellectual consciousness. When such women hear it said that women are either inferior or superior to men they smile. They know that women are—different; and that the world will achieve even a temporary solution of the mystery only when the intellect of men and the intellect of women meet and work together. Therefore, let the women go over to business and politics, and the men to poetry, culture and the fine arts. For then only you will have the ideal world.

THE DAILY TEMPLE.

In the very heart of "materialistic" New York, at 35 East Thirty-second Street, a young woman has established a church for all peoples. She is Elizabeth Knopf, and she says she was impelled by a vision to found

cerned. He doesn't bother much about this, for he is a democrat with a big D, but he says it strengthens his sinews to remember it when he is fighting, against great odds, to make this world a fit place for children to be born into. For that to him is the whole meaning and purpose of "city planning": the elimination of the inhumanities and barbarities of cities as we see them today. He once wrote for the leading paper of a city not a thousand miles from Boston a series of one hundred and fifty articles which covered the whole field of city planning as we now know it. And yet this science had not then been given a name. It was his idealistic enthusiasm for a more perfect city that first drew him and George W. Coleman together. What this has meant to the Ford Hall Meetings I need not say.

Mr. Gallup was born in a little town near Albany, New York, and served his newspaper apprenticeship as reporter on the Albany Argus. Then he became interested in library work and helped to organize the first State Library Association of which Melville Dewey was president. Somewhat later he was called to a newspaper position in another New York city where, at that time, capital and labor were engaged in deadly combat. The vision of what the city might become if these two opposing forces were made to work together smote Mr. Gallup with mighty force, and he began to try what he could do towards bringing this happy thing to pass. The president of the labor union was a friend of his and so was the president of the Chamber of Commerce. Through Mr. Gallup's good offices the two were made to know each other as men and as citizens, with the result that the union label was soon to be found on all the city printing and men began to be proud of residence in a community of which they had heretofore been ashamed.

In the great work of stimulating a similar pride in our New England communities Mr. Gallup now gives scores of addresses every year before all sorts of civic bodies on The Perfect City as he sees it. At the Ford Hall Town Meetings his vision has already kindled the imagination of the citizens and has borne fruit in actual civic improvement. For Mr. Gallup is quite as ready to lend his shoulder as his silver tongue to the boosting of any good movement; seconded by Mrs. Gallup, he has been of immense service to those in charge of our soup kitchen enterprise.

The Gallups are, indeed, a refreshingly congenial and like-minded couple, and their one son is now enthusiastically following his father's profession in New York city. Such families serve to keep our faith firm for the principles upon which New England was builded.

Play is the joy of good work in tabloid form.

prize-fighter in the ranks of woman suffrage. I would strongly persuade all baseball and football and cricket players to join the cause, and above all to go in the processions.

It is true that Strindberg has exposed the parasite woman, and the vampirish and cannibalistic aspect of women, which is in all, even the best of them. You can see it in the unscrupulousness of mothers, and the horrible cannibalism of parents who live by draining the strength of their children. But I come to a still more subtle point. Some people in their hearts hold with Nietzsche that what we want is a dramatic and exciting world, and that women make it so, but that in order that they may do so they must be dangerous. This is an important philosophical aspect of woman suffrage and the feminist movement. I know some people think that women, when they have economic equality, will become uninteresting, horribly eugenic, badly dressed lathe and plaster drabbltags. Why should I argue with these people? Well, suppose I hid in my heart of hearts a sneaking, lurking sympathy with them? I understand their little emotions upon this matter. But if you think that the dangerousness of women will come to an end because of their equality you are grievously mistaken. If there is dangerousness in women which makes them at once so perilous and so devilishly attractive, it will not disappear for all the voting in the world.

Now I am going to talk to the people who hold the old fashioned Victorian ideals—"my backyard, my beer, my wife, my beefsteak, I don't know anything about it but I know I like it and it's mine." If you may know a profligate by his use of the phrase "free love," you may know a hypocritical villain by his use of the phrase, "the sanctity of the home." If you know a man who says, "The sanctity of the home is in danger," send a detective after him. But with these men are their wives, who have been forced to listen to this talk, and who have at last come to think, through utter weariness, "Suppose my husband is right after all?" To the wives and daughters who have lived in this mephitic and miasmic atmosphere. I address myself. All that is really beautiful and delicate and precious, in the natural sense sacred and pure, in the old-fashioned order of society, will not be killed. Women will not cease to be attractive—when they have more money they will spend more on dress, and I rejoice in it. And they will not forget how to cook, how to be gracious hostesses or charming society women.

The tide is coming on to something really important, and we have to face it. We have to ask ourselves horrible questions, and be good agitators. We have to discuss every moral basis and every conviction, principle and morality in the world. Suppose you ask yourself: What are you afraid of? "If the

instead of being poor human beings, all condemned alike to die? Since life is short let us be content to go together like good philosophers, and while we analyze and dissect everything in the skeptic's and agitator's way, let us be magnanimous and honorable opponents. A good war is what we want, but we must play the game fairly.

The economic aspect of woman suffrage, you see, really means that in the future men and women will work together. It seems to me that for the first time in evolution women as women have become conscious of what it means to be a woman from the point of view of psychic and intellectual consciousness. When such women hear it said that women are either inferior or superior to men they smile. They know that women are—different; and that the world will achieve even a temporary solution of the mystery only when the intellect of men and the intellect of women meet and work together. Therefore, let the women go over to business and politics, and the men to poetry, culture and the fine arts. For then only you will have the ideal world.

THE DAILY TEMPLE.

In the very heart of "materialistic" New York, at 35 East Thirty-second Street, a young woman has established a church for all peoples. She is Elizabeth Knopf, and she says she was impelled by a vision to found this spiritual centre, intended primarily for the working people who pass the Daily Temple on their way home from work. For a year and a half she has been traveling in Europe and the Holy Land to prepare herself for this work, and now she has remodelled an old stable into a church, and moved into its upper story as her permanent home. Miss Knopf is supporting the enterprise herself, and not even a collection will ever be taken.

Every evening she will have religious services, so conducted as to appeal equally to the followers of all religions or of none. When the Daily Temple was opened on December 28, six different religions were represented in the congregation.

Every noon there will be an open forum on the Ford Hall plan, for the discussion of topics not necessarily religious. Miss Knopf is a militant suffragist, as well as a spiritual enthusiast, and many of these noon discussions will be on various aspects of feminism. Dr. Anna Howard Shaw has been asked to speak on "Women and Religion."

The game of success is never a game of solitaire.

FRIENDS WHO ARE COMING.

April 12—Dr. Thomas C. Hall of New York, "Religion and Social Revolution."
April 19—Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch "Is the Woman Movement Going to Save Society?"

APRIL 12.—DR. THOMAS C. HALL of New York will discuss "*Religion and Social Revolution.*" Following close on the heels of Prof. Harry Ward's remarkable address on "*The Challenge of Socialism to Christianity*" this talk ought to link inextricably in the minds of the Ford Hall audience the very intimate relation which must and should exist between the religious motive and the social motive in any effective scheme of social reconstruction. Dr. Hall is the son of Rev. John Hall, one of the most famous preachers America has ever known, and he himself has a rare oratorical gift as well as the delightful wit of his native Ireland. One of Cooper Union's most acceptable speakers, he scored a big hit here



also, when he gave an address a year or so ago on "*The Morals of Anarchy and Socialism.*"

PROGRAM FOR APRIL 19

Mrs. H. CARLETON SLACK	Soprano
Mrs. ANNA C. BREED	Soprano
Miss EDITH L. MUNROE	Alto
DAVID LANGILLE	Tenor
H. CARLETON SLACK	Baritone
GEORGE MENDALL TAYLOR	Accompanist
1. Zion	Root
By the QUINTETTE	
2. { (a) White Rose	Whelpley
{ (b) Spring Song	Lynes
Soprano Solos by Miss ZOA AMIDON	
3. { (a) May Song	Anonymous
{ (b) My Native Land	von Suppé
Mr. LANGILLE	
4. A Perfect Day	Bond
Mrs. SLACK	
5. Welcome to Spring	Rubinstein
Miss MUNROE	
6. Viva l'America	Millard
Mrs. BREED	
7. List the Cherubic Host	Gaul
By the QUINTETTE	

ADDRESS, "Is the Woman Movement Going to Save Society?"
 —Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch of Rochester, N. Y.
 HYMN, "Battle Hymn of the Republic"
 QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

APRIL 19.—PROF. WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH will brilliantly close our seventh season in a lecture bearing the provocative title "*Is the Woman Movement Going to Save Society?*" Prof. Rauschenbusch is too well known and too dearly loved by this audience to call for any commendatory comments. A great scholar, he is also a very great soul. One of the most distinguished Jews in America recently spoke of him to the Secretary of these Meetings as "The Saint of Our Times." From such a man any message on the relation of Feminism to the future of the race is bound to be an important contribution to a vexed problem. Obviously, you will need to come early that night!



THE Ford Hall meetings are years old. They have a wide reputation. A number of similar popular meetings have been instituted in other cities by those who got their inspiration from Ford Hall. For more than a year Ford Hall has not been large enough to accommodate the crowds who come to these meetings. The most famous speakers gladly give their services to the cause, though their regular engagements are from fifty to one hundred dollars and expenses. Likewise the ablest musicians generously give their services for the good of the cause. The man and director of the meetings is the head usher and his assistants help to make their services without compensation. The Boston Baptist Society has the free use of the hall, appropriate for running expenses, and makes its own management of the meetings. What are the results of this work and devotion, and why do we have in all this superficial success? The answer to this question is barely outlined within the scope of these meetings. One of the greatest results of these years' work is a totally new illumination to the minds of those who are more blessed to give their services. While the Ford Hall meetings are a church agency without special advantage for itself, asking nothing but to serve others, I would not find these meetings in their churches themselves. We emphasize the correct method. More than a score of churches have adopted the methods employed here and hardly a day goes by when the church is eagerly inquiring about the changed attitude of individuals toward social and economic conditions. Their changed feeling toward the unidentified with organizations is another happy result of these meetings. Hall meetings have made a contribution. On the other hand, churches who attend these meetings are largely unsympathetic toward organized religion, a former bitterness, a fair consideration, honor and love many churches and synagogues. Protestants and Jews are once of the Ford Hall meetings to their abandoned who have identified themselves with the work for any length of time to respect each other. Another great work of these meetings is also in the fact that we have had