Sketch the suffrage movement at that time. The leaders - Mrs. Gilman, Helen Campbell. Go through the files of the Chautauquan to see how we touched these interests. My notions were entirely practical that if the cook stove why could not a cooperative kitchen help out. Why do the laundry at home; why bake the bread at home. And I became an ardent advocate of cooperative housekeeping, a cooperative kitchen.

It was so entirely American politics where the representatives properly chosen and directed to get what the man wants. The attempt on something outside of yourself. That women should have cried out that the way to meet their difficulty instead of dramatizing with entire disregard to facts and codes, with a shameless concentration on evil, an indifference to improvements, gains in their situation, was something on the ballot as pure a remedy a way out. Give us a ballot and we would cure all these evils from which we suffer and from which society suffers. That has always been America's cry.

Now I never was much for laws believing very thoroughly that the best governed country is the one that has the fewest laws, never much for curing people by ordinances and rules, believing that if people are cured they must cure themselves.

I became very resentful about the way I thought women were underestimated; I had a tremendous regard for women and their place in this world and what she had done. I think this was natural enough when I go back to that early reading of mine - George Elliott - the type of women, the character. I thought they were great. I thought the jobs they had done in the world in breeding and rearing was the greatest job in the world.
What could women do in public life? There seemed to be the feeling that she must get in, take a part. I knew enough had about history to know that women at times played a very great part in public affairs. There were the women of the Revolution. It seemed to be a period near enough related as it was to our own revolution brought up as we had been on their names. And here as part of our education on the question of women I turned my attention to a long series of books by Abbott. Tell the story.

Now what had those women done for the public? In my High School days I had read Corinne with Nettie Grumbine. (Sketch) How about the author? She had been a big figure, so a figure felt he in public opinion that Napoleon had to get rid of her. I knew it. I was becoming a contributing editor, trying to put in articles there have been great women on these women and say to my sex, why do you insist on underrating our abilities and our achievements - why not play them up and if they have done so much say how much. I did not feel quite sure about it. Learn from what they done - paper.

The longer I went on with the Chautauquans I could see a decided change in my desire to weigh this value of women in public life. I finally concentrated on Madam Roland who certainly had played a great part and suffered bravely the penalty. It was not a dramatic figure I portrayed Madam Roland, I wanted to find out what she had really been. If there were qualities in her the contributions to the French Revolutionary scene was and problems that could not have been contributed my men. She was bringing something.

See Preface to Madam Roland.
In order to do this I had to specialize. Long before this a specialty had appealed to me, to know some one thing. I did not care how small it was and to know it well from top to bottom. Now I said I had to find out about women—had forgotten the microscope. I would take Madam Roland—go to Paris to study her.

But mixed up with this decision was a conviction that on the professional side the material for the Chautauquan was exhausted for me. I could go no further there, impossible to satisfy my new ambition. I knew I took it as a duty.

I must make a change. A conflict between stability & purpose.

See note.