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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, women's 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 daily intimacies of personal life, then only do we have a real fulfillment 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 immense 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 1700's. 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 the profits. It is going to be very hard to change the family on this fundamental base.

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 1700's. (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 the 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. It is almost impossible for a woman to feel that her husband's property is her own, even when such 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-
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 all 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 case 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 divorces 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 edible 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 fulfillment through group activities. The most powerful of these hungers is that of sex, which starts in early 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

---

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."

(Continued on Page 4.)
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 a question of eugenics really a question of the conservation of the race?
A: Yes; thank you for putting it that way.
Q: What is 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 deplore 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 emotional basis. But it must also show 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 will 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 between people of different races?
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?
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: 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 much marital infelicity due to the transference of love from a Platonic to a physical plane?
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: 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 much marital infelicity due to the transference of love from a Platonic to a physical plane?
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: 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 much marital infelicity due to the transference of love from a Platonic to a physical plane?
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: 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 much marital infelicity due to the transference of love from a Platonic to a physical plane?
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.
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 economic independence 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 wouldn't you 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 deplore pathological teaching.

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

A: So far as I know, love in its highest manifestation is not a transference but a growth of love. When there is no deep and strong animal basis. But it must rise above that basis.

Q: What is your opinion of "The Damned Goods"?

A: To quote a well-known fertile writer: "The Damned Goods" are the "Damned Goods" of the present and the "Damned Goods" of the future. (Applause.)

Q: Do you believe in trial marriage?

A: Manage it just like any business.

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

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 given to thought and discussion. (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 given to thought and discussion. (Applause.)

Q: Is there any demonstration of the fact everywhere. Love does not depend upon a purse.

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

Q: In some cases restricted sterilization is desirable.

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

Q: Is not much marital infidelity due to the presence of men and women, and we have no definite knowledge bearing upon it.

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

Q: How can people be healthy today when the food is so pure? (Applause.)

A: It 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 general public is interested in the idea of a "healthy marriage" and we are trying to help them. (Applause.)

Q: What is the questioner younger than 20? (Laughter.)

A: It is true it has made marriage late but is it not the same difficulty. It does not strike directly at the problem.

Q: Do not economic conditions make marriage a cause of destitution?

A: I am not very ardent about 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. (Laughter.)

Q: It is true it has made marriage late. What is the special cause of that?

A: It is a very rare privilege, a very rare privilege, a very rare privilege, a very rare privilege, a very rare privilege. But it is not due to any difficulty. It does not strike directly at the problem.

Q: Do not economic conditions make marriage a cause of destitution?

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: Is it not against human nature for one to love two men 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: What is your opinion of legislation with reference to vasectomy?

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

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

A: It is one of the most important scientific problems now given to thought and discussion. (Applause.)

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

Q: What is your opinion of legislation with reference to vasectomy?

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

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

A: It is one of the most important scientific problems now given to thought and discussion. (Applause.)

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

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

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

A: It is one of the most important scientific problems now given to thought and discussion. (Applause.)

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

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

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

A: It is one of the most important scientific problems now given to thought and discussion. (Applause.)

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

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

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

A: It is one of the most important scientific problems now given to thought and discussion. (Applause.)

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

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

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

A: It is one of the most important scientific problems now given to thought and discussion. (Applause.)

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

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

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

A: It is not the displacing of men by machinery a cause of destitution.

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

A: It is one of the most important scientific problems now given to thought and discussion. (Applause.)
FORD HALL FOLKS

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 Schnittker are sent to the platform in written form, and 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.

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 a thing that must be done a great many times 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 subscribed for your magazine, which is a very strong inducement 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 modesty that made a public man fuss about allowing his portrait to appear in a newspaper. And I made up my mind perhaps 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?"
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, quite likely to find out all about it very soon.

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.
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 store force. The father determined to put an end 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 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 beneficial influences of Ford Hall meetings is the democratic atmosphere of the place, and this pleasing impression is very noticeable at once 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.
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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.


THE FAMILY OF THE FUTURE.
(Continued from Page 1.)

voices in the United States. These divorces 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 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...
It is love, and love, and love, and that no family can persist unless it rests on a foundation of indissoluble love.
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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 Horace Lowell.”

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 F. Sisson on “Rhodesia”;

E. L. Grimes Company, Printers, 122 Pearl Street, Boston, Mass.