



THE

DEBUNKER

AND THE AMERICAN PARADE

Sept.
1931

25
CENTS

In This Issue

Review of the
Freeing

the Human Mind

Forces that Made for the Undermining
of Orthodoxy

Harry Elmer Barnes, Ph. D.

\$2.50
A YEAR

\$3.00 CANADA
AND FOREIGN

Other Features by

Charles W. Smith, Isaac Goldberg, George
H. Shoaf, Clay Fulks, Clive Lovett Cleaves,
G. M. Boumphrey, F. A. Ocampo, Booth
Mooney, N. Bukharin, Farnsworth Crowder,
Leo Gruliow, Dr. Frederick W. Parsons

THE DEBUNKER AND THE AMERICAN PARADE

EDITED BY E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS

Girard, Kansas, September, 1931.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
In Which I Go Fictional; <i>Isaac Goldberg</i>	2
Freeing the Human Mind, <i>Harry Elmer Barnes</i>	5
In the World of Books, <i>Isaac Goldberg</i>	50
Hoover Blankets, <i>Charles W. Smith</i>	53
Can They Lift the Lady's Countenance? <i>Clay Fulks</i> ...	56
A Scrutiny of Faith, <i>G. M. Bounphrey</i>	58
The Road Is the Bunk, <i>Clive Lovett Cleaves</i>	60
The Best of All Possible Religions, <i>F. A. Ocampo</i>	69
Civil Liberty in Colorado, <i>Leo Gruliov</i>	74
Theodore Dreiser Fights for Honest Art.....	75
Science and Politics in the Soviet Union, <i>N. Bukharin</i> ..	81
They're Killing Tom Mooney, <i>George H. Shoaf</i>	85
E. H.-J. Insults a Fundamentalist, <i>Booth Mooney</i>	88
The Los Angeles of The Times, <i>Farnsworth Crowder</i> ...	89
Anti-Militarism Alarms Y. M. C. A., <i>Leo Gruliov</i>	95
How People May Prevent Mental Diseases, <i>Dr. Frederick W. Parsons</i>	96

THE DEBUNKER AND THE AMERICAN PARADE

Published monthly at 229 East Forest Ave., Girard, Kansas, by the Haldeman-Julius Company, publishers of Little Blue Books, the famous Pocket Series (Free catalogue on request). . . . 25 cents a copy. Annual subscription \$2.50 (\$3 Canadian and foreign).

. . . . Printed in the United States. Copyright, 1931, by the Haldeman-Julius Company. . . . Entered as second-class matter October 30, 1924, at the postoffice at Girard, Kansas, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. XV

September 1931

No. 4

In Which I Go Fictional

Isaac Goldberg

SEXARIANS. By Isaac Goldberg. Privately printed by The Panurge Press, 100 Fifth Ave., New York City. \$5.

I HAVE no intention of reviewing this book, or of recommending it for purchase—that is, if the small edition of 1500 copies has not yet been exhausted. The reader must, if he is sufficiently interested, form his own opinion of its worth. This I know: as soon as the book was ready for the press, the type was re-distributed, so that, unless it is all set up over again—which is extremely unlikely—this is the beginning and the end of this particular book. The Panurge Press, for which I did the book under circumstances that I shall presently relate, are, I understand, the largest publishers of privately printed erotica in America. What, you will ask, am I doing in this galley? This is the story:

You will probably recall the name of Esar Levine as that of one of the staunchest friends of Frank Harris. Harris, indeed, has dedicated one of the volumes of his "Life and Loves" to Mr. Levine—an honor that young Esar richly earned by sacrificing himself in the interests of courageous letters and of the aging Harris. It was indirectly through Harris, or through Harris' autobiography, that I came to know Levine personally, and it is directly through him that I wrote this my first book of fiction.

About a year ago, on a visit to Boston, Levine stepped in on me with his charming petite wife, and brought me the news that he had entered upon the career of a specialist publisher. My reviews of Harris's books in this family organ, and of other works that approach sex with an attempt at decency and sanity, had

suggested to him that I might be the man for a volume on the new conceptions of morality. I don't think he was wrong, and I may yet do such a book. How did the question of dignified erotic fiction arise? It seems that, during our discussion, the talk turned to a book of such tales; I shall not name the book, and it is not very likely that you have ever heard of it. I didn't happen to think much of the collection of stories, and, in an off-hand way I made the remark that I could do better than that myself.

"Why don't you?" challenged Levine. Such a notion was the farthest possible from my mind, but all at once the childish impulse not to pass up a dare got the better of me, and before I knew it I answered, "By Jove! I will!" And I did.

Much to my surprise I found that I was having a great time at the work. It was so much more fun embodying libertarian principles in flesh and blood than in the colder form of philosophic abstractions. After years of promising myself that I would some day get down to fiction and the drama, here, by happy accident, I was fulfilling that promise.

What I have tried to do in these stories—there are eight of them in all: Resurrection, Triptych, Mothersong, Double-Lover, Twilight, Honeymoon, Nocturne, Victory—is to view the sexual activities of man and woman in a rational manner that shall not, at the same time, rub off the bloom and the poetry of the experience. Not all aspects of sex are beautiful; neither are all aspects of sex ugly. Even among liberal students of sex there is also opportunity for debunking. This, too, in these stories, I tried to do.

Honeymoons, for example, are by no means unexceptionally the ecstatic rhapsody pictured by the popular acceptation of the word. Too frequently, they represent an almost tragic period of adjustment for which the pruderies of convention are largely to blame . . . There are victories in sexual life that have all the pathos and the depression of defeat . . . In sex we make ourselves sublime as well as ridiculous, and I tried hard to catch now a reflection of that sublimity and now a reflection of the ridiculousness or—to be more charitable—the humor . . . That good may be rooted in evil, and that evil may be rooted in good, does not seem to occur to those hide-bound moralists who would put humanity into a straight-jacket and who look upon every bed, except the bed of Procrustes, as an invention of Satan. These themes, too, I tried to treat in terms of living creatures . . . So, too, I approached the questions of the dubious sex of love for more than one person at the same time, of the trifling circumstances that impel us to passion or aversion.

Casting about for a general title, I sought a word that should serve as a generic term for those to whom the ramifying problems of sex are a central preoccupation. Strangely enough I was put to it to find one. We have the word libertarian for lovers of liberty; we have the word vegetarian for certain

dietary specialists; for lovers of humanity we have the term Humanitarian. Why not, then, on the analogy of these formations, the word "Sexarians" for such persons as I have described above? The thought was so logical that, so to speak, I added the word to the language by grouping my stories as a whole under that title. So that the epigraph of the book reads "SEX-ARIANS" . . . A word not yet in the dictionary, but long ago in life" . . .

I am glad to see that the publishers, in describing this book, call it erotic but not pornographic. I have no interest in writing what is called smutty literature. Such literature has no attractions for me when written by others, unless it be the scientific interest of the man in the laboratory examining pathological tissue. As I wrote to a lady friend of mine, I know that the book—whatever its value as art may be—is decent simply because I happen to be decent myself. It is outspoken, for a similar reason. It is not mealy-mouthed, and again for a similar reason.

And I have a very strong notion that shortly I shall be working at some more fiction.

BURRED LAUGHS

SCOTCH. Or, It's Smart to be Thrifty. A volume of the Best Scotch Jokes. (Mac) Simon and (Mac) Schuster, New York. 99 cents. You Pay a Dollar, and the Cent Change is Imbedded in the Front Cover.

There are styles in prejudices, as in everything else. Once upon a time it was the Jew who was supposed to be niggardly, and Shylock was made, by a lofty genius of the drama—who happened to know nothing about Jews—into a scowling symbol of greed and hatred. Now it is the turn of the Scotch to bear the burden of the accusation, and to be the scapegoat of mankind's dislike for the tightwad. To me, the best joke in this collection doesn't appear between the covers. It is this: many of the jests were first told of Jews, and it has been a simple matter to translate them into the burred dialect of the Scotchman. Jakie and Ike become Angus and Tammsus, coats and trousers become kilts, the Jew's harp (who ever saw a Jew playing one, by the way?) becomes a bagpipe, and presto! the joke is Scotch.

A few of these jests are vulgar, if funny. Many of them are no more Scotch than I am. Stinginess, penny-squeezing, and the like, are attributes that are pretty well distributed throughout the human species. I can take a joke as well as the next man, but I don't see why the Scotch should be any more graceful about these grinning libels than any other race. And when they are exaggerated into cheap caricatures, they cease to be funny.

Not that there aren't plenty of laughs in the collection. There are. Only, I am from policy against anything that increases, however subtly, ill-will amongst the nations.

FREEING THE HUMAN MIND

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGINS OF FREE SPECULATION AMONG THE GREEKS

IT WAS once customary to represent the passage from oriental to Classical history as a sharp break, and to hold that Greek civilization was a unique thing, quite apart from the civilizations which had gone before it. This view is no longer shared by any informed scholars. Indeed, the early history of Greece is quite inseparable from the history of the Orient. By its intrusion into the commerce of the eastern Mediterranean, oriental civilization left its fluvial basis and entered upon the thalassic or seabound age which characterized Classical civilization. The earliest age of Greek culture was an integral part of the Aegean civilization, distinctly an oriental culture. Further, the first important stage of Greek civilization, after the fall of the Aegean culture, was attained in the Ionic islands immediately off the shore of Asia Minor. Much of the Greek intellectual life owed its origins to the previous oriental achievements in science and the development of the art of writing. Throughout all of Greek history there was a close interaction between Hellenic and Asiatic forces and influences. Hence the understanding historian no longer maintains the thesis of any considerable hiatus between oriental and Classical civilization.

Classical civilization illustrates the second great type of environmental basis in the evolution of civilization; namely, that of the thalassic, coastwise, or seabound setting. The geographical environments of the Greek peoples played a very large part in developing Hellenic civilization. The fact that the first Greeks of any historic significance dwelt in the Ionic settlements on the mainland of western Asia and in the islands just off the coast was of great importance in stimulating that unique development of independent thinking and philosophic speculation, which was perhaps the most important contribution made by Greece to the later world. This was an area through which travelers and merchants passed from every part of the civilized world, bringing with them a diverse display of commodities, ideas, and knowledge. This was designed to provoke speculation and to arouse curiosity. At the same time, the Greeks in this area were so distinctly on the fringe of the Assyrian and later of the Persian Empire that the repressive influence of oriental despotism did not function markedly in the way of restraining the independence of Greek thought. Hence, the Ionic Greeks were subjected to maximum intellectual stimulation and enjoyed the minimum of intellectual restraint. Likewise, the Greek peninsula exerted a great influence over the history of the Classical Greeks. The long coast line naturally inclined the Greeks who dwelt along the shores to commercial pursuits, with all the dynamic and civilizing characteristics of commercial activities.

The Greek city-states represent perhaps the best historical exhibit of that type of civilization which seems to have been unusually stimulating to the development of independent thinking and aesthetic interests and

achievements. The city-state civilization that prevailed in the Hellenic world until it was swallowed up in the later imperial system of Rome is so important in explaining many traits of Classical, economic, intellectual, and social life that it is worth while to quote the following brief characterization by Professor Hutton Webster:

A Greek or Roman city usually grew up about a hill of refuge (*acropolis, capitulum*), to which the people of the surrounding district could flee in time of danger. This mound would be crowned with a fortress and the temples of the gods. Not far away was the market place (*agora, forum*), where the people gathered to conduct their business and enjoy social intercourse. About the citadel and market place were grouped the narrow streets and low houses of the town. Thus an ancient city was closely built up and lacked the miles of suburbs that belong to a modern metropolis.

Each of these numerous cities was an independent self-governing community. It formed a city-state. Just as a modern nation, it could declare war, arrange treaties, and make alliances with its neighbors. Such a city-state included not only the territory within its walls, but also the surrounding district where many of the citizens lived. It was usually of small size. Aristotle once said that "a city could not consist of ten men, nor again of one hundred thousand." By this he meant that a city ought not to be so small that no community life was possible in it, yet not so large that a man could not know many of his fellow-citizens.

The members of an ancient city-state were very closely associated. The citizens believed themselves to be descended from a common ancestor and so to be all related. They were united also in the worship of the patron god or hero who had them under his protection. These two ties, the tie of supposed kinship and the tie of a common religion, made citizenship a great privilege which came to an individual only by birth. Elsewhere he was only a foreigner without legal rights—a man without a country.

To the free-born inhabitant of Athens or of Rome his city was at once his country and his church, his club and his home. He shared in its government; he took part in the stately ceremonies that honored its patron god; in the city he could indulge his taste for talking and for politics; here he found both safety and society.

The ancient city-state, then, stimulated and encouraged self-expression to as great a degree as the older tyrannical oriental empires had repressed it.

The fundamental psychological characteristics of the Greeks were in marked contrast to the leading psychic traits of the Orient. Whereas the Orient had been characterized by a lust for homogeneity, and by intolerance of diversity and dissent, the Greeks prized most highly intellectual freedom, independence, and free speculation. It was the unique contribution of Greek civilization to establish for the first time the freedom of the human mind to speculate freely upon the problems of god, nature and society. This was the indispensable foundation for any marked progress in science, and hence it is not surprising to find that the Greeks made more advances in the field of natural science than mankind was subsequently able to achieve until the seventeenth century of our own era.

There is little doubt that the socio-political situation in Greece exerted great influence on the promotion of intellectual freedom and philosophic speculation among the Greeks. The city-state with its small compass, diversity of race and occupations, and ideals of self-fulfillment within this community life, was far better adapted to the stimulation of self-expression and to the advancement of free thought and reflective analysis than the extensive and repressive empires of oriental antiquity. When dominated by special and appropriate ideals, however, as in the

case of Sparta, the Greek city-state could be as coercive and repressive of individual initiative as Egypt, Babylonia, or Assyria.

This speculative freedom and scientific curiosity quickly led the Greeks to question the existing supernaturalism and to criticize the mythology which this supernaturalism had created. Some of the ablest of the Greek philosophers and scientists worked out a naturalistic theory of the evolution of the cosmos, the earth, and human culture. The Epicureans, while they did not deny the existence of the gods, vigorously contended that the gods played no part whatever in the creation of the world or the direction of human conduct. They were not even conscious of the existence of either the world or man, but spent their time in a truly god-like fashion on a sort of perennial celestial picnic. The Greeks were able to make these advances in religious skepticism in large part because of the absence of any sacred book, because of the fundamentally secular and political nature of their pantheon, and because of their tendency not to take their religious mythology too literally or too seriously. To be sure certain Greek schools, like the Stoics, took a moderate theistic attitude towards the universe and assigned the processes of nature and the facts of human experience to divine intervention.

Many Greeks rejected the supernatural interpretation of the purpose of life as thoroughly as they did the supernatural explanation of the causes of life. They contended that the chief purpose of life was the harmonious development and complete expression of the human personality in the city-state civilization. They had no idea that the chief objective of human endeavor should be to secure the salvation of a soul in the world to come. Accepting this highly secular outlook upon the purpose of human life, the Greeks were in a position to speculate freely upon human problems and social issues in order to discover what really constitutes "the good life," when judged by strictly mundane considerations. Such a humanistic and speculative outlook upon leading social problems inevitably generated a high degree of tolerance and intellectual freedom, quite at variance with the political despotism which preceded the Greeks, and the ecclesiastical intolerance which followed the decline of Classical civilization.

Freedom of thought, the speculative and inquiring spirit, toleration of dissent, animated discussion for the sake of arriving at the truth, and a thoroughly secular point of view with respect to the problems and objectives of life are, then, the outstanding aspects of the psychology of the historic Greeks. These were achievements not excelled by any other peoples in the history of human civilization.

The Romans were distinctly less given to inquiry and speculation, and more inclined to be interested in the problems of system and order, which explains the character of early Roman society and law, but in the intellectual world the Greeks dominated Classical times to as great a degree as did the Romans in the realm of engineering, politics, and law.

The Greek achievements in science were diverse, numerous, and impressive. In the field of mathematics Euclid and Euxodus systematized plane and solid geometry. Apollonius made important beginnings in projective geometry. Hipparchus founded trigonometry; and, if he had possessed the indispensable algebraic notation, Archimedes would prob-

ably have invented the calculus nearly two thousand years before it was finally created by Leibnitz and Newton in the seventeenth century.

Remarkable progress was made in the field of astronomy which far outdistanced the crude astrological theories of the Babylonians. Aristarchus of Samos proved the rotation of the earth on its axis, and suggested that the earth moves in an orbit about the sun. These discoveries constituted an anticipation of the views of Copernicus as set forth nearly two thousand years later. By ingenious computations Aristarchus also arrived at a rough estimate of the distance of the sun from the earth. Hipparchus worked out the most adequate star catalogue down to the time of Tycho Brahe in the sixteenth century. He also arrived at a mathematical theory of the movement of the heavenly bodies, and discovered that extremely obscure and complicated astronomical fact—the precession of the equinoxes. He estimated the length of the year within six minutes of the absolutely correct time, and he devised the modern method of establishing latitude and longitude. Much of this Greek astronomy was systematized by Ptolemy and embodied in his *Almagest*, written in the second century of the Christian Era. Not until the time of Kepler and Newton did astronomy advance beyond these discoveries of the ancient Hellenic scientists.

In the field of physics Euclid and others established the scientific study of optics, but the greatest achievements here were those of Archimedes, perhaps the greatest man of science that the ancient world produced. He founded and remarkably extended the field of static mechanics, involving the discovery of the principles of the lever and the pulley, and of specific gravity and the law of floating bodies. He unquestionably would have done valuable work in dynamics had it not been for the fact that the Greeks possessed no adequate instrument for the accurate measurement of time. In chemistry there was some little progress in the way of the discovery of new minerals and chemical substances, but there was only very slight advance in this subject beyond the alchemy of the Egyptians. Aristotle's theory of the four fundamental elements—earth, air, fire, and water—not only provided the basis for Classical and medieval chemistry and physiology, but also constituted the chief obstacle to the development of scientific chemistry down to early modern times.

In the field of biology Aristotle and others made notable achievements in the way of describing the life, habits, and anatomy of the various types of plants and animals. Aristotle also made a number of suggestions in harmony with the theory of organic evolution. He contended that species developed from the more simple to the more complex, and he possessed some rudimentary knowledge in the field of genetics. Greek biology, however, was chiefly descriptive, and no very close and detailed work could be done even in this field because of the absence of the microscope.

The science of medicine was founded by Hippocrates, whose ideals as to the ethics of the physician were so high that the so-called "Hippocratic Oath" is still administered to the graduates of our medical colleges before they receive their diplomas. While his theory of the pathogenesis of disease was based upon the grotesque doctrine of the four humors—blood, phlegm, yellow bile, and black bile—and was inseparably involved with astrological dogmas, he showed great astuteness by emphasizing the

value of a close study of symptoms, and by his thesis of the development of all diseases to a certain so-called "crisis." The Greek medicine, founded by Hippocrates and his successors, was taken up and systematized later particularly by Celsus and Galen. A Roman contemporary of Galen, Dioscorides, brought out a systematic work on the *materia medica*, which represents the best summary of classical knowledge in this field. Surgical operations of a major type were performed, and even rudimentary methods of producing anesthesia were provided by the use of mandragora and other drugs.

Geography was also established as a science during the Classical period, and in the works of Strabo we find a systematic effort at a complete description of the earth and its inhabitants, as far as these facts were known in the Hellenic world. Anthropogeography, or the science of the relation of geography to man and human culture, was also initiated by the Greek physician, Hippocrates, and elaborated by other Classical writers such as Aristotle, Cicero, and Vitruvius.

Perhaps the most notable of all the intellectual and scientific achievements of the Classical world was the formulation of the theory of evolution by Heraclitus, Democritus, and the Epicureans. Our chief source for this ancient theory of evolution is the great poem of Lucretius on "The Nature of Things," which has been rightly described by Professor Shotwell as "perhaps the most marvelous performance in all antique literature." Not even in the cosmic philosophy of Herbert Spencer do we find a more thorough acceptance of the evolutionary theory as applied to the universe, the earth, man, and society.

We also discover in the Classical period the beginnings of systematic compilations of scientific knowledge, and the origins of the encyclopedia idea. Aristotle executed a scholarly compilation of all existing knowledge, and in the Roman period Pliny the Elder, in his *Natural History*, produced a somewhat more popular encyclopedia of the characteristic learning of the age. Great libraries were established, of which the most notable was that at Alexandria, possessing some seven hundred thousand volumes, thus being larger than the libraries of most American universities.

The theory of the supernatural origin of social institutions and usages was to a considerable degree dissipated among the educated classes, and the secular basis of social life asserted itself more and more effectively. The conception of legislation as enacted by man on the basis of its utility to society gradually supplanted the theory of divinely revealed customary usages. Much of the earlier progress in the way of social freedom and flexibility was, however, destroyed by the attempts in the later Roman Empire to stereotype society and to introduce something approximating a caste system.

The decline of supernaturalism among the Greeks and the Romans had an important influence upon the family and the ideas regarding sex and sex behavior. The Classical peoples were, in general, free from the Jewish and Christian notions of sin in relation to sex, and tended to think and act in this field according to dictates of personal desire and social expediency. Their criteria in this area of behavior were based upon social, psychological, and aesthetic considerations in relation to their view of the "good life." Among the more cultivated Greeks the family

played a purely socio-biological role, in the way of rearing children, more or less divorced from sentiment and romantic love. The latter features were secured from association with mistresses, who were usually better educated, personally more attractive, and culturally more interesting than the wives. The Romans introduced the notion of marriage as a legal contract, to be controlled by law according to the prevailing conceptions of social welfare. The important thing about the Greek and Roman views in this field of sex behavior was the rational and secular approach to the whole matter, placing the issues on a sociological and aesthetic basis. Not since pagan times has society been able to analyze and control sex in a manner so divorced from supernaturalism and mystical considerations.

The skeptical tendencies among the Greeks were best represented by the Sophists and the Epicureans. The Sophists were made up of a group of fifth century realists who endeavored to check the tendency toward both supernatural theology and abstract philosophy, and to bring knowledge down to earth by showing its relative basis and giving it explicit application to human society. Gilbert Murray has admirably summarized the significance of the Sophists in the intellectual history of western civilization:

Their main mission was to teach, to clear up the mind of Greece, to put an end to bad myths and unproven cosmogonies, to turn thought into fruitful paths. Many of them were eminent as original thinkers: Gorgias reduced Eleaticism to absurdity; Protagoras cleared the air by his doctrine of the relativity of knowledge. The many sophists to whom "wisdom" meant knowledge of nature, are known to us chiefly by the Hippocratic writings, and through the definite advances made at this time in the various sciences, especially Medicine, Astronomy, Geometry, and Mechanics. Cos, Abdera, and Syracuse could have told us much about them; Athens, our only informant, was thinking of other things at the time—of social and human problems. In this department Protagoras gave a philosophic basis to Democracy. The mass of mankind possesses the sense of justice and the sense of shame—the exceptions are wild beasts, to be exterminated—and it is these two qualities rather than intellectual powers that are the roots of social conduct. Alkidamas, a disciple of Gorgias, is the only man recorded as having in practical politics proposed the abolition of slavery; in speculation, of course, many did so. Antiphon the sophist represents, perhaps alone, the sophistic view that a wife is a "second self" and more than any friend.

In history, Hippias laid the foundations of a national system of chronology by publishing the list of Olympian victors. The whole science of language rests on the foundations laid by such men as Prodicus and Protagoras: the former insisting on the accurate showing that language is not a divine and impeccable thing, but a human growth with conventions and anomalies. As to morals in general, most of the Sophists were essentially preachers, like Hippias and Prodicus; others, like Gorgias, were pure artists. The whole movement was moral as well as intellectual, and was singularly free from the corruption and lawlessness which accompanied, for example, the Italian Renaissance. The main fact about the Sophists is that they were set to educate the nation, and they did it. The character of the ordinary fourth-century Greek, his humanity, sense of justice, courage, and ethical imagination, were raised to something like the level of the leading minds of the fifth century, and far above that of any population within a thousand years of him. After all, the Sophists are the spiritual and intellectual representatives of the age of Pericles; let those who revile them create such an age again.

The Stoics, who constituted that school of philosophy founded by Zeno (ca. 350-ca. 260 B. C.) in the latter half of the fourth century B. C., and which lasted until the close of the period of the domination of the Western Roman Empire, interpreted society in terms of rational thought and held with Aristotle that all men must be social, both for the development of their own personality and for the proper discharge of their duties toward their fellow-beings. Their conception of society was far broader than that of the other schools of philosophy, to whom the world was either Greek or Barbarian. The cosmopolitan Stoic conception of a world-society and citizenship did much to develop the idea of the essential brotherhood of mankind. Especially important in their ethical doctrines was their emphasis upon the law of nature as the proper guide for moral conduct.

The Stoic views of society had a marked relation to their views of God, man and the world. The Stoics were avowed theists and looked upon the universe, man and society as a product of divine handiwork. God had created the material universe and man; the human institutions were but the feeble imitation of divine wisdom, secured by man's imperfect assimilation of divine guidance. This divine wisdom emanated from God in the form of the *Logos* and might be absorbed to some degree by the rational nature of man. Such views naturally led to an attitude of human resignation, for what happened was God's will. It also produced a fundamentally religious and pietistic outlook upon social processes and problems.

The Epicureans, founded by Epicurus (342-270 B. C.), presented a conception of society diametrically opposed to that held by the Stoics, maintaining that it had its only basis in conscious self-interest, which led to the institution of social relations in order to escape the evils and inconveniences of a non-social and isolated condition. Such a theory, it will easily be perceived, was based on that fallacious conception of society which opened the way for the later development of the doctrine of the pre-social state of nature and the foundation of social relations in a contract founded upon the perception of the utility of such an arrangement. With the possible exception of the Sophists and Plato, Epicurus was the first to premise an original contract, though it was more after the nature of the governmental than the social contract. As compared with the cosmopolitan and idealistic Stoics, the Epicureans were thus marked individualists and evolutionary materialists, though they were by no means advocates of sensuality, as is often asserted.

The Epicurean attitude towards society was exactly the reverse of the Stoic position on fundamentals. The Epicureans were evolutionary materialists. They combined the atomic theory of Democritus with Heraclitus's doctrine of flux or eternal change into what constituted the classic evolutionary philosophy of pagan times. They did not deny the existence of the Gods, but they did hold that the Gods had nothing whatever to do with the material world, man or society, which had evolved in a wholly naturalistic fashion. Hence, religion, based upon the fear of the Gods and efforts to placate the Gods, was deemed the chief bane of humanity. The Epicureans, then, repudiated the whole theistic and pietistic view of things and frankly accepted a materialistic philosophy, which does not mean, as so many have imagined, a gross hedonism or any justification

of vulgar corporeal indulgence. They believed happiness to be the highest aim of man, but their view of happiness was that of a civilized and cultured man and was not centered upon the aspiration for prolonged carnal indulgence.

The chief Roman representative of the Epicurean school was the great philosophic poet Lucretius (99-55 B. C.), the most original mind that Rome produced. Acknowledging with pride his obligations to Epicurus, he justified, by his original presentation of the course of human and social development, the title of the first great evolutionary sociologist. Correlating the current written and spoken accounts of the customs of primitive peoples and the previous theories of poets and philosophers, he produced a theory of social evolution which, in all its aspects, was infinitely superior to anything which was presented by any other writer down to the critical period of eighteenth century philosophy. The struggle for existence; the survival of the fittest; the mode of life among primitive peoples; the origin of language, fire, industry, religion, domestic relations, and the arts of pleasure; the sequence of the culture ages, and the development of commercial relations are set forth with a clearness, accuracy, and modernity which precludes the possibility of entire conjecture or of the complete reading into his writings of later ideas which did not occur to him. Professor Shotwell has thus estimated the nature and significance of Lucretius's achievement: "It is a poem for the twentieth century, in this sense perhaps the most marvelous performance in all antique literature. Any survey of antique processes of mind as they bear upon the development of the historical outlook would be sadly incomplete without an examination of *De Rerum Natura*."

While, from the standpoint of intellectual history, Classical developments are essentially limited to the achievements of Greece, yet one must not overlook certain important contributions made by the more practical-minded Romans, particularly in the field of engineering, government and law. The Romans made practically no contributions to abstract thought or pure science, but they did bring about a number of considerable technological advances in the field of architecture. They first made wide use of the Babylonian principle of the arch and the vault structure. Applying the arch concept to the general field of engineering, they devised the first successful arched bridges, viaducts, aqueducts and sewers. They carried the art of road-building far beyond the level of achievement reached by the Persians. There are yet found in parts of Europe stretches of Roman roads which are still passable and in a reasonable state of repair. The Romans also had notable success in constructing dams and reservoirs, as well as in building harbors, lighthouses, and other phases of maritime engineering. It should be remembered however, that many of these Roman technological exploits were not the product of native Italians. Most of the scientists, architects, and engineers of the Roman Empire were Greeks, and much of Roman technology, particularly in the maritime realm, was learned from the Egyptians.

When we come to the field of political development and institutions we observe remarkable progress. Both the Greeks and the Romans created representative government after the lapse of the many centuries accompanying the transition from tribal society to the despotic empires of oriental antiquity. The Greeks and the Romans were able to combine

for the first time in human history political order on a large scale with the relative freedom of the individual citizen. Of course, it is true that in neither Greece nor Rome was there any approximation to democratic institutions or majority rule, but within the fortunate minority of citizens there was a degree of personal liberty which had not hitherto existed in the history of mankind. Likewise, government by discussion, which had been present in a rudimentary form in tribal society, now became a basic technique in political control.

The Roman lawyers developed the theory of popular sovereignty; namely, the view that the ultimate foundations of political power were to be sought in the will of the people. However little this theory may have achieved in the way of emerging into actual practice in the Classical world, it entered prominently into European tradition and later became a powerful basis of the rise of modern representative government and democratic theory.

Roman imperial institutions, however defective they may have been in actual practice, constituted the most ambitious and successful effort attempted up to that time in the way of extensive political administration and the assimilation of widely diverse peoples to a common culture and a single unified political control. Incidentally, the Roman Empire proved the social and cultural blessings of even an arbitrarily enforced régime of peace and order. The Greek Stoics were the first to develop a rational conception of internationalism. The imperial prestige and ambitions of Rome left their impress upon subsequent ages, most notably in the attempt to revive imperial grandeur in the Holy Roman Empire, and in the rise of a new Roman Empire in the form of the Holy Catholic Church. The latter was a great secular political administrative unit, modeled after Roman imperial precedent, as well as being a vast spiritual kingdom embracing the faithful throughout western Christendom. Not only did the Roman imperial administration furnish the model for the general organization of the Christian Church; the bishopric in the cathedral city was also the direct and logical successor of the ancient municipality.

In the field of legal theory and practice Rome made some of her most enduring contributions to the subsequent history of mankind. The Roman lawyers developed the theory of the universality of fundamental legal principles which they believed to be common to all rational men. The Roman jurists also emphasized the supremacy of secular law over all other forms of actual control, and insisted upon the subordination of all to the reign of law. Still further, the human individual made his first formal appearance as a recognized entity in the theory of Roman law. The codification of legal principles was executed on an elaborate scale by Justinian.

Roman law had a tremendous influence upon late medieval and early modern Europe in the way of stressing the supremacy of secular authority over the Church or any other form of rivalry, and through giving rise to the movement for the realization of popular sovereignty and the rule of the majority.

We should, perhaps, emphasize another point; namely, the growing

tendency of the Greeks and Romans to emphasize the secular nature of the origins of the state and law, in contrast to the thorough-going acceptance of the view of supernatural origins by primitive and oriental peoples. This attitude was the basis of what became the exaggerated emphasis upon this position in regard to political origins in the social contract theory of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

CHAPTER II

DISSOLVING THE MEDIEVAL SYNTHESIS



GENERATION ago it was fashionable to assign great importance to the Renaissance in the development of modern civilization. In the works of the esthete Symonds and the poet Burkhardt one finds the thesis that the Middle Ages were a period of general and relatively uniform stagnation, the paralyzing shell or envelope of which was burst by the potent forces arising from the new appreciation of classical literature and the remarkable developments of chromatic and plastic art during the two centuries following 1450. The most diverse results of a progressive nature have been assigned to such factors and causes, not even excepting the rise of the national state system.

The results of a generation of historical scholarship have been such as totally to dissipate this illusion. In the first place, we have learned much more about the real nature of the Middle Ages. It has been shown that they cannot be dealt with as a unified period, there being an enormous gulf between the culture of Merovingian France and the Italy of Dante. It was not an era of uniform cultural stagnation. Particularly from the twelfth century onward there was a steady, if gradual, intellectual and scientific improvement, and the Renaissance, as such, did little to stimulate these tendencies in any unique manner. In the second place, it has been shown that it is manifestly inaccurate and misleading to throw together all the multifarious and diverse cultural developments of the period from 1450 to 1700 and assign them to the Renaissance. If this term is to have any specific meaning whatever, it must be held to refer to Humanism and to the development in art.

As to Humanism it can scarcely be proved that the laudable increase of interest in, and approval of, the literatures of Greece and Rome produced any remarkable intellectual revolution. Least of all did it produce any marked impulse to renewed scientific curiosity. The only direct contribution which Humanism made to the new science lay in the recovery and reading of some of the writings of the Greek scientists, who had far more modern and acceptable ideas on scientific matters than those of most medieval figures, but instances of this sort were very few and relatively unimportant. It was found that everything of use in Galen had long been incorporated into medieval medicine. The most encyclopedic of all the Greek scientists, Aristotle, had been well known to the Schoolmen in good translations from the Greek after the close of the thirteenth century. The Humanists were much more attracted by rhetorical and mystical pagan works than by the scientific treatises of antiquity; in other words, by works that did no violence to the Christian outlook. Cicero and Neo-Platonic writers loomed far wider on the horizon than Aristarchus, Archimedes or Hipparchus. As Professor Robinson has judiciously said:

The so-called Renaissance offers little comparable to the intellectual achievements of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is true that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the Italian towns developed an interesting

civilization and a marvelous art different from that which went before. These have perhaps blinded us to the relatively slight contributions of the period to general change. To one who is intent upon establishing the continuity of history, the men of letters, the philosophers, and even the artists of the Renaissance, exhibit an extraordinary intellectual conservatism. They transcended relatively few of the ancient superstitions, contributed but little to the knowledge of the world, and readily yielded to the fascination of Neo-Platonic mysticism, as is illustrated by Ficino, Pico and Reuchlin.

As has been said elsewhere, it was quite possible to read the classics without becoming forthwith Hellenic in one's attitude of mind. It may be safely said that as one's acquaintance with the Middle Ages, as well as his appreciation of our own time increases, the Renaissance seems to grow more and more shadowy as a distinctive period; and yet many writers use the term as if the Renaissance were a bright spirit, hovering over Europe, touching this writer and that painter or architect, and passing by others who were in consequence left in medieval darkness.

It is a grave mistake to assume that this renewed interest in the Greek and Roman authors betokened a revival of Hellenism, as has commonly been supposed. The libraries described by Vespasiano, a Florentine bookseller of the fifteenth century, indicate the least possible discrimination on the part of his patrons. Ficino, the translator of Plato, was an enthusiastic Neo-Platonist, and to Pico della Mirandola the Jewish Caballa seemed to promise infinite enlightenment. In short, *Plato was as incapable in the fifteenth century of producing an intellectual revolution as Aristotle had been in the thirteenth*. With the exception of Valla, whose critical powers were perhaps slightly stimulated by acquaintance with the classics, it must be confessed that there was little in the so-called "new learning" to generate anything approaching an era of criticism. It is difficult, to be sure, to imagine a Macchiavelli or an Erasmus in the thirteenth century, but it is likewise difficult to determine the numerous and subtle changes which made them possible at the opening of the sixteenth; and it is reckless to assume that the Humanists were chiefly responsible for these changes.¹

The most significant and potent impulse given by Humanism to intellectual and scientific advance was an indirect one, consisting in a revival of interest in the things of this world. The intellectual classes among the pagans, by contrast with the Christians, had been singularly little interested in the supernatural world or the destiny of the soul. They were primarily concerned about the most happy, adequate and efficient type of life here on earth. Philosophy was designed to teach how to live successfully rather than how to die with assurance of ultimate safety in the arms of Jesus. This dominant secular interest had been lost for approximately a millennium on account of the Christian absorption in the problems and technique of the salvation of immortal souls. Augustine himself had warned against becoming too much engrossed in earthly interests lest assurance of successful entry into the New Jerusalem be jeopardized.

As men like Petrarch and his followers and successors came to read more of pagan literature and to approve it heartily, they were inevitably infected to some degree with the virus of the secular orientation of the Greek and Roman past. Hence, there arose the amusing situation of actually pious Humanists enthusiastically recommending what was frankly branded by Augustine as an undoubted and integral portion of the City of the Devil. Erasmus admitted that the appellations St. Socrates and St. Cicero were neither inaccurate nor inappropriate and sacrilegious.

¹J. H. Robinson, *The New History*, pp. 116-117, 157-158.

He thus openly expressed his preference for pagan writers when compared with even the most illustrious Schoolmen:¹

Whatsoever is pious and conduces to good manners ought not to be called profane. The first place must indeed be given to the authority of the Scriptures; but, nevertheless, I sometimes find things said or written by the ancients, nay, even by the heathens, nay, by the poets themselves, so chastely, so holily, and so divinely, that I can not persuade myself but that, when they wrote them, they were divinely inspired, and perhaps the spirit of Christ diffuses itself farther than we imagine; and that there are more saints than we have in our catalogue. To confess freely among friends, I can't read Cicero on "Old Age," on "Friendship," his "Offices," or his "Tusculan Questions" without kissing the book, without veneration towards that divine soul. And, on the contrary, when I read some of our modern authors, treating of politics, economics and ethics, good God! how cold they are in comparison with these! Nay, how do they seem to be insensible of what they write themselves. So that I had rather lose Scotus and twenty more such as he (fancy twenty subtle doctors!) than one Cicero or Plutarch. Not that I am wholly against them either; but because, by the reading of the one, I find myself become better, whereas I rise from the other, I know not how coldly affected to virtue, but most violently inclined to cavil and contention.

That the generation of an interest in the secular world was an impulse in the direction of scientific curiosity, as compared with the supernaturalism and eschatology of Patristic and Scholastic Christianity, cannot be denied. Yet it was but a feeble and indirect urge, which was probably far more than offset by the anti-scientific tendencies of the Humanistic movement in education. This is still extant and well reflected by the notion that a college student majoring in physics, chemistry or biology can make no claim to any true education and culture as compared with one who has shown proficiency in wrestling with the ablative absolute, hortatory subjunctive or future periphrastic, and should, accordingly, have his barbarism properly stigmatized by the degree of bachelor of science.

It was the mystical and esthetic, rather than the scientific and rationalistic, attitude which was promoted by the spirit of Humanism. At its very best the latter could do no more than to produce the learning of a Scaliger or Casaubon or the broad-minded tolerance of a Montaigne. Humanism could no more produce the modern world than the Greek and Roman culture upon which it was based. And, finally, what slight indirect impulse Humanism may have given to secular studies and science was in large part obstructed or frustrated by the revival of supernaturalism and bigotry in the period of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. By the time scholarship had recovered from this blow, the explorers and scientists had created a new world of fact and ideas quite foreign to Erasmus, Baronius and Loyola alike.

The invention of printing, which came as a result of the labors of Coster and Gutenberg in the period of Humanism, was a very important contribution to the ultimate development of a technique which is so much a matter of co-operative effort and effective communication as modern science, but there again the service was indirect and incidental rather than causal.

There was no immediate flood of radical or scientific books. The

¹K. Pearson, *The Ethics of Free Thought*, pp. 165-166.

majority of the books printed during the first century or so after Gutenberg were not scientific and critical works but pious, religious and theological books. Usually they were a reproduction of those which had appeared in the centuries before the invention of printing as a result of the patient and persistent efforts of medieval copyists in the monastic *scriptorium*. It was not until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that books reflecting the beginnings of the new thought and science were printed in any considerable number.

Neither did printing make it easier to produce progressive books. The European governments made unlicensed printing a serious offense, in some states a capital crime, and established a thorough censorship of the licensed presses. The precarious nature of the printing profession in regard to the issuance of novel scientific or philosophical works is well illustrated by Osiander's famous preface to Copernicus' work. In this Osiander, to protect his press, implied that probably Copernicus was only joking. Today this sort of censorship functions chiefly as regards textbooks and works dealing with sex.

Even less than the Renaissance did the Reformation and Counter-Reformation directly promote a scientific and critical point of view or encourage interest in mundane and secular affairs. It has been assumed by many that the Renaissance produced the Reformation, but it seems that this is true only in the sense of a somewhat ironical remark once made by Professor Robinson to the effect that the mythical Renaissance may have caused the mythical Reformation. Between Humanism and Protestantism there was little real intellectual affinity or genetic relationship, however much there may have been of personal identity and inter-relationship between Humanists and Reformers.

If any of the Protestant reformers derived inspiration from the Humanists, it was from the piety and Christianity of the scholars and not from their Humanism. If Luther was impelled to ecclesiastical and doctrinal reform by his study of Erasmus' writings, it was due to the ideas of Erasmus the Christian and not to those of Erasmus the Humanist. The exuberance of Erasmus over the writings and doctrines of Saint Cicero could never have been the starting point for the theological views and intellectual attitudes of Luther, Calvin, Knox or Jonathan Edwards. Cicero's beautiful little motto, which might appropriately serve as the starting-point for tolerant thinkers in all ages, "We who search for hypotheses are prepared both to refute without prejudice and to be contradicted without resentment," could hardly have been the fountain-spring from whence Calvin derived his canons of hospitality, as exemplified in his burning of Servetus after their little verbal tilt over the nature of the Trinity.

The important point is that, strictly speaking, Humanism, on the one hand, and Lutheranism and Calvinism, on the other, were fundamentally divergent and opposed. Humanism was a moderate and rather unconscious revolt against the supernaturalism and other-worldliness of Patristic and Scholastic Christianity; the Protestant revolt brought with it an all-pervading revival of even the grosser forms of supernaturalism, diabolism, miracle-mongering, witchcraft and a host of other phases of this general cultural complex. In short, Humanism and the Reformation were highly divergent in general cultural orientation and intellectual out-

look, and we may agree with Erasmus that if Luther hatched the egg which he (Erasmus) had laid, it was quite a different bird from what Erasmus had intended.

Some Protestants have taken great pride in the elimination of many alleged idolatrous practices of the Catholics which was effected by the Reformation, but their exultation rests upon dubious foundations. By doing this they enormously weakened the emotional power of the church and took from it one of its most potent forces and appeals in visual and oracular imagery. The rich emotion-bearing ritual and liturgy of the Catholic church is far better adapted to attracting and holding the mass of faithful believers than the metaphysical dogmatism of Calvin or the intense vocal emotionalism of our evangelical Protestant cults.

The intellectual classes, who were once attracted by the Calvinistic metaphysics, have now generally discarded all types of orthodoxy. It may well be that the heroic evangelistic gymnastics of Billy Sunday and his kind are required to fill up the depleted ranks of Protestantism chiefly because of the fatal strategy of the leaders of early Protestantism in giving up most of the impressive Catholic ceremonial of worship. And no candid critical observer is likely to regard the miracle of the mass and its attendant ritual, or images of Jesus, the Virgin and the Saints, as more pagan than baptism, or various phases of Protestant theology which have a definite Greek basis. Probably no one has more sagaciously summarized the necessary and desirable qualifications upon exuberance over the progressive intellectual tone of Protestantism than Professor Robinson:¹

The defection of the Protestants from the Roman Catholic Church is not connected with any decisive intellectual revision. Such ardent emphasis has been constantly placed upon the differences between Protestantism and Catholicism by representatives of both parties that the close intellectual resemblance of the two systems, indeed their identity in nine parts out of ten, has tended to escape us. The early Protestants, of course, accepted as did the Catholics, the whole patristic outlook on the world; their historical perspective was similar, their notions of the origin of man, of the Bible, with its types, prophecies and miracles, of heaven and hell, of demons and angels, are all identical. To the early Protestants, as to Catholics, he who would be saved must accept the doctrine of the triune God and must be even on his guard against the whisperings of reason and the innovations suggested by the scientific advance. Luther and Melancthon denounced Copernicus in the name of the Bible. Melancthon re-edited, with enthusiastic approval, Ptolemy's astrology. Luther made repeated and bitter attacks upon reason; in whose eyes he freely confessed the presuppositions of Christianity to be absurd. Calvin gloried in man's initial and inherent moral impotency; and the doctrine of predestination seemed calculated to paralyze all human effort.

The Protestants did not know any more about nature than their Catholic enemies; they were just as completely victimized by the demonology of witchcraft. The Protestant revolt was not begotten of added scientific knowledge nor did it owe its success to any considerable confidence in criticism. As Gibbon pointed out, the loss of one conspicuous mystery, that of transubstantiation—"was amply compensated by the stupendous doctrines of original sin, redemption, faith, grace and predestination" which the Protestants strained from the epistles of St. Paul. Early Protestantism is, from an intellectual standpoint, essentially a phase of medieval religious history.

¹J. H. Robinson, *The New History*, pp. 117-118.

Without attempting in any way to pass judgment upon the theological merits or validity of the positions taken by Protestant reformers, it may be pointed out that the majority of historians have now accepted the view that the great significance of the Reformation lay in the political and economic movements associated with it, rather than in the purely religious and theological problems and issues involved. In line with the suggestions made long ago by Sleidanus and Harrington, contemporary writers like F. W. Maitland, James Harvey Robinson, Herbert L. Osgood, Preserved Smith, Max Weber and R. H. Tawney have shown that the most vital phases of the Reformation period were the rise of independent sovereign states and the ideals and practices of the modern *bourgeois* business man. God was supposed to have initiated the latter and to have given them His unqualified approval.

Intellectually speaking, the Reformation was most decidedly backward-looking. Theologically it assumed to go back to the Apostolic age. Luther denounced the universities, designated reason¹ as the devil's most seductive harlot whose neck faith could easily wring, revelled in devil and miracle-mongering, and was the first important European to condemn the Copernican theory. His ground was that the theory was preposterous in the light of the fact that "in the day when Jehovah delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel Joshua said in the sight of Israel, 'Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon' and the sun stood still and the moon stayed until the nation avenged themselves of their enemies."

The Calvinistic anthropology, with its morbid basis in the concept of human treason before God, and the predestinarian theology, were alike intellectually depressing and abhorrent. And no person could be less sympathetic with science and critical philosophy than a fanatic like Knox. Then, the Protestant emphasis on the infallible nature of the Bible was in some ways more dangerous and obstructive to progressive thought and scientific advance than the Catholic dogma of an infallible Church which might periodically alter its tenets. The Protestants might be more readily forgiven for their Bibliolatry if they had evidenced a major concern with the teachings of Christ. But, instead, they revived an interest in, and put primary emphasis on, the Old Testament, with all its savagery and anachronisms. This served well as a basis for the Sabbatarian excesses of the Puritans.

About the only contribution to intellectual progress which can be assigned to Protestantism is the indirect aid which it gave to the growing difficulty in carrying out ecclesiastical repression of the freedom of thought and expression. This was foreseen and deplored by Bossuet. As he clearly pointed out, once the unity of Christendom had been broken by the Protestants, there was no reason why the process should not go on indefinitely. This would lead to the multiplication of innumerable Protestant sects, thus making it impossible to enforce any unity of doctrine. It was in this matter of rendering ecclesiastical interference with thought less easy and effective, through promoting the disunity of Chris-

¹"Reason is the devil's greatest whore; by nature and manner of being she is a noxious whore; she is a prostitute, the devil's appointed whore; a whore eaten by scab and leprosy who ought to be trodden under foot and destroyed, she and her wisdom. . . . Throw dung in her face to make her ugly. She is, and she ought to be, drowned in baptism. . . . She would deserve, the wretch, to be banished to the filthiest place in the house, to the closets." So wrote Luther. Cited by Maritain, *Three Reformers*, pp. 33-3.

tian belief and organization, that Protestantism aided, if at all, in advancing intellectual progress. In a minor sense Calvinism, with its emphasis on the God-given calling of money-making, may be said to have promoted the fostering of those phases of applied science that have been closely related to modern industry and the practical applications of the "theory of business enterprise."

The reaction of the Protestant revolt on Catholicism was intellectually more disastrous than its effect upon the followers of Luther and Calvin. The cultural degradation which came with the Catholic defense-reaction in the Counter-Reformation can best be gauged and measured by the contrast between a typical pre-Reformation Catholic like Erasmus and the most characteristic figure in Counter-Reformation Catholicism, Ignatius Loyola. While no movement founded by an Erasmus could have produced a Voltaire, as the most cursory comparison of the "Adages" with the "Philosophical Dictionary" will readily demonstrate, neither would it have naturally led to the creation of the Jesuit Order.

The Church had been growing more tolerant and more appreciative of secular learning, when it was put on the defensive by the Protestant assaults. It then felt it necessary to recover, revivify and defend vigorously monstrous dogmas which had been partially allowed to lapse, and to defend as grotesque and repellent a supernaturalism as that propounded by any Protestant fanatic. Protestantism and Counter-Reformation Catholicism collaborated in producing and enacting perhaps the most degrading and deadly drama in the history of western civilization—the witchcraft mania and delusion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is a pleasant task to turn from this abysmal culmination of the revival of supernaturalism in early modern times to the parallel and synchronous achievements of the scientists who were discovering a new heaven and a new earth.

If neither the Renaissance nor the Reformation can well be regarded as forward-looking or progressive movements which notably aided in producing the modern scientific and critical outlook, one of the adequate and potent causes of the origins of modern times can be located in the rise of modern astronomy.

It is futile to attempt to discover or assign any one specific cause for the *rise* of modern science; in fact, it is probably inaccurate to use that term, for modern science was not a sudden development but a gradual growth. The new knowledge from the east, the new intellectual life promoted by the rise of the towns and universities, the overseas explorations and discoveries, and the cumulative ferment and knowledge from these sources, all combined to bring about the remarkable outburst of scientific activity and achievement of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In general, the whole movement was, consciously or unconsciously, a revolt against the deductive method and spiritual objective of Scholasticism. It grew out of the conviction that the new body of saving knowledge was to be created through the observation of nature, and that in this procedure the Scholastic technique was impotent because, as Bacon himself expressed it, "Nature is more subtle than any argument."

Perhaps one major reason why the first remarkable results of early modern science were so impressive was the fact that it was directed to-

wards a majestic and imposing problem and objective—an investigation of the nature and movement of the heavenly bodies. Few would claim that Kepler and Galileo were greater scientists than Huygens and Leeuwenhoek, but the field of their labors was one designed to give their results a more compelling interest and widespread wonder and admiration. It should be remembered, of course, that while the Schoolmen had accepted it and Dante had immortalized it in his *Commedia*, the cosmology of the early sixteenth century was not a Christian but a pagan product.

The Scriptural cosmology was one which represented the earth as a minute slab of earth and water supported on the void and lighted with heavenly bodies of varied candle-power which studded the canopy of the heavens at no great distance from the earth—a system similar to that today taught in the schools of Zion City where Voliva gives proof of greater astronomic literalness and piety than was exhibited by the learned Aquinas and the poet Dante. One is moved to an ironical smile when he contemplates the fear of Copernicus, the persecution of Galileo, and the martyrdom of Bruno at the hands of Christians for uprooting a basically pagan cosmology and theory of celestial mechanics.

Copernicus did little to modify the Hellenic celestial mechanics which had been accepted by Christendom. He simply exchanged the positions of the sun and the earth in the vast and complicated arrangement of fixed crystalline spheres, thus transforming it from a geocentric to a heliocentric system. But Giordano Bruno perceived clearly the implications of the shift from a geocentric to a heliocentric universe and set them forth with impressive clarity and comprehensiveness.

Among his hypotheses damaging to the cosmology of the Christian Epic were such things as: (1) the infinite size of the universe; (2) the lack of finite limitations on, or a fixed center for, the universe; (3) the fallacy of the doctrine of the rigid crystalline spheres, with the substitute conception of the free motion of the heavenly bodies in space; (4) the relativity of space, time and motion; (5) the ever-changing positions and relations of the heavenly bodies; (6) the similarity or identity of the constituent materials in the heavenly and earthly bodies; and, (7) above all, the particularly disconcerting concept of the plurality of universes.

When to these challenging innovations in cosmic philosophy was added an effort towards the popularization of such doctrines it is not hard to understand why the Catholic church of the post Counter-Reformation type interfered and arranged the speedy translation of Bruno. Most of his views were at the time pure guess-work, but all have been confirmed by the subsequent developments of celestial mechanics, astrophysics and chemistry.

The succession of figures who laid the definitive basis for the celestial mechanics which held the field largely unchallenged until the era of Einstein consists of Tycho Brahe, Kepler, Galileo and Newton. Tycho Brahe, quite in the spirit of old Hipparchus, carried on a careful study of the heavens and gathered concrete data of great value for later theorists. The first of these was his assistant, Johannes Kepler, who showed that the planets moved in elliptical paths rather than circular, that they traveled most rapidly when nearest the sun, and that there was a fixed

relation between the cubes of their distance from the sun and the squares of their times of revolution. Galileo founded dynamic mechanics by his famous law of falling bodies, which he arrived at as a result of a classic example of experimental science. This achievement was so significant that Bergson is said to have remarked that modern science came down from Heaven along Galileo's incline-plane.

Isaac Newton, a half century after Bacon's age, combined Kepler's third law with Galileo's law of falling-bodies in his famous law of inverse squares or universal gravitation. This was not only the crowning achievement of seventeenth century science, but the inspiration for much of the liberal philosophy and theology of the eighteenth century. The old heavens, not merely of Genesis and the astrologers, but of Aristotle and Ptolemy, had been wiped away and a new cosmos of infinite expanse and complexity had been substituted. It is very curious that pious theologians have not understood that this new astronomy was far more of a challenge to the fundamental tenets of the Christian Epic than the Darwinian theory of evolution.

One of the characteristic phases of the early modern attack on the medieval synthesis was the criticism of the medieval doctrine of the superiority of the Church over the State. Even Dante's notion of the coordination of a universal Church and Empire was viewed with doubt. The rise of Roman law with the teaching of Irnerius at Bologna (c. 1088 et seq.) developed the doctrine of the supremacy of the State over the Church and all other social institutions. The experts in Roman law lined up with kings and emperors in defense of the pretensions of the secular monarch. Two of the most notable were Pierre Du Bois and Marsiglio of Padua.

Pierre Du Bois, (1255-1321) in his *De recuperatione terre sancte*, defended Philip the Fair in his struggle with Boniface VIII. He warned the Pope not to meddle with temporal affairs, since such interference in the past had cost the Christians the possession of the Holy Land. He outlined a comprehensive program of social reform in which, among other enlightening suggestions, he advocated international arbitration to settle disputes between nations.

Marsiglio of Padua (1270-1342) in his *Defensor pacis*, the most modern and original political treatise produced during the late medieval period, attacked the church with something of the spirit and modernity of Voltaire. He offered a powerful criticism of the doctrine of the primacy of Peter. He declared that the priests were merely the ministers of salvation, and denied that they possessed the power of forgiving sins or the right to interfere in temporal matters.

• In his strictly social and political philosophy Marsiglio was also highly original. He accounted for the origin of society on a purely utilitarian basis. Society was essential to mankind for the carrying on of those coöperative activities necessary to existence and comfort. But unregulated society was likely to degenerate into disorder, and hence civil government was indispensable. This political authority was merely delegated by the people, in whose hands reposed sovereign power. Marsiglio also emphasized the unity of society by outlining the organic analogy in an original way in which the six estates or professions were made to cor-

respond to the organs in the individual organism. Further, by his separation of politics from theology, Marsiglio made an advance toward Machiavelli's separation of ethics from politics.

Nicholas of Cues (1401-64) and Aeneas Sylvius (1404-64) fittingly opened the modern period by presenting the anticipation of two of its most characteristic social and political doctrines. The former in his *De concordatio catholica* presented the most elaborate development of the analogy between the organism and the state that had yet appeared. He also introduced the conception of political pathology and, reviving the Platonic figure, designated the ruler as the physician-in-chief to the sick state, prescribing for its ills according to the best advice of political philosophers, past and present. In the more strictly political aspects of his theories Nicholas emphasized the doctrine of consent as the basis of political authority and outlined an original scheme of representative government. Aeneas Sylvius (1404-64), in his *De ortu et auctoritate imperii Romani*, advanced the clearest distinction between the social and the governmental contracts that is to be found in the writings of a medieval author.

It is perhaps typical of the process whereby medieval civilization was disintegrated by the intrusion of elements from without, to find that the first writer to possess the modern dynamic ideas of progress and the unity of the social process was the Muslim historian and statesman Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406). At the outset of his *Prolegomena to Universal History*, which is the systematic exposition of his theoretical views, he drew a sharp distinction between the popular episodic history and history as he conceived of it—namely, as a science tracing the origin and development of civilization.

Man, he maintained, is by nature social, since his wants are so varied and extensive that they can be supplied only through co-operative effort. But the conflict of human desires produced quarrels and led to the necessity of instituting government to insure order and stability. With almost the emphasis of Professor Giddings, he insisted upon the necessity of homogeneity for the existence of a stable state. His description of the tribal society of the Arabs was probably unsurpassed as a study of this period of human society until the time of Morgan. Again, his analysis of the influence of physical environment upon society was more thorough than any other study of this subject until the time of Bodin, if not until that of Montesquieu.

But the most important of the innovations of this interesting writer was his grasp of the unity and continuity of the historical process. In sharp contrast to the static conceptions of the prevailing Christian historiography, he grasped that fundamental conception that the stages of civilization are in constant process of change, like the life of the individual. He pointed out clearly the coöperation of psychic and environmental factors in this process of historical development. All in all, Khaldun rather than Vico has the best claim to the honor of having founded the philosophy of history, and his view of the factors involved in the historical process was sounder and more modern than that of the Italian of three centuries later.

The greatest social philosopher of the period conventionally known

as the Renaissance was Nicolo Machiavelli (1469-1527). He advanced beyond Plato and Aristotle in separating ethics from politics and proceeded to make one of the most acute analyses of human nature which is to be found in the early history of social philosophy. A perfect child of the conspiratorial society which formed his political environment, his analysis was frankly based upon the premise of man's intriguing self-interest and the insatiability of human desire as the mainsprings of all human activity. There was no theology in his political theory. He further maintained that personal prestige and material prosperity are amply sufficient to satisfy this desire, in so far as it can be quenched.

In his *Prince* and *Discourses* (the latter is the less well known, but by far the most valuable work) he logically deduced from these pessimistic views of human nature the methods which are to be followed by a successful ruler of a monarchy and of a republic, respectively. The former was the greatest sociological study of the process of leadership and impression that had yet been made. Again, there was a beginning of a conception of social dynamics in his criticism of the ideals of social stability and localism, as expressed by Plato and Aristotle, and in his dictum that a state must expand and develop or decay. Finally, Machiavelli took social philosophy out of the realm of abstract speculation and made a beginning toward putting it on the firm foundation of historical induction.

But in spite of these contributions, Machiavelli's analysis of society was not synthetic or well balanced, and his work was rather a handbook of political motives and a guide for the self-seeking despot or an imperialistic republic than a systematic theory of society.

CHAPTER III

SCIENCE, SECULARISM AND THE ORIGINS OF MODERN TIMES

IN THE same way that the geographic setting of oriental civilization started on a fluvial basis and gradually emerged into the thalassic or Mediterranean stage, so the setting of the history of Western Europe started out with a Mediterranean orientation and soon evolved into the oceanic or world outlook and scope of activities. From the decline of the Roman Empire until the discovery of America the geographic trend was ever toward the West.

In laying the foundation for this westward orientation of European society the Roman occupation of Gaul, following the invasions of Julius Caesar, was of the greatest significance. The superiority of the Orient in material culture was always a strong magnet attracting the center of the Roman Empire. Its influence was so powerful that, early in the fourth century A. D., Constantine moved his capital to the shores of the Black Sea. Had it not been for the Roman conquest of Gaul, and its subsequent development under Roman control, to act as a counterbalance to this eastward attraction, it is quite possible that the West would gradually have abandoned civilization and have reverted to a barbarism from which it would not even yet have emerged. Gaul not only helped to preserve the balance of culture towards the West, but also furnished the Germanic tribes with much of the institutional basis of medieval life. It was in Gaul more than in Italy that Classical culture merged with Teutonic barbarism to furnish the institutional groundwork of medieval civilization.

With the gradual development of the prosperity of western Europe in the later Middle Ages, owing to the revival of trade with the East, the seaboard towns of western Europe became jealous of the Italian monopoly over the oriental trade, and they sought direct contact with the sources of the oriental commodities through overseas discoveries. The mariner's compass, devised sometime during the later Middle Ages, made possible the concrete realization of this ambition. By the close of the fifteenth century man had emerged upon the last or world-stage of history. As Professor William R. Shepherd and others have clearly demonstrated, the expansion of Europe overseas, and the reaction of this expansion upon European and world society in the Commercial Revolution, is the master-key to the complicated processes of modern history. No up-to-date historian any longer seeks the origins of the modern age in the Renaissance or the Reformation.

The inventions in the field of navigation and the improvements in shipbuilding represent the chief technical advances of the age related directly to industry and commerce. The expansion of Europe and the Commercial Revolution depended as much upon these innovations as the Industrial Revolution did upon the inventions in textile machinery, steam power, and metallurgy. The mariner's compass is first referred to in the late medieval period, and was progressively improved until its first

extensive utilization in the fifteenth century. The quadrant, sextant, telescope, chronometer, and other nautical instruments, provided between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries, enabled mariners to find their way at sea with far greater safety and certainty, and alone made possible ocean navigation. To these basic instruments should be added the provision of maps, charts, and tables indispensable to the sailor.

Larger and more seaworthy vessels were also constructed to withstand the greater shock of ocean storms and to facilitate the carrying of the extensive cargoes which it was desirable to transport over these long distances. These technical advances in navigation had a powerful indirect influence upon a much more epoch-making phase of the advance of technology; namely, the rise of the mechanical technique during the Industrial Revolution. The great expansion of commerce brought about by new modes of navigation enormously increased the demand for manufactured commodities, and hence greatly hastened the introduction of mechanical methods of manufacturing.

Cultural historians and anthropologists have long recognized that the contact of cultures is far and away the most potent force in breaking down cultural stagnation and provincialism—in other words, the most dynamic factor in history. This all-important progressive force had earlier manifested itself during the period of the Crusades with certain results noted above, and had not failed to maintain itself as an important factor in European history from that time onward, but the era of its greatest potency followed the successful voyages of Columbus and Vasco da Gama. The elucidation of this set of historic influences, which has been the work of historians from Raynal to W. R. Shepherd, has been probably the most important contribution which historians have made to the establishing the background of the work of both Francis Bacon and early modern scientists.

First and foremost among the forces and impulses coming from European expansion should be put the general disintegration of the medieval and feudal system, and the substitution of a generally novel social and political system. In short, the actual transformation of the whole face of European civilization through: (1) the stimulation of the spirit of adventure, scientific curiosity; (2) new knowledge; (3) the rise of world commerce and large scale oversea colonization; (4) modern capitalism and capitalistic institutions; (5) the increase of urban life; (6) the rise of the middle class, and (7) the gradual extinction of the feudal system to be supplanted by the national state, first on a dynastic and absolutistic basis, and later on a representative and parliamentary foundation. In co-operation with the Protestant *Ethik* it altered the attitude of religion towards economic practices by eliminating the social point of view of the Middle Ages and stressing the divine sanction and approval of the ultra-individualism of modern capitalism, with its emphasis upon pecuniary profit as the most pleasing of all achievements in the sight of God. It was this great series of interrelated transformations that laid the basis for the Industrial Revolution and the exploitation of modern sciences and technology which has produced contemporary civilization.

In its specific contributions to science the expansion of Europe was

by no means unimportant or negligible. Most directly influenced was the science of navigation, with its accessory sciences of mathematics, engineering and optics. The explorations and discoveries not only enormously increased the concrete geographic information of every type, but stimulated scientific cartography upon the basis of determinable latitude and longitude. Astronomy was enriched by the discovery and observation of constellations in the southern hemisphere, and by the scrutiny of hitherto known heavenly bodies from new positions on the earth's surface. Additions were made to chemical knowledge by the discovery in oversea areas of rocks and minerals of new and significant types. Botany, the materia medica and zoology were remarkably aided and advanced by the great variety and number of newly discovered forms of plant and animal life. And a strong if not adequate stimulus was given to the movement which ultimately founded the science of man or anthropology through the contact with a large number of new racial and sub-racial types in widely different degrees of cultural development.

The reaction of the commercial revolution upon historiography was in no way more notable and far-reaching than in regard to the scope of the historian's interest. The narrowness and superficiality of the field of historical investigation since the canons of Thucydides and Orosius had come to prevail could no longer endure unimpaired; it meant the beginning of the return to the field that Herodotus had to some extent marked out for the historian. Writers to some degree ceased to be absorbed by those most superficial phases of political and ecclesiastical history, which had hitherto claimed all of their attention, and became for the first time interested in the totality of civilization. It meant a much greater impulse to that broadening and secularizing process which had been revived by humanism. Not only were there great stores of knowledge to be obtained from the contact with the older civilizations of the East, but in the natives, historians and philosophers at last found the "natural man," who had hitherto only existed in the mythical period before the "Flood." No greater contrast could be imagined than the vast difference in the type of subjects which interested such an historian as Pufendorf and those with which Oviedo concerned himself. Again, the new range of historical interests offered some opportunity for originality of thought; there were fewer erroneous notions to handicap the writer at the outset. Neither Thucydides, Polybius and Livy, nor Augustine and Aquinas had provided the final authoritative opinion on the marriage customs of Borneo or the kinship system of the Iroquois. The only exception in this respect was the prevalent doctrine of a "state of nature," which had come down from the Stoics and Roman lawyers and now seemed to have practical concrete confirmation.

It was also inevitable that the new scientific discoveries and the new philosophy of nature should react profoundly upon the contemporary social philosophy. The idea of orderly development and continuity in social as well as natural processes was comprehended by Vico, Hume and Turgot. The older idea of human history as a gradual decline or retrogression from a primordial "golden age" was replaced in the writings of Vico, Voltaire, Hume, Turgot, Kant, Godwin and Condorcet by the concept of continual progress from lower stages of civilization. The

need for miracles to justify history and the other sciences dealing with human activities was lessened by the growing prevalence of the Deists' doctrine of the inherent and reasonable "decency" of man—a notion widely at variance with the older views of the "Fathers" and of Calvin, which maintained the hopeless depravity of mankind. Finally, the new discoveries and the secularization of natural and social philosophy produced a great extension of the interests of the historian beyond the field of politics and religion. In the writings of Voltaire, Raynal, Montesquieu and Heeren it became apparent that the impulse to a broader and sounder scope of history had begun to affect others than those who described the course of the explorations.

With the equally marked influence of the results of the expansion of Europe on prevailing currents of thought we shall deal later. It is worth pointing out, however, that it did much to stimulate that appreciation of diversity and relativity which loomed large in the thought of Montaigne and Bacon as compared with that of Aquinas.

It is evident that this expansion movement, as a whole, produced a new earth in two important senses; in the first place, by discovering the western and southern hemispheres; and, in the second place, by changing the cultural complexion of the world that had been known before 1500. It is doubly significant for the scientist, in that it not only stimulated many phases of modern science, but also did much to create that contemporary intellectual, economic and social world in which present-day science can function.

The new interest in the inductive or experimental method, the increasing body of scientific knowledge brought in by the period of discoveries, the growing curiosity of the age, and the beginnings of toleration and free thought, made possible a truly unparalleled development of natural science in the century and a half following the work of Copernicus.

In the field of mathematics, algebra was notably developed beyond the level which it had reached when first introduced into Europe by the Arabs in the later Middle Ages. Logarithms, devised at the opening of the seventeenth century, enormously simplified mathematical problems and computations. Descartes and Fermat invented analytical geometry and laid the basis for the development of graphic methods. Finally, Newton and Leibnitz, in the last half of the seventeenth century, perfected the calculus, upon which most of the developments in physical science and engineering have rested.

In astronomy there was sufficient progress to create a revolutionary change of man's attitude toward the universe, and to constitute veritably the discovery of a new heaven, in the same way that the geographical explorations had revealed a new earth. Copernicus, relying in part upon the recovery of ancient Greek astronomical knowledge, interchanged the positions of the sun and the earth in the medieval system of fixed, revolving, transparent spheres, thus substituting a heliocentric for a geocentric theory of the universe. Galileo invented the law of falling bodies, thus furnishing the basis for the dynamics of the new astronomy. Kepler showed that the planets move freely about the sun in elliptical orbits rather than revolving in rigid positions on fixed transparent spheres. He

also worked out the basic laws of planetary motion, which Newton combined with Galileo's law of falling bodies in the famous law of inverse squares, or universal gravitation.

The net result of the new astronomy was to produce a sense of cosmic order, law, and impressiveness which quite upset the older views of the earth and man. Such a notion as that of Joshua stopping the sun was henceforth ruled out as preposterous in all of its implications. Likewise, the new astro-physics raised many serious doubts as to the probability of our earth being the pivotal element in the universe and the chief object of God's creative ingenuity, as well as the center of his divine solicitude. It should also be remembered that the progress in optics made possible the ever more perfect development of the telescope, which advanced the science of astronomy in subsequent years.

In physics Galileo discovered the law of falling bodies and thus founded dynamics. His experimentation in arriving at this law was so perfect and such a classic in experimental method that the French philosopher, Bergson, has said that modern science came down from heaven along Galileo's incline plane. Torricelli and Pascal invented the barometer in the middle of the seventeenth century, and Fahrenheit perfected the thermometer at the opening of the eighteenth century. Von Guericke invented the air pump and began the scientific study of atmospheric pressure. Newton, Huygens, and others developed the science of optics. In the middle of the seventeenth century Huygens perfected the first practicable pendulum clock and thus laid the basis of a time-telling instrument sufficiently exact in its nature to make possible the subsequent development of dynamics.

In chemistry and alchemy, Paracelsus criticized the classical tendencies and called for a more practical attitude in this field. The foundations for subsequent progress in general chemistry were laid by the work of Boyle and Stahl, who performed the indispensable service of wiping out once and for all the preposterous Aristotelian theory of the four basic elements—earth, air, fire and water. In addition, Boerhaave made rudimentary but significant beginnings in the field of organic chemistry.

The progress in biology was as revolutionary as that in astronomy. Vesalius began the systematic study of anatomy. Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood and thus established dynamic physiology. The developments in optics which made possible the microscope most notably forwarded the progress of biology. Hooke was thus enabled for the first time to demonstrate the cellular structure of organic matter in 1667. Malpighi and Grew built upon the achievements of Hooke the first careful work in the anatomy of plants and animals. By the use of the microscope Leeuwenhoek isolated blood corpuscles, bacteria, and other microscopic bodies. Swammerdam likewise carried on intensive microscopic studies of the insects, including a minute investigation of the intestinal tracts of flies and bees. Redi founded pathology by his studies of putrefaction, and largely discredited by experiments the theory of spontaneous generation. Finally, Borelli introduced the fundamental principles of mechanics into an explanation of biological facts including the manipulation of the human body. Building upon these advances in biology and chem-

istry, Sydenham and others founded empirical medicine and began the long and difficult process of undermining the authority of Hippocrates and Galen.

In the field of geology much progress was made toward the beginning of a recognition of the real nature of the origins of the earth, and the earth-building processes. Steno and others began to comprehend the nature and implications of the fossil remains of previously existing forms of organic life. In this way some dim inkling was gleaned as to the vast antiquity of our planet, thus preparing the way for discrediting the scriptural theory of the recent and cataclysmic nature of the creation of the earth.

There was also much progress in the related field of geography. The explorations and discoveries enormously extended man's knowledge of the planet and its topography and configuration. The new navigation and exploration rendered necessary better maps and charts. The scientific methods of establishing latitude and longitude, anticipated by Hipparchus in antiquity, were now firmly established. Books like Chardin's *Travels* did much to popularize this new geographical knowledge, and on the basis of the greatly extended body of information in this field Varenus and others founded scientific geography. Bodin, Mead, Arbuthnot, Montesquieu and Herder, made many suggestions in the field of anthropogeography emphasizing the influence of geographic factors on man and culture.

These scientific advances had a profound influence upon the general thinking of the period, through impressing upon the attention of man such matters as the hitherto unsuspected extent of the universe, the relative insignificance of the earth, the reign of law in the development and processes of the universe, the conception of God as a law-making and law-abiding being instead of an arbitrary violator of natural laws, and the recognition of the antiquity of the earth.

The progress in natural science also had a significant effect upon the growth of toleration. It has often been held that it was toleration and rationalism which made scientific activity possible, but in reality it was chiefly the scientific achievements which created a spirit of tolerance. The seventeenth century, which saw the scientific movement in full swing, was one of the worst centuries for religious wars, persecution, and witch superstitions. It was really the scientific advances of the seventeenth century that rendered possible the tolerance and enlightenment of the eighteenth. The growth of science in the one hundred and fifty years from Copernicus to Newton was due to the rise of a large leisured, learned, and non-ecclesiastical class. Such a class was brought about by the increase of wealth attendant upon the Commercial Revolution, by the better maintenance of domestic order through the triumph of centralized government over feudalism, and by the invention of printing. The religious controversies also helped the process along indirectly through making theology at once dangerous and repulsive, thereby turning into scientific fields much cerebral energy which had once been lavished upon Scholastic theology.

It is difficult to summarize concisely the dominating psychology of modern times. The supernaturalism of the Catholic Church held over

without any serious break, and was actually intensified in the process of defending itself against the assaults of Protestantism. In many ways the Protestants believed in a more crass and direct supernaturalism than did the Catholics. Nevertheless, there was a rather steady progress toward various types of secularism and rationalism. Protestantism was very closely related to the rise of capitalism. Indeed, certain penetrating writers like Max Weber hold that Protestantism was primarily the cause of capitalism. While the Protestants were still predominantly and almost fiercely absorbed in the matter of the salvation of the soul, they nevertheless believed that one mode of assuring spiritual salvation lay in industry, thrift, and the accumulation of pecuniary profits.

This was in direct opposition to the Catholic attitude during the Middle Ages, which had repudiated the desirability of worldly prosperity and had closely restrained business enterprise in the interest of social service and human welfare. Protestant divines frequently preached from the parable of the three stewards and from the Pauline text: "Seek ye not your own but your neighbor's wealth." Thus, an economic basis for secularism was constructed within orthodox Protestant supernaturalism. Even in the Catholic countries which were caught up in the stream of the new commercialism and colonial enterprise, worldly motives attained ever greater influence. A political basis for secularism was found in the growing influence of Roman law and the development of the social contract conception, which emphasized secular absolutism and the human origins of political institutions. The period of discoveries generated a spirit of adventure and novelty, helping on economic and social change and serving to arouse an interest in secular matters.

In addition to these more or less indirect forms of assault upon the dominant supernaturalism, there were a number of more direct and immediate modes of attack. The Humanists, although for the most part relatively pious Christians, nevertheless, in their literary and philosophical activities, stressed the excellence of Greek and Latin literature, with its secular viewpoints and interests. The Rationalists, while firmly believing in a sort of impersonal cosmic God, vigorously attacked orthodox Christianity and the prevailing type of supernaturalism. The Rationalists and the Deists anticipated the contemporary Modernists by contrasting the teachings of Jesus with orthodox historical Christianity, both Catholic and Protestant. They repudiated historical Christianity, but found much to commend in the teachings of Jesus. They believed that they found much in common between the doctrines of Jesus and their own rational brand of religion.

The rise of modern astro-physics from Copernicus to Newton proved that the sun, rather than the earth, is the center of our system, and also gave some preliminary hint of the vast extent of the universe. Both of these innovations were a direct challenge to the orthodox theory of creation and cosmology. Francis Bacon, the great herald of the new scientific age, called attention to the serious weaknesses and inadequacies in the deductive and logical method of the orthodox Catholic scholastic theology, and called for an ever greater reliance upon the inductive and observational methods of natural science. Science, he believed, would be able to revolutionize the world and greatly increase human happi-

ness. He repudiated the scholastic dialectic as a technique for acquiring information on the ground that "nature is more subtle than any argument." The Humanists and particularly the Rationalists assaulted the intolerance of Catholics and Protestants and some warmly defended not only toleration but complete freedom of thought. As far as the psychology of modern times marked a break with that of the Middle Ages, it may be said to have been characterized chiefly by secularism, tolerance, and an increasing reliance upon scientific method. Further, a theory of human progress replaced the Christian Eschatology which was circumscribed by belief in the Fall of Man and the Day of Judgment,

CHAPTER IV

THE DAWN OF THE SECULAR ERA

IT IS quite impossible to describe the psychology of the contemporary age. Even the German historian Lamprecht, who has attempted to divide the history of mankind into a number of definite psychological stages, has admitted his incapacity to find an adequate psychological characterization of present-day civilization. He finds that the chief psychic traits seem to be those of uncertainty and nervous tension due to the dynamic character of the age.

In discussing the psychology of early modern times we found it necessary to call attention to the marked contrast between the orientation and ideas held by a pious Catholic and Protestant, on the one hand, and the outlook of persons like Thomas Paine or Voltaire, on the other. The simply unparalleled progress in thought and science in the last two centuries has served to make this contrast between the psychology of the orthodox and conservative groups and the civilized and progressive elements in the community much more marked than it was at the close of the eighteenth century. We have, on the one hand, the great mass of mankind, who hold firmly to primitive and medieval views of man and the world. At the opposite extreme, we have the intelligent and cultivated groups who adhere to the astro-physics of Michelson and Einstein, accept without question the evolutionary hypothesis, read with general approval the philosophy of Bergson, William James, John Dewey, and Bertrand Russell, enjoy the historical and social philosophy of writers like H. G. Wells and James Harvey Robinson, share the ethical views of Havelock Ellis and Anatole France, and peruse with enthusiasm the literary products of such writers as Anatole France, Gustave Flaubert, John Galsworthy, James Branch Cabell, Bernard Shaw, and H. L. Mencken.

It is evident that such a contrast in culture and psychology between two contemporary groups in human society has rarely if ever existed in any earlier era. The divergence between the positive information of Pericles and that of the most illiterate Teutonic tribesman of eastern Europe was as nothing compared to this. We can simply point out that the psychology of the majority of mankind is still that of primitive man, with his theories of supernatural causation, his illogical acceptance of myth-mongering, and his terror-stricken subservience to herd domination, and pass on to a brief summary of certain of the more characteristic aspects in the mental outlook of what may be called with accuracy up-to-date citizens.

Doubtless the most characteristic thing in modern psychology has been a sweeping and comprehensive assault upon the supernatural view of man and his world. Modern astro-physics has enormously advanced that tendency to enlarge our ideas of the universe which was begun by the earlier period of astronomy that culminated in Newton. Our planet has been proved to be but a most insignificant celestial juvenile in our

own petty universal system. Our universe appears to be but a very recently produced and relatively insignificant unit in a universe of universes which in extent and complexity quite transcends the comprehension of the human intellect. It is easy to see how such facts as these completely undermine the notion that God created the earth as the central element in the universe and placed the heavenly bodies in their respective places for the benefit of man.

Modern physics has provided a naturalistic explanation for many hitherto mysterious processes of nature. Biological evolution has proved that all forms of organic life, including man, have slowly and gradually developed from simpler and more rudimentary types. The thorough development and complete vindication of Biblical criticism has destroyed the validity of scriptural warrant for belief in the contending creation story of Genesis. Anthropology has shown that man and his culture were not provided ready-made by the divine hand some six thousand years ago, but that both have gradually developed from a very rudimentary basis over a period of a million or more years.

In the place of the earlier retrogressive tendency to look back towards a primitive Paradise and of the naive anticipation of a cataclysmic Day of Judgment, we have gradually developed adherence to tentative theories of progress, based upon the observed fact of the enormous advances of man and culture since the early stone ages, and upon the reasonable hope of further development through modern science and technology, ever more adequately applied to the betterment of man in society.

The attempt to secure valid information on the basis of revelation or dialectical processes has gradually been given up by the cultivated classes, and the scientific and inductive methods of approaching the problems of man and nature, so warmly recommended by Francis Bacon at the outset of the seventeenth century, have now definitely triumphed. At least in the field of material culture and technological equipment man has become accustomed to dynamic change and achievements which in a single year often outdistance the advances in these fields made in a thousand years prior to 1750.

The new technology and the resulting developments in economic life have produced an unprecedented concern with material things. Prestige in life has come to be associated to an astonishing, if not an alarming, degree with success in acquiring power over material things, and with the acquisition of pecuniary profit and the social status therewith associated. Conspicuous display and waste, as a method of demonstrating social power and prestige, have come to be utilized much more diversely than in any previous period in human history. Non-productive leisure is more generally esteemed as a mark of superiority and culture than in any earlier age. A critical writer has described the contemporary economic philosophy as "steadfast cupidity, sedulously practiced and persistently inculcated."

The general methods and processes of the mechanical technique, together with the uniformity of the products thereof, have served to bring about a tendency towards standardization and uniformity in culture more notable and widespread than that which was actually achieved

in the days of the oriental "passion for homogeneity." To a certain extent these trends toward standardization have been intensified by the progress of modern democracy and the necessity of catering to the ignorance and prejudices of illiterate and primitively minded majorities. To a large degree the "dead level" theory of democracy, suggested a century ago by De Tocqueville, has been vindicated by the developments since he wrote his famous essay on *Democracy in America*.

The net result of all these changes has been to produce a situation of complexity, confusion, and uncertainty of ultimate human destiny quite in contrast with the coherent and logical doctrine of human origins and the ultimate fate of the race embodied in the Christian epic of the Middle Ages. These unprecedented complexities of contemporary society are of a sort which completely defy the unscientific guidance to be derived from scriptural revelation or political rhetoric, and render necessary an ever greater development and exploitation of scientific information for application to man and his problems.

A general air of assurance, finality and certainty prevailed the learned classes in previous generations. They felt convinced that they possessed exact and satisfactory knowledge concerning God, the world, man, human destiny, the purpose and meaning of life and all the other basic issues and problems which confront man. Now all this is changed. We possess, to be sure, much more exact knowledge about the material universe and the biological nature of man, and we are coming to know more about the type of behavior most likely to insure human happiness on this earth, but the meaning of the whole matter and its setting in the cosmic scheme of things has become ever more baffling. The orthodox, dualistic cosmic philosophy, which took its origin from the Persians and represented the *rationale* of the cosmos to be the provision of an arena where good and evil might indulge in a death grapple, scarcely seems plausible in the light of modern knowledge. We are coming to have impressive concrete confirmation of Descartes' intuition that if there is a divine purpose in the universe it is of a divine character, presumably beyond the comprehension of man. Indeed, the whole teleological complex, which insists upon there being a purpose in everything, may, once more, be nothing but a circumscribed human way of looking at things.

The older idea that there is a definite time limit set to the existence of the earth and man, which will be terminated on a final day of judgment, the date of which is reasonably well established, is now seen to possess no substantial foundation. It would seem that man may look forward to a future as extensive as his past has been, though there is no reason to be certain that another cosmic accident may not occur at almost any time which will whisk the earth out of existence as abruptly as it was originally snatched in fragments from solar atmosphere. Though at some vastly distant time the sun may cool to such a degree as to make human life unsupportable on the planet, there is no reason to believe that nature can not evolve a being able successfully to assume the burden of directing mundane affairs under atmospheric conditions quite different from those now existing. Likewise, the old view that the eschatological termination of the earth would also involve the destruction of the rest of the heavenly bodies, now appears quite preposterous. Even the disappear-

ance of our universe would, in all probability, be attended with great cosmic complacency by its colleagues in the galaxy of universes. In other words, we can do nothing more than speculate upon what it is all about, and the declarations of eminent philosophers upon the problems of cosmic purpose and destiny are interesting for their demonstration of stylistic power or ingenious guessing, rather than for any assurance of finality or accuracy in their discourses.

CHAPTER V

THE UNDERMINING OF ORTHODOXY

I. ASTROPHYSICS

AT the present time practically all of the foundations of the old order have been either seriously challenged or entirely destroyed. In the light of modern astro-physics our planet becomes the most insignificant of celestial juveniles, microscopic in size and incomparably recent in origin. In the place of a single universe existing primarily for the benefit of one of the smaller planets, we have now come to conceive of the cosmos as constituted of infinitely complex and numerous groups of universes moving with incredible speed over paths of unfathomable extent, all apparently obeying laws of the utmost uniformity and precision. In a brilliant article on "Man and His Young World" Professor Harlow Shapley has indicated the significance of modern astro-physics in providing the cosmic perspective for human efforts at social betterment:

The thing that appalls me is not the bigness of the universe, but the smallness of us. We are in all ways small—little in foresight, shriveled in spirit, minute in material content, microscopic in the vastness of measured space, evanescent in the sweep of time—inconsequential in every respect, except perhaps, in the chemical complexities of our mental reactions. In that alone, our advance may surpass that of other terrestrial organisms.

But the sanctity of all protoplasm has practically disappeared in this, the heroic age of the physical sciences, when knowledge of the material universe, its content, structure, and dimensions, has so completely overthrown egocentrism. It should sufficiently deflate the organism, you would think, to find that his fountain of energy, the sun, is a dwarf star among thousands of millions of stars; to find that the star around which his little parasitic earth willessly plods is so far from the center of the known stellar universe that sunlight, with its incomprehensibly high velocity, cannot reach that center in a thousand generations of vain men.

The deflation, however, is not stopped at that point. We now reach much deeper into space than a few years ago, find millions of stars mightier than our sun, find greater velocities, larger masses, higher temperatures, longer durations than we have previously known. Even more illuminating, in this orientation of organisms in the physical universe, is the revelation that the earth, whose surface we infest, is not a parcel of grand antiquity. Rather recently, as astronomers now measure time, a singular incident happened in the life-history of the sun. Before that time the earth was not, nor were the animals of the earth. Nevertheless, for trillions of years, in the absence of the "Lords of all Creation," the stars had poured out their radiant energy, the celestial bodies had rolled on, law had governed the universe. Before that event, you and I, the material of our bodies, were electrons and atoms in the solar atmosphere. Since then we have been associated with the inorganic and organic evolution of a smaller concern.

The earth, as I have intimated, appeared only a few thousand million years ago. Our sun, it seems, had already passed its prime of radiance when in its wanderings through celestial space it met up with another star—a stellar romance—a marriage made in the heavens. From that affair—realistic astronomers call it an encounter—the planets of the sun were born. The passing star, ruffling up the exterior of the sun, detached some rela-

tively small fragments of the solar atmosphere. Now we strut on one of the surviving fragments and wonder and speculate and discuss: "How can we *better* the world?" Crown of absurdities—we repairing the world. That cast-off fragment, the ancestor from which and on which we descend, was composed wholly of gas! An emblem for us, that ancestral hot vapor—"How can we straighten out the world?"

The gaseous planet quickly liquefied as out in cold space it began its tireless revolutions around the parent sun. Soon after a crust formed, and we may thank our lucky stars, the distance from the sun was right, the atmospheric and crustal chemistry was right, and other adjustments of the physical environment happened to be suitable for an elaboration of chemical reactions. The energy of the overflowing sunlight aided in complexifying this protoplasmic chemistry, a green mold formed in spots on the planet, and here we are—parasites on the energy of the sun that cast us forth. How can we better the world?

The implications of modern astrophysics are absolutely destructive to the orthodox version of the Christian Epic, as well as to orthodox Judaism or any other type of geocentrically circumscribed religion. The old views of God as a venerable and somewhat gigantic being, resembling man in every detail, frequently taking up his abode upon this earth and being at times accessible to call from his more faithful supporters; the notion of the earth as the chief product of the creative endeavor of God and the supreme object of His divine solicitude; and the view that Christ could have been in any literal sense "the only begotten son of God" offered up as a vicarious sacrifice for the sins of a small group of rather backward peoples dwelling at the extreme eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea—all such conceptions become easily and immediately recognizable as primitive anthropomorphic and geocentric misapprehensions. While it may be true that the age, size and complexity of the cosmos revealed by modern science make more plausible than ever the hypothesis of a divine creative and controlling principle, anterior to and directive of the whole cosmic process, yet this new cosmological God can in no way be harmonized with the petty anthropomorphic tribal deity which the ancient Hebrews seem to have derived through an accident of Moses' particular conjugal adventure.

2. EVOLUTION

In place of the special creation hypothesis we now have the concepts and processes of cosmic and biological evolution, which indicate that all matter and life are in a process of endless transformation, comprehending both progressive evolution and disintegration. Our earth, all types of organic life and man himself appear to have come into existence as an integral part of this great process of development and destruction. No human trait or characteristic has yet been discovered which clearly violates the natural laws discovered and expounded by scientists. There is *nothing* which can in any way support the hypothesis of the supremacy of man in the cosmos. The combined implications of cosmic and biological evolution have destroyed entirely any foundations for the hypothesis of human uniqueness, primacy or permanence. This startling fact has been lucidly expressed by Professor Shapley:

Man, as a species, has had a short and brilliant career on the face of the earth. From ape-like ancestry to the editorial board of *The Nation* is at most a few million years. There are some cynics who think it is much

less than that. Thousands of other species of animals besides *homo sapiens* have also risen rapidly to a high specialization, and then ceased to be. They paid for their brilliance with extinction. The dinosaurs lasted but a single era in geological history; they rose to a great climax of size, laid their eggs, and were gathered unto their fathers. They left no lineal descendants.

But the cockroach has a straight-line ancestry of two hundred million years or more. His is a stock sufficiently strong to carry him through numerous terrestrial upheavals, through desiccations and glaciations—and the cockroach today is just as good as he ever was. . . .

Biologically, it seems, we are as inexperienced as physically we are frail. Moreover, we are hampered with brains. We have mentality to burn, and many of us do burn it, at both ends. Our more or less primitive bodies cannot keep up in the evolutionary progress of our abnormal mentalities. . . .

Our concern mainly should be with the species—can *it* survive? It has no chance against the stars, of course; but can it long hold its own as a surviving form, or be ancestral to surviving forms, against other organisms, against primitive microbes and advanced insects? There is a fair chance, an optimistic scientist would say, if it were not that man's worst enemy is man.

The cockroach survives because it stands pat on form—it avoids experimental progress. Man, however, cannot stand still. He is delicately balanced in an unstable chemical complex; his abnormal mentality has led him to create an environment in which stagnation means extinction. Survival of the species appears to depend upon uninterrupted progress. Resignation is cowardice. Bended knees cannot help. The continued development of the reasoning intellect—our one conspicuous advantage—seems to be the only possibility.

On these points the stellar perspective is clear. Protoplasm appears trivial and transient; but for man the Drift prescribes progress and survival. If progression halts, we go to join the dinosaurs. If stagnation enters, in a million years or so, by the light of those undisturbed stars that heed life not at all, some conservative cockroach, crawling over the fossilized skull of an extinct primate, may be able to observe: "A relic here of another highly specialized organism which failed to recognize the laws of the universe, which preferred the current minor whims to the search for survival, and which missed its great opportunity to inherit the planet, perishing an early victim of the world's subtle chemistries."

The first striking implication to be noted is the complete revolution of our time perspective which the evolutionary conception has made necessary. In the place of a very brief period of some six thousand years for the age of the earth and all living matter, we must reckon with a time conception which defies both the human imagination and our conventional standards of measurement. Hundreds of millions of years must be assigned to the earth in a minimum estimate, whereas the sun had passed its maximum radiance before the earth originated. When one turns to the probable amount of time involved in the evolution of the cosmos, the conceptions and standards which prevail in measuring time for earthly purposes seem quite trivial and inadequate. Indeed, we may have to admit that, in the new cosmic time perspective, the very notion of time as we understand it may be nothing more than a convenient geocentric illusion. Einstein and others have, indeed, suggested that time and space are but incidental manifestations of energy. The age of man in his new time perspective, instead of being coexistent with the duration of the earth and all the heavenly bodies, must be regarded as but the briefest trifle in earth history to say nothing of its utter insignificance in terms of cosmic history.

Along with the revolutionized time perspective has come the dynamic notion of change as the vital and universal principle of cosmic development. In the place of the older static notions of a perfect creation a few thousand years back, with but slight subsequent alteration of the nature of the heavenly bodies, the earth and its organic life, we have to recognize that change appears to be the most vital law of cosmic development and to realize that there is no such thing as a static condition to be observed in the universe. Everything is in a state of alteration, some of this being in the way of development and progress while other changes definitely manifest disintegration and devolution. We have, then, the conception of a dynamic and ever-changing universe in the place of the static outlook of a half-century ago.

A third vital implication of evolution is the fact that man has been demonstrated to be, not a theological entity a little lower than the angels or higher than the earthworm, but a definite biochemical entity, at the present time the temporarily dominant type in the animal kingdom inhabiting this planet. There seems to be nothing about human life or behavior which is in any sense unique and not susceptible of explanation according to naturalistic laws and principles.

The evolutionary biological conceptions and the new cosmology are as disruptive of the accepted views of man as they are of the older theological attitude toward God. According to the accepted Biblical theory, man was a theological entity and not a unit of biochemical behavior. He was important chiefly as the custodian of an immortal soul for which his fleshly being merely served as the temporary envelope pending the earthly experiment which determined the ultimate destiny of each individual soul. In the more optimistic passages of Holy Writ man was defined as only a little lower than the angels, while in the abject strains he was viewed as but a worm of the dust. The scientific facts reveal man as neither a worm nor an angel with pruned wings. He is the leading member of the simian group and, therefore, the dominant element for the time being in the animal kingdom.

This view of man as an animal has been extremely repellent to many of the more pious and conventional brethren, but there is little rational ground for such an attitude, once it is understood what one really means by the inclusion of man in the animal kingdom. When one views the situation in a scientific and common-sense attitude one recognizes that the animal kingdom represents the highest order of life on the planet, that is, the highest level of organic development known to man. Therefore, to be the temporary leader of the animal world is the highest form of achievement to which man could possibly pretend, and this title is the superlative praise which can possibly be bestowed on *homo sapiens*. The older theological conception that man is only a little lower than the angels or is made in the image of God may be in a certain way more flattering, but it is not consistent with modern scientific knowledge, and must be discarded along with other illusions of a primitive derivation.

Further, not only is the conception that man is an animal a demonstrated fact in no way humiliating to the human race; it is also much more of practical significance. Even if it were known to be true that we are slightly mitigated angels, this would afford no clue for the study of

mankind, because no one has seen an angel and we possess no knowledge of the personal traits and behavior patterns of the angelic host. On the other hand, once we come to recognize the fact that man is an animal, we immediately have the rich fields of comparative anatomy, physiology and psychology to draw upon from which to build a solid approach to the study of human nature and behavior. These branches of science reveal man as a super-simian, and the study of simian psychology, as summarized in such books as those by Kohts, Kohler and Yerkes, affords more in the way of a key to human behavior than all the books on theology ever compiled from the days of primitive folk-lore to the most abstruse apologetic manual of a contemporary professor of systematic theology. Even a humorous and avowedly trivial little book like Clarence Day's *This Simian World* will tell one more relevant and cogent things about human nature than all the ponderous tomes of an Aquinas or the collected sermons of a dozen Moodys, Talmages or Spurgeons.

The implications of the above for sociology and ethics are very great and far-reaching indeed. They come down to this, namely, that the type of behavior and institutions which are best suited to advance human happiness and efficiency must be sought and constructed in conformity with the needs of a species of super-simians temporarily inhabiting divers types of geographic environments. Morals can no longer be intelligently discussed in relation to the type of conduct befitting a mystically interpreted theological entity aiming to secure the safe translation of his hypothetical, metaphysical soul into a supposititious, eternal, spiritual world. This need not be taken to mean that man must or should dispense with religion, but if he is to retain a religion which will have permanent social value it must be a reconstructed religion, worked out in harmony with our present knowledge of the nature and requirements of man in secular social situations.

3. DETERMINISM

Even the rudiments of our present scientific knowledge concerning the nature of man and his behavior serve completely to destroy the conventional view of man as a free moral agent, capable of making unlimited freedom of choice, irrespective of his biological ancestry or his social conditioning. Modern biology, physiology and psychology offer simply unlimited proof that the free-will hypothesis is as incapable of scientific support as the astrophysical doctrines which made plausible Joshua's heroic feat in the way of solar control. Differences in original endowment make it quite impossible for certain individuals to react in identical ways to the same type of social conditioning. Diversities in surroundings and experiences lead to great variations in the social conditioning of individuals and in the complexes thus developed. This conditioning of response determines the behavior of individuals, and any such conception as that of ability to act in an arbitrary manner independent of inherited traits and social experience is the most transparent nonsense to anybody familiar with the rudiments of human psychology. Conduct is the inevitable resultant of a vast set of influences, running from the general physical nature of mankind and the particular hereditary traits of each individual to the effects of the most recent set of experi-

ences which have operated upon his psyche. Our personality at any time is but a cross-section of the habit-complexes which have been built up in the lifelong process of conditioning. Human behavior, then, reveals a process of strict determinism obeying scientific laws as invariable as the law of gravitation.

There is nothing alarming about this conception, as it merely means that human conduct is not independent of the range of scientific causation. When we say that an individual "chooses" some action, we can only mean, in scientific terminology, that the complex of conditioning which led him to the type of action "chosen" was more powerful than the conditioning which pressed him toward a different decision. That man has the power to select in an arbitrary and independent manner the particular conditioning to which he will respond is as silly in its scientific assumptions and implications as to hold that an apple may choose whether it will rise or fall from a tree. One should, of course, differentiate sharply between determinism and fatalism, which are often confused but are fundamentally different in nature. Determinism means that nothing happens arbitrarily but always as the result of a definite chain of causation in harmony with scientific laws and processes. Fatalism implies exactly the opposite, namely, that something is predestined to happen in some particular fashion at a given time wholly independent of antecedent or predisposing circumstances.

The deterministic position carries with it very revolutionary applications to social policies. It quickly becomes apparent that no one can be held to be personally responsible for his actions, for they are the result of hereditary and social conditions over which he had little or no control. Man can not be wilfully perverse. A man who commits a multiple murder is no more responsible for his behavior than an amiable and generous philanthropist. Therefore, if one, for example, desires to reform a criminal he must subject the criminal to a new type of social conditioning which will, if possible, become more potent than the set of previous experiences which led him to commit crime. If one wishes to lessen the volume of crime he must endeavor to decrease or eliminate those social habits, customs and institutions which furnish the basis for anti-social conditioning or bad habits. The conventional theory of punishment as social revenge for arbitrary or wilful perversity dissolves at once in the light of the contemporary conceptions of the determination of conduct through biological and social influences.

It is frequently held that, whatever the scientific validity of the deterministic view of life, it is a pessimistic philosophy, and that any rational motivation for social progress and reform can be found only in conformity with the free-will hypothesis. Exactly the opposite is the case. The free-will conception offers no basis for constructive social work. According to its tenets, a child might be born of eugenic parents so perfect as to make Francis Galton turn in his grave for joy, be given every opportunity for an excellent education, and have the best of surroundings, and yet might at any time burn down an orphan asylum or rob the vaults of the Salvation Army. From the deterministic point of view we can feel assured that the person who is born with normal qualities and is afforded the opportunity to build up normal social habits is

not likely to go wrong. We can thus work with some confidence in the task of improving the human stock biologically and in eliminating those social environments which constitute the breeding-places of bad habits and anti-social attitudes and actions.

4. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE RELIGIOUS THRILL

An important contribution to the explanation of the religious thrill in certain well-developed world religions has been offered recently by the dynamic psychologists such as Everett Dean Martin. Such writers call attention to the tendency of the child to project into his attitude towards the supernatural world the psychological attitudes of awe, trust, fear and dependence which he has built up towards his earthly parents. In answer to the insistent inquiry of the child into problems of causation the mother tells her off-spring that God "made" things, and then explains that God is "our Father in Heaven." The thrills derived from the earthly family thus become, by process of projection, inseparably intertwined with the religious thrills which come from the supernatural world thus interpreted in terms of the domestic complex. This psychoanalytical interpretation of the religious thrill and the religious experience is so important that it will be worth quoting some of the more essential conceptions and mechanisms as they are described by Dr. Martin:

I am dwelling on this symbolic character of religious ideas and beliefs because it is in the symbols that we must discover the psychological meaning of the matter of redemption from sin. Chiefly important among the symbols of religion is the idea of the "Heavenly Father." This idea is very widespread in religion because it reflects a universal human experience, the child-parent relationship. Psychopathologists are in the habit of looking at this child-parent relationship as one of the main sources of the phenomena of the unconscious. It is no mere accident that men speak of the Deity as Father. This is a common practice, both Christian and Jewish. The child in its early years looks upon his Father as an ideal person. The father is strong, he is wise; in his presence there is security from all harm; he provides all the child's wants; in fact, nearly all members of the human family have first learned to adjust themselves to the world through the assistance and under the protection of the parents. . . .

When the growing youth about the time of his adolescence finds himself a new being, face to face with a newer and wider environment, with new tasks and duties and dangers to face, it is natural that he should strive so far as possible to meet the new situations in habitual ways. The youth needs security. He wishes to feel at home in the new situations into which he has suddenly grown. He therefore strives to conceive of the world as an *imaginary family affair* and he gains the feeling of security by constructing an imaginary father who will be to this larger family what the actual father was in the family circle of his childhood experiences.

This device of gaining the feeling of security by the use of the imaginary father leads, however, to a conflict within the psyche, or, rather, it it revives a conflict which has laid there for a long time. . . .

The growing child, when he conceives of the Heavenly Father pictures the father as the perfect or ideal father which he knew before he had to face the fact of the true nature of the love that existed between his parents. The Heavenly Father, therefore, is perfect in the sense that the disillusioned child conceives of perfection. But this perfection causes a conflict for the youth who in adolescence needs the father-image to give him the feeling of security. The adolescent individual finds that there are now in his own nature the very elements which in his childish egoism he refused to admit in the nature of the father. Consequently, the very use of the father-image in religion involves a conflict. "There must be *reconciliation* with the father."

This need of reconciliation is the feeling of *sin*. Sin is not what many moderns conceive it to be. It is not the same as concrete immoral behavior. Sin is thought of as "the corruption of the entire nature." It is a curse. It is a soul-destroying, world-destroying blight. The sinner does not regard himself as such because of something he has *done*; but rather because of what he *is*. The doctrine of sin is this: that human nature is so corrupt that no matter what sinful humanity may achieve, its achievement is only adding to the original offense. The individual must be *born again*. There is here a wish for the infantile return about which we have spoken in a previous lecture. The reconciliation with the father is redemption from sin. This reconciliation is achieved by the use of certain symbols. The function of these symbols is to reconcile the childhood idealism of the individual with the facts of his own mature nature. The father must be propitiated, must become forgiving. . . .

Hence, we may say that redemption from sin is, psychologically speaking, a mechanism of *defense against the feeling of inferiority*. The salvation of the soul means in psychological terms the securing of the "personality picture," a matter which I discussed in an earlier lecture. . . .

There is a peculiar fact about the religious community. Towards no other form of human association, not even the State, do men have such reverence. Men take a *filial attitude* toward their church. The church is the Holy Mother and it is very interesting that the mother-image which we saw is suppressed in the religious symbolism along with the idea of the conjugal relation of the parents, reappears as the church. In entering the church, therefore, the believer symbolizes the wish for the return to the mother. In other words, we have here again a phase of the Oedipus-complex, for the church here is both Mother and Bride. And this is true of the Christian Church and the Hebrew congregation. In this way, the infantile wish becomes socialized and directed toward socially accepted goals. But the filial attitude toward the church, its very sacredness, tends to bring into operation another element. The church and the world are incompatible. The church is set over against the world; it becomes the "church militant." In other words, the religious group conceiving itself as a peculiar people, tends to become crowd-minded and as the church gains in numerical strength through its proselyting, the will to power of its members tends to increase. It becomes coercive. And this note of coercion is almost universal.

5. BIBLICAL HISTORY AND CRITICISM

Another most important development in historiography in the last century has been the gradual but sure secularization of "sacred" history and the consequent removal of the obstacle to the scholarly and objective treatment of every field of history. This progress has been in part a product of the brilliant advances in the critical methods in the last century, and in part has been due to the philosophical destruction of the whole basis of the conception of "sacred" history, which has resulted from the unparalleled discoveries in natural science since 1800. On the whole, it is probable that the latter has been the most important influence because the difference in the skill in handling documents on the part of Mabillon and Wellhausen was infinitely less than the divergence between their "Weltanschauung." The process through which the sources of the Old Testament were discovered and separated has been significant in the growth of a more critical historical scholarship. Upon the basis of this criticism of the sources there has grown up a critical history of the Jewish nation and its religion which had been impossible of attainment since the inclusion of Hebrew history as the corner-stone of the Christian synthesis of the history of antiquity by Eusebius, Jerome and Orosius.

A rather lame and halting beginning of a critical and objective history of the Hebrews, upon the basis of the Biblical criticism of the early nineteenth century, was made by the Göttingen professor, Heinrich Ewald, whose "History of the People of Israel" was published in the years following 1843. The first straightforward and thorough-going critical history of the religious development of the Jews was contained in the "Religion of Israel," published by the Leyden professor, Abraham Kuenen, in 1869. Even more advanced was the epoch-making "History of Israel" of Julius Wellhausen, a professor in Göttingen and the greatest of Old Testament scholars. Wellhausen's work, published originally in 1878, was but a brilliant fragment, and the preparation of a systematic history of Israel in accordance with the advanced views of Wellhausen was the work of the Giessen professor, Bernhard Stade, whose "History of the People of Israel" was published in 1887. The results of these works from the new critical mode of approach were utterly to destroy the exaggerations regarding the glories of ancient Israel, which had been set forth in Kings and Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, had been repeated by Josephus, and were thoroughly embodied in Christian tradition. For the first time the history of Palestine was revealed in its proper perspective in the larger history of the ancient East. Not less damaging was the effect of the work of Wellhausen and his associates upon the doctrine of a unique, primordial and revealed monotheism among the Jews. It was clearly shown that monotheism had been a gradual and precarious development out of an original polytheism, and that its maintenance was always difficult and subject to serious lapses. The late origin of the alleged laws of Moses was no less clearly established. The secularizing process was carried still further by the brilliant Cambridge professor, Robertson Smith, in his "Religion of the Semites," which showed the many points of similarity between the religion of the Hebrews and the religious beliefs and practices of the other branches of the Semitic peoples. Finally, Delitzsch, Winckler and Rogers have made clear the profound influence of the Babylonian historical and religious traditions upon the religion of Israel. While the work of the most of these writers was highly technical and intended primarily for scholars, its general significance was popularized through Renan's brilliant and widely read "History of the People of Israel."

No less startling has been the result of the invasion of the "sacred" history of the Christian era by the critical methods. Building on the basis of the textual criticism of the sources of the New Testament by such scholars as Strauss, Baur, Loisy and Harnack, and the study of contemporary religions by Renan, Hatch, Cumont, Glover, Dill and others, Percy Gardner, Weizsäcker, Conybeare, Wernle, Harnack, Duchesne and McGiffert have explained with great scholarship and lucidity the syncretic nature of Apostolic and Patristic Christianity, the historic causes for the final success of Christianity, and the nature of the gradual development of Christian dogma and ecclesiastical organization. Henry C. Lea, in a series of massive monographs, which constitute the most notable contribution of America to Church history, has dealt with the most diverse phases of the history of the medieval Church in a fine objective and secular spirit. Beard and Tröltzsch have traced the rise and development of

Protestantism with insight and candor. Three Catholic scholars of the highest rank in the field of scholarship, Döllinger, Huber and Reusch, have made as great contributions to the battle against ecclesiastical obscurantism as any historians from the Protestant or skeptical camps. Döllinger totally demolished the alleged historical foundations of ultramontaniam and infallibility in his work on "The Pope and the Council." Huber surveyed the history of the Jesuits with the aim of proving their deadly opposition to the spirit of modern learning and the freedom of thought. Reusch contributed the standard treatise on the history of the Papal Index and threw a flood of light upon the sinister machinery through which the reactionary element in Catholicism has endeavored to perpetuate the credulity of its followers and to exclude the perilous fruits of modern scientific and critical research. The net result of the labors of critical scholars of every religious complexion in the field of "sacred history" has been to destroy entirely the premises of the "Fathers," which led them to mark off a field of historical development which was taboo to critical research, and it has opened every field to the operation of the same degree of patient research and calm and objective narration.

6. THE RISE OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

While one may accept Dr. Davis' statement that "psychological sociology as we now know it is extremely recent," it by no means follows that the psychological interpretation of social and political processes is of recent origin. Aristotle, in his *Ethics*, introduces his readers to a discussion by ancient Greek philosophers of the problem whether men prefer the society of those who resemble them or that of those who differ from them. The similarity of this to the discussions twenty-five years ago respecting the validity of Professor Giddings' theory of the "consciousness of kind" will be evident to all familiar with the development of sociological theory. Aristotle's own doctrine of the instinctive sociability of men, which was adopted by the Stoics, Cicero, the Church Fathers and the Scholastic philosophers, was a distinctly psychological interpretation of society and an anticipation of Trotter. One might further call attention to his acute psychological analysis of the bureaucratic spirit, of the effect of the possession of property, of political revolutions, and of the instability of the masses. Polybius contributed a striking anticipation of the theory of reflective sympathy developed later by Spinoza, Hume and Adam Smith, and of the notions of Bagehot and Sumner with respect to the evolution of customs and folkways. A dim foreshadowing of Stanley Hall is evident in the basic concepts of Epicurus and Lucretius. The contract theory of political and social origins, which had a distinguished history from Epicurus to Blackstone and Kant, was distinctly a psychological conception. Thomas Hobbes set forth a trenchant psychological interpretation of the basis of social and political institutions and processes, particularly stressing the element of fear as the foundation of political obedience. Spinoza touched upon the sociological significance of reflective sympathy and prepared the way for Hutcheson, Hume and Adam Smith.

John Locke, in his discussion of "the law of fashion or private censure," anticipated Sumner and Trotter by holding that the force of

group custom and fashion was more powerful in its psychological pressure than the laws of God or the state. Berkeley attempted to adapt the Newtonian terminology to a psychological interpretation of social processes. Hume made important contributions to the socio-psychological significance of sympathy and imitation. Adam Smith's analysis of sympathy was of sufficient thoroughness and insight to lead Professor Giddings to characterize Smith as the founder of psychological sociology. The first systematizers of sociology, Comte and Spencer, make a liberal use of suggestive psychological concepts. Comte's bio-psychic interpretation of social unity, his psychological interpretation of history and progress, and his emphasis upon feeling as the dynamic power in society are common-places in the history of sociology. Spencer's powerful statement in his *Study of Sociology* of the relation of psychology to sociology, and his contributions to the psychology of primitive men are equally well-known.

In spite of these notable anticipations of the modern psychological sociology, the more significant phases of the subject have been developed since the time of Comte. Sir Henry Maine and the legalists stressed the sociological influence of habit in building up social institutions and insuring respect for constituted authority. An attempt was made by certain German writers, of whom Röhmer, Stein and Gierke are representative, to apply concepts similar to those of Comte and Spencer to a classification of the psychological stages of political development and to the elaboration of the notion of the state as a psychic personality. George Henry Lewes, an admirer of Comte and a contemporary of Spencer, gave the first clear and definite statement to the notion of the unity of the social mind, while Adolf Bastian carried the conception still further to establish the unity of the human mind. The newly-awakened interest in folk-psychology, which proceeded from philosophical and anthropological antecedents, was given a great impetus through the foundation of the *Zeitung für Volker-Psychologie und Sprach-Wissenschaft* by Lazarus and Steinhal in 1860, and was carried further from widely different standpoints by such men as Theodor Waitz, Charles Letourneau, E. B. Tylor, D. G. Brinton and Wilhelm Wundt. Then came the attempt of Lester F. Ward and Simon N. Patten to readapt hedonism to serve as the psychological basis of sociology. The significance of evolutionary biology for psychology, individual and social, was established by genetic psychology in the hands of Granville Stanley Hall and James Mark Baldwin. At the same time a group of important writers, such as Bagehot, Tarde, Sidis, Durkheim, Sighele, Le Bon, Sumner and Giddings, were developing the sociological bearings of such psychic factors as imitation, suggestion, fear, social constraint, custom and the consciousness of kind. While emphasizing different psychological forces they were at one in assaulting the intellectualism of the venerable Benthamite felicific calculus.

The most important developments in social psychology during the first two decades of the present century have been the tendency towards a synthesis of the various specific doctrines which had emphasized some psychological force or process which is active in society, and the provision of new technique and modes of approach to psychological and sociological problems. The need for a more synthetic consideration of

socio-psychological problems was set forth by Professor W. I. Thomas in his notable paper on *The Province of Social Psychology*, delivered before the Congress of Arts and Sciences at St. Louis in 1904. He emphasized the necessity of a pluralistic approach to the subject and of a consideration of the interaction of man and his social environment. Soon works began to appear which proved the soundness of his thesis. McDougall, Thorndike, Trotter and others carried further William James' preliminary generalization concerning the socio-psychological significance of human instincts and the "original nature of man."

The results of their work were appropriated for sociology and social psychology by writers such as Graham Wallas, Edman and Lippmann. American psychological sociologists also made many important contributions to this synthetic tendency. Professor Giddings has broadened his psychology of society by weaving the doctrine of the "consciousness of kind" into a theory of social causation founded upon the doctrine of the differential response of organisms to stimulation which issues in "pluralistic behavior." Professor Small has contributed a psycho-economic explanation of the social process resting upon the notion of the basic significance of a number of vital human interests. Baldwin, Cooley, Gault, and Balz have presented original syntheses which aim at a merging of individual and social psychology in the attempt to analyze the chief psychic factors in social organization and democratic society. Professor Ross has united an original adaptation of the theories of Tarde and other European social psychologists with his own penetrating observations on modern social processes in one of the most lucid and striking of the systems of psychological sociology. Professor Ellwood has prepared what is unquestionably the most reliable and comprehensive synthesis of the best and most up-to-date writings in the fields of psychology and psychological sociology. Further, a number of writers, most notably Ward, Hobhouse, Wallas and Trotter, have shown that while one must admit the potency of instinctive and emotional factors in social behavior, yet progress and constructive effort can come only from a social appreciation and appropriation of volitional and intellectual factors. New concepts and methods have been developed which contribute powerfully to an improvement of social psychology and psychological sociology. The experimental and statistical method, developed especially by Cattell and Thorndike, has provided a more perfect technique for gathering reliable data and testing results. Behavioristic psychology is far more related to social psychology than the older introspective approach. Psychoanalysis has both provided a new set of mechanisms for exploring the mind of the individual and has shown the social significance of the repression of normal instincts. The introduction of fairly reliable methods of mental testing has revealed the existence of wide variations of mental capacity in even the so-called "normal" population which have sociological significance of the greatest import. These advances have been synthesized by F. H. Allport in the most original treatise yet produced in the field of social psychology, and by L. L. Bernard, E. S. Bogardus and Kimball Young in the most recent general textbooks on the subject.

In the World of Books

Isaac Goldberg

Hero of the American Short Story

THE CALIPH OF BAGDAD: O. HENRY. By Robert H. Davis and Arthur B. Maurice. New York. D. Appleton & Co.

THERE was a time, and it was not so long ago, when O. Henry—the best known pseudonym, though not the only one, of William Sidney Porter—was the god of all the young men and women in the nation who aspired to fame and fortune in the field of the short story. The short story form, for that matter, is itself a sort of god to aspiring writers. It seems to be a peculiarly Aentrican type. It means ready money, that is if you can sell your product. It means nothing like the close and persistent application demanded by the novel.

True, there were always a few critics who declaimed against the mere journalism of O. Henry's tales, and pointed out the mechanicalness of the trick ending. The author himself was not too much enamored of these trick tales; had the editors allowed him to, he once told Witter Bynner, he would have done more narratives in the style of his Roads of Destiny. I do not think that Porter enjoys today anything like the esteem in which persons of taste held him twenty years ago.

For the moment, it is a life and not a critique that concerns us. Many persons, some of them intimately associated with O. Henry—that is, if anybody may be said to have been intimate with this peculiarly reticent personality—have written about him in letters, in magazine articles, and in books. Yet somehow, the man, in his death as in his life, defies analysis. Bob Davis and Arthur Maurice knew him as well as anybody else. The one is a widely known journalist and the other is prominent in the history of our magazines. (It was Maurice, by the way, who as editor of *The Bookman*, commissioned my first magazine series shortly after I got out of college).

Their account, which levies tribute upon everything that has dealt with their subject before them, has also much new material in the shape of anecdotes and letters. We follow the career of the man from his beginnings, when he promised to become an excellent caricaturist rather than a story-teller, through his apprenticeship to the druggist's shop, thence to a good position in a bank, thence to indictment and punishment for malversation of funds amounting to the sum of less than \$1200, thence to years in prison, and finally to his emergence as one of the most beloved yarn spinners of his country.

There will always be a haze of doubt surrounding the prison career of O. Henry. It is virtually an accepted fact today that he went to jail to shield another. Why, remains the enigma, did

he flee to Honduras while still awaiting sentence, thus seeming to admit his guilt? But there are many such whys in Porter's life. After he got to New York he became more taciturn than ever, shielding himself against the discovery of his past. What was it that turned him into a tower of silence?

Into his married life we get a pathetic glimpse; we see him, too, briefly as a father. We watch his first story being whipped into shape; we discover him receiving his first check in prison; we follow him around the haunts of New York. We hear his friends speak of him; we read his jocular notes to them and see some of his funny drawings. And yet, an invisible barrier protects him from full comprehension even by his friends.

There is no doubt that one will enjoy O. Henry's stories more and understand them better for having read this volume. It affords, also, a valuable side-light upon American authorship in the early days of this country. It seems to me that O. Henry's life, if we could reconstruct it in something like its entirety, would make a more interesting story than any that he wrote. His tales now appear to have been far more sincere, and much more deeply rooted in personal experience, than we knew before.

The Radical as Lyrist

PREGNANT WOMAN IN A LEAN AGE. By Ralph Cheyney. William Faro Inc., New York.

It has been a common objection to the poets of the radical economic school that in their passion for justice they have overlooked the beauty of passion itself—that in their fanatic adherence to a noble cause they have shut themselves against the beauties of that very human companionship in whose cause ultimately they labor. I have myself frequently spoken of this angular sexlessness in so many "poets of the revolution".

Certainly this objection is not to be brought against the verses of Mr. Ralph Cheyney. He thinks to the root, whether in economics or sex. He has no burrs on his tongue. If this be an age that worships leanness and its concomitant sterility in woman, he sings all the more lustily of the woman with child. This small collection, in fact, may be regarded as a dithyramb to fecundity—to fruitfulness and multiplication. A biblical, Whitmanian exaltation is in it, often overflowing the borders of taste or technique, but as often discovering the vital epigram and the pregnant phrase that is a welcome contrast to the leanness of much contemporary verse.

Cheyney, in his exuberance, is tempted to pack too much into a line until, like his own "taut horizons" his verses "are stretched till they burst." No matter. With time will come increased skill. The poet is already here, richer than in the brown-paper pamphlet with which he made his debut. Let me quote a few of his epigrammatic stanzas:

MY ME AND I

Though I must keep my cloven hooves
 Concealed beneath an office desk,
 Destroy the rhythm of my moves
 And never show myself grotesque,

I still elude these heavy fools
 With whom ostensibly I deal.
 My me obeys their grimy rules;
 My I does just as it may feel.

AS FOR PIETY

I have never had help from the piously meek
 But halm from the sinners and strength from the weak
 The pious cheat god, their god who is dead.
 But the lovers trust God who is Love and are led.

Cheyney, who uses the word God a trifle too frequently —it is so easy to rhyme—nevertheless, as appears above, does so in no deistic sense. His God is Love enthroned. Nor is his Love a harmless, flirtatious chit. It is a Love that flouts convention, that bears children, that has pain as well as pleasure. This he has summed up quite expertly in his

PARABLE

Four kisses my love gave me:
 On the brow for constancy,
 On each eye no tears now blur,
 That all I see may tell of her,

And one she pressed upon my mouth.
 My heart need dread no further drouth.
 Then lest I fear I dreamt delight
 My love gave me a warm, sharp bite!

That, it strikes me, is worthy of Emily Dickinson.

Mr. Cheyney, with a little chastening—this is meant in the technical, not the moral sense—could develop this gift for epigrammatic utterance into a rich, personal style. His danger, and it is the danger of the genre as well as of his temperament, is to run carelessly off into prose, into over-emphasis of the intellectual substance. It would be eminently worth his while to attempt an organic fusion of his thought with his passion. By the token of this most interesting collection he can do it.

Hoover Blankets

Charles W. Smith

THE long freight train moved slowly over the Cascades toward Seattle. If some federal enumerator had had occasion to visit the different cars he would have found not less than two hundred men aboard, a majority of whom, just like me, were earnestly and honestly seeking work.

Night came on; it was cold. One of the hoboes, an interior decorator who had aided in dressing some of New York's and Los Angeles' finest hotels, and had credentials to prove it, drew some newspapers from his pocket, spread them down in a corner of the box car and said:

"Well, I guess I'll try to get some sleep on my Hoover blankets."

This interior decorator was not an exception in the type of men on that train. There was a young attorney, there was a doctor, I have been a newspaper man for several years. But all of us were in the same condition, broke, hungry and seeking work, victims of a vicious condition that everyone believes could have been avoided with intelligent leadership.

But being "on the bum" has been an education in itself that is worth a great deal from the human standpoint, for it has shown me to what extent a man will go to get something to eat.

My search led me to Tacoma. Broke, hungry, tired, I went to the Salvation Army looking for respite. I was given a ticket and told to return to the social service department at 7:15 o'clock, when supper would be served. Needless to say, I was there.

Presenting my ticket at the door, I was told to sit down in the meeting room and wait. Presently, when the room was filled, the commanding officer and his corps took their places on the platform. "We'll have just a short service before supper," he said. He called for a song; then a prayer; then some specialties by some of the women members of the corps who performed only by their own courage and not by any talent they might have possessed. **Preaching**—and at a quarter to ten we were marched into a back room where we were fed some cold kidney beans, cold coffee and stale bread.

That was the initiation into the mysteries of the slogan of the Salvation Army: "A man may be down but he is never out."

The next evening, my hunt for work being fruitless, I went down into the "Big G" freight yards, intent on obtaining a train for Portland. The train pulled into that Oregon metropolis shortly after daylight, and we who were aboard found the city's multiple Grover Whalens, wearing natty khaki uniforms, awaiting to welcome us. Piled into three automobiles, we were hauled off to the police station, where we were "mug-

ged" and fingerprinted just as though we had been fleeing convicts or murderers.

Fortunately, I studied public speaking when I attended Baylor university, down in Texas, so I was able to convince the police sergeant that I was actually looking for work and had been for some time. He tore up my Bertillon measurements and said he would see that I got out of town all right. He did: he piled me into a car with four heavily armed officers, who took me out to the city limits and told me to "keep moving." I did!

I wanted work, and I was determined that I was going to find it somewhere, and, thinking thus, I continued on my way, down through Oregon to Klamath Falls. There was a town—a bums' paradise! Down by the Southern Pacific yards was the jungle. Each night, one of the sawmills backed up a truck and dumped off a load of wood; some of the bakeries and groceries sent down food. And the police would come down and "jaw" with the boys.

Incidentally, around Klamath Falls they are not "bums"; they are unemployed men.

The trail carried me down into Southern California and to Phoenix, Arizona. There, on "skid row," I met a young hotel clerk, a war veteran, who had just obtained a job picking cotton. The field was out about five miles and he was "broke." We considered ways and means of raising carfare—ten cents and an additional ten cents to get me to the field where I might apply for work, too. We tried panhandling, but to no avail.

He espied a policeman, and decided he would "put the bee" on him. The result was that the boy was taken to jail and charged with vagrancy, and in court he drew ten days. When I went to see him he said: "I won't be in here but a couple of days." "What are you going to do?" I asked. "Never mind." he grinned, "I'll be out." Sure enough, he was out in two days.

"It was simple," he explained. "I got back in a corner and bumped my head against the cement walls for about fifteen minutes, and managed to work up a good fever. I called the jailer and told him I was sick, and he sent for a doctor, who found I had a temperature of 102. He said he would come back the next morning to see how I was, and when he came he found I still had fever. Then he ordered my release. And here I am."

What to do? Where to go? Boulder Dam! And so we headed for Las Vegas. There a sight met my eyes that I shall never forget. A little "overnight" town with accommodations for ten thousand persons trying desperately to care for forty thousand teeming, eager, cursing men and women, all demanding work. Out on the edge of town were perhaps fifteen hundred families, encamped, waiting for the day to come when the man of the family would get his chance to work on some phase of the dam project.

A typical picture: the man tinkering with a dilapidated

automobile; the woman hauling water from a nearby desert well; children, dirty little brats, gnawing on the bones of a wild burro killed in the hills back of the town and the only food they had had for days.

Inquiry revealed that a chance to find work in Las Vegas or at Boulder Dam was useless, so the war veteran and I turned our eyes toward Reno. What, we asked ourselves, was to keep us from horning in on some of the rackets in Reno, at least long enough to get a stake to move on? Thirty minutes in Reno answered our question. Every conceivable racket was already being worked and there were hundreds waiting in line to get their hands into the grift.

I decided to give the Salvation Army one more chance to make good on its slogan. I went to headquarters—it was about ten o'clock at night—and sought out the commanding officer. I explained who I was and what I wanted, and I received this answer:

"Aw, g'wan down in the street an' sleep with the rest of the bums."

"Well," I said to my traveling companion, "there's nothing to keep us from panhandling a few dimes here." He agreed, and we divided the town. I started out; I saw a likely prospect coming toward me. I stopped and started to ask him for a dime when:

"Say, buddy, you ain't got a quarter you can spare a feller, have you?" he asked. I decided I was a piker in seeking dimes, so made up my mind to ask for quarters, and when I approached my next prospect he "hi" me for a half dollar before I had a chance to speak.

There was nothing to do but to get out of town, I concluded, and boarded an eastbound freight that very night. The next morning the train pulled into Carlin, Nevada, a small railroad town midway between Reno and Salt Lake City. I learned there was a bakery in town that would "hand out" to the boys, and skewered up nerve enough to go begging. But when the train slowed down not less than fifty men leaped from cars along the train and started a mad race to get to the bakery first, and be the fortunate one.

I left Carlin without eating.

Other things I learned on this trip: one was that hobodom has an underground telegraph system that compares with any of the great wire systems. At Reno I heard about the railroad detectives at Helper, Utah, and Emporia, Kansas.

"That guy at Helper is a robber," said my informant. "The one at Emporia is a mauler."

However, when I got to Helper I found that the robber had been discharged by the road "to keep him from being killed," as the superintendent's letter said. He had played a little game of "shaking down" all men who came through on freight trains,

taking their money and then sending the 'boes on their way, broke. At Emporia I ran into the "mauler," and saw him unmercifully beat a boy of seventeen who was on his way home from the harvest fields.

If I were alone on the hunt for work I might be inclined to believe that the fault is mine. But I'm not; not a train did I ride but that I encountered from fifty to one hundred men all bent on the same apparently hopeless quest—work—and a trainman told me that every train is the same.

"There's no use trying to kick the 'boes off," he complained, "they get right back on again, so we just have to grin and bear it."

"You might as well, brother," a begrimed man said, "because they's a lot of hard-nosed guys on some of the roads what are marked, and if this toughness keeps up when cold weather sets in something's going to pop."

And that's the sentiment everywhere I have been—through forty states—if something doesn't happen to relieve conditions before cold weather sets in something IS going to pop—and pop loud. "Hoover blankets" might be all right when the sun is beaming down but they don't keep a man warm when snow is falling.

Can They Lift the Lady's Countenance?

Clay Fulks

"STATUE of Liberty to be renovated by army. Page 19".— This item in the news index of *The New York Times* for July 6 intrigued me. After wading through the flood of slush about how Hoover is saving civilization by postponement, it was something of a relief to come upon a dramatic little incident smacking of Yankee-doodleism.

I turn to page 19 and this gay headline greets my eye: "Statue of Liberty to Get 'Beauty Treatment'; First Renovation in its Forty-five Years." I paused to repress my rising contempt before reading any further. The whole incident, in its bare outline, struck me as involving a bit of sardonic mockery, something likely to grate on the nerves of that lonely remnant of "queer" Americans who are still so poor as to do reverence to the spirit of liberty; and as I read on, noting how neatly the details fell into their proper places, my suspicions were confirmed. This goddess with a past, and now fat and forty-five, is to "undergo a special electric 'beauty treatment'."

"The now obsolete system of lighting the statue at night has provoked criticism. It has been said, for instance, that the bronze goddess appears to have a double chin." **Obsolete—that's** the word. Certainly it is obsolete to let any light, save a dim,

blinking, and uncertain one, shine from that statue. When, many years ago, Nemesis, filled with indignant shame, as I supposed, extinguished the torch held aloft in such glaring irony by the poor, prostituted Lady from France, I reflected sadly that, for decency's sake, she should be draped with black crepe and left alone in her dishonor. But it seems that some one having a cruel if not perverted sense of irony brought another light.

"To remedy this [the double chin and 'other unseemly illusionary blemishes'], Major Gen. Hanson E. Ely, commanding the Second Corps Area, has completed arrangements," etc., etc. But—

Can all of Hoover's horses and all of Hoover's men
Lift the old lady's countenance again?

I'm afraid they cannot. The Major Gen. may pencil her eyebrows, give her a permanent wave, remove some superfluous hair and moles, but what about rouge, that cosmetic so dear to the feminine heart? Aye, there's the rub. It would constitute plain sedition, or worse, to rouge up that old girl. Surely, however, we can depend on Ham Fish and the Daughters of the Revolution to see to it that nothing red is smeared on her.

The new lighting, which is to be installed by Westinghouse, is to cost \$14,386. There, I suspect, we have a clue to the re-lighting of the statue. Isn't there an old French adage to the effect that when something apparently inexplicable happens, look for the woman in the case? Well, in this country, when anything puzzling takes place, such as this notable instance of re-lighting the Statue of Liberty, look for the contract in the case. Admitting my complete ignorance of what the job should be actually worth, I shall only remark, in passing, that, if the most approved American rule in such cases is followed, the job should be worth at least \$14.

"The grime, accumulated in generations, is to be removed." But is this not a left-handed slap in the face to many of our duly constituted authorities? Ignoring, of course, all of the criminally imbecile among them—"company gunmen," Pennsylvania "Cossacks," and many deputy sheriffs and policemen—who could not possibly perceive an insult half so subtle, we cannot help wondering what many of our federal judges and high sheriffs, who have begrimed the goddess with such reckless abandon, must think of this plan of taking her to a cleaning. And there's old Mitchell Falmer—is he still encumbering the earth? Then, he should feel offended deeply and irreconcilably.

"In the twenty-one 'windows' of the statue's crown it is planned to place lights, and a blinker system will create the impression of glittering jewels." There is real appropriateness for you—that blinker system which "will create the impression of glittering jewels." Aye, there's appropriateness that hits the spot exactly.

"When the work is completed it is hoped that the statue may be seen from vessels as far out as Sandy Hook." Certainly,

that's far enough now. Back in the days of our patriotic innocence it was "Liberty Enlightening the World;" now it is merely "hoped" that the light may reach as far as Sandy Hook!

How many millions of honest, illusioned foreigners, after being "Americanized" by our captains of industry, with their injunction judges and warlike constabulary, have felt forced to look back upon that colossal bronze figure as the most colossal piece of irony an indifferent God has ever let them encounter!

A Scrutiny of Faith

G. M. Boumphrey

IN the days when one was young enough to embark upon long theological arguments in the sanguine hope that some conclusion might be reached, one was always being brought up short against the question of "faith." However confidently the other side might lead off with the promise of some definite proof to be adduced, the ending was always the same: "Well, you must have **some** faith." And sorrowfully one had to postpone one's longed-for conversion to a later date. Nor were these proselytizers always so callow as might be imagined. They included one of our senior bishops—"There must have been someone to put all these atoms and molecules together, you know." Not a very valuable statement, since it immediately called forth the question: "Why?" Or, again, the Christian Scientist, a man of considerable attainments, who, promising a mathematical proof of the existence of the Trinity, began: "Well, you will admit that there must have been a Cause for everything"—and was aghast at being denied this foundation-stone of his argument. There is indeed a fundamental difference in outlook between the present middle-aged generation and that older one which reached intellectual maturity in the age of Victorian certainty about everything. These latter find it necessary to assume a cause and a beginning; to us it is more difficult to allow a beginning than to envisage eternity itself.

How shall we define this "faith" upon which all religion must rest? It is the delief in something that one has been told—which one may come to believe and feel is true—but of which no proof can possibly be given. In fact, when it runs counter to our own beliefs it is called "superstition" and is held to be a degrading thing. Can it be otherwise than degrading—or at best, stultifying? If we attempt to analyze the process by which man has evolved from the beast to his present state of semi-civilization, we shall find that every material and intellectual advance has been due to the use of his power of reasoning: the observation of facts, the deduction of certain principles from those facts, and the employment of those principles to his ad-

vantage. Generally speaking, whenever he has acted upon belief alone, unsupported by knowledge, it has been to his disadvantage. So long as he worshipped fire as a terrifying deity, it availed him little; but let him learn about it and exploit it—and his first and possibly greatest step forward was taken.

This on the debit of faith. To its credit can be put that it promises man some return after death for the troubles of this life and for the sacrifices he has to make in order to obtain the greater leisure and security offered by herd-life. It is held, also, to take away something of the sting of death. We shall attempt to balance these two sides and see whether faith—in particular the Christian faith—justifies its existence, or whether, like every other superstition, it should go.

Perhaps the strongest argument against the Christian faith is that it attempts to focus our attention upon a future life—to the consequent neglect of this present one. It advises the unfortunate to bear their lot instead of exhorting them to improve it. The religion of Moses was not at all like this: it was expressly framed to secure the utmost material advantage for the chosen People—and admirably it succeeded. But it was a cruel and selfish religion, and was vastly improved by the addition of Christ's commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The wisdom, the necessity of this has never been so widely recognized throughout the world as it is today. The late War may be to some extent responsible for this; but it seems probable that the vast increase in general reading has done and is doing far more. Reading is the most powerful factor the world has ever seen in promoting that sympathy for others which alone can lead to the true happiness of mankind. The Squire's wife is not so virtuously vindictive towards the fallen village maiden when she has read half-a-dozen books setting forth the sinner's point of view more adequately than the girl could ever hope to do. The English read **All Quiet on the Western Front**; the Germans study **Journey's End**—and so the process continues. It is becoming permissible to inquire whether the bulk of mankind is not almost fit to be trusted to work in the right direction simply because it obviously is the right direction—without the threats and lures of religion. But faith, as we are looking at it, is less concerned with this commandment than with its accompanying: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," with all its implications of "life to come," "original sin," and even "everlasting torment." And it is here that much of modern thought refuses to follow. May it not be better to leave all mystical problems to solve themselves, and to concentrate upon making this present world a better place? And if there be a God, surely this will be an acceptable form of worship. It sees the churches absurdly at variance with the precepts of their Founder ("Vain repetition," "Sell that thou hast and give to the poor," "Judge not")—and holds this inconsistency against their creed as well as against themselves. In our new humility, which looks

upon man less as the lord of creation than as an animal struggling upwards, we see the belief in immortality as but the more evidence of conceit. Shall so wonderful a thing as a man simply come to nothing! Yet a human personality consists of little but a bundle of memories. Take away his memory and the man is dead already! It would hardly seem to matter whether he have a soul or not, if his memory is not to survive the grave. And memory is a very fragile thing, easily deranged. If one finds, after death, that memory persists and that one has a soul—so much the better!

Thus runs the creed of the man with no faith; and we shall try to see what he has lost. He has not denied God: he has ignored Him; but it seems unlikely that an infinite Being could be petty enough to bear malice for this—especially if the love which should have been given to God has been expended in the service of his fellow-men. He has lost the comfort and the efficacy (doubtful indeed so far as this world is concerned) of prayer; but he has gained largely in concentration and self-reliance, since he has had no vague hope of supernatural assistance. Lastly he is left exposed to the full terror of death. It will not be denied that a devout faith may act as a powerful drug against this—though other faiths have proved more potent than Christianity in this respect. Yet death can be faced bravely enough without it. The War, which brought so many of us into closer contact with death than we should otherwise have come for many years, failed to mark any difference between those with faith and those without. In any case, we must surely adjudge this a paltry and unworthy motive for a life-long exercise.

The Road Is the Bunk

Clive Lovett Cleaves

JACK LONDON, Jim Tully, Harry Kemp, and a host of others have written of the Road, but none of them first dipped his pen in realism before he wrote. However, they are not entirely to be blamed. Few writers ever are allowed to achieve realism in any subject, and for a most potent reason—most editors believe the public can't stomach the truth. Hence the writers of Hobohemia, Houdini-like, have produced and hung between us and their subject a softly glamorous veil, a veil that upon close examination turns out to be composed of half-truths and airy nothings. They have made it appear that the roadsters' life is a rollicking one, a carefree life wherein all are adventurers, brawny, two-fisted men who have chosen the Road because it suits them. According to these writers, hoboes in general are men too independent of spirit to meekly conform

to society's demands for regularity of habit and stability of abode, and yet real men withal. This is buncombe and nothing more. While, in the first place, the roadster may have chosen the long trail, in the end it is the Road that chooses him. And not as a jolly comrade, but as a helpless victim.

Primarily, when we think of those who go on the Road, we have to consider youth and its adventurous spirit. For, aside from a few poor souls of mature age who have been forced by economic pressure to go a-rambling, by far the greater percentage of the roadsters is made up of youths and men who went on the Road in their teens, men who have become enamored of the life, this because of their own mental stagnation and bodily laziness, or men who are unable to discontinue it.

Ninety-nine times out of a hundred, youth runs away from home for two unlike but equally powerful causes. One is an uncongenial home life, and the other the allurements of far places. If the runaway lives in the west, New York City becomes his Mecca; if in the east, it is California. In any case, wherever he may live, we may be sure that the farthest fields are the greenest.

By way of adequate illustration, let us put on the Road a lad of sixteen and see what befalls him. He has a few, a very few dollars in pocket and an even greater paucity of ideas in mind. His mental machinery is not as yet adjusted to the production of thought, being wholly given over to the generation of desires, to various schemes for their fulfillment, and to a vast eagerness to experience wonders.

Let us name our lad Joel and start him from Los Angeles. Being a runaway, his greatest concern is to get out of the state before the police lay hands on him and return him home. He has a notion that once he crosses the state line, he is reasonably safe. He couldn't tell you why he feels this way, but his thought is based on a hazy idea to do with the difficulties attendant on extradition. He wishes that Honduras were just across the border. That being impossible, he contents himself that Arizona is not under the same authority as California. He reasons that the more states he puts between himself and his home, the less likely is he to be arrested and returned.

He pays his fare by stage to El Centro, in the Imperial Valley, but he doesn't tarry there. Because he has seen others soliciting rides by the highway side, he takes first of all to this mode of travel. His first ride takes him to Holtville, and there he sticks. Automobile drivers are suspicious of him and his kind. After spending several unprofitable and irksome hours on the eastern edge of town, he finally gets a lift that takes him to Yuma. He never dreamed that people could be so niggardly as not to give one a ride, especially when they had so much spare room in their cars.

In Yuma he repeats his Holtville experience, with the exception that he does not get a ride. After hours spent on the

cutskirts of Yurna, he returns to town. There he spends the last of his money for a meal. Next he becomes acquainted with a twenty-year-old dressed in greasy overalls and a torn sheepskin coat. This one is also going east. Joel tells of his troubles, how hard it is to get a ride. What's the matter with people anyway? His new friend enlightens him.

"Well, y'see, it's like this. Drivers usta give fellas rides, but some fellas bumped off some drivers and robbed others, and now they ain't puttin' out. The highway ain't no good no more on 'at account. What you wanta do, is grab yourself an armload o' box cars and stick with 'em."

"Oh, a freight train, hey?" says our neophyte. "But won't they put you off?"

"Well, 'at's up to you. If y'know how, like me, you can ride 'em easy. Anyways there's so many guys on the Road these days that the shacks don't bother you. All y'gotta do, is look out for bulls, and even they ain't so tough as they usta be. There's a drag pullin' outa here about nine tonight. You come along with me, and I'll show you how to ride it."

At half past eight the two go to the railroad yards, where they meet a group of ten or a dozen hoboos also waiting for the nine o'clock drag. They sit under the car-icing platform and talk of handouts mooched, of dimes, quarters, and half-dollars stented, and of railroad bulls. Oh yes, they also talk of sex. One voluble soul, a hawk-nosed man of about thirty-five, tells an interesting tale.

"Coupla days ago, when I wuz in El Centro, I worked the stem for an hour or more, but I couldn't get a lousy deemo. Then I thought I'd try the privates, so I mopes out into a classy residential section and walks along until I seen a house that wuz made to order. There wuz no fence around it, so I knew there wuz no dog, and smoke wuz comin' outa the chimly, and that said somebody wuz home. Not only that, but it wuz the kitchen chimly, and **that** meant cookin' wuz goin' on.

"Seein' everything wuz so fine and dozy, I makes for the back door and gives it its rappin's. Say! I'm here to tell you the prettiest lookin' broad I've ever laid a lamp on opens the door and asks what can she do for me. She wuz a blonde and about five-foot-three, one of them real Scandahoovian blondes what you only see in Minny-so-tah. And she hada voice like the deep notes on a flute. Listenin' to it made my backbone quiver. Well, I stood there gapin' at her for a minute, and then I told her my troubles. 'Sure,' she says, 'Sure I'll feed you. Come right in and sit down.' While she's puttin' on the java and fixin' some eggs and such, we talks, and all the time I'm lookin' her over. What I mean she wuz a real eyeful, too. She hada short dress on what come only to her knees. And boy, what a shaft! Them Zigfield follies dames couldn't show a better. Say, who's got the makin's?"

One of the group passes Hawknose a cigarette. He lights

it and goes on with his tale. According to him, the blonde became a bit flighty. Toward the end of his meal, she pretended solicitude about whether he was getting enough to eat. She brought him various dishes of food, and as she placed each on the table she took care that some part of her person contacted some part of Hawknose's anatomy. Her hip brushed his arm as she placed a dish of jelly on the table. Her knee touched his thigh as she reached across the table to get the sugar bowl.

"But you know how it is," continued Hawknose. "Such things mighta ben accidental, and then again, they mighta ben done on purpose. But I didn't make a break. Jeez, if I'da made a break and they wuz done accidental, where would I'a' ben? In the old hoosegow, that's where, and pronto! Well, we got to talkin' of the Road, what a tough life it is and all. And then, outa a clear sky, so to speak, she asks innocent-like, 'But what do you do for women?' Imagine that! O'course I knew that everything wuz okay then. Who's gotta match?"

One of the group gives Hawknose a match and impatiently demands, "What happened then?"

Yes, what happened then? The mind of every man present already had thrust out lascivious tentacles of thought that enfolded the blonde in the depths of imagination, there to play with her lustily and as each sex-greedy mind saw fit. Joel sits with mouth agape and hot eyes. To think that such things can happen on the Road!

"Well, I musta ben jinxed. Just as everything seems to be goin' fine and dandy, there comes a knock-knock on the back door, and in flounces some old battleaxe of a neighbor woman. She plants herself in a chair. And there she sits and gabbles like as if she'd swallowed a phonygraft. I wuz already finished eatin', so when I seen this fat old haybag wuz gonna stay for a coupla hours at least—well, what could I do? Nothing but get up and mope."

At this juncture a road engine comes from the roundhouse and is coupled onto the eastbound drag, which stands on a nearby track. The group now breaks into twos and threes, and all head for the train. Several empty box-cars are on it. Joel and his friend climb into one of these. They shut its doors.

"We should have gotten into that other car with the rest of the gang. Then we would have had some company," asserts Joel.

"Aw, them dinocs!" says his friend, contemptuously. "Who wants to ride with them? Better stick by ourselves. Here, light a match and hold it while I spread these newspapers what I brought along. They'll help us to keep clean. If it gets cold we can wrap some of 'em around us."

The papers are spread and the two sit on the floor, talking in low tones. Presently the engine whistles twice. The engineer takes up the train-slack with a jerk. Then come two more toots from the whistle. Another jerk and the train is started. Its

noise precludes conversation. The two stretch themselves at full length on their newspaper bed.

The night becomes chilly. The lads wrap themselves in newspapers; known on the Road as "California blankets". The train's vibrations keep the pair from being too cold. After a time, the train stops. No longer partially warmed by its jolty progress, they become chilled through and through. Their teeth chatter and they shiver violently. Desert nights are always cold. The two instinctively draw together for mutual warmth.

"Jeez, kid, I'm cold, ain't you?"

"G-g-gosh y-yes!" Joel chatters so he can hardly talk.

He lays on his right side with his knees drawn up. His companion lays in a like position.

Joel has a sort of girlish softness about him, a certain roundness of limb and features that one frequently sees in boys during adolescence.

As they lay there shivering, curious thoughts run through the elder's mind, flamelike thoughts that sear all they touch. He throws his left arm protectively over Joel's shoulder and draws himself closer. All the ancient evil of the Road boils in his imagination. The train jerks noisily and resumes its march.

The elder removes his arm momentarily, feigning to scratch himself drowsily. Again rethrows his arm over Joel. But this time over Joel's left hip. Joel stirs uneasily. The night wears on and he sleeps.

He awakens suddenly and without any of the preliminaries usual to a normal awakening. He passes through no half-and-half state. One moment he sleeps, the next he is awake. A hand fumbles with his belt.

Dismayed and wondering at the meaning of this unfamiliar performance, he cries out, "Hey, wake up!"

His companion fakes a hearty snore.

Joel thrusts his elbow sharply into the other's midriff. "Hey, wake up!"

"Ugh! Huh! Wasser matter?"

"Leggo my belt."

"Huh? . . . Oh that! Go to sleep." He takes his arm from around Joel.

And the train rolls on. Twice again does the elder awaken Joel who finally becomes filled with dread over some indefinite thing that seems to menace him. The last time he awakens, he rolls onto his left side and moves away from his partner. Again 'hey sleep.

"Hey!" A flashlight darts from end to end of the car. "Hey! Come outa there. Come on!"

The pair awake and tumble hastily from the car. On the ground, the flashlight thrusts its beam mercilessly into their eyes. Whoever holds the light is to them merely a voice, an exceedingly tough-sounding one.

"Where d'you gazoonies think you're goin' hey?"

Wisely Joel holds his tongue. Let the other one answer. ut his partner is afraid.

"We're g-oin' to Ph-Phoenix," he chatters fearsomely. "We ain't done nothing wrong."

"Who's this kid?" The flashlight indicates Joel.

Inspirationalnally he takes it upon himself to answer. "We're brothers," he announces.

"Oh yeah?" The railroad detective isn't interested. He merely asked the question to give him time in which to decide whether or not to use his club on these two trespassers. He concludes that a good scare will be just as effective as bodily hurt.

"Well, get to hell outa these yards and stay out!" he snarls savagely. "I'll beat you to a pulp if I catch you here again. Get!"

"Yessir," says Joel trembling with fear, and "Yessir," says his friend.

They cut straight across the tracks to where a street light shines. As they go, they cast fearful glances backwards until assured the detective does not follow.

They spend the remainder of the night on the floor of an empty box-car that stands on a spur track serving a cotton gin. Although they close the car doors, the cold night air seeps in through numerous cracks and sets them shivering miserably. They are too cold to sleep. In the morning, Joel is instructed in the art of begging a handout. Because of his youth, which moves the woman of the house to pity, his first venture is successful. Carrying his "jump" with as much pride as any conqueror carrying the spoils of victory, Joel returns to his partner. Cold bacon sandwiched between the halves of four "baking powder" biscuits, a piece of blackberry pie, two large and shiny red apples, three pieces of crumbly cake, and three oranges are what they find upon opening the paper bag. They eat until nothing remains. A cup of coffee would have set o'r their repast perfectly. Since none is to be had, they philosophically content themselves with water. The sun shines gorgeously, quickly driving the night-chill from their bones. Life is not so bad after all—just then.

* * * * *

Two years later finds Joel riding atop the engine-tender on the Omaha Flyer of the Nebraska and Iowa Northern. It is near midnight. The whis.e blows for a town. Joel climbs down the ladder and stands in the half vestibule of the first coach. The train slows. It is entering Quanna, Iowa. Soon as the slackening pace permits, Joel gets on the tender steps and swings to the ground. Momentum forces him to run twenty-odd feet before he can stop himself safely. He is still shaken by his jump when a burly shadow leaps out of the dark and at him.

"Gotcha, you lousy good-for-nothin!"

"Hey, lay offa me!" Joel shrieks hysterically as he throws up an arm to ward off an impending blow, a blow more sensed than seen.

Crack! The hardwood billy descends forcibly. Joel yelps in

pain and blindly tears off through the night. His attacker does not follow. Joel runs until he puts four blocks between himself and the railroad yards.

His way toward the main part of town leads him through a residential section. Softly colored lights shine from the windows of some of the houses. A woman's fruity laughter comes to Joel. He passes a cooing pair sitting in a parked automobile. A lump rises in his throat and his eyes smart. He feels cheated. A wave of mingled longing and self-pity engulfs him as he realizes his outcast state. He has sold out for a mess of pottage . . . mess of pottage . . . mess of pottage . . . the words form a dirge-like refrain in his mind.

As a drowning man, Joel reviewed the past two years. Again he fought the fight that ended his first partnership. Again he snarled and clamped his teeth viciously in a dirty ear. The taste was still in his mouth, a faint taste of cinders that quickly turned to one of warm and salty blood. It had been no fair fight surely, but a wild thrashing of arms and legs, there in the park and speed-rocking box-car, a mad whirling and bumping of bodies, a ferine struggle of sudden primitives. His ear-biting had won the fight, reducing his opponent from swelling malignancy to mewling cowardice in a twinkling.

The days that followed had been hard ones until little by little he had acquired proficiency in the art of begging. Then he had been content to roam from place to place, content to live only for the present. These last few months, however, all zest had gone out of the life. An annoying tendency to take stock of himself and of his condition had begun to manifest itself. And that incident in Broadly, Illinois—ugh! Intending to knock on the back door and ask for food, he had entered a yard just at dusk. A concrete path led alongside of and to the rear of the house. He had followed this until it turned at right angles and made for the kitchen door. A woman was bent over a small garden to one side of the path. Her back was toward Joel. Evidently she didn't hear him approaching. He coughed gently, meaning the sound to serve as a warning of his presence. It did.

Startled, the woman turned abruptly. In the half-light Joel, with his unkempt hair and his generally ragged and begrimed appearance, seemed to her as some sudden monster. She screamed despairingly. And Joel made matters worse by running. All that night he lay hidden in a weed-choked ditch while irate and armed citizens searched for the "fiend" who had frightened young Mrs. Switzer.

A fool woman like that could easily cause a poor tramp a lot of grief.

The Road a place of romance? City judges sentenced you to the workhouse for vagrancy, railroad policemen beat you at will, and small-town cops chased you out of their towns. Every man's hand was against you.

Lately, Joel had been watching people closely, trying to glean from their faces some inkling of what they thought of him. Inkling indeed! Why, he had gotten enough information to fill a book. Formerly he had hardened himself to the obscene staring of small-town people, a staring that seemed trying to rape one's mind of all it contained. Now their stares took on the nature of an indictment of him and all his ways. And the sharp, size-you-up-and-classify-you-in-an-instant glances of city folk! Both in town and city the women were the worst. They not only saw you as you were, but they also seemed to be seeing you as you might have been; that is, physically and outwardly. Apparently they cared nothing about your mentality. Momentarily they seemed resentful that you had used yourself so badly. Then they dismissed you contemptuously from their thought. You simply didn't belong. Yes, people flailed you with their eyes. And why? Because you were of low estate, because you did not conform, because you were on the Road. The Road—ugh!

A sense of desolation and sickening futility envelops Joel. He suddenly realizes that nothing short of a direct change in his way of living can banish the increasing gloom of these latter days. Home, that was it, he must hurry home.

Fifteen days later, he swings around a corner and approaches his father's house. Good old dad! what difference does it make that he had opposed Joel's desire to study aviation and become a flyer? It is supper time and his father is home. As Joel eats, his parents question him. What have you been doing all this time, and where have you been? His mother chides him gently for not having written to her.

"But I'm glad you're home again," she says. "Here, take some more gravy, it's the kind you used to like so well."

When he is finished eating, his father asks in a friendly tone, "Well, son, how do you like the Road?"

Joel's reply, given from the side of his mouth and with upper lip askew, is swift and bitter: "The Road is the bunk!"

The father takes painful notice of Joel's manner of speaking. He notices that Joel often squirms uncomfortably and that he slyly scratches himself when he thinks no one is observing. His father knows what this signifies. He too tried the Road in his youth.

"Better fix the boy a bath, mother," he suggests. "And put in as much lysol as you think he can stand."

Shamed blood suffuses Joel's face, and he stammers, "How did you know I need—I mean, what makes you think—"

"Well, son," interrupts the father, smiling tolerantly, "you're not the only one of this family who's been on the Road. Why, I started out back in nineteen-ten. That's not so long ago as time is counted historically, but the country was younger then. I was a dirt-mover, a donkey-spanker. No, I know these terms mean nothing to you. They're pretty well forgotten now. Speak-

ing generally, a dirt-mover was a man who worked in construction jobs that involved the moving of great quantities of earth, jobs such as railroad-making, dam-building, and irrigation-ditching. And a donkey-spanker was a man who drove the mules that did the work.

"That kind of work wasn't very steady, and the jobs were scattered all over the country, so we used to hobo from job to job. It was a great life. The nation had use for such men. Jobs were easy to find, and there was no excuse for a man being broke. Of course plenty of us did go broke, but it was always from gambling or drinking. We worked hard and we played hard, and nobody seemed to mind. But we were different and better than the hoboes of the present day. The times made us so. We gave more freely to each other than hoboes do now, but then we had more. Now when a hobo has money, he sneaks away from his partner and eats by himself. And the 'boes now aren't so self-respecting as they used to be, they're not so clean. Why, if an old-timer got lousy he'd move heaven and hell to get a chance to boil-up. These present-day hoboes haven't any morale, or gumption if you prefer. If they get lousy, they stay lousy until someone gives them a change of clothes, or until acute discomfort forces them to clean up.

"Yes, I hoboed for years. Even then the Road was none too good. Just like everything else in life, it was changing. Its covering of humanity was wearing thin. For all its fellowship, which after all was largely superficial, the majority of its followers, yeggs, dope addicts, moral weaklings, and lazy good-for-nothings were forthrightly vicious. Each had some bad trait that kept him on the Road. The good men who took a flyer at it sooner or later saw it for what it was. And when they did, they left it and settled down."

As his father quits speaking and fumbles in his pocket for his pipe, Joel regards him with a new and wide-eyed respect. Why—the thought startles him pleasantly—his dad is a regular fellow. And here he had always thought of him as a misunderstanding old grouch.

The father, lighting his pipe, pretends not to see the favorable impression he has made on his son. His pipe lit, he leans back in his chair. He is content, his boy is home.

Softly and without Joel's rancor, he echoes Joel's judgment, "Yes, the Road is the bunk!"

The Best of All Possible Religions

F. A. Ocampo

JUST recently an ex-heathen Chinaman, now a Protestant preacher extraordinary, came to our pious city. His purpose was to pay a brotherly visit to the local Baptist bunk-dealer and their unsuspecting customers, called the Faithful. He came heralded by the pompous and all-embracing title of: "Mr. Leland Wang of China." This visit set our hospitable Baptists a-twitter, and four gala nights of much rejoicing, psalm-singing, praying and preaching marked the event.

For this special occasion the unpainted, half-finished Church of Christ at Legarda Street, Manila, was used. This tabernacle, seen from the outside, presented a very unsightly appearance. The interior, however, was abundantly decorated with artificial flowers, in such way that it resembled a miniature Japanese garden at cherry blossom time.

For four nights this serious-visaged ex-disciple of Confucius was given free rein to relate to the ever-credulous Faithful, and other stray mortals who happened to heed the circulated invitations, the miraculous story of his conversion to the best of all religions and, in particular, to the best of all possible denominations under the beneficent wings of the Protestant church.

I was unaware of Preacher Wang's presence in Manila until the 8th of January, which was the last night of his scheduled vocal show at the Legarda tabernacle. I was then going home from work, and while passing near the Azcarraga "Fishing" Station, about which I reported to you previously, I noticed that under its window there was an exceptionally large crowd. My bunk hunting instinct whispered that there was something unusual, so I went to investigate. A native holy croaker of the most rabid type was gesticulating violently simply to tell his gaping, itinerant audience that that very evening at 7:30, at the Legarda Church of Christ, a Chinese convert, now a Protestant preacher of unusual distinction, would discourse on the greatness of the faith founded by the Holy Nazarene. Furthermore, he added that this ex-heathen preacher would relate the very interesting story of his conversion. I did not wait to hear more as it was almost half past six. I took a bite in a nearby restaurant and rushed to the appointed place.

I reached the Legarda tabernacle about seven o'clock and already the Faithful, with their guests, were pouring in. A good many came on foot, while others arrived in automobiles and trucks. At seven-thirty the tabernacle was full to overflowing, and the sacred show began.

The opening number, of course, was the inevitable vocal

music. We were requested to stand up, and lamblike we did and sung "Jesus is Calling." Here are two sample stanzas:

Jesus is tenderly calling thee home—
 Calling today, calling today;
 Why from the sunshine of love wilt thou roam
 Farther and farther away?

Jesus is waiting, oh, list to His voice—
 Hear Him today, hear Him today.
 They who BELIEVE on His name shall rejoice;
 Quickly arise and away.

And here is the chorus:

Calling today, calling today
 Jesus is calling, is tenderly calling today.

This was immediately followed by another song entitled, "O Happy Day," of which the following masterpiece is a part:

'Tis done, the great transaction's done;
 I am my Lord's and He is mine;
 He drew me, and I follow on,
 Charmed to confess the voice divine.

As if the Good Lord were not satisfied with the awful din we made, a young native—a pot-bellied would-be Caruso—was called to the platform to sing a solo. His voice was unnatural, but nobody seemed to notice, and even the Good Lord did not raise a protest. After this I thought the music for the evening was over, but not so. The native was followed by a bewhiskered, middle-aged American who made a similar noise, all alone!

Then, finally, another American, pot-bellied, too, and with a crown like that of the late lamented William Jennings Bryan, came forward and announced the choicest part of the show: Preacher Wang of China.

Modestly the Chinaman took the stage, and I appraised him. He could not be more than thirty-five, and his height must be about five feet and two or three inches. He had a regular, oval face with the typical slanting eyes. His skin was not exactly yellow as there was a rich mixture of pink, indicating that he was in an enviable state of health. He wore spectacles, which lent dignity to his already solemn countenance.

After making a few preliminary remarks, extolling the incomparable greatness of the faith founded by the Holy Nazarene, he proceeded to relate his life in China. "None of the members of my family were Christians," he said. "My first contact with the Holy Scripture was when I was about six years old. A thoughtful friend gave my father a Bible, but as he had no biblical inclination, he passed on the book to me. Do you know what use I made of it? I used it as an album for postage stamps."

Then he proceeded to relate his schooldays, and at the age of seventeen (or eighteen) he joined the Chinese Navy, where

he stayed for some years. When he returned home he fell in love with a Chinese damsel, who previously had fallen into the clutches of Protestant missionaries and was almost drowned in making a Christian of her. The young lady had become so pious that she consented to marry only on the condition that he embraced the True Faith. Many a better man than Preacher Wang had succumbed to the exigencies of unreasonable love, and because our preacher at the time believed he could not go on living without the One Woman for him, he decided to desert the faith of his ancestors rather than have his happiness blasted. In other words, he permitted himself to be submerged in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, thereby gaining not only a wife but Eternal Salvation, too!

In becoming a Christian, a Protestant Christian, to be exact, it became his duty to attend service regularly. His pious wife looked to it that he did. He told us that when he attended service for the first time, he felt like a stray sheep in a strange fold. "And when the moment of prayer came," he said, "I observed that, as if by common consent, the people bowed their heads and closed their eyes. I noticed, however, that there were a few who only bowed their heads and did not close their eyes. Seeing the humor of the situation, I bowed my head, too, but only closed one eye and left the other open." There was a general laugh, of course, but our preacher, like the frozen-faced comedian, Buster Keaton, did not show his teeth.

Then he spoke of the Holy Writ. He said that the first time he read the Bible, instead of reading from the first page, he opened it at random and the chapter that his gaze rested on did not inspire him, as from beginning to end he gathered nothing but that "So-and-So" begat "So-and-So." In spite of the first disappointment, however, he did not give up. Sometime later on he continued reading, and inspiration came when he reached this passage in Matthew: "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God." From that moment, he told us, he read the Bible assiduously, and then he felt the "call" to follow in the footsteps of the Master. Having heard the call, he wasted no time. He began to preach, and those who heeded his preachings he tried to convert. Being a methodical man, he began the job of converting at home. Utilizing the gentle art of persuasion learned from his Protestant overlords, he succeeded in dragging his parents from the faith of their forefathers to that founded by the Holy Nazarene. After this, the job of converting his brothers and sisters was a matter of little effort. "However," he told us, "I met a very stiff opposition from my oldest brother who clung tenaciously to the old faith. All my earnest efforts having failed, I resorted to prayer, and for one whole night, without ever a wink, I prayed as I never prayed before. When morning came my oldest brother, to my surprise, approached me. I noticed that he looked tired. 'Brother,' he said to me, 'I don't know

what came to me last night. I wasn't able to sleep even for one minute.' Then I told him that I prayed for him throughout the night, begging the Holy Ghost to shed His grace on him, and to open his heart to the Christian faith, and that my prayer was answered." After this, he said, his brother consented to be converted and was **saved**.

Preacher Wang had a great faith in the efficacy of prayer and his very loose use of the word "save" was extremely remarkable. With never a flutter of the eyelid, he brazenly told us that all members of his family were "saved" in becoming Christians; in other words, it would appear that a pair of saving wings was reserved for each of them in the Seventh Heaven, wherever that might be!

According to our ex-heathen preacher, the Good Lord was kind to His lambs, and, in particular, to His shepherds, otherwise called preachers, and He never failed to provide for them. He cited his case as a living example. "For many years," he rattled on, "I have been preaching with not a mission backing me nor receiving a salary from anyone, but in spite of that my family and I never want for anything that we do not get. Often, I find money inside my Bible; sometime it is thirty dollars, in another, forty. On one particular occasion, we needed one hundred dollars very badly, and not knowing where to get this sum, I **prayed**. On the following morning, a little girl came to me and handed me a sealed envelope. Inside I found the exact sum we required."

Preacher Wang did not bother to say where the envelope came from. He undoubtedly wanted to leave the impression that the girl was an angel who came all the way from the jasper throne of the Heavenly Father. He gave another example how "the Lord provideth." "A day came," he said, "when we had no money with which to buy the next meal. I went out feeling very much depressed, knowing that there would be nothing to eat when I returned. However, when I came back, upon entering the door, a sweet, appetizing odor greeted my nose. I went straight to the dining room, and on the table, I saw a dish of rich food. I looked questioningly at my wife. 'Pigeon!' she told me. 'Where from?' I asked; wondering who the kind provider might be. 'Heaven,' she said smiling, and continued by way of explanation, 'It entered through the kitchen window. I tried to drive it away, but it wouldn't go; so I caught it and cooked it, believing that God must have sent it to us.'"

Finally, after more than two hours of rattling, our ex-heathen, human chatterbox appeared to have exhausted all he had to tell us about his life and experience in the once Celestial Empire. What followed as the climax of the evening performance did not surprise me. They call it "fishing for souls." Preacher Wang looked us over and asked, "Who would like to be **saved** this evening?" This was intended for the stray "sheep" who did

not belong to the fold. No one stirred. Our preacher probably thought that misguided souls could be baited with music, so he said, "Let us sing." We stood up and rendered "Jesus is Calling" *con amore*. After this, the tireless Chinaman repeated his question. The music, it would appear, proved effective, as there was a stir in the back seats, and three young native ladies, all dressed in blue with white frills, came forward to be saved. "Decoys!" I told myself irreligiously. Our preacher, however, was not satisfied with the "catch." He let his gaze wander over our heads, and then asked again, "Anyone else?" Nobody came.

At this juncture, I happened to look back and saw, near the main door, Rev. Dr. R. C. Thomas, mentioned in my last report, with some of his watch-dogs around him. Parenthetically, the watch-dogs' business is to spot stray "sheep" and induce them to join the religious army.

"Anyone else?" I heard the ex-heathen ask again. Still nobody came forward. He tried another method. "Let us pray," he said. We bowed our heads, and the Chinaman began his lamentations. When this was over, he asked once more, "Who would like to be saved tonight?" In answer, two native young men presented themselves. At this moment I felt someone put his hand lightly on my shoulder. I turned my head and recognized one of Dr. Thomas' watch-dogs.

"This is the first time I have seen you here," he said. "Did a friend invite you?"

"No," I answered, "I came of my own accord."

"Good!" he said, nodding. "That means you are interested."

"Sure!" I said with some fervor, but continued no further. I left him to figure out in what way I was interested.

"This is a fine opportunity; won't you like to join our church now?" he asked.

"Changing one's form of belief cannot be decided in a few hours," I temporized, "I think I must have time to think it over."

"Oh, yes!" he agreed; nevertheless there was a perceptible drop in his voice, which, to me, seemed to signify disappointment. He tapped me on the shoulder in a friendly way and proceeded to say, "We hold service at No. 331 San Rafael Street every Sunday morning and we should be glad to see you there. If you could bring along some friends, it would be very much appreciated." I told him I would try to go there, and he left me.

After the watch-dog had left me I found that it was almost eleven o'clock. I went home, leaving Preacher Wang still engaged in the pious task of fishing souls.

Days afterwards I heard that the Chinaman had returned to China, and possibly by now he must be very busy converting heathens to the best of all possible religions.

Civil Liberty in Colorado

Leo Grulio

AFTER being beaten and illegally held in solitary confinement at a Citizens' Military Training Camp, Michael Schansick and Sol Greenburg, civilian youths, are out on \$2,000 bail each, charged with violation of the Colorado anarchy and sedition act of 1921. They will be tried when the Colorado state district court meets in Denver in October.

Greenburg had secured a registered druggists' license, but was unable to find employment. In desperation, he went to the training camp to secure information about joining the medical corps of the U. S. army. He took Schansick, his friend, with him, and while they were at the camp they decided to visit a mutual friend who happened to be on lifeguard duty at the camp lake.

When, unable to find the lake, they sought the camp barracks to make inquiries, an officer accosted them and took them to headquarters for investigation.

Their friend at the lake was summoned and asked if Greenburg had given him radical leaflets. When he answered "Yes," two officers seized Greenburg from the rear and a third hit him in the face.

Schansick and Greenburg were searched without warrant and were questioned by the officers. When nothing incriminating was discovered, the two were taken to the fort guardhouse and held there in solitary confinement for two days. There they were grilled separately by eight officers and by Kenneth Hoffman, official of the American Legion and local red-baiter.

Among the questions asked them were "Are you atheists?" and "What would you do in case of a war?"

In spite of the fact that there were no charges against them, nor evidence or complaint of wrong doing, the two were forcibly detained. After two days in the guardhouse they were handed over to state and federal authorities to be prosecuted on the basis of their admission of radical beliefs, under a law created in the days of the Mitchell Palmer anti-"red" hysteria.

At the Denver county jail Schansick and Greenburg were held in solitary confinement. Representatives of an organization for the defense of political prisoners vainly attempted to see them there. Ten days after their confinement, charges were filed against them and bond set. Now, after suffering beating, questioning and illegal solitary confinement and search, they await trial for their legal and openly avowed radical beliefs.

Theodore Dreiser Fights for Honest Art

[The facts set forth below, concerning Theodore Dreiser's struggle for integrity in literary and dramatic art, will interest everyone who has a lively regard not only for culture but for culture in its freest, most humane, most searching and uncompromising aspects. The rugged honesty of Dreiser as a novelist of true life and character has for years been a glorious and hopeful fact (though until recent years appreciated by too small a circle) in American literature. Now it will arouse a just resentment among all admirers of Dreiser and lovers of the truth that his powerful, fearless, poignant novel, *An American Tragedy*, has been defiled and falsified and indeed butchered in its form as a movie. We recognize that Dreiser is fighting not alone for justice as an individual artist but for a more fair and intelligent treatment of all art; and that his own case against this particular movie and its producers is really a case against and a strong, blasting criticism of the puerility, the unreality and the lack of integrity which all but ruins, with few exceptions, a form of art which has high possibilities.]

"AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY"

Film Version; Pending Legal Contest

Paramount Publix Corporation, Faramount Building, New York City.

Gentlemen: Mr. Theodore Dreiser has consulted us in reference to the alleged moving picture version of "An American Tragedy", which we understand your company intends to produce. Unless the picture as produced actually represents Mr. Dreiser's work, we have been instructed to seek an injunction against your company in order to protect Mr. Dreiser's legal rights.

In order that there be no misunderstanding as to facts, we are frankly stating Mr Dreiser's position.

When the motion picture rights to Mr. Dreiser's work were purchased, there was an understanding that the novel in its ideology, psychology, in its essential problem and final resolution should be fairly presented. The value of the work, which caused it to be acclaimed as one of the greatest of American novels, arose from the fact that it presented the situation of an ordinary but weak youngster who, through the vicissitudes of life, over which he had little or no control, was gradually forced to one position after another, until he became involved in a great tragedy. From the beginning Clyde has one's sympathy. In general, the book is an indictment of our social system. On the other hand, the picture presents just an ordinary murder story, where one feels that Clyde, a designing, lecherous, mean, greedy and contemptible individual, pays a proper penalty for his own misdeeds. Other characters, to wit, Roberta and Sondra, also are misrepresented. The courtroom scene, merely an incident in the book, is the most important feature of the picture. The trial in the book is one of the best presentations of an actual trial that has ever been written. On the screen the questions

and behavior of the lawyers are such that in an ordinary case the judge would preforce be obliged to order a mistrial.

The main vice of the picture, however, is its utter misrepresentation of Clyde. One test of great literary work is a portrayal of circumstances which inevitably brings about a final situation. None of this appears in the picture. Instead of the picture presenting a universal psychological theme, it tells a specific story of a murder; instead of an indictment of society, the picture is a justification of society and an indictment of Clyde. Thus the picture is not only not a fair representation but a complete misrepresentation of Dreiser's novel.

When the motion picture rights of the book were originally purchased, Mr. Lasky specifically stated that the producer wished to make a "gesture" and to present a picture of real merit, quite unlike the ordinary screen material. This was insisted upon by Mr. Dreiser before he would sell it. When your company acquired the talking rights, this was likewise a condition, so much so that the contracts of purchase contained the rather unusual clause:

"TENTH: The Purchaser agrees before production of the first motion picture photoplay to be made pursuant hereto to submit to the seller the manuscript intended to be used as a basis of or from which there may be adapted said motion picture photoplay for such comments, advice, suggestions or criticisms that the Seller may wish to make with respect thereto and to afford the Seller the opportunity of discussing with the scenarist of said motion picture the manuscript thereof and the Purchaser agrees it will use its best endeavors to accept such advice, suggestions and criticisms that the Seller may make insofar as it may, in the judgment of the Purchaser, consistently do so."

It was originally contemplated that Sergei Eisenstein of Russia would produce the picture and a script was prepared by Messrs. Eisenstein and Montague. While long, the script carried out the purpose, intent and psychological effect of the novel, and this script could have been shortened to meet the reasonable requirements of the industry.

The facts show that your company has practically ignored advice, suggestions and criticisms from Mr. Dreiser. This no doubt will be admitted, but the company seeks to justify itself. The fact is that after the contract was made on January 2nd, Mr. Dreiser waited in New York until the first week in February. On February 9th, for the first time, an effort was made to get hold of him. Your lawyers wrote letters which intended to suggest that Mr. Dreiser's failure to be on the job on the particular day wanted—though without advance notification—might justify you in ignoring the above clause of the contract. However, Mr. Dreiser was in communication with your company within a week and Mr. Hoffenstein was sent to meet him. Indications are, however, that everything was set and fixed definitely prior to that time, and that except for minor changes, Mr. Dreiser would have to stand for the script then prepared. Clear indication of this appears in Mr. Hoffenstein's telegram of February 17,

1931, where he says, "It is now too late for me to go over script with you as we commence photographing next week." When Mr. Dreiser read the script, it was so entirely out of harmony with the novel, that he realized it would be useless to consult with Mr. Hoffenstein with the idea of making a few changes. In addition to this, the script was entitled "First Yellow Script", suggesting that further and unsubmitted work had been done hereon. (Incidentally, even that script in the beginning suggested Clyde's early life which led to the tragedy, material now left out of the picture.) Mr. Dreiser then notified the company, and in no uncertain terms, of his views of the script. Later, and on March 10th, Mr. Dreiser stated his views in a detailed letter and asked an opportunity to prepare a script. It is interesting to note that every criticism then made applies with equal force to the present picture, which shows how completely he has been ignored in the matter.

In connection with that letter, Mr. Otto Kahn wrote Mr. Dreiser:

"Thanks for letting me see copies of your refreshing letters concerning the film version of 'An American Trgedy.'

"If writers in general would stand up, as you have done, for the dignity of their work and refuse to bend the knee to the puerilities and sloppiness of Hollywood, we could expect to get somewhere in having the 'movies' pulled out of their rut."

This may suggest to you gentlemen what is wrong with the movies.

As to this script, Mr. William C. Lengcl, of Hearst's International Cosmopolitan, wrote:

"That is a most unimaginative adaptation of the story you wrote. There is no development from cause to effect.

"But why itemize? This thing is so lacking in the poetry, the inevitableness of the tragedy of the story, that it is shocking."

In reply to Mr. Dreiser's letter of March 14th, Mr. Lasky wrote that "for some weeks we endeavored to get in communication with you" (which is not a fact) and that "it is far too late to accept your suggestions" . . . and this, in spite of the many promises and the express terms of the contract! Mr. Dreiser naturally resented this "ocus pocus" in regard to time.

In an endeavor to be of service to the company, and in order to avoid any aspersions that failure to produce an honest film might be laid at his door, Mr. Dreiser, without compensation, went to Hollywood to assist in revision. The matter was there subject to conference. Mr. Dreiser even went so far as to submit detailed changes in script on the 28th day of March, and also additional suggestions with regard to the script, some of which were expressly approved by Mr. B. F. Schulberg (letter April 1st). All this was ignored in the picture. The reason we do not know. Mr. von Sternberg on occasion expressed his contempt and dislike of Mr. Dreiser. In a newspaper article—the "Times"—dated the 3rd day of March, 1931, he is reported to have designated George

Bernard Shaw as antiquated and old-fashioned who "emptied himself twenty years ago"; apparently as a gratuitous insult, he added, "that also applies to many of the so-called literary giants, in particular Theodore Dreiser." An impertinent letter was written by Mr. von Sternberg's secretary to Mr. Dreiser, ending with a postscript, "May I call you just plain 'Teddy' in my next letter?" Whatever may have been the reason, whether personal, due to lack of intelligence, or anything else, the fact is that instead of seriously submitting the manuscript for comments, advice, suggestions or criticisms, and sincerely considering the same, the clear fact emerges that there was pretense of giving Mr. Dreiser something to say, but a definite studied contemptuous attitude toward anything he might suggest. The reason may be that given in Mr. Lasky's letter of March 14; that is, the unprecedented hurry which made it "far too late" properly to prepare the script. But it is clear that Clause 10th of the contract has been entirely disregarded.

When Mr. Dreiser left Hollywood, the suggestion was made that the picture on completion would be submitted to him for further advice, suggestions, criticisms, etc. Apparently that was intended as a gesture and pretense. Your company had had Mr. Dreiser's suggestions and knew the basis of his complaint. It was presumed that something would be done to construct the picture in accordance therewith. The result shows that nothing of the kind was intended.

In order to avoid the implication that the personal equation might affect Mr. Dreiser's judgment, he called into consultation ten or fifteen recognized writers, critics and men of fair judgment. In no respect were any of them "yes" men. Without exception this jury, whose judgment Mr. Dreiser invited, condemned the picture as a complete misrepresentation of the novel. Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes said:

"The film fails to indicate the crushing inevitability of the tragedy of Clyde. . . . He should be portrayed as in the clutch of circumstances rather than as a deliberate villain. . . ."

Carl Van Doren said:

". . . He does not begin as a young boy whose life determines his later conduct, but is shown as already in a position of authority and influence which he is plainly abusing. . . ."

Mr. Patrick Kearney, author of "A Man's Man", the dramatic version of "An American Tragedy", said:

"The picture is a gross misrepresentation of the book, of its story, its characters, its situations, its emotional and esthetic values . . . its social philosophy and moral implications. . . . The character of Clyde and his relations with Roberta and Sondra are all grotesquely misrepresented. . . ."

Dr. A. A. Brill, noted psycho-analyst, said:

"The picture does not represent 'An American Tragedy.' . . ."

Ralph Fabri, Hungarian painter and architect, said:

"The picture is no 'American Tragedy,' not even a local one. A

few minutes after having left Roberta, Clyde tells Sondra that he has no girl friend. From that moment on, he is a cheap, common liar and so all through the rest of the picture. . . . As shown in the film, Clyde is a criminal, but the 24 million Americans for whom, as the producers always claim, the talkies are made, will never understand (from this version) the motives of Clyde or Sondra or the uncle or the district attorney—or anybody."

James D. Mooney, President, General Motors Export Corporation, said:

"The book made me think; the picture didn't."

Ernest Boyd:

"The essential aim of your book has been ignored. The motivation of Clyde's character, all the background of his formative years, the desires which incessantly pursued him—none of these things is presented on the screen. Without them, the picture becomes inevitably what it actually is, a skeletonized outline of a murder story in which the leading figure is shown as a highly unsympathetic youth who wishes to rid himself of a pregnant girl."

Burton Rascoe said:

"It is just another motion picture, and not even an approach to a translation of the novel in terms of the motion picture."

Hermann S. Oelrichs said:

"I do not think the film version of 'An American Tragedy' represents the book. It does not develop the character of Clyde by showing the original atmosphere in which he lived or how his type would be influenced by it. It simply deposits him on the scene as a rather unsympathetic young man with cheap ambitions and a sex urge. It is a succession of banal intrigues, sure-fire courtroom scenes and how sorry mother is."

The murder motive (not plot) of the book is not the murder plot (not motive) of the film, and the trial of Clyde Griffiths in the book is not the trial of Clyde Griffiths in the screen version. In the first instance doubt, pity, regret, even forgiveness, are obviously the effect on the mind of the understanding reader, as ample reviews, letters and the great success of the book and stage version show. In the film, on the contrary, and as the jury of distinguished critics have not only voted but by letter attested—a reprehensible and even nauseous young criminal, never dubious, never hesitant, horrified or remorseful, is properly punished for an unforgivable sex crime. The Clyde of the book is not the Clyde of the film. The Roberta of the book is not the Roberta of the film. The Sondra of the book is not the Sondra of the film. The screen version ignores the painstaking care which presented the psychology and background which motivates human beings. Thus your corporation proposes a fraud not only on the public, but on Mr. Dreiser, who is desirous of having his work honestly presented, or not presented at all.

The present film is an utter misrepresentation and libelous distortion of Mr. Dreiser's book. It is not a sufficient answer to say that the novel is long and that more time and labor than your company could profitably supply would be required. Unless a motion picture producer is prepared intelligently to produce a

novel which requires time and space, the company should not buy it. Any attempt to disguise or modify the discrepancies by a foreword as suggested by Mr. Schulberg in his telegram to Mr. Lasky, or a statement as suggested by Mr. Lasky, which Mr. Dreiser might make in person, by appearing in a film introduction to be incorporated with the film and denouncing its errors as well as explaining his ideology, cannot be considered.

We therefore claim,

First, that your company has violated the definite understanding with Mr. Dreiser that the picture would be a fair presentation of the novel;

Second, when a motion picture buys a novel, there is an implied agreement that it will present that novel and not something else. When a writer grants his name, reputation and the title of one of his greatest works to a motion picture company, he does not expect to be wholly misrepresented to his public;

Third, although the company pretended to observe forms, yet it is clear that the express provision of the contract as to Mr. Dreiser's suggestions, comments and criticism, has been definitely and clearly violated.

Mr. Dreiser intends to appeal to the courts to prevent this gross misrepresentation of "An American Tragedy". Before taking action, however, we should like to know whether you intend to produce the picture substantially as exhibited to him in New York on June 15th.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS
ARTHUR CARTER HUME

Attorneys for Theodore Dreiser

Science and Politics in the Soviet Union

N. Bukharin

CONSERVATIVE and Fascist circles in various countries are at present zealously engaged in the most intensive propaganda against the Soviet Union. One campaign succeeds another like a cinema film. First a crusade is proclaimed in defense of persecuted religion. Then the magnates of Capitalism and the plantation owners begin to raise an outcry against "slave labor." The campaign rapidly becomes a campaign against the so-called "Soviet dumping." Finally, the dumping develops itself into frightful Soviet aggression of a military character. This masquerade might, of course, be examined from the point of view of a humorist. It is interesting to observe how, out of the ideological eggs hatched in the Vatican, there crawl forth reptiles of quite a prosaic commercial nature. It is amusing to see slave-owners attacking the proletarians of the Soviet Union under the banner of the defense of labor. And it is quite comic to watch staff-generals and imperialist politicians accusing the Soviet Union of an aggressive policy, while they very calmly prepare war themselves.

But, unfortunately, all this is far from humorous in its social sense. The organs for moulding public opinion which are in the hands of the financial and capitalist oligarchy are still so powerful that they succeed in deceiving and terrifying the man in the street, the middle and petty bourgeoisie and even some sections of the workers. True, not for long. You cannot by these means charm away or liquidate, or even diminish, the gigantic economic crisis which has gripped the capitalist world. Nor can they serve to destroy the importance of the growing Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union is living through a period of quite exceptional intensity of labor. The Five Year Plan has become the true banner of broad masses of the proletariat. It is being rapidly carried out, though not without internal and external difficulties. But the proletariat of the Union, realizing its position as that of the ruling class, is developing such energy, displaying such devotion to the cause of Socialism, growing so rapidly in the political, technical, and cultural sense, that we are victoriously completing the first Five Year Plan and have begun to work out the second. We are doing this on the basis of the fullest, most scientific, most reasoned analysis of the totality of existing conditions—external and internal, natural and social, technical and economic. The greatest constructive work in human history is proceeding in our country. The pathos of construction, of heroic labor, of cultural growth, is the characteristic feature of the period we are going through,

The masses live and breathe precisely for this. Cold political

calculation says: Every year of peaceful labor is a new story of the social structure of Socialism. The politician of the Soviet Union who ventured to think of aggression would be laughed at by our masses, and we have no such foolish politicians.

But with all the more valor will the working classes of our Union defend themselves in the event of attack. They know that the Soviet Government pursues and will pursue to the very end a genuine policy of peace—because it is a government of labor, a government of Socialist reconstruction, a government of great works, the leader and organizer of vast masses who are transforming the whole country from the White Sea to the Black, from the Baltic to the Pacific.

It is time, at last, to understand this truth. Of course, those who control the capitalist States understand it excellently well. But they say the opposite, precisely because the peaceful policy of the Soviet Government confounds the policy of the interventionists.

The world-historical competition of two economic systems is taking place at present in extremely peculiar conditions of social development. If we examine the state of things statistically, the level of technique, the indices of production, the degree of "wealth" in our country, are still much lower than in the so-called "advanced" capitalist country. But we shall arrive at very different conclusions if we consider the movement of these two economic systems. We are making tremendous leaps forward. The capitalist world is reducing production. We are developing huge creative energy; we have insufficient machinery, people, science, technique, means of consumption. And we are creating with tremendous élan ever newer and newer values. The capitalist world, on the contrary, is choking in its property relations, because the masses cannot buy. The capitalist world cannot make use of its apparatus of production, its workers, its science. It is destroying its productive forces.

We are hammering out the ideology of the greatest possible activity, of labor enthusiasm, of social optimism, technical optimism, scientific and cognitive optimism. The capitalist world is "tired of life"; it is sinking into the bog of senile mysticism and social pessimism; it is losing its faith in rational cognition, and appealing more and more to intuition, religion, mysticism, at the same time preaching a return to pre-machine methods of production. Who could have thought that in the twentieth century capitalist Luddites were possible? And yet they now exist, and their names are known. Capitalism has become a brake on human development in all its functions, from technique to the highest forms of ideological consciousness. That consciousness reminds one more and more of the decadent consciousness of the end of the ancient world; the foreboding of inevitable destruction can be seen throughout the whole of the so-called "spiritual culture" of modern capitalism.

In the Soviet Union the re-grouping of men in the material

process of labor, and the social readjustments generally, the transition to the rails of planned economy, have produced the greatest changes in the sphere of the whole of culture. Planned Socialist economy has lately won particularly striking successes, because it has conquered new and powerful positions in the sphere of agriculture. It has required the rapid bringing together of theory and practice, science and labor, of various branches of science between themselves and of all these with production—Socialist industry and Socialist agriculture.

Here it is necessary to emphasize the particular character of this drawing together. It is quite a different type from that which takes place in the capitalist countries, because there is a vast difference of principle between the practice of Capitalism and the practice of Socialism. In place of the petty, huckstering, commercialized practice, which seeks profits for the capitalists, individual or trustified—practice which makes science into an instrument of gain and competition, an object of commercial secrecy and monopolist patents—we have the great practice of social construction, anti-exploiting in its character, and effected on an enormous scale. These qualitative and quantitative scales are new magnitudes in world history. They require a gigantic development of science, unknown to previous epochs and previous social formations in history.

The geological study of the country; the investigation of the physical and chemical properties of new varieties of fuel and raw materials; the discovery and study of new sources of electrical power; problems of synthetic raw materials; new types of machinery, apparatus and their aggregates springing directly from the new dimensions of the units of production; the problems of electrification (the super-power lines, high-pressure systems, the passing from alternating to constant current, etc., and questions of the electrification of agriculture); the problems of tractorization (heavy fuel for Diesel engines, etc.); the problems of the chemicalization of the country, and the problems involved in the correct distribution of industry and agriculture, special crops and so forth—all these require the rapid and resolute speeding up of the tempo of all our scientific research. We cannot forget that it is a question of new quantities, new qualities, new tempo. Thus there is coming into being a vast stimulus to the development of science.

It would be quite wrong to draw the conclusion from this that we are by this means falling into narrow practicalism of the American type. For planned economy requires the synthesis of all branches of learning, the synthesis of theory and practice, and that on a social scale. This means, taken in its entirety, the development of every branch of science, their mutual connection and mutual fertilization. It means the growing unity of method. It means the realization of the vital purpose of science, the optimum combination of theory and practice, the increasing bridging of the abyss between physical and intellectual labor. It means

the cultural remoulding of the broadest masses of the people, and the even greater influence of science on the very construction of the economic plan, i.e., the rationalization of economy in all its component parts.

Thus there is being created a new type, a new order of cultural life, distinct in the highest degree from the order of cultural life of preceding economic formations, including the capitalist. One of its most essential features is the rapid cultural maturing of the masses. This is a totally new current in history, and is of vast importance. We have set ourselves the task of "overtaking and outstripping the capitalist countries." We consider that we shall carry out this task with the aid of the powerful levers which constitute the specific peculiarity of our Socialist order of society—the planned character of economy, the possibility of operating with immense resources to a single end; the ever increasing planned quality of our scientific research; the ever growing co-ordination of science and material production, on the basis of the rapid growth in influence of science, and the vast deploying of the potential energy of the masses.

You can think what you like about these truly geological dislocations in the history of mankind. But one must be a Philistine by nature, a stunted provincial in thought, feeling and action, not to feel beating here the pulse of world history. Every thinking individual knows that the modern capitalist formation of society is undergoing the most profound internal disorder, that it is in a state of crisis, and that world history is at the crossroads. And it is this that makes so pitiful the efforts of the most enraged opponents of the Soviet Union. Their logic is halting on all its four legs. Their method is an even more monotonous, shallow, and elementary system of slander. Their absence of any big positive idea is accompanied by ever more petty—*sit venia verbo*—"politics." That is the inevitable fate of every class which is departing forever from the historical arena.

They're Killing Tom Mooney

George H. Shoaf

SINCE Tom Mooney spoke his mind about C. C. Young, former governor of California, and especially since he wrote and sent out his pamphlets pillorying certain leaders high in the American Federation of Labor, he has been discriminated against by the officials of San Quentin Prison, and subjected to a treatment so brutal, friends say, that unless it is discontinued he may not live another year. While Tom's physical condition is not as good as it was a year ago, due to the treatment sustained in recent months, personally he is making no complaint for fear of having visited upon him the vengeance of the prison heads. Breaking though his body may be, however, his mind is just as sound and resourceful and his spirit is just as militant and defiant as when he entered San Quentin fifteen years ago.

It seems to be the settled policy of California officialdom to kill, if possible, the man whom the corporations refuse to release. He has been denied his former privileges, taken from the light work he did for years, put into the kitchen, hot and steamy, where he is compelled to perform services menial and considered degrading, and instead of the light and airy cell that used to be his home, he is now forced to remain between working hours in an almost air-tight tomb with one door that has but a single opening. He can no longer receive the mail he used to get, and visitors can see him only if they have vital reasons and after they have run a long gamut of red tape.

There is no doubt in the minds of many of Tom's friends that certain labor politicians have entered into a conspiracy with the henchmen of the corporations to keep him where he is until he dies. These labor politicians know that Tom knows them through and through, and they are afraid if he is liberated he will explode that knowledge upon the world. Rather than risk exposure at the hands of the man able to make it, they have decided to sink still deeper into iniquity by cooperating with the big men of California capitalism in sending to certain doom the man they know is innocent of the crime charged against him.

In an exclusive interview with a man just released from San Quentin many significant facts relative to Tom Mooney's present plight have been secured. This man has known Tom in prison more than a year, has watched his gradual physical decline, and observed the efforts prison officials are making to break his spirit and drive him to his death. He talked as follows:

"I am firmly convinced that those in charge of Tom's imprisonment are pursuing a course which they believe will effectually break him and put him in a condition where he will be able no longer to live. Tom dares not complain; his keepers

want him to complain so they will have an excuse to further degrade and humiliate him. Every day prison stoolies insult the famous prisoner and do everything possible to arouse his ire so he will hit out and fight back; they are trying to provoke his resentment so if he does fight they can jump on him and beat him to death. Tom is well aware of their intention, and so he submits to their insults. If he were to complain, he, not the stoolies, would get punished.

"When I first entered San Quentin he had a nice clean cell in the newer section of the prison. His work was light, and he really was regarded as an honored guest rather than a prisoner. All the prisoners believed him to be the victim of an infamous frame-up, and all of them were sympathetic with his efforts to free himself. But conditions have changed in recent months. The change started when Tom denounced Governor Young for double-crossing him in the matter of granting a pardon; the change grew quite pronounced when Tom wrote and issued his pamphlet exposing the leaders of the American Federation of Labor.

"The hole in which he sleeps is a fright. I am a man of vigor and exceptional health, but fifteen minutes confinement in a hole similar to the one Tom occupies took my breath and flattened me out. His present cell is one of those built of brick in the original prison building. It is shaped like a tomb, and has a solid steel door with just a small aperture through which he must get his air. He has none of the sanitary arrangements common to the newer cells, and he has to use a bucket for his pressing needs.

"The kitchen where he works is hot and steamy. But this is not the worst. Alongside of the kitchen, with several doors opening into it, is a general wash room with showers where the prisoners come to bathe. These showers are hot and send out huge volumes of steam most of which invade the kitchen, already stifling to suffocation. Besides the hot steam, body odors from the men, who change their dirty socks and underclothes, also find their way into the kitchen. In this foul and disease-breeding atmosphere Tom Mooney toils every working day, breathing this hot steam and these foul odors, and when his work is done he is taken to his brick tomb and locked up. How long his body can stand this treatment is hard to say; not long is my guess.

"Worse than this is the adverse psychology that is being created against him. During the last several months stoolies throughout the prison have circulated insinuating stories against Tom. They are trying to prejudice the other prisoners against him. They covertly assert that the outside world has turned against Tom, that everybody believes him to be guilty, and that Tom may commit suicide any day. My idea, which is shared by other prisoners, is that a well concocted plot exists to try to provoke him to engage some of the stoolies or guards in a fight; if

he resents some of the insults daily heaped upon him and strikes back, his finish would be quick; he would be knocked out and killed.

"The warden of San Quentin is merely a policeman, and when that is said, all is said. Over five thousand prisoners are crowded into quarters that cannot possibly accommodate them. The only reason why riots do not occur is because of the menacing presence of over fifty machine guns always ready for instant action. The guards are hard-boiled. Most of them are ignorant brutes who really believe they would be serving God if they turned loose and slaughtered several hundred prisoners.

"I am not trying to unnecessarily alarm, but really something should be done to get Tom out of that kitchen and out of that tomb where he sleeps, and that immediately, otherwise it will all be over with him soon. Of course that is what his enemies desire. Tom Mooney's death right now would be their biggest relief.

"This much must be said for Tom. He does not and he dares not complain. To the few visitors who see him he must maintain a smiling face and pretend that all is well; the guards overhear every word he utters to his visitors. Tom knows if he complains the punishment that will follow will put him in a position infinitely worse than his present predicament. He is prematurely aged, and the treatment accorded him during the last several months is largely responsible."

Such is the terrible condition in which Tom Mooney, militant leader of labor, finds himself as a result of his championship of the cause of the working class. Tom does not complain for the reason that he is thinking not of himself, but of the cause in the service of which he lost his freedom. Long ago he announced that he would give his life, and that gladly, if the sacrifice would help to emancipate the slaves of labor. The only thing that frets him is the fear that the implications of his imprisonment might be misunderstood by the workers, and that the injustice of his case is not used with sufficient vigor to awaken and arouse the people to their peril. Tom has repeatedly refused the parole offered him on the ground that such acceptance would imply guilt; he says he will rot where he is before taking a parole.

In what light does the imprisonment of Tom Mooney place the workers of America! How feeble is the labor movement which permits him to remain where he is! What leaderless leaders the American labor movement has that they do not raise hell and high water for his release! How the blood of the organized American workers has changed from red to yellow in recent years! And California labor—how abject and how damned!

E. H.-J. Insults a Fundamentalist

Booth Mooney

MOST of the people in this particular section of the Bible Belt of the great Lone Star State think you're not such a muchness, Mr. Haldeman-Julius. And if you keep on insulting good, true, stand-pat-for-God-and-the-Bible Fundamentalists, you'll always be about as popular as a contagious disease quarantine.

Here's the way it came about, and while you may not know it, you came mighty near being sued for insult. Yes, sir!

In April, 1930, you published an article called "Back to Puritanism." I wrote this article, which was an account of the organization of a Fundamentalist church in Decatur, Texas. It had a few words to say about Scott W. Hickey, pastor of the then newly formed Fundamentalist church.

Hickey never even read it—in the magazine. But Haldeman-Julius put it in a Little Blue Book, along with an article about President Harding's case of venereal disease. That was where Hickey read it, and that was why he was so highly insulted.

He stormed to me, but of course I couldn't do anything about it. "Why, the idea!" he mouthed. "The very idea of his putting my name between the same covers as a story of a man's venereal disease. Why, naturally, people would think, or get the same idea about me.

"I'm going to sue Haldeman-Julius. I've talked it over with a lawyer, and he says I have a clear-cut case. He said I ought not to have any trouble getting big damages."

I tried to tell him that nobody said anything about **him** having any kind of disease. "I know that," he replied, "but it'll leave a bad impression. Lots of people know me; I talk over the radio nearly every week, and thousands of people all over the country hear me. What are they going to think if they read this book?

"And besides, I have children; I have a son with my name. Don't you see this is always going to count against them among people who read the two articles in the same book? People remember things like that, and here I am, and lots of people know me, featured in the same book with the story of a case of venereal disease."

And on and on. He, it appeared, was quite furious, and, as I have stated, was quite determined on a suit. Evidently money was the only thing that could wipe out the insult. So far as I know, however, he has never sued. If I'm wrong, tell 'em so, Mr. Haldeman-Julius.

P. S. And, oh, yes, another thing. He read the story of President Harding's venereal disease and reasoned in this wise: "It may be so, I don't know. I never thought so much of Hard-

ing, and I never voted for him, so I wouldn't know whether to believe this story or not.

"But one thing about it is very ridiculous. The writer of the article tries to show that the puritanical atmosphere in which Harding was reared was largely responsible for his catching the disease.

"That is quite absurd. I know, for I am sure that no one was ever brought up in an atmosphere more puritanical than the one that prevailed in my home. But I never did have a venereal disease, and, according to the author of this article, I should have had. That makes the whole case fall through."

And he looked as triumphant as though he had actually proved something!

The Los Angeles of the Times

Farnsworth Crowder

FEW city papers better reflect their constituency than does the Los Angeles Times; it is Southern California done up in woodpulp and printers' ink. It can brag. Or it can close its eyes like any fastidious Iowa-deacon emigrant. It leaves the city's dirty washing to the **Record**, cautiously progressive Scripps sheet and sticks to safe news, pollyannaisms and reactionary policies. Articles of the American credo—individual material success, strict social conformity, practical utility and mechanical efficiency, universal education and democracy, optimism and sweet delusion—sound from its columns; it is exactly the paper to make contentedly warm the hearts of all the Louis Schmaltzes and George Babbitts, with just enough of the tedious sophomoric cynicism of columnist Harry Carr thrown in to save them, in case they are sensitive, from thinking they are Schmaltzes or Babbitts at all.

The Times has little, save bulk, comics and routine press reports, to relate it to the average big papers of the country. It makes ambitious and pretentious metropolitan gestures; its wealth and circulation assure it a potent position; but essentially it is a small-town daily—sensitive, pettish, cautious and safely gruff.

An examination of one issue will furnish a quick sketch of many aspects of the coast metropolis. I propose to call attention to three or four of these.

On page 1, part 1, rides the Times burgee: "Liberty under the Law. True Industrial Freedom." Hauled to earth and translated, this high-sounding sentiment reads: the open shop, solid anti-unionism, Bolshevik-baiting. It indicates approval of the notorious Criminal Syndicalist Law, approval of the efforts of the Better America Federation to turn up red scares. It is a

huzza for the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association, the Chamber of Commerce, the Realty Board and the incredibly brutal Los Angeles Bar Association.

The *Times* is proud to boast that its banner bears stains of battle—the blood and dust of 1910. In that year, when General Harrison Grey Otis was publishing the paper, the *Times* Building was dynamited and lives lost. General Otis and his lieutenants were in the thick of a knock-down drag-out fight with the Socialist-Labor element for the political and industrial control of the city. With Clarence Darrow defending the McNamaras, charged with the bombing, with public sympathy on their side and with a Socialist-Labor candidate all but dusting out the mayor's chair for his incumbency, the future looked dark for General Otis and friends. But all at once the McNamaras upset the apple cart by confessing to a hand in the bombing. Public opinion executed a to-the-rear-maneuver; the Socialist-Labor prospects faded away. General Otis rode at the head of the parade; and shortly thereafter, the mighty exodus of the safe and sane from the Midwest began to pour into Los Angeles to bulwark his position and make it secure for his friends and successors.

Probably no member of the commonwealth is more safely American and at the same time more happily assured of a red-menace and yellow-peril than California. It, and the *Times* with it, has the fond attachment of a neurasthenic for these imagined deadly ailments.

* * * * *

We will search our copy in vain for any encouraging hint of political, industrial or economic liberalism, or even honesty. But we can find abundant compensating assurance that the Southland is far from an evil place. Nowhere, surely, has the business of smiling down reality been better developed. The press fairly glows. This, from the editorial page of our *Times*, has exactly that content of ozone and ultra-violet ray, that tonic of bounce, piffle, bird-tweeting and school-marm nobility that make the city purr and whistle:

. . . What a glorious thing for the school children of America to be given such an honor . . . to help plant Washington trees to beautify, glorify, adorn their homes, parks, highways, by-ways and avenues! . . . Just trees, trees, trees, trees that "only God can make" named for a godly man and peerless—George Washington.

Oh Children! What gladness and joy must be yours, planting trees, beloved trees, Washington trees. . . . But for him we would have no country and no flag. Think of watching them grow and give beauty and shade, sweetness and fruit and shelter to the birds—birds to sing their songs and help you to sing "America" and "The Star Spangled Banner." Royal palms and lofty redwoods, stately pines and gothic elms, acacias, myrtles and cherry trees—yes, cherry trees, immortalizing the character-building story of childhood and truth. . . .

The *Times* employs the gentle Mr. John Steven McGroarty 'o write a whole page of that sort of thing every Sunday; and

John knows his syrups! Birds—flowers—this blessed Sabbath morning—little children—spring—tweet tweet!

Everywhere you turn in the *Times* or in the Southland, you meet that temper and tone. A typical father, lumpy in the throat, writes: "Looking out of the window, I see a lot of new faces, a Barber Shop, a Drug Store, a Candy Pavilion . . . Lumber Yards, a Furniture Store . . . Cleaners and Dyers and a Police Station. Fine! Fine! This lovey k.d of ours is growing up in the best spot in the wide world!" Maudlin lyricism fills the air. The rhymsters of sunshine, the preachers of delightful delusions are countless. Old-fashioned religion is at home. Windy charlatans can explain How to be Happy, Fat, Thin, Lovely, Prosperous, Healthy, Saved. Christian Science and Unity thrive like the irrigated flora.

Look here, for instance, in the *Times*. If you are ill there is a way out. Here are over seventy-five advertisements offering Keys to Health and "absolutely guaranteed cures" for everything from bunions to cancer. For the healthseeker, the town is one endless jolly side-show outside the big-top of the medical profession. Observe: 1) a sanatorium that sends the vibrant tone of health through sluggish bodies by the famous milk treatment, 2) Pro-Vita Laboratories that correct ALL diet deficiencies, 3) Clowes Laboratory that "removes callouses like magic", 4) Consolidated Laboratories that have "a heartening message for bald headed men", 5) Prof. S. Westley Martin who routs asthma with deep breathing, 6) Bu-T-Meal which is doom to blackheads, 7) Sal-Tassia that assures cancer sufferers that there is no need to die, 8) P. C. Ointment that "takes the itch out of piles," and so forth and so on and on.

The sunshine poet, the sweetness-and-light preacher, the Science practitioner, the chiropractor or osteopath, the palmist, the faith healer, the numerologist, the medium, who can't clean up in Southern California is simply hopeless.

This whole buoyant delusional phenomenon is reflected in the stories and advertisements and editorials of the *Times*. I know any number of its readers who patronize some cult or ism, who go about mumbling prayers and incantations. Why? It may be the climate; it may be the sea air.

I would like to digress, for a few words, into a theory. California, Southern California in particular, is the last resort in life for thousands and thousands of broken personalities. Escapists from over the mountains to the east look to it for relief. It is more than the shore of the Pacific; it is the last brink of hope.

Bringing their neuroses and psychoses and break-downs with them, the emigrants pour over the passes into the Promised Land. They want to be healed (they read the ads in the *Times*); they want to fit in and make a final go of life. One cannot gainsay the advantages of the land, but, after all, the terms of peace, success and health are much the same as they are

elsewhere. These people are not immediately rid of their illnesses. Amidst loneliness and the new difficulties, their distress becomes unbearable. They begin to turn up at Amiee's Temple: they come together in pathetic brave knots in the halls and parlors of the numberless cults and religions; they haunt the chiropractors and laboratories; they try the mysteries of the Swamis or a flight into "science." In general, these people defend their last stand; they cannot acknowledge failure—they care not. They breathe deep of the ever present anesthetics of sweetness, light and illusion. Some idea of just how effective they are can be gained by a glance at the surpassing divorce, suicide and insanity rates. And yet, it is not wise to claim that the anesthetics do not serve to keep hundreds on the fringe of sanity; they probably do.

* * * * *

It is natural that a population so profoundly desperate not only should hunger for consolation but should suffer the psychic pain of a lurking sense of inferiority. The accommodating reaction—the Southland's blustering bombast—is familiar to everyone. People do not travel two or three thousand miles for new pastures and then admit to the folks at home that the grass is often dead and the water brackish. Twit an emigrant about his adopted land, he will begin to fume and quote clever Chamber of Commerce statistics. This tender defensive self-consciousness breaks out in a rash all over the **Times**. Let us examine our copy:

Nearly everybody in the East and in Europe is simply crazy to see California. I predict that fully fifty percent of the normal tourist traffic to Europe will be diverted to Southern California. . . . California is home to Yehudi. The musical world has been conquered by this lad, but kings and conductors and great audiences and sundry honors weigh little to him in the balance with his beloved California. . . . Among the baritones, *our own* Lawrence Tibbett. . . . Another evidence that Terpsichore as well as artists in other lines are coming to appreciate the opportunities for success in Los Angeles, is the recent arrival here of Miss Mary Bracken, acrobatic dancer. . . . It has been estimated that Los Angeles has more women painters than any other city. . . . A "So You're Going to California" may properly be her (Clara Laughlin's) next book. . . . Everybody (in So. America) has heard of us. . . . Southern California has the reputation of recovering more rapidly from business depression than other sections. . . . Here in this, the romance capitol of the world. . . . No other district in the world is more receptive to new ideas in agriculture than is Southern California. . . . In no other place than Los Angeles could such an array of talent (Anita Page, Sue Carroll, Chic Sale) be assembled for a like affair (a Writer-Wampas Roast imitating Washington's noted Gridiron dinner). . . . The World's biggest Sunday newspaper. . . .

Truly the wonders are many; and truly one is never free from being reminded of them. Yes, there is more than the climate, the flowers and the cheap vegetables. The emigrant learns at once that he has entered a city "rapidly becoming the cultural center of the country," already "the Style Capital of the World," and, since the luring of Dr. Millikan from Chicago, "a science center second to none." In fact "there is more genius

between the City Hall and Santa Monica than in any like area in the world."

All this wonder and glory is a bit terrifying. Half the people you meet have just been hobnobbing with X, the great so-and-so. Celebrities are celebrated in California. Let one of them, major or minor, register at the Biltmore; by midnight the *Times'* Lee Shippey will call to claim him; and in the morning, the arrival will find himself in a two-column spread on the editorial page, "Personal Glimpses of Famous Southlanders."

* * * * *

Certainly one of the most satisfying opportunities open to the arrival is to live under the light of the Stars, which is even better than living next door to the judge back home. The cinema folk supply the envied crimson fringe on an immense drab spread of population; they are the royalty. A most acute comment was once made, I believe, by Miss Beatrice Lillie. Shown from a hill top the ocean of lights paving the darkness, she said, "Well, they're very lovely—only, aren't you afraid they'll reassemble themselves any minute to spell 'Marian Davies'?"

The *Times* grovels like the populace; it makes the same sort of genuflections that characterize the sweet things getting autographs at the big premiers. The Sunday rotogravure is a showing of previews, Peggy Hamilton fashion plates, movie colony social notes and gossip.

In the way of intelligently evaluating the products of the studios, the press of the community contributes absolutely nothing except balloon gravy. For the cinema is the city's greatest industry and the critics are being invited regularly to drink at bill-side parties. The result is blah. The sappish character of the reviews resembles the *Weekly Blade's* write-up of a senior class play at Swink High:

At last a picture to suit Charlotte Greenwood's laugh-provoking talents! . . . for sheer fun and nonsense, it's tip-top . . . snappy dialogue, hilarious situations, excellent clowning. . . . Charlotte finds an excellent running mate in Harry Stubs. Leila Hymans and Denny, too . . . are well matched. . . . Denny scores heavily in a farcical role. . . . Needless to say, Miss Hymans gives a good performance. . . . Praise goes to Chuck Reisner, the director. . . . Obviously this duo (the authors) should come in for their share of praise too. A new charmer, Lillian Bond, makes her appearance . . . easily gains favor as a luscious vamp. . . .

* * * * *

The emigrant who fails to be stirred by the life and works of the contemporary talkie nobility may be impressed by the "romance-drenched aristocracy of the past." California seems to derive some deep consolation from the exercise of imagination on its Spanish days. The *Times* gives an enormous amount of space. Here, on the cover of the magazine section, you see a Spanish girl, "so beautiful they called her Springtime." Within, you read a tribute to her charm. The magazine's center spread features historical articles by Mary Pickford and Ramon Novarro. Elsewhere in the same edition, you read that the California

Restoration Society is to meet; that the Russia Club will have a Spanish Night; that the Daughters of the Golden West are in for a spectacular and dramatic Historical Entertainment; that the Travellarians spent a delightful Spanish evening at Paseo de Los Angeles; that the Ebell Club bridge-luncheon is to be sponsored by the physical culture department and the Spanish Class; that a troupe of Argentine dancers have been imported to teach the tango; that expensive preparations are being made for fiestas that will introduce the 1932 Olympiad; that the city fathers are grinding out ordinances to create a Little Spain on Flower Street.

Whatever the reasons—because it feels a raw thinness in its own gringo tradition, or because it has enough conscience to want to atone in some degree for American imperialism, or because it has a wistful hankering for the loveliness it destroyed with powder and pavements, or because it is whooping good business—whatever the reasons, California displays a detective fervor in resurrecting its history and in trying to pretend that the Spanish tradition still breathes. It is in some ways a splendid effort; but essentially it is abortive in that the whole gringo temper and manner of life is hopelessly out of step with the slow-paced days of the Dons. Red tile, mission arches and the deliberate staging of a Little Spain do not sustain the life of a culture—merely the shell. The Miss Los Angeles of the *Times*' cartoonists may wear the high comb and mantilla of a blooded senorita, but her heart is the heart of a Hollywood siren from Omaha. Modern Los Angeles' spiritual progenitor is Main Street in Middletown.

And it is the weight of the obligation to give Middletown a second chance and a good show that constitutes the principal determinant of the town's psychology. It will go to any length, compromise its small integrity, bend over backward in an effort to win and to hold the emigrant and to impress the visitor. The great leader and the super voice is the *Times*. It is conscious in its slightest movements of being watched; it has a painfully stagey presence and manner. In its anxiety to be impressive and original, the Southland dares any experiment that contains no political or industrial threats. The results are too often bizarre, extravagant and silly; and they will continue to be so while the city persists in being a national vaudeville and good-hope clinic.

* * * * *

California is crowded with great beauty, wealth, calm and splendor. In time these may temper a people. When they do, Los Angeles will cut its publicity budgets, curtail its spurious bragging, perhaps even become jealous of intrusion; it will no longer lean on ghosts and myths of an alien people; its blatant adolescent self-consciousness will have gone; it will stand ir-

banely serene, with its own authentic works to speak for it.

All this is a consummation probably impossible in a world where any authentic individuality is more and more difficult to attain, where the soil and the land and the sky play increasingly minor roles in the conditioning of human culture. It is certainly utterly out of the question so long as the great Times animates the town.

Anti-Militarism Alarms Y. M. C. A.

Leo Gruliov

BECAUSE he wrote that "We still believe the army builds men, but we forget what they are being built for," A. D. Rugh has been fired by the Y. M. C. A.

Rugh wrote this in a discussion of Citizens' Military Training Camps in a recent issue of "West Side Men," the official bulletin of the West Side Y. M. C. A. of New York City. He declared that "the military system and all those who have vested interests in it foster the suspicions, misunderstandings and hatreds that ultimately make 'defensive wars' necessary from the militaristic point of view."

And, as a result, Rugh "is no longer with the West Side Y. M. C. A. and he is not endorsed or supported by any official act of the Y. M. C. A.," according to "Y" officials.

After several conferences among the consternated "Y" authorities, a special issue of the "West Side Men" was published for the sole purpose of apologizing for Rugh's forthright declaration. Cleveland E. Dodge and Walter T. Diack, president and general secretary of the Y. M. C. A., supervised the "apology issue," which proclaimed:

"The Y. M. C. A. has always given a good account of its loyalty to the government under which it operates. The general approval of military authorities, including Gen. Pershing, as to the work of the Y. M. C. A. is evidence of this."

The incident was exposed by Heywood Broun, who commented:

"After all, the President himself sloganed that conflict as the war to end all war. And if the Y. M. C. A. did its best to nail down the finality of that particular conflict, it can well afford now to emphasize the 'C,' and to take the attitude that from the Christian point of view, war and preparation for war do not belong in its scheme of training the young to the best possible rule of ethics. The Y. M. C. A. should have the courage to say 'We are for peace first, last and all the time!' And no apologies to anybody."

How People May Prevent Mental Diseases

D. Frederick W. Parsons

IT MAY be of interest to be reminded that in some of the more forceful and less elegant forms of speech good advice is occasionally hidden.

As a phrase it might be decided that "pull yourself together" is common. Many a man would do well to pull himself together. It would mean that he was integrating himself physically and mentally.

On the physical side of an integrating process one would have a general muscular tightening, an erect posture, a forward and upward look; all of which are much better than a careless, slovenly carriage. In this connection one thinks of quick steps, bright, eager eyes and deep breathing. So pull yourself together physically.

Serious forms of mental disease result from a splitting of the personality. This is the reverse of pulling yourself together. By splitting of the personality one expresses the theory that part of the personality leaves, starts an independent development and carries on an existence apart from the rest. Some interesting examples of individuals with more than one personality have been described. Multiple personalities are rare and dramatic but of not much importance in the daily life of the average person.

The less spectacular splittings are of greater consequence. Some of these are day dreams which go so far afield that they cannot easily be pulled back. If the main source of our inner satisfactions is the wanderings of our minds into the imaginative spheres we are drifting dangerously. We must, and usually do, pull back these trends of thought and make ourselves look at life as it is and not as we wish it were. That is the safeguard and wishful thinking is not dangerous when we can pull the string and regain complete contact with reality.

When we let parts of our mental life embark for distant shores, settle and build a new and independent existence, free from the correcting influences of reality, then we have set up a rival who may develop vitality enough to dominate and to destroy. We have lost our personality when our actions in the real world are controlled by our imaginations. What started out as a pleasant excursion has become a tragedy and the admonition to pull ourselves together falls on a mind not able to respond.

THE ANTICHRIST

A Popular Edition of Friedrich Nietzsche's Masterly Attack on
Christianity

The Antichrist is the most fighting book ever written by a great scholar. Nietzsche put all his energy, all his thinking power, all his critical acumen, all his human idealism into the preparation of this magnificent attack upon Christianity. He took the most earnest pains to make this book strong, clear incisive—to make it carry its message with mighty effectiveness. He said eloquently: "I have letters that will burn even upon the eyeballs of the blind."

Success crowned Nietzsche's great effort. He wrote a masterpiece of criticism and of cultural vision. In *The Antichrist* the reader will find the most vivid, impressive summing of what Christianity has meant to our western civilization. Nietzsche discusses the history of Christianity—the typical workings of the Christian mind—the antagonism of Christianity to the "noble values" for which Nietzsche fought with a mind and pen that have never been excelled for their strong, cutting clarity, slashing through the shams of Christianity with a swift sureness that is a rare delight.

An especially interesting portion of the book deals with the psychology of Jesus, with the atmosphere in which early Christianity came into being, and with the differences between the gospel of Jesus and the dogmas of Christianity.

Scholars have recognized the value of Nietzsche's superb anti-Christian masterpiece. But, curiously, this masterpiece has never been given the wide, popular circulation that it so richly deserves. At last, we offer a beautifully printed, inexpensive edition of *The Antichrist*—a book which every freethinker should own and which should make every man a freethinker. *The Antichrist*, printed on fine book paper, bound in beautiful stiff covers, set in large type, and with 30,000 words of text is priced at only 50c, 5 for \$2. Its size is 5½ by 8½ inches.

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS



USE THIS BLANK



Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

Enclosed is 50 cents, for which send me, postpaid, a copy of
The Antichrist, by Friedrich Nietzsche (5 copies for \$2).

Name.....

Address.....

City..... State.....

Why not remit 50 cents more and get an extra copy for a friend?