

SECOND SERIES

Questions and Answers

E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS

SECOND SERIES

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

E. Haldeman-Julius

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD :: KANSAS

CONTENTS

	Page
Old Age Pensions and Social Panaceas	3
Hitler and the Nazis	13
Problems of Government	29
The Roman Catholic Church	40
Mussolini	57
Imperialism	63
The International Scene	67
Personal Estimates and Criticisms	74
Capitalism	99
Militarism and Disarmament	112
Index	119

Copyright, 1935
Haldeman-Julius Company

Old Age Pensions and Social Panaceas

Do you believe we will get old-age pensions in this country soon?

Yes, I believe it is only a question of time before we get a federal old-age pension law passed and put into force. It may even come during the present session of Congress. I see that Secretary of Labor Perkins, in her report to the President, on January 30, 1934, came out for such a law. When a man or woman reaches an age where he or she cannot compete with younger workers, then it falls upon society to take the old person out of the grind of making a living, through the facilities of an old-age pension. The government already supplies such protection to its own employees. The time has come to pass on this humane measure to everyone. The funds can be raised from private industry and federal taxation. It is cruel to let aging men and women look forward to a bleak, helpless, insecure old age. We have plenty of wealth to care for them, and I believe we are ready to assume this duty. If it is all right to pension the soldiers of destruction, why shouldn't we pension the industrial soldiers of production?

How many aged persons are in this country?

About five percent of our population are 65 years of age, or over. This means we have an aged population of about 6,000,000. Most of these aged persons are unable to provide for themselves and are therefore compelled to live off their relatives or charity. Industry refuses to keep them when they begin to show signs of age. The only remedy is social insurance in the form of old-age pensions. Such a pension is just and decent. The suggestion that the old be forced to live in institutions or homes of charity should be rejected. An old worker, who is no longer wanted in industry and who is without means of support, should be provided with

a regular, substantial pension, in cash, so that he or she may spend the last years in peace, comfort and dignity. It is no argument to claim that the old workers should have saved their wages when they were able to work. Most workers get barely enough to live on, so why should they be expected to provide the funds to keep them in their old age? There are 17 states, and the territory of Alaska, which provide old-age pension laws, but it is a bitter fact that the relief they offer is too meager, the yearly payments ranging from \$100 to \$350 to persons who qualify under the laws. At present, the states pay nothing to individuals who own property worth from \$2,000 to \$34,000 or who have incomes over \$300 or \$400 per year. The problem should be taken from the states and put on a federal basis. There isn't the slightest doubt that such a federal law will be passed in the near future. The federal government cannot escape its responsibility much longer.

* * *

In recent articles on economics I frequently bump into a new word which puzzles me: "Autarchy." What in the world does it mean?

It is a new word intended to describe the economic philosophy which maintains that a country should so plan its economy that it will be independent of imports and exports. It is the most extreme expression of economic nationalism. Just how such an ideal can be realized I do not know, except if one were to propose that civilized peoples return to the primitiveness of isolated tribes.

* * *

Please list some of the great books describing utopian social systems.

One naturally begins with Plato's "Republic," written 2,500 years ago. His utopia was based on chattel slavery, which is a most peculiar way of reaching an economic Eden. Campanella, who spent 27 years in

an Italian prison, wrote "The City of the Sun." Probably the most famous book of this class of literature is Sir Thomas More's "Utopia." Others: Harrington's "Oceana," Cabet's "Voyage en Icarie," Lord Bacon's "New View," and Edward Bellamy's "Looking Backward." The fault with all books about utopia is their lack of scientific background. A mere sentimental yearning for an ideal society is certainly not enough. Any scheme of human perfection must be based on facts—facts of industry, economics, politics, administration policies, psychological appreciation of human factors, the lessons of history and the tactics of social change. Utopianism has always been derided by scientific economists like Karl Marx. Marx's "Das Kapital" attacks capitalism and proposes a cooperative commonwealth, not through the maze of poetry or mysticism but with the logic of science.

* * *

Would you consider the Single Tax, as advocated by Henry George, if generally adopted, a fundamental remedy for the existing economic conditions?

Henry George has never impressed me as an important economist. He made a great splash, but only among immature and superficial students of economic phenomena. His "Progress and Poverty," written in 1879, is a solemnly pretentious work, motivated by a sincere desire to help mankind, but nevertheless an incomplete description of the social evils facing us and a thoroughly inadequate solution.

Henry George was not an original, creative thinker. The basic ideas described under the general theory of the Single Tax originated with the French economists of the 18th Century, known as Physiocrats. Quersnay, the chief theoretician of the Physiocrats, based his economic philosophy on the then sound premise that the major part of man's wealth came from the soil. George, writing a century later, had already seen vast advancements in the industrial and financial processes, which he had blandly ignored, and then pro-

posed an exclusive tax on rentals. There was to be no other levy.

Such a theory might be made to fit into an exclusively agricultural economy, but imagine the absurdity of such a program in a day of large-scale industry, machinery, billion-dollar banks, capitalists and all the other manifestations of a capitalist order of society, in which the bulk of wealth no longer comes from the land but from industry.

Henry George, as late as 1891, defended capital and interest, and merely insisted on taking "for the community the value that attaches to land by the growth of the community." Not only was private capitalism to be untouched by the state, but it was to be completely free of assessment by the tax collector. This would mean that J. P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller, each being expressions of financial and industrial capitalism, were not to be taxed, either on their businesses, their incomes or their estates at their death. Single Tax is as dead as the dodo. It is now merely the peculiar notion of a group of senile eccentrics.

* * *

Your attack on the Single Tax has created a great sensation in their press, particularly "Land and Freedom." Please comment.

I have seen the articles in the Henry George publication, and am amused over the cavorting of these economic illiterates. They are even worse than their leader, who seemed to be the last word in superficiality. They claim that because the American people pay \$12,000,000,000 to the landlords, that this alone is the cause of our economic disasters. To "remedy" this they would establish a single tax on rentals, leaving all other capitalist property untouched. What about the \$13,000,000,000 paid annually in interest? What about the seemingly countless billions paid yearly to corporations and others, in the form of profits, dividends, surplus values, etc? Not a word. Just nationalize land and all will be put in order! My claim that the Single Tax would be a blessing to the greediest capitalists goes to the heart of the case. Nothing

would suit the great bankers and industrialists better than to see the Single Tax put into universal practice. It would make capitalism stronger than ever before. Even Wall Street hasn't the nerve to ask for it.

* * *

How would Henry George's single tax on land values and not improvements affect some of today's plutocrats? Or would they have any land to pay on? If not, who would have it?

Your questions strike at the very heart of the weakness of Henry George's reactionary theory of the single tax. I have previously said that the great capitalists—Morgan, Rockefeller, Mellon, Schwab, Henry L. Doherty—would get a wonderful "break" under the single tax, because they would have to pay no taxes on their businesses, banks, utilities, money, securities, income, death estates, etc. This brought me columns of criticism in the single tax press, but nothing was said to indicate that single tax could in any way deal with the problem of wealth concentration and social exploitation. The single tax, naturally, would fall mainly on the middle class. The big fellows would have to pay hardly anything. Single tax has been tried out in a few scattering communities, without the slightest effect on the problems of modern industrial and financial life.

* * *

What is the Townsend Plan?

This new movement, started in Los Angeles during the present depression, is known as the Townsend Revolving Fund Old Age Pension Plan. It is beginning to attract national attention, after a few years of surprisingly effective propagandistic and organizational work in Southern California. Its founder is Dr. M. E. Townsend, a physician, and it is his claim that support is coming from powerful individuals in high places. It is also claimed that organizations are now functioning in every state in the Union, except Delaware, and in Alaska and Hawaii. It has been reported that the Townsend Plan was endorsed by Upton Sinclair, but this is not true, the fact being

that Sinclair has a pension plan of his own based on State action, whereas the Townsend plan calls for congressional collaboration. In brief, the Townsend Plan proposes:

1. Every U. S. citizen, 60 years old or more, is to receive a monthly income of \$200.
2. No pensioner is to have a criminal record.
3. No pensioner may have an independent income.
4. The pension money must be spent in the United States, but it is to be spent during the month in which it is issued.
5. The pensioner may spend the money as he or she pleases, in order to prevent hoarding.
6. The funds for this plan are to be raised by the Federal government through a sales tax variously figured from 5 to 10 percent. This, it is estimated, will raise \$2,000,000,000 monthly for the purpose of the plan, there being about 10,000,000 persons qualified to receive such a pension.

In all fairness, paragraph 6 is said to be under consideration with a view to lowering the amount of the pension and the size of the sales tax. However, it is argued in opposition that such a plan would mean that the poor, who are least able to carry the load, would be called upon to pay most of the sales tax, thereby making them the benefactors of the aged, when, as a matter of fact, such an enterprise should be financed by those better able to pay, particularly the rich corporations and the members of that small class of four percent of the population who control 80 percent of the nation's wealth.

All this ferment is a sign of health, for it is evidence of the fact that the American people are beginning to give serious attention to great social, political and economic questions. During such a time it is to be expected that numerous utopian and unscientific plans will be proposed, but there is no reason to be discouraged over this fact. The truth is that the more thought the nation gives to problems of old-age dependency, unemployment, over-production, under-consumption, war, lock-outs, etc., the sooner will the commun-

ity learn the scientific, logical approaches to social questions.

* * *

Can the money needed to finance the Townsend plan be raised?

That question is an important one, and I am glad to see it brought up. The supporters of the Dr. Townsend Old Age Revolving Pension Plan glibly propose that the 8,000,000 persons over 60 years of age shall receive \$200 per month. This means it would be necessary to raise \$1,600,000,000 for only the first month's pension payment. Multiply that by 12 and you will see what it means in a year. The argument that this money will be raised by a 10 percent sales tax falls down when we see what the American people spend in a year. During 1928, a prosperity year of the late boom period, the American people spent a total of \$46,000,000,000. As the Townsend Plan envisions a yearly sale of \$192,000,000,000, it can be seen at a glance that the necessary pension funds cannot be raised unless the American people were to increase their purchases by \$146,000,000,000 per year, a perfectly astronomical calculation. Of course, if the supporters of the Townsend Plan favor wild inflation, such an amount could be spent very easily, but then it would take something like \$1,000,000 to buy a newspaper or a postage stamp! This is no denial of the necessity and reasonableness of a fair old age pension law. Almost every civilized country in the world now has old age pensions, except the United States, China and India. The Soviet Union provides for every old and dependent man or woman. Why not the U. S. A.? It will come, and soon, but not the Townsend way.

* * *

I notice a great deal of publicity for the Townsend Old Age Pension Plan, but very little criticism of the proposal. Why is this?

You have brought up a most interesting question, and I am glad of this opportunity to answer it. The capitalist press (which is the mouthpiece of Wall Street) would welcome such a plan, for it recognizes the "virtues" of capitalism and makes no proposal of an end-

ing of that iniquitous system of society. Dr. Townsend, who impresses me as a sincere man of humanitarian impulses, is not an economist, but rather a visionary, a dreamer, an utopian sentimentalist. These problems demand scientific, not sob-jerking, treatment. In Dr. Townsend's plan we find no protest against the system of private ownership of the machinery of production, distribution and exchange. Private ownership is to go on, as yore, which means that the basic industries would continue to remain in the hands of the capitalists. Could anything be nicer for Wall Street? Ah, you say, but there will be a sales tax of 10 percent in order to raise the money needed to pay each person over 60 years of age a pension of \$200 per month, provided the money is spent in this country within a month. That won't please Wall Street, you say. But it will, because Wall Street knows that a sales tax is a tax on the poor, and not on the incomes or possessions of the capitalists. One capitalist who spends \$20,000 per year on which to live will be more than glad to pay \$2,000 per year in sales tax for the Townsend Plan when he sees 1,000 heads of working class families paying \$100 each in order to maintain the old and needy. A sales tax is right up Wall Street's alley. The capitalist spends a lot as an individual, but less as a class, when compared to the necessary mass spending of the workingman and farmer. Personally I doubt that the Townsend Plan will be adopted by Congress, but if it is, you won't hear much of a squawk from the rich interests. I expect to see a federal old age pension law passed soon, but it won't be along the lines of the Townsend plan, in my opinion.

* * *

Who and what are the Utopians?

The Utopian Society is a California organization that has been making astonishing progress. It is reported that the society now employs a large office staff in Los Angeles and that the membership is growing rapidly. The society is veiled in a certain amount of secrecy and mystery, but enough has

come out to prove that the organization is intended to further "collectivist ends," which means something of a socialistic program. The Utopians are causing a great stir in Southern California and it is more than likely that the movement will spread to the entire state.

The business interests in Los Angeles are admittedly worried over this new, secret society, but thus far they have been able to do nothing to stem its tide. Several large corporations, department stores and manufacturers have made attempts to discourage Utopians, threatening discharges in several authenticated instances, but the society suddenly appeared with proof of its great numbers and powers of boycott, with the result that the employers withdrew their threats and beat an undignified retreat.

It is said that membership costs \$3 to enter and something like \$1 per year in dues, though free membership is given to the unemployed. It is said that the promoters are limited to salaries of \$25 per week, in order to keep the secret order from becoming a racket. It is too soon to judge of the society's effectiveness as a weapon in the war for economic independence, but the experiment is more than interesting and worthy of the closest attention.

Several readers have asked me to explain Sinclair's EPIC movement. The word EPIC means: **End Poverty In California**. Although Sinclair was not elected Governor, EPIC is still a live issue. The plan aims to take over all closed factories and put the unemployed to work producing wealth for use instead of profit. There is a certain amount of socialistic policy in this plan, but not enough to constitute a threat against the capitalist system. The plan proposes to have the workers in state-controlled factories produce goods for the men and women employed on state farms, who, in turn, will provide the factory employees with food. The money to do this will be raised by bonds to be issued by the State. Sinclair also claims that these bonds can be sold to the federal government, though the details are not explained.

Upton Sinclair is showing himself as a master politician and mass organizer. This world is full of surprises, and perhaps the biggest of all is the sudden rise of Upton Sinclair as a leader of the masses.

* * *

How does the California Socialist Party stand on the Utopians?

The official policy is antagonistic, because it is held that the Utopian Society practically ignores the class struggle, on which fundamental rests the structure of mass action against Capitalism. It is granted that the Utopians are getting many persons to give thought to economic questions, but it is maintained that the secret and hierarchical form of the organization implies a dictatorship. A society which claims to have democratic ends in the sphere of industry should itself be democratic, in which the rank and file are given the power to dictate policies, control officers and in other ways be the masters of their group and purposes. The Socialist Party properly holds that secret "cycles" are a form of Fascism, even though there are so-called socialistic principles involved in the platform of the society. This reminds me of a statement made by Eugene V. Debs, in 1912, as follows: **"The work of the Socialist movement must all be done out in the broad light of day. Nothing can be done by stealth that can be of any advantage to it in this country."**

* * *

What economic theories underlie the Utopian Society?

The California society's program suggests Technocracy and a system of socialized society, which is Socialism. I quote the following, from the society's official literature:

The Utopian Society is in existence for a single purpose: that there shall be set in motion a mechanism of money precisely designed to meet the following requirements:

That all available plant, equipment, productive land, transportation facilities and all other wealth-producing capacity shall be operated at full capacity continuously and at the highest rate of efficiency.

* * *

That as many able-bodied

people be assigned to plan, supervise, coordinate, operate, maintain and improve this productive plant and its efficiency as there are jobs to be done.

That the total number of hours of human effort that are necessary to carry on at full pace * * * be distributed evenly over the total number of capable people available for that purpose.

The plan provides for the division of the population into the following classes: 1. All persons under 25 years of age to be assigned to education. 2. From 25 to 45, all persons are to be productively engaged, at jobs they are best able to perform. 3. At 45, all persons are to be retired on pensions, except those who prefer to continue working as an avocation or hobby.

The Utopians propose what they call "Effort Money," which will be apportioned to the persons in the various classes. This money would be good for all kinds of commodities and services, except that it could not be hoarded because it will be non-transferable. The society's propagandists promise short working hours and ample provision for the old and disabled through an elaborate system of old-age pensions and the like.

It is claimed that the society, with headquarters in Los Angeles, now has 250,000 members and that about 5,000 new members are joining daily. This means that the organization is growing at the rate of almost 2,000,000 yearly, surely a tremendous enterprise, if the figures are accurate.

* * *

Is the Utopian Society based on revolutionary tactics?

This society, which plans to enroll from 14,000,000 to 25,000,000 members, claims to be entirely constitutional in methods and program. In fact, all members are expected to take an oath of allegiance to the U. S. Constitution. Its literature says the society aims to "educate the American people along economic lines, so that, by the use of reason and the ballot, rather than by the use of hate and the bomb, it may bring a readjustment in national economic thinking,

placing human values before bond values, by stressing production for use rather than profit." The society has a rather involved secret ritual. There are four "cycles" through which each member passes, but even the members are denied access to the fifth "cycle," to which only a few are admitted, it being claimed that those in the fifth "cycle" are to be trained as leaders of the new social order.

* * *

Can you tell me a little about the Social Credit Plan?

This plan was worked out some 10 years ago by an English engineer, Major Clifford Hugh Douglas, and has attracted attention in almost every land of the British Empire. It is now being agitated by an organization in New York City, led by the noted writer, Gorham B. Munson.

The Social Credit movement is not fascist in any sense, nor is it at one with Socialism or Communism. It aims at purely monetary reforms, it being the contention of Douglas that the trouble with our economic system is the fact that we do not have enough real money to buy back all we produce. He would leave the industries and business in private hands, as at present, but he would nationalize credit so that each individual would be able to buy the commodities he needs. Just how this Social Credit plan will be applied is rather complicated, but what it really amounts to is the issuance of government money to make purchases by consumers, instead of having credits pile up with the bankers.

The plan would have the retailers of the country deliberately mark down the prices of the various articles they sell. When a marked-down sale is made, a copy of the sale slip is sent to the U. S. treasury, which refunds the retailer for the amount of the actual discount he has permitted. In this manner, says Douglas, the consumer's purchasing power will automatically increase, perhaps something like 100 percent at once, and the retailer would get the consumer's money plus the government credit based on the extent of the mark-down.

As already stated, Major Douglas would leave capitalism untouched. The monopolies would continue to belong to the monopolists. The factories in the large-scale industries would remain privately owned. The workers would still be wage earners, if they had jobs. The profit motive would continue to serve, instead of the motive of social service. This means only one thing to me: Douglas thinks that tinkering with money will fix our great industrial machine. The money question is the first subject tackled by those who want to patch things up in a hurry. We have our Greenbackers, our Silver men, our Inflationists, and now we have the Douglas plan to have the government enter every sale of commodities with a plan to pay the retailers a part of the purchasing price, or rather make an addition to that price. Such a scheme, it seems obvious, will not reach the problems that go to the roots of capitalist society.

It is a commonplace among Socialist economists, that production under capitalism is an easy function, the difficult part of the problem being the one of distribution. The money question is not a fundamental part of the problem, though it does have its superficial aspects. Bringing new billions of credit to the consumers cannot bring lasting relief so long as the people tolerate monopolistic control of the essential avenues of production, distribution and exchange. A real program of socialization would include the nationalization of credit, but only as a part of the greater campaign to socialize the instruments of production and distribution.

What is the position of the California Socialist Party with regard to the EPIC plan?

The State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of California issued a statement attacking Upton Sinclair and his EPIC plan. Its first objection was on the score of injuring true Socialism by getting the masses to trust their economic future to "partial reforms." It is claimed that Sinclair promises too much within the shell of

the capitalist system. It is also stated that Sinclair's approach is based on the theory that "good men" can bring about "good conditions" when the real issue demands a fundamental change in the social order.

* * *

Is Sinclair's EPIC plan limited to California?

No. He advises workers and farmers everywhere to organize EPIC clubs, pledged to demanding the inauguration of a system of employment whereby the workless will be put to work in state-owned factories, etc., in order to provide for their primary needs, without regard to profit for the capitalist class. He says the plan will work anywhere, if proper organization can be put into action. Then, says he, the slogan will change from "End Poverty In California" to "End Poverty In Civilization." Under such a system of employment the fruit growers of California would exchange their crop, or at least part of their crop, with the iron miners of Wyoming; the cotton growers of Texas would exchange their crop with St. Louis shoemakers; the steel workers of Pittsburgh would exchange their products for the clothes of the New York garment makers, and so on. This would mean work for all, because all have need for commodities. There is really no over-production of goods today, or any time in the past, because millions of people have been condemned to living under conditions of underconsumption.

* * *

Please explain Dated Money?

Los Angeles is becoming the fountain-head of new economic movements, as it was, in the near past, the source of scores of new religions. The latest (if no new ones sweep into sight before this appears in print) is Jonathan F. Glendon's National Dated Purchase Money Plan. This same Glendon was one of the founders of the Utopian Society, which has made amazing progress recently, and he withdrew from it when certain internal wars developed, now devoting himself to his own economic scheme and organization. Dated

Money is to be issued, says the plan, but must be used within one year, after which the money becomes worthless. Before the time limit the money will buy something, but would become valueless the moment it is used. Such money, it is urged, cannot be "manipulated, bought, sold, borrowed, loaned, lost, embezzled or otherwise misused or misappropriated." In addition, the plan provides that the industries of the country shall be run for consumption and not for profit, which, of course, is a socialistic policy. This plan, like the one proposed by Dr. Townsend, is just another proof of the nation's readiness to give ear to remedies for our social ills.

* * *

Are the Technocrats right in saying that the latest developments of the machine age mean that it is now impossible for everyone to have a job?

I disagree with the Technocrats. Every able-bodied, willing worker can have a good job at good wages, if we will tackle the problem along the following lines:

1. Make a good job of ending child labor, beginning with the newspaper publishers, who are among the worst offenders. No one under 16 years of age should be permitted to be employed in any industry. We have made a great deal of headway in the right direction, especially in the textile industry, but there is still room for improvement.

2. Students in high schools, colleges and universities should not be made to accept employment in order to maintain themselves while finishing their education. Here we can learn from Russia, where each student receives a monthly stipend from the government, in the form of social insurance.

3. Pay the hundreds of thousands of prison laborers full union wages, as is done in Russia. Convicts should not be permitted to do productive labor in competition with free labor, but pay them the same as is paid outside workers, turning the wages over to the prisoner's dependents or keeping the money in trust until he is released.

4. As there are something like

7,000,000 men past 60 years of age in industry and other mediums of employment, Congress should immediately pass an old-age pension law so that these aged workers may spend their last years in peace, comfort and security. Some of these 7,000,000 are indispensable to industry, so they will remain, but it is safe to say that an old-age pension would remove perhaps 5,000,000 men and women from the labor market, thus making room for younger workers without injury to the older ones.

5. Cut the hours of labor by federal law, in order to equalize jobs with the increased productivity of the machine. The machine is a blessing when it is used to produce wealth, but it is a curse when it is made only to bring in additional profits. Society, rather than the individual capitalist, should benefit from the machine's increased powers of production.

* * *

What do you think of Technocracy?
Howard Scott, the Technocrat, comes closer to the proper remedy than any one. His prediction is that the price system measured in dollars will have to be discarded, due to the high producing capacity of the machine. In other words, energy in production will be the measuring rod, with the working day at four hours for two days a week. And the pay will be all the necessities of life.

Technocracy is a new name for a fairly old branch of economics. Karl Marx, in his immortal "Das Kapital," showed how the machine was displacing labor and increasing man's power to produce wealth without a proportionate increase in his purchasing power. And that was more than a half century ago.

It is an old practice for philosophies, theories and schools of science to be taken over by new hands, window-dressed, trimmed with new names and phrases and palmed off as something new, but the careful student is not fooled by such frivolous behavior.

The weavers of England, who mobbed mills and destroyed power looms more than a century ago, knew about the machine's ability to displace labor, though they

never heard of the word Technocracy. I do not consider Howard Scott altogether reliable in his charts and figures, but where he is accurate he is merely echoing the arguments and conclusions of better economists who preceded him.

The suggestion that Scott offers—to use energy in production as the measure of value—is high-sounding, but hollow. You must first demonstrate that the energy you are using in production is socially necessary. I could apply millions of horse-power to an industrial process that is unwanted by society, and yet I could expect that energy to have value. The thing is pretentious and silly.

After making a case against scientific capitalism, which isn't at all new since the explorations of Karl Marx and other economists, including some conservatives, Mr. Scott blandly refuses to say just what he is going to do about it all. When questioned, he takes a high and mighty position, waves his arms in lordly gestures and refers vaguely to vast reconstruction plans filed away in his private archives. Social movements are not directed in that way.

Mr. Scott has never shown how he is going to tackle the problem of the machine's vastly increased productivity. He offers no remedy. He has no plan. He criticizes but neglects to advance a constructive line of action. Who is to bring about the change? How is it to be done? Are there to be political campaigns? Is the ultimate goal benevolent feudalism, fascism, state socialism, socialized industry, communism, or what? Mr. Scott does not answer. He vaguely assures us that all this will be taken care of at the proper time. This may satisfy school boys, but serious students of current affairs are not going to get excited over such a prophet.

In addition to explaining the significance of the machine, the scientific Socialists come forward with a workable plan that promises the elimination of the bad features of machine economy. In short, they propose that the machine, along with large-scale industry generally, be socialized for the good of the workers of brain

and brawn. That is a constructive philosophy. It is superior to Technocracy because it offers a diagnosis of the disease and a method of treatment that promises quick recovery.

* * *

What is your opinion of Huey Long?

The Senator from Louisiana is a genius in the art of self-advertising and rabble-rousing. So far as real economic and social progress are concerned, Long is a menace. Like Hitler, the Kingfish throws out radical phrases, but only the ignorant are fooled by them.

Long's most popular idea is the "Share-the-wealth movement"—probably the most unsound proposal offered during the depression, not barring the Townsend Plan, Utopianism, dated money and the other crack-pot plans to solve the economic problem in a jiffy, with the Garden of Eden a reality a week from next Tuesday. Long proposes the share the wealth plan so that each U. S. citizen will own \$5,000. Capitalists are to be held down to a single million dollars. Both suggestions are screwy.

For decades the Socialists have been accused of wanting to "divide up" the wealth—a plan that has never been proposed by any Socialist movement in any country at any time since the foundation of Socialist parties. For years and years, Socialist speakers and writers were kept busy denying they intended to "divide up" the wealth of the country—and now comes a political quack and offers the "divide up" idea in all seriousness as a cure for the ills of our social order. It is to laugh.

There's only one thing in the land that can be divided up, and that's money. But if all the money were thrown into one pile and divided up, each individual would get much less than \$5,000. The real wealth of the nation—mines, mills, machinery, utilities, railroads, factories, chain stores, great department stores, heavy industries, etc.—could never be "divided up," because to attempt such a crazy idea would mean to distribute bricks, stones, wheels, cogs and other parts of the industrial machine.

with the result that civilization would collapse. That's why the Socialists have always fought the idea of "sharing the wealth" or "dividing up." It simply can't be done, and if it were attempted it would bring ruin to civilization and put us back in the stone age, when dividing up wasn't an impossible feat to perform.

Huey Long, of course, has never given serious thought to the difficulties of "dividing up," because he isn't interested in serious questions of sociology or economics. He is a cheap, blatant politician—a wizard at lining up the ignorant voters—and it seemed to him that this "share-the-wealth" notion would get the yokels excited and on his side of the fence. Being shrewd, he seemed to know what he was about, for the charlatan is making tremendous headway among our economic illiterates. It is a sad commentary on the public's intelligence when one sees how ready the masses are to rush to the banners and fall for the slogans of a political racketeer like Huey Long. It makes one almost ready to despair. He has nothing to say about Capitalism, except to offer to "dis-mantle" it and give Tom, Dick and Harry a "share." A share of what? Does he offer to socialize the industries and the other means of wealth production, distribution and exchange? Of course not. That would smack of Socialism, and no political shyster cares to propagate a scientific theory of social reconstruction. Besides, it takes real thought to understand Socialism, and no rabble-rouser cares to bother with such "nonsense." Does he offer to end production for profit in the large-scale industries and put the masses to work producing wealth for use and service? Of course not. That's socialistic! Besides, it would take too long. It's too big a job. The yokel-voters want hurry-up remedies—overnight cures—so Huey Long promises each jobless worker, landless farmer and mortgaged homeowner a nice, fresh, new bank account with \$5,000 in it to start off with. That's the kind of bunk that goes over big. Guarantee everyone over 60

years of age \$200 per month; contract to give every man, woman and child \$5,000; sell stock on the feathers in the wings of angels and you get somewhere with the fool voters. The Huey Long type of political fakir understands the psychology of the ignorant "sovereign" citizen, and the result is a pish-posh of quackery, political bunk and social pipe-dreams. And meanwhile the masses remain bogged in the swamp of economic depression!

* * *

What is Huey Long's plan for a capital levy?

In a speech before the lower house of the Georgia legislature, early in February, 1935, Senator Huey Long said his capital levy plan would leave untouched any income up to \$1,000,000 per year, and added:

"But if you make \$2,000,000 there will be a capital levy of 1 percent and so on up to 100 percent on the ninth million."

Then, reaching a glorious peroration, this demagogue roared that his plan would yield "150 to 165 billion dollars tomorrow."

How it would be possible to produce anywhere near \$150,000,000,000 "tomorrow" when America's best income (for 1929) amounted to only \$81,000,000,000 does not bother this political charlatan. Economic realities mean nothing to a rabble-rouser who knows his audiences are too ignorant to check up on his "facts." For example, Long claimed he would apply a capital levy tax of 100 percent on incomes of \$9,000,000 or more, but as no one in this country has ever reported such an income just what can this part of the plan mean, except so much hot air?

Hitler, before he assumed power, talked like this, and even though Germany's intelligent people criticized his statements he went right ahead and captured the government. Which leads one to fear that a demagogue like Hitler—and Huey Long is as ignorant and brazen as Hitler—could just about say anything and get away with it in this country, if he had the power and opportunity to move the masses.

Hitler and the Nazis

Is Hitler a menace to civilization?

Hitler, his hands red with the blood of thousands of innocent victims, has a death grip on 65,000,000 Germans. There is no hope for any internal organization that might seek to unseat this bigoted, fanatical, raving, degenerate maniac.

Hitler—surrounded by sadists, homosexuals, dope addicts and murderers—holds a sword at Germany's heart and it is a case of "Obey Hitler or Die!" Germany obeys.

Hitler has organized Germany's sewer-rats into a vast, powerful, invincible MURDER MOB. This crazy man has given the civilized world a spectacle of horror, frenzy, blood lust, perversion and triumphant medievalism. His infamy knows no limits. He dances wildly on a mountain of rotting human flesh, and as he dances Germany guts herself. Hitler belongs in an insane asylum, but the tragic course of events has lifted him to the most powerful position in the most populous country in Central and Western Europe.

Hitler stole power by a gigantic crime—the crime of firing the German Reichstag. He had his henchman, Goering, burn the building in order to make possible a program of usurpation and destruction.

Hitler declared immediate war on civilization. Less than one percent of the country's population—about a half million out of more than 60,000,000—were immediately denied the right to their businesses, occupations and professions—why? because they were Jews. Hitler's murderers drew Jewish blood—the innocent blood of men, women and even children—for no other reason than bloodthirsty anti-Semitism. His young hoodlums assaulted and murdered young and old—crimes that have been proven to demonstration. Then followed a program

of "cold pogrom," in which Jews were driven from the law-courts, the hospitals, the schools, the universities and every other place in which Jewish scientists and professionals served culture and humanity.

Hitler confiscated the presses, buildings and treasures of Germany's great Social Democratic party. Socialist leaders were killed, imprisoned or exiled.

Hitler suppressed the institutions and property of 500,000 German Freethinkers.

Hitler gave the worst that was in him to Germany's Communists, hounding, murdering and torturing thousands of their leaders and members. The menace of Communism was Hitler's invention, for even at its peak German Communism could claim less than 15 percent of the total vote.

Hitler savagely slaughtered Pacifists, organized or unorganized, because they refused to accept Hitler's program of murder, because they opposed all wars.

Hitler immediately militarized the schools and colleges, literally giving daggers to young boys.

Hitler, moved by the medievalism of his beloved Roman Catholic Church, went on a heresy-hunt, gathered together the books of thousands of authors, and gave the 20th Century the spectacular and terrible picture of savages destroying culture and enlightenment.

Hitler tore down, in Frankfurt, the beautiful monument erected to the memory of Heinrich Heine, Germany's most gifted poet, Germany's greatest writer of prose, one of the world's greatest wits, one of humanity's most loyal friends, one of liberty's greatest fighters. Why? Because Heine was a Jew.

Hitler exiled Professor Albert Einstein, confiscated his meager savings, denied him the right to return to the country he had hon-

ored through his great discoveries in science and mathematics. Why? Because Einstein is a Jew.

Hitler grabbed the baton of Dr. Bruno Walter, next to Toscanini the world's greatest orchestra conductor, one of the greatest interpreters of Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Wagner and the other masters of music. Why? Because Dr. Bruno Walter is a Jew.

Hitler ordered Mendelssohn Hall closed and forbid all organizations to play the great composer's music. Why? Because he was a Jew.

Hitler made it a crime against the State for anyone to play any of the compositions of Meyerbeer the composer of "The Huguenots," the friend of Heine and Heine's greatest musical admiration. Why? Because Meyerbeer was a Jew.

Hitler sent his storm troops to break up Germany's trade union movement. Its cooperatives were stolen, its funds confiscated, its leaders sent to concentration camps. Why? Because they were the backbone of German democracy.

Hitler murdered every manifestation of democracy.

Hitler made it a crime to think and a capital offense to speak. He gagged the press, stamped out every viewpoint that opposed his own, ordered his ignorant vaporings written into Germany's school textbooks, rewrote history with the pen of hatred, put a club-footed degenerate in command of the radio, the moving pictures and every other means of communication.

Hitler struck down Germany's womanhood, after the wives and mothers of that country had won the age-long fight for the right to equality. They were reduced to the degradation of womanhood in the days of Catholic supremacy. Hitler told them to go to church, cook for their husbands and breed more babies. Hitler wants more babies in order that he may have more soldiers.

Hitler made the ideal of liberty a target for his assaults—and liberty died in Germany.

Hitler horrified the world, and when it gasped in pain he spat in its face.

Hitler brought back the headman and his block, and heads began to fall.

Each day brought its new horror. His brazen, brass-lined throat roared with glee when he beheld the sight of civilization bleeding and dying.

And when he saw Germany in chains, completely in his power, he turned to the rest of the world and began hurling firebrands right and left. Germany, under Hitler, is no longer a civilized country. The men and women of the past, who contributed most to progress, humanity and truth, would be tortured, persecuted or murdered if they were in Germany today.

Let us bring back to life a few of the glorious dead and see what would happen to them if they were put into Hitler's slaughter-house.

Confucius, China's great sage, would be beheaded by Hitler, because this moral genius of more than 2500 years ago taught a rationalistic code of human behavior, with not a hint of religion and superstition.

Mencius, China's great democrat, taught in the fourth century B. C. that economic and political power should rest with the people—and that, in Germany today, would earn him a stretch in a concentration camp.

Plato, trying to enter Germany with a copy of his "Republic," would see his great work confiscated and his book and himself burned at the stake.

Aristotle, Greece's world-scholar, would be hooted out of Hitler's university lecture-rooms because, as a scientist, he would demand the right to learn about Albert Einstein's discoveries.

Ptolemy, of Alexandria, invited the world's greatest scientists, thinkers and writers to come under his patronage, and that would make him *persona non grata* in today's Germany. His "mistake" was in failing to hound and exile those masters of culture who came under his influence.

Julius Caesar could not set foot in Germany because he gave privileges to the Jews, instead of persecuting them.

Peter Abelard, who in the Dark

Age led a one-man intellectual revolt against the enemies of reason, would not be wanted in the realm of Naziland.

Dante, who opposed tyranny, could make no peace with Hitler's dictatorship.

Gutenberg, who gave the western world its printed books, would feel strange in his native land, if he were to see the heresy-hunters burning the works of history's choicest spirits.

Galileo, who was gagged by the inquisition, would fancy himself at home in the prisons of Hitler, the new Torquemada.

Erasmus, who wrote a book about Folly and another book on how to avoid war—Erasmus, one of the makers of the Reformation, would be put in chains for his pacifism, if Hitler could get his hands on him.

John Hus, Bohemia's martyr, would have to make a second journey to the flames, tied to a stake shaped like a Swastika, should he venture too far north.

Giordano Bruno, who died for freedom of thought, would have to consent to Hitler's chains on thought or go to another fiery death.

Cervantes, who laughed away the absurdities of Chivalry, would have to write Nazi propaganda or go back to Spain.

Rabelais, the philosopher who spent his whole life laughing and making others laugh, would weep without end in Hitler's madhouse.

Montaigne, who made sanity the cornerstone of his genius, would have to chuck over his sanity if he hoped to write essays for Hitler's propaganda department.

Shakespeare, to live in Germany, would first have to convince Hitler that Caliban was not intended as a picture of the Chancellor's character.

The blind Milton, who defended the freedom of the press, would have to accept a gagged press in Germany or take the serious consequences.

Spinoza, who is accepted as one of the greatest philosophers, who

helped liberate the mind of man, who taught that the state should always allow the utmost liberty of discussion—Spinoza was a Jew, so he must stay out of Germany.

Frederick the Great, who turned Germany into a modern country, who was so liberal in his thinking that he was, for some years, Voltaire's friend, could never endure the stifling atmosphere of Berlin under Hitler, so he would have to go to Paris, where he would be at liberty to mingle with Freethinkers and write bad French verses. However, his treatment of Poland would give the Nazis pause.

Montesquieu, who promulgated the philosophy of the Rights of Man, would have to change his political philosophy to the Rights of Dictatorship and Usurpation or be exiled to his native France.

Voltaire, who fought tirelessly against intolerance, would have to embrace Hitleristic intolerance or stand trial under the charge of high treason.

Lord Bacon, Newton, Locke, Descartes, Moliere, Rousseau and Diderot—all would find themselves unwelcome in Germany. As would Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, Gibbon, Kant, Adam Smith, Thomas Paine, Mirabeau, Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln.

Beethoven would be imprisoned because he was a rebel against orthodoxy, while Brahms would be beheaded because of his Atheism.

Goethe would be welcomed back to Germany, until he opened his mouth, when he would be shot, as would Schiller, the poet of rebellion against economic, political and intellectual slavery.

Byron, Shelley, Bolivar, Robert Owen, Pestalozzi, Watt, Nietzsche, Pasteur, Haeckel, Burbank, Anatole France, Carlyle, Mazzini, Pushkin, Victor Hugo, Darwin, Ibsen, Renan and Herbert Spencer would be watched and spied on in Germany, with eventual imprisonment a certainty.

And so goes the roll of honor! And herein is found the key to Hitler's perfidy. The splendid spirits of culture and humanity could not find asylum in Germany today

—only the enemies of freedom and thought and peace would be welcomed by these sinister torturers.

Yes, Hitlerized Germany is a menace to civilization!

* * *

Explain Hitler's Totalitarian State?

This is a fancy way of saying that the state was not made to serve man. In its place, Hitler's totalitarianism says man was made for the state. The individual is to have no rights, except the "right" to serve the state in complete and abject submission to what the state (Hitler) says is right and just. The individual is forced to surrender all rights to freedom of conscience. Instead, he is to accept the state's conscience. He must think, act, do, believe, hope, fight, produce and sacrifice as the state demands. To say that the Germans want such a state is to libel them. They are being forced to accept it. To rebel against the totalitarian state now would mean the block. But there are millions of Germans who are waiting for the first opportunity that presents a way out. It may come through war. And when it comes, Hitler and his totalitarian state will be torn to shreds.

* * *

Is it true that Hitler advocated Socialism before election?

Hitler never advocated Socialism. He used the words "National Socialism" to differentiate his program from "International Socialism" or "Marxism." By this corruption of the name of Socialism Hitler was able to attract a number of dupes from the working class. He included in his program of racial hatred and insane militarism a line of socialistic policies that were intended to serve as bait in deceiving the toilers, but he has never shown the slightest interest in bringing them into existence. In fact, the great department stores, industries and estates are still there, and capitalism is stronger in Germany than it ever was before the advent of Hitlerism. Hitler's greatest support comes from the capitalists in German industry and finance, so we must describe "National Socialism" as nothing more than capitalistic

fascism. Hitler hates Socialism and persecutes the Socialists. He will never move a finger to socialize the industries now privately owned, because they are the interests he is serving, and the interests from whom he must draw his greatest measure of financial support. He has enslaved the workers, so that they are now being exploited worse than at any other time in the entire history of Germany. He has destroyed their unions and established the employer as the "leader" and the workers as his "subjects." The next step is to introduce military discipline into the industries, and that is now being worked out, so that in the end the workers will be nothing more than privates in a great, militarized industrial state of fascism, without civil or social rights, without a voice in the affairs of the nation, and without the protection of unions. They are to be dumb beasts of burden. Will that status last? I doubt it.

* * *

A year of Hitler's rule proves that, despite numerous objectionable policies, the simple fact remains that he has given Germany unity, order, solidarity.

Not so fast, my friend. If Germany is unified, why is it necessary for Hitler and his murderers to suppress the freedom of theaters, movies, radio and the press? Why must he establish the worst censorship in all Europe? Why must he hound, and beat, and murder Jews, Communists, Socialists, Free-thinkers and Pacifists? Why must he establish concentration camps, if there is unity? Yes, there is a certain kind of unity—the unity of Sing Sing. But who is going to praise a penitentiary because there is unity? The proper name is slavery, subjugation, repression. Let Mr. Hitler remove the threat of the hangman and the headsman and then see how unified the Germans are! He wouldn't dare, because he knows his unity is a fraud. The order he has established in Germany is the order of a tyrant terrorizing those within his reach. There was real order during the days of the Republic, and in those days editors, writers, speakers,

teachers, scientists, historians and other leaders of thought had the right to express themselves freely. The solidarity that Hitler has given Germany is not genuine co-operation—it is the solidarity imposed by autocracy. It is the solidarity of a crazy militarist who is determined to militarize his slaves and have them goose-step their way into a new war. Hitleristic solidarity will yet prove the undoing of his regime. The day will come when this leader—or rather, misleader—will be ready for the war he has in mind, and when he turns guns over to his subjects there will be millions of men who will grab that opportunity to turn on Hitler and his murderers and give them a demonstration of true solidarity.

* * *

Did the Communist Party of Germany, with its large bloc in the Reichstag, do anything to prevent the triumph of Hitler's Nazi-fascism?

A great deal of the blame for the collapse of the German republic is to be traced to the policies of the German Communist Party. Being enemies of parliamentarism and democracy, the German Communists often voted with the Nazis. This was done deliberately. Their policy was to unite with the Nazis in order to make it impossible for Dr. Breuning to get the Reichstag to running. The Nazis welcomed Communist support, because they too wanted to keep the Reichstag out of whack, so that it would be easier in the end to stab democracy and end the Republic. The Communists worked under the theory that they would sooner attain their goal by cooperating with the anti-parliamentarian Nazis than with the republicanism of the Social Democrats, the Socialists who believed in democracy in industry and government. Every possible thing was done by the Communists to help the Nazis embarrass the Republic, even to the extent of conducting a Communist-Nazi street car strike in Berlin, with a view to discrediting the Socialists in the local government. After months of these tactics, during which the Reichstag could not get organized,

it became an easy matter for the Nazis to grab control and crush the Socialists. Now, of course, the Communists blame the German Socialists for "permitting" the Republic to fall and "allowing" the triumph of Hitler's fascism, but the facts indicate that the blame falls, in the main, on the Communists. The Socialists (Social Democrats) made heroic efforts to save the Republic, but what could they do in the face of the Communist-Nazi conspiracy and the plots of the monarchists? Had the Communists shown real respect for political democracy, they would not be hunted by Hitler like so many beasts. They are getting their medicine, richly earned, by their amazing stupidity and malicious hatred of the more moderate Socialists.

* * *

Is the boycott against Germany getting anywhere?

The German Statistical Office, on March 15, 1934, issued a report which stated that the close of February showed a deficit in the foreign trade balance, amounting to 34,600,000 marks. It is interesting to note that this was the first February deficit in five years. However, it is claimed that this deficit resulted not from the boycott but from the fact that German exports were worth less and the German imports were worth more in actual money, while the actual quantity of goods moved out of Germany was greater than it was the year before the boycott started.

* * *

The Rev. Dr. Ewart Edmund Turner, pastor of the American Church in Berlin, recently praised Hitler for his sincerity. Please comment.

Let us grant Hitler's sincerity. What does that prove? A man's sincerity should not be considered a suitable justification for his anti-social behavior. After all, a gangster who holds you up some dark night is perfectly sincere when he hits you on the head with a blackjack, but who would ever consider such sincerity as a valid excuse?

* * *

Do you recommend Lion Feuchtwanger's novel, The Oppermanns?

Heartily. It is a good book. I read it in a few sittings and it played

havoc with my blood-pressure. Here is a beautiful, exciting, intelligent, emotional, graphic, ironic and truthful report of what happened in Naziland in 1932-33. One feels its truth, and it condemns Hitler and his barbarians to eternal damnation in the eyes of decent, humane people. Here is perfect balance between art and propaganda. The book was written by an artist who wanted to plead a cause—the cause of civilization. The author is a superb craftsman, but because he is a Jew he cannot return to his native land, Germany. Hitler has exiled the brains and culture of Germany. The loss is Germany's. The gain is the world's. When will the better side of Germany assert itself?

* * *

I see in Nazi literature that Jews had to be curbed in Germany because they are natural-born criminals. Please comment.

The Jews in Germany are 1 percent of the population. One fifth of 1 percent of Germany's criminal population are Jews, so on the face of it the charge falls down. In other words, German Jews are more law-abiding, on the average, than the bulk of Germany's "Aryan" population.

* * *

What is Hitler's claim to racial superiority based on?

An inferiority complex.

* * *

Why is Hitler, himself a bachelor, so anxious to have German women breed more and more babies?

Hitler has appropriated \$60,000,000, which will be used as dowries for 200,000 young women. They will be expected to breed as quickly as nature will permit. Hitler's reason is very simple: he wants more soldiers for the great wars he has in store for the world. It is his declared purpose to begin, at what he considers the proper time, a drive into western Russia, which he intends to add to Germany. Naturally the Russians are not going to stand by and let him grab what he wants. So there will be a man-sized war. Meanwhile, Hitler wants to discount his expected losses in man-power that will inevitably result from his campaign, and he

figures the best way to do this is to get about 200,000 women busy now. It's that callous.

* * *

Is there danger of any other form of dictatorship should Hitler fail?

Hitler's dictatorship is of a civil nature. Should he fail, there is danger of a military dictatorship, headed by Goering, Prussian Prime Minister. Goering could give Hitler lessons in brutality, ruthlessness, persecution and slavery. On the other hand, should Hitler fail there is a possibility of a swing to the left, with German labor reaching for control. Germany's working class is beginning to show restiveness. The workers are not cheering for Hitler with the old enthusiasm. There is quiet, growing opposition to Hitlerism, and there is no telling what form the bust-up may take.

* * *

Is the condition of German labor better than before the days of Hitler's rule?

Germany's working class is in a deplorable condition, by far worse than anything experienced during the past 50 years. Robert Dell, in *The Nation*, June 13, 1934, reports that the average wage in October, 1933, was lower than 1913 by 35 percent, and lower than 1900 by 31 percent. Since last October conditions have grown steadily worse. Hitler has enslaved the workers, forcing cut after cut in their wages. Fascism is labor's worst enemy. It is the modern world's most ruthless form of mass exploitation.

* * *

Do you believe that progress is a delusion?

I believe that progress is a measurable quality. The best way to get a picture of progress is to imagine a country that has lost all sanity, decency, tolerance and humanity—Germany, for example. Compare Germany of a decade ago with the Germany of Hitlerism, and you begin to see what happens when a country loses its grip on itself and surrenders to the forces of fascism and reaction. The thing that is lacking in Germany today—and has been lacking since Hitler took power early in 1933—is a feeling for progress. There is a fear of the

free exchange of ideas and opinions, a cowardly persecution of helpless minorities, a denial of fair play to persons of superior intellect and ability, a craving for military advantage, a craven desire to steal what others have created. Progress has been stifled in Germany. And one gets the effect of a real person having been lynched. Only the cynical question the reality of progress, and their cynicism is out of place in a social order that respects personality, encourages independence of thought, helps labor get the social value of its toil, strives to end once and for all the social order that is based on class exploitation and wage slavery. No, progress is not a delusion. Progress suffers from the attacks of those who fear freedom. Fascism, the Catholic Church, absolutism—all conspire to keep man from achieving progress, but that does not alter the fact that their victories here and there only serve to bring out in bold relief the living realities of progress.

Hitler must believe in some form of Democracy or he wouldn't hold elections so often. Please comment.

A German election, under Hitler, is a farce. No opposition is permitted. Hitler's side is presented, and no other side is tolerated. All opposition political parties have been outlawed. Elections held under such conditions are empty gestures.

Please comment on Germany's decision to throw out all clock-punching in factories.

I saw the report, and it gave me a good laugh. No more time clocks. They reflect on labor's dignity! They are American expressions of materialism! They degrade the workman! Instead, a bugler will call the toilers to their tasks. With living costs rising and wages dipping lower, with unions outlawed and strikes forbidden, I fail to see how the German workers are going to accept a bugle-call as something "dignified" and "liberating." I don't recall ever having heard a soldier sing songs of praise for the bugler that wakes him at six o'clock in the morning. I vaguely recall a song during the World War in

which the composer, Mr. Irving Berlin, told how he hated the bugler because he kept repeating "you have to get up, you have to get up, you have to get up, you have to get up in the morning." In Germany today he would have to sing "Oh, how I love to get up in the morning!"

* * *

How long do you think Hitler will last?

Hitler himself says Hitlerism will rule for a thousand years. That's too long to wait for the awakening of the decent element in Germany. On the other hand, Walter M. Citrine, president of the International Federation of Trade Unions, said, in a speech in New York City, on October 25, 1934, that "Hitler is on his last legs and will be gone by spring." I hope he's right, but I have no opinion in the matter. I hate to go in for long-range forecasts, because so many of them don't come off. Citrine claims it is the international boycott of organized labor on Germany's trade that will cause the mad Adolf to come to his early finish, unless some of his followers at home grow impatient and bump him off sooner. Citrine maintains that the boycott is having drastic effects on Germany's economic life, causing a great decrease in foreign trade, which, together with the almost total disappearance of gold, has made it next to impossible for German industry to get needed raw materials. The much-touted substitutes aren't working out, because many of them are even more costly than the real things. This inability to buy raw materials from foreign countries is compelling many industries to shut down or go on reduced production schedules, which means a marked aggravation of the grave unemployment problem. Citrine, who knows whereof he speaks, reports that only one German in 100 is getting more than \$13.50 per week.

* * *

German propagandists allege that they are entitled to union with Austria because both nations are German-speaking. Please comment.

This argument, seemingly so

plausible, is without validity. Let us imagine the United States announcing that because Canadians speak our language (or something approximating our language) we are therefore entitled to the country. What would the world think of such an argument? By the same token, Canada could absorb us! Or England could grab all of us into the Empire. Or France steal Belgium. Or Spain take Mexico and South America, along with Central America. If such an argument were accepted as sound, the door would be opened for an endless series of wars.

What do the Germans mean by "anschluss"?

It means union. "Anschluss" describes Germany's policy to bring about union with Austria.

What is the meaning of "putsch"?

This German word came into the news dispatches when Hitler, more than a decade ago, pulled off his famous beer-hall pocket revolution in Munich. It was, and is, used in the sense of a fiasco. When a fellow plans a revolution and ends up with a flop, the word "putsch" describes the failure. Some correspondents and editorial writers have been using this word, of late, to describe a bona fide revolution, which is an entirely inaccurate use of the word. If Hitler had put over his revolution in Munich when he planned it the first time, he would not have pulled a political boner (putsch); it was his pop-gun uprising that called for the word "putsch."

What would have happened if the German people had voted "No" in the recent "election"?

Most likely Reichsfuehrer Hitler would have stamped his foot, thrown his pansy on the floor, gone through a fit of hysterical weeping and cried: "There, that's gratitude, after I let my *volk* vote! Just for that there'll be no more elections!"

Why does Hitler call elections when he is a dictator?

This is done mainly to appease democratic opinion abroad, but it

is pure hypocrisy. Let us, for the sake of argument, grant the honesty and secrecy of his ballot (which, of course, I do not do in reality), and what do we find? Of what value is it? None, because a citizen cannot vote according to democratic principles unless the election was preceded by discussion (forbidden), free assembly (denied), and free press (suppressed).

What does Hitler mean when he says Germany now has an "enobled democracy"?

This is bunk, intended for foreign consumption. At home it is laughed at openly, even in the press. Hitler allows a referendum when the results are certain, only as a ceremonial gesture. Hitler would never allow an election to go against him, which, of course, could never happen so long as he does the counting. Hitler can't be voted out of power. He can be ousted in only two ways: 1. The collapse of his unsound economy, resulting in the country's bankruptcy, which is fast approaching; 2. A violent uprising.

With all your criticism of Hitler and his German fascist program, you'll have to admit he has brought about wonderful changes for the better in the economic condition of the masses.

A United Press dispatch from Berlin, dated January 10, 1934, reports that unemployment in Germany on January 1 was 4,050,000. This registered an increase of 350,000 in a month. Germany's economic situation has not improved since the advent of Hitlerism. It has gone deeper into the depression, whereas other nations, like the United States and England, have made progress in the direction of improvement, though there's a long way to go before conditions are good. Hitler's lieutenants juggle figures and statistics, but the fact remains that unemployment is still a tragic problem in Germany. The facts are much worse than the figures just quoted, for it is known that Hitler's government does not count jobless Jews among the unemployed. There are hundreds of thousands of Jews and part-Jews

who have been driven from their jobs and professions, and yet they are not counted among the unemployed because Hitler doesn't consider them to be Germans, though Jews have been living there a thousand years, as history shows. Not only has he deprived the Jews of their right to a job, but he has robbed them of their money and property. As a consequence, several billions of Jewish dollars have been stolen by these Hitler hoodlums. Naturally, such wealth can buy a lot of uniforms and banners and bottles of beer for his followers, but when that money is gone, which will be soon, Germany will be worse off than ever before. In addition, the decent sentiment of the entire world is now unfriendly to Germany, refusing to buy German goods or services. Such an attitude will, in the end, mean the collapse of the Hitlerite regime. Germany cannot move forward while it is being ruled by a bloodthirsty, medieval-minded, homosexual, dope intoxicated, bigoted savage.

Can you point to one economic fact that will prove democratic America superior to Nazi Germany, in proportion to population?

That's easy. The U. S., with a population of 125,000,000, has motor cars numbering 24,000,000. Germany, with half our population, should have 12,000,000 cars, but actually has only 500,000.

Germany, according to official 1934 figures, has only 3,374,900 unemployed. This would mean that something like 2,000,000 unemployed Germans had been put back to work.

The figures do not take into consideration the jobs taken away from Jews, Pacifists, Socialists, Communists, Freethinkers and women. This 'invisible' unemployment is so vast that it is now estimated that Germany's army of unemployed numbers almost 7,000,000. Germany can take its "enemies" off the unemployment relief rolls, and thereby show an "improvement," but this does not mean the displaced unemployed, who are now denied relief, have been given jobs. Before the advent of Hitler-

ism an unemployed woman was counted as out of work, but as she is no longer considered a human person her being out of a job means nothing to the official figure factories. The fact remains that fascism in Germany, as in Italy, has played havoc with the country's economic life.

Germany's Institute for Business Research reports that during 1933 that country recovered 40 percent of the industrial production loss suffered since 1929.

But the same report states that Germany's production for January, 1934, was only 77.8, while the index for the rest of the industrial world showed 85.7. Thus do we see that by Hitler's own figures Germany's capitalism is not enjoying the world's rate of industrial recovery.

Has Hitler revised his policy with regard to large landed estates?

For years before his theft of power Hitler carried in his platform a plank that promised to split up the large landed estates and parcel pieces of land among the peasants. Since crushing the republic he has done nothing about this promise, except to announce that what he really meant was the elimination of absentee landlordship and Jewish ownership. The rich landlords need merely return to their estates in order to remain owners, while the Jews in Germany have always owned very little land, so the situation is practically as it was before the Nazis put Germany in chains. The peasants are still landless.

Is Germany under Hitler publishing more or fewer books compared with pre-Nazi days?

Prior to the World War, Germany published over 35,000 books per year. In 1933, Germany published 21,600, according to the U. S. Vice Consul at Berlin, C. T. Zawadzki, in his report to the U. S. Dept. of Commerce. This is absolutely final evidence that culture is waning under the disease of Hitlerism. The decline is even more drastic than the figures indicate, because 15 percent of the 21,600 in

1933 consisted of propaganda trash. In addition, religious books ranked second, which is out of line with the publishing experience of countries that respect free press and free thought.

* * *

How much money did Hitler confiscate when he stole the treasures of the German labor unions and then suppressed the organizations?

The Hitler regime of organized banditry stole 700,000,000 marks (about \$300,000,000) from the German trade unions. This was in actual money. In addition, Hitler's hoodlums stole vast fortunes tied up in buildings, club-houses, assembly halls, cooperatives, supplies, merchandise and money belonging to labor cooperatives, furniture, fixtures, general equipment, printing machinery, hundreds of newspapers and magazines (most of which were forced into suspension), gymnasiums, sport palaces, training grounds, etc. Such tremendous properties were valued up in the hundreds of millions.

* * *

Is the payment of interest legal since Hitler became dictator?

Here we have another right-about face on Hitler's part. His platform for years promised an end to the "slavery of interest." What has happened? The people are curtly told that interest is all right if it is not usurious. Time shows that Hitler made scores of promises with no other end in sight except the assumption of power. The promises are now discarded. However, those promises that were based on racial hate are being kept, as shown by the brutal manner in which the Jews have been, and are being, persecuted. Communists have been beheaded, Jews have been robbed and tortured, Pacifists have been imprisoned, intellectuals have been driven from their professions—these things Hitler has done. But what has he done to remedy Germany's economic plight? Exactly nothing. Every report on economics, finance, industry and trade indicates failure, disruption and approaching collapse.

* * *

The Nazis claim a reduction in un-

employment from 5,598,000, in April, 1933, to 2,799,000 on April 1, 1934. Please comment.

The fraud in these figures may be seen easily. The best check is to get the official employment figures of the international labor office. The figures show that early in 1934 there were registered, in Germany, only 13,518,000 as among the employed. During 1933 the average monthly figure for the employed was around 13,550,000. From this it is plain that Germany's list of employed persons has declined. It would be impossible to both reduce unemployment and employment at one and the same time. The fact is merely this: Germany has thrown tens of thousands of women, Jews, Communists, Pacifists, Social Democrats and others out of jobs, given their places to brown shirts and then refused to list them among the unemployed. The decrease in employment proves this contention, and also indicates that Germany is in a most calamitous condition. Hitler's regime is tottering.

* * *

What is the size of Germany's foreign debts?

According to the German State Statistical Department, Germany's foreign debts amount to about \$25,000,000,000. A great deal of this paper is already due or about to fall due. As Germany is so broke that she hardly has "till money," it is plain that Hitlerism will soon prove beyond question that Fascism is an expensive "luxury." It spells ruin economically and politically; it means loss of foreign friendships; it means cultural decay; it is the open door to destruction. Hitler is maintaining himself through terror, not through results. The future will see even greater wage slashes, in order to keep Germany's industries alive, but this policy will also fail because of Germany's inability to cope with the international boycott and the refusal of Russia to renew her contracts for supplies and heavy machinery. The international financiers know that Germany will not be able to pay on her foreign debts, so it is out of the question for Hitler to look to them for more money. The mad homosexual will continue to give the

Germans magnificent parades and pageants, but people can't live on circuses alone. They need bread, clothes, and homes—things Hitlerism does not know how to provide.

* * *

How does Germany's drop in foreign trade compare to the rest of the world?

There has been a general drop of 35 percent in foreign trade from 1929 to 1934, but there are growing indications of improvement, except in Germany, where conditions are getting worse instead of better. In 1929, Germany had a foreign trade of 13,000,000,000 reichmarks; in 1934 it was estimated at less than 4,000,000,000. This decline is calamitous and means the early bankruptcy of Germany's finance, industry and trade. Hitlerism has brought despair, slavery and commercial ruin to a great industrial nation. Conditions in Germany will grow worse, even while the rest of the world works itself out of the depths.

* * *

Can Germany fill her larder without outside help?

She cannot. Germany is at best able to produce only 70 percent of her food supply. Her industries have always depended on the outside for raw materials, except for a time during the World War when substitutes were resorted to. Today she must get well over 50 percent of her raw materials by the way of imports. The idea of discovering substitutes is far fetched. Just how can Germany get along without copper, nickel, zinc, lead and other essentials? Substitutes, if possible, would cost more than the originals. These two problems are haunting Germany's economists—how to get food and raw materials when the world is unfriendly and will part with its commodities only on a cash basis. Germany has no money, and her credit is just about at zero, so it won't be long now before the big bust-up comes.

* * *

Will vistra free Germany from the necessity of importing raw materials for its textile industries?

Each year Germany has been spending about 1,000,000,000 marks for wool and cotton, most of which

came from the U. S. Now, without gold or credit, Germany is trying to eliminate these raw materials and use in their place a textile fiber made from wood, called by the trade name of vistra. Most of the laboratory work has been done in the gigantic I. G. Farben dye plants. The government is subsidizing this work to the extent of more than 100,000,000 marks.

During the war, Germany experimented with paper clothes, to the horror of the wearers. Every rain turned part of the population into prospects for nudist colonies. Now comes vistra, and the knowing Germans (who have some money) are rushing the stores that still offer suits made from woolen goods. Such stocks are running low, and something must be done quickly or hundreds of thousands of employes in the textile mills will be laid off, to follow other hundreds of thousands who have already been turned into the streets because of the government's inability to command enough credit to make purchases of raw materials. Hitler has begun a great ersatz ballyhoo (domestic substitutes), but facts are stubborn things.

Vistra, like rayon, is a victory for modern chemistry, but it is no substitute for wool or cotton. It is better than paper, of course, but it can't supplant woolen clothes, at least during the present stages of chemistry. Vistra is ground wood, as is rayon and cheap paper. It is offered as a wool substitute, because its thread is curly instead of having the straight slickness of rayon. Like paper and rayon, vistra can't stand water. Wetness causes quick disintegration. Also, it burns easily. Finally, it can't hold its shape, as does wool or cotton. All of which means that vistra is no real threat to wool or cotton.

For the present, the industry is abandoning the idea of pure vistra and is working on the problem of mixing it with wool or cotton. A little vistra mixed into clothing may not be noticed much, but as it is increased the substitutes will assert themselves to the unhappiness of the wearers. If vistra is used in only a small percentage, then Germany's problem of financing im-

portations of wool and cotton certainly is not solved. Even now, when Germany is in such desperate straits, it is admitted that vistra, with all its obvious disadvantages, is considerably more expensive than cotton and only a little less costly than wool.

As for production, the latest figures show an annual production of only 1,000 tons. The total production of vistra, shoddy and rayon amounts to only 12,000 tons yearly. Of course, this can be increased ten-fold, perhaps before half of Germany's population goes naked, but what will be the gain? In the past Germany imported almost 1,000,000 tons yearly of raw materials for her textile industries. That would mean something like 900,000 tons to be accounted for.

And even if Germans themselves stand for this substitute (as they seem to stand for anything else that Hitler orders) what will happen to Germany's foreign trade? Will foreigners pay Germany high prices for substitutes when England and the United States can sell them clothes made of real cotton and wool at lower prices? Germany must either buy and pay for about 900,000 tons of wool and cotton each year or close most of her textile mills. What will that mean to German business and employment? And what assurance is there that the hundreds of millions of marks needed to get the vistra industry going will eventually even pay interest on the investment?

* * *

Is Hitler's "substitute" campaign economically feasible?

No. It is the worst kind of waste. For example, Hitler's propagandists are urging the women to save even the thread ends. It is estimated that 15,000,000 housefraus could save at least a sixth of an ounce per home per year, which would mean five tons each year. That would mean a "saving" of perhaps \$5,000, which is my notion of moving a mountain to catch a mouse. Let us suppose the women were to save 20 tons of string in the same time. Figured at 20 cents per pound, the whole campaign would result in a "saving" of \$8,000. Such figures lead one to won-

der if the leaders of Germany's fascist government are nuts or jokesters. Whale oil is being used to make margarine, but is that a good trade for one's liberty? Bread is being mixed with potatoes and bran. That's a strange combination after one was given to understand that the regime of Hitler was to bring security and the Garden of Eden. How long will 66,000,000 people consent to being treated like kindergartners?

* * *

Has Germany solved the problem of oil substitutes?

Ersatz, or home-made substitutes for imported commodities, has centered on a substitute for oil, which was begun years before Hitler took power. There is no denying that synthetic oil can be made from coal, through a chemical process of hydration, and there is no denying the further fact that the substitute will work, but that doesn't alter the point frequently urged that the substitute costs more than the original. So what? Germany can, if she wishes, escape importing 150,000,000 marks worth of oil yearly, but that won't help the economic situation at home because the substitute will cost even more. In addition, the work on an oil substitute is being subsidized by the government to the extent of 250,000,000 marks.

* * *

What do you think was the reason for the Reichswehr's sudden switch to Hitler, even to the extent of taking his extreme oath of allegiance?

With the death of Hindenburg a large section of foreign opinion expected something of a struggle between Hitler and the regular army (Reichswehr), especially after Hitler had practically suppressed his own Brown Shirts. Instead, the army came over quickly. This was something of a surprise to many, but a glance at history should show even the most casual student that such things are not unusual. Armies have a way of doing that. Look at the French army from 1799 to 1852. In that time the French army gave oaths of allegiance to the following: 1. a consul; 2. two emperors; 3. three kings; 4. a republic. In addition the flag

underwent three changes. Hitler has now pushed himself to the very top. He can go no higher. But that doesn't mean his position is secure. Time will tell. He has no place to go now but down—and down he will go as a result of the pressure of economics, disillusionment, hatred, bankruptcy, loss of friendly foreign opinion, denial of financial credits, revolutionary propaganda, illegal Socialist and Communist underground work to undermine the dictatorship, and the general impossibility of Fascism functioning in a modern state. The end is in sight. But no one can name the day.

Does Hitler's Germany recognize the writ of habeas corpus?

This great result of Anglo-Saxon progressivism—habeas corpus—is no longer recognized in the courts of Hitlerland. It is Hitler's notion that the body of any individual belongs to the state—his state—and therefore it is to be the sole judge of whether it is to be delivered in a court of justice in response to a formal writ. Every civilized country recognizes the right of habeas corpus, but in Fascist lands, particularly Germany, no such "nonsense" is tolerated, for it is supposed to belong to the "decadent" era of liberalism! So, instead of bothering about such "inconveniences" Hitler's murderers arrest at will, with or without warrant, sentence men to prisons or concentration camps without so much as a trial, without so much as letting the victims know what charges have been made against them. Men are kept in prison months on end, without even the promise of a trial. Under such a regime how can one expect a precious right like habeas corpus to be respected?

What is the situation with regard to university enrollments in Nazi Germany?

Before Hitler stole power, in 1933, the German universities received 40,000 students each year. In the fall of 1934, according to official figures, only 4,000 students entered such institutions, which is proof of the charge that German Fascism is the enemy of education, culture

and civilization. Of the 4,000 students admitted this year only 15 percent were girls. Hitler makes no bones about hating education. He considers intellectual pursuits unworthy of real Germans, who rather should be taught to murder their fellow men on the fields of battle. Intellectualism is supposed to be a degenerate result of liberalism! So argues the mad Adolf! If he remains in power much longer he will succeed in destroying the last remnant of scholarship in Germany. What a sad decline when one considers that for more than a century German universities were the pride of the academic world. Incidentally, in passing, let me mention the feeling of pleasure I had when I read the splendid news of how the heads of Harvard University refused to accept a gift from one of Hitler's henchmen, the reason being that Harvard could not accept the dirty money of a group of mercenaries who had done their utmost to kill and destroy the best individuals and departments in the great calling of education and free inquiry. It was a splendid gesture, but its effects will be to the good in countries other than Germany, for those degenerates in control of that poor, unfortunate land are insulated against the appeals of decency and humanity.

Do you approve Hitler's Plan to sterilize the unfit so they cannot reproduce their kind?

Sterilization is acceptable if its purpose is scientific, for it is the best means of ridding the world of idiots, congenital insanity, perversion, etc. But it must be recognized that this same weapon, put into the hands of a degenerate like Hitler, can be used for only one fundamental purpose, and that is as a class weapon against political and social enemies of fascism. If Hitler were really sincere, he would apply this program of sterilization to homosexuals and dope addicts, but that would mean he would have to sterilize himself and worthies like Goering and Goebbels. It is common knowledge that Hitler is himself a pervert and is surrounded by all sorts of degenerates and fairies. If he would apply steriliza-

tion to that outfit, I would give the plan my heartiest approval.

* * *

Is it true that Hitler, Goering and the other Nazi leaders are degenerates?

I have made the charge frequently, without denial or action from any of the accused. The evidence is common knowledge in Berlin and other European capitals. It is a serious matter to call a man like Hitler a sadist and homosexual, and Goering a dope addict, so it is safe to expect that such charges made baselessly would result in criminal or civil action. Why don't they act? Because they know the world has the goods on them. Organs of intelligent journalism like *The Nation* have frequently referred to the degeneracy of the German Nazi leaders, without getting a rise out of the persons thus characterized. The Feb. 8, 1934, New York *Herald-Tribune*, page 19, prints a report covering a speech by Lord Marley, a deputy speaker of the British House of Lords and now on a lecture tour in this country in his capacity as chairman of the International Committee for the Relief of Victims of German Fascism. This high authority used the following words:

"When it is realized that the leaders of the Nazi government are, many of them, drug addicts, certified lunatics, or persons who have been involved in extremely unfavorable scandals before the courts (and all these facts are admitted and have never been denied), some explanation of the sadistic developments in Germany may be given."

* * *

Congratulations on your steady stream of anti-Nazi comments. Your frequently asserted charge of perversion against Nazi leaders is now officially substantiated in the reports that have come through the censors in Berlin since Hitler and Goering murdered scores of Storm Troop leaders.

Roehm, the murdered head of the Storm Troops, was an admitted homosexual. His great organization was saturated with the most disgraceful forms of sexual vice. How-

ever, truth compels me to add that he and his followers were murdered by two men—Hitler and Goering—who are just as degenerate as Roehm ever was. Goering was exposed by Roehm as an inmate of a lunatic asylum, a dope-fiend and an all-round degenerate. Hitler was Roehm's mate in sexual perversion. These two rotten degenerates were old-time friends and were known to be sexual partners for more than 12 years. In order to silence the charge of rotten immorality, Hitler and Goering sacrificed their comrades in vice. What a picture! And what an unfortunate situation for Germany, to be ruled by such leaders of corruption.

* * *

Are you not somewhat unkind in twitting poor Hitler on account of his homosexuality, for which he is no more to blame than a man born blind for his misfortune?

I do not agree with you. I admit that a homosexual is the victim of his biological nature, but this does not mean that a people should let such a person achieve complete power over their industrial, social and economic destinies. We must get the picture in our minds. It isn't that Hitler alone is a homosexual. Goering, Prussia's prime minister, and a tremendously powerful figure in Germany, was an inmate of an insane asylum, where he was treated for morphinism. Roehm, the late head of the Storm Troops, was a confessed homosexual. These three tremendously powerful figures surrounded themselves with their own kind—degenerates, perverts, dope-fiends, lunatics, sadists, masochists and paranoics. Their sexual degeneracy is a symptom of Germany's tragedy. It is a key to Germany's attitude. It explains the amazing cruelty of these perverts, why they persecute the Jews, Pacifists, Communists and other non-conformers. It explains the return of the headman's ax. These beasts get a sexual thrill from sadistic orgies. Blood feeds their lust. To say they are victims of their biological nature is no real excuse for keeping them in power. They belong in hospitals, instead of government quarters. They

should be treated, instead of being made rulers. I call attention to their homosexuality, not because I want to ridicule them but rather because I want to explain them. Homosexuality does not always result in sadistic outbursts. History gives us many illustrious names of homosexuals—Shakespeare, Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci and many others. But they expressed themselves humanely and through artistic channels. That kind of homosexuality did not harm the world, but if they had been victims of a sadistic form of homosexuality, and had been given great economic and social power, they would, most likely, have done as the Hitlers of a later age.

* * *

Are nudists immoral?

There is nothing immoral about nudism, especially in an environment of nature. The first thing Hitler did when he became dictator was to suppress the nudist colonies. This was done because nudists are usually radical in economies and heterodox in thought. Imagine the absurdity of a homosexual like Hitler suppressing nudist colonies on the score of morality.

* * *

Your comments on the homosexuality of Hitler have interested me considerably. The last time I was in Germany, in the summer of 1931, I was amazed at the apparent wide social acceptance of the homosexual idea. Magazines on the subject, such as "Die Insel," and the weekly news sheets such as "Das Freundschaftsblatt," "Blatter fur Menschenrecht," were circulating openly on the news-stands. So-called "freundschaftsballs" were being held frequently, and homosexual cabarets, restaurants, pensions, etc. were openly advertised and patronized. But I understand now that since Hitler has come into power all this has been suppressed. If Hitler himself is homosexual, why do you suppose he has put a quietus to all the free manifestations of the homosexual idea that existed prior to his dictatorship? Please comment.

It is true that Hitler suppressed periodicals published for German homosexuals, and that their so-

cieties and groups have been disbanded. This is Hitler's bow to foreign opinion. He feels keenly the criticism of himself and followers on the score of homosexuality. He practises the vice, but like most other homosexuals he resents any talk about it. He therefore destroyed the public manifestations of homosexuality. He killed Roehm in cold blood—Germany's most notorious homosexual, next to Hitler himself—and claimed that he had learned of Roehm's behavior only a day or two before the "purge." The facts were public property for years. Roehm's love letters to young Brown Shirts and other love-mates were printed in a German newspaper almost two years before Hitler took power. Surely Hitler knew this. He did nothing for almost a year and a half after he took power because he didn't quite have the heart to kill his own love-mate, but the informed opinion of the world knew all too well that Hitler himself was equally guilty.

* * *

What is Hitler's slogan?

If you will permit me to be facetious, I'll answer this by quoting Eugene O'Neill, the famous dramatist, who suggests that the great pansy adopt the slogan of the Canadian Northwest Mounted Police: "Get Your Man!"

* * *

Please explain why Karl Barth was dismissed.

The famous German theologian, Professor Karl Barth, was dismissed from his university post by the Nazis because he refused to accept certain of Hitler's demands. This has caused an immense wave of publicity throughout the world, that gives the impression that this leader of German Christian thought is fighting the Hitler regime. The facts tell a different story. It is true that Barth refused to accept Hitler's oath, but the reason for this is not his anti-Hitlerism in general but merely a difference of opinion on a comparatively unimportant issue. Barth, in short, refused to accept the idea of Hitler that Christianity should reject the Old Testament, because of its Jewishness. Hitler, being the world's most aggressive anti-Sem-

ite, could not consistently retain the Old Testament, but here Barth said No. I quote Prof. Barth's own words:

"If the German Evangelical Church excludes the Jewish Scriptures or regards them as of secondary importance it ceases to be a Christian church."

There you have the issue in a brief sentence. Notice that Barth does not protest against anti-Semitism, against dictatorship, against repression, against persecution of liberals, radicals and Free-thinkers. All these are quite acceptable. All he insists on is that the Old Testament shall not be kicked overboard. I fail to see anything in this to get excited about. Barth, like the Catholic Church, insists on retaining a series of books that have served priests, preachers and rabbis for centuries. They don't want to lose them, because to do so would mean they had been forced to admit they had been preaching for about 15 centuries from documents not considered essential to Christianity. In this I see no brave spirit fighting for liberty, free inquiry and social justice; I merely see a theologian defending one of his precious notions.

* * *

Why didn't the Socialists and Communists of Germany get together to fight the Fascism of Hitler?

The facts clearly show that the blame for this division rests with the Communists, both in Germany and Moscow. A real, honest, united front, in 1933, would have prevented Hitler's theft of power. In December, 1922, the Communist International, at its fourth congress in Moscow, announced that it would consider unity only on the basis of unlimited - propaganda "against the . . . counter-revolutionary Social Democracy," which was the name by which German Socialism was known. After this slap in the face the German So-

cialists could do nothing but go ahead with their work on an independent basis, for there was no possibility of a united front after such an insult. It is as though one were to say to another: "You and I can work together, but it is to be clearly understood that I am always to have the right to call you a crook, scoundrel and rogue." Human nature, being what it is, will not tolerate such behavior. Ten years after the above-mentioned insult from the Communists, the German Socialists, in June, 1932, again offered to work in a united front in order to prevent the advent of Hitlerism, with all its attendant horrors. What was the response from the Communists? They officially and formally announced that a united front would not be entered into with "social fascist leaders." Defeated in the attempt to achieve a united front, the German Socialists then begged for an armistice, during which both working class parties were to refrain from mutual attacks, in order to make possible a more effective war against the Nazis, who were threatening to take power and destroy liberty, decency, civilization, labor unions, education, free press, etc. What was the answer? Here it is: "The Socialist Party of Germany is still the most important social support of the bourgeoisie," according to a statement issued by the German Communist Party (July, 1932). Then came the deluge, and the Communists, expecting to profit by the chaos of Hitlerism, found themselves denied all rights, their leaders imprisoned or executed, their members herded into concentration camps, their presses destroyed, their ideas outlawed, and in other ways hounded out of existence. The facts do not make pretty reading, but they tell a simple story. The German Communists, obeying the dictates of the leaders of the Communist International, in Moscow, helped bring on Hitler's fascism.

Problems of Government

In the American Magazine, Henry Ford declared that what "goes on in the capital is of no great importance, one way or the other." Please comment.

Henry Ford can do wonders in the mass production of motor cars, but when it comes to discussing government, economics or social questions, the great Henry can talk like a blithering idiot. To say that a country's capital—the seat of its government—is not important to the people of a country is to shut one's eyes to the simplest realities. Washington, London, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, Rome, Madrid—all are of tremendous significance, as any high school boy knows. The government at Washington has the power to tax Mr. Ford out of business. Isn't that important? Washington can tell the country to go to war. Isn't that important? Washington can decide to outlaw your property, if it deems such a policy advisable. Isn't that important? Washington can decide to do something about unemployment insurance. Isn't that important? Washington can make or break any industry in the land. Isn't that important? Washington has the power to socialize our industries, bringing about a social order in which wealth will be produced for use instead of profit. Isn't that important? And yet, Ford can shut his eyes to all this—and get widely circulated magazines to print his tripe. There's a very private part of my anatomy that Henry Ford gives a pain.

What is a "Demarche?"

This is a French word, used generally in European diplomatic circles. It is pronounced "day-mash." The word means an ultimatum or a statement of policy by a single or union of governmental voices. Frequently the word means not only a statement of position

but a demand for an answer. Our good old word "ultimatum" is just as good.

* * *

Was colonial youth active among the founding fathers?

Thomas Jefferson was only 36 when he wrote the Declaration of Independence. Washington, after the long war, was still only 55 when he attended the Convention to draw up the Federal Constitution. Others of more youthful years who were among the 55 members of this great convention: Alexander Hamilton, 30; Madison, 36. At the other extreme was Benjamin Franklin, who was 81 when he attended the convention. Youthful men were active before, during and after the Revolution.

* * *

Under a dictatorship of the proletariat, would the non-workers be allowed to vote?

A proletarian dictatorship implies a classless society, in which all are workers, whether of brain or brawn. Under such a social order it would be impossible to grant the vote to non-workers, defining the word in its broadest sense. If by a non-worker you mean a speculator, a labor sweeter or exploiter, a profiteer or a propagandist for counter-revolution. I fail to see how such elements could be granted citizenship in a dictatorship of the proletariat, for it would be the first policy of the workers' state to liquidate such elements.

* * *

Why don't you start a fight to resist the attempt of the censorship crowd to gag the movies?

I have a great hatred for censorship, as I have shown on many occasions. I have never failed to fight tirelessly for free press, free speech, free assembly, but when it comes to the Hollywood crowd, frankly I can't work up a lather. Editors usually believe in freedom

of the press, and are ready to fight for their rights, as history shows during the past 150 years or more. Thousands of editors have gone to prison and faced persecution in their brave fight to win a free press.

We have a free press today, not because it was handed to us on a silver platter but because the editors weren't afraid to get up on their hind legs and fight the suppressionists. The clerical and governmental elements had to be whipped before the press won its rights. But what about the movies? Did you ever hear of a crowd of movie magnates offering to go to jail for the right of free expression? Did you ever hear of the rich movie crowd offering to do battle with the clerical enemies of free expression? I never did. They are interested in only one thing—profits—and civil liberties mean absolutely nothing to them, so long as they see another dividend ahead of their fat jowls.

There is no sense in fighting for movie liberty when the movie people themselves don't care a hang about freedom. They are always ready to take it on the chin every time a clergyman or a priest shows up. They have accepted censorship in more than a half dozen states without a mutter of protest, and they have never used their powerful medium—the screen—to fight these censorship movements. They don't believe in liberty, and one is a fool to stand by them. They don't deserve anything but what they are getting.

The movies have become too big a business interest to be able to think of anything but profits. Such people have no regard for rights of expression, and when they don't believe in it why give it to them? Rights are not to be given; they must be taken. We have a free press, because there were editors ready to fight and die for freedom. We have enslaved movies, because we have movie owners who don't know the meaning of the word "guts."

* * *

What was Lord Macaulay's theory of the cause of revolutions?

I don't know that he ever elabor-

ated it very much, but it amounted to this: Revolution, in the main, comes because nations that would move forward come to an impasse when they meet a Constitution that refuses to budge. The observation contains a lot of cleverness, but like most all-embracing generalizations it can't stand the tests of the scientific historian.

* * *

Did President Wilson lead the world in proposing the end of secret diplomacy?

He was the first head of a great state to openly propose the end of secret treaties, but it is interesting to note that while he talked and wrote a great deal on this subject he privately made use of secret diplomacy, during and after the war. Colonel House was Wilson's secret diplomatist, who made frequent and long journeys to the heads of various states.

There is no denying that secret diplomacy is one of the minor causes of war and should be eliminated. A certain amount of open diplomacy results from our system, which demands that the Senate shall approve all treaties, but we are a long way from reaching the goal of open diplomacy openly arrived at.

After the war, the world believed, naively, that the Peace Conference, influenced by Wilson, would give history a lesson in open diplomacy. Disappointment soon resulted. Wilson was as bad as the old-line diplomats. The Peace Conference soon settled down to the secret conferences of the "Council of Ten," with Wilson showing it was possible to preach one doctrine with extraordinary zeal and then, put to the test, throw his great "idealism" out the window.

* * *

Why do the newspapers almost invariably oppose the adoption of the Child Labor amendment to the U. S. Constitution?

That's simple. The newspapers are among the greatest users of child labor in the country. By using children to sell and distribute newspapers, the publishers get a "bargain" in labor. If the Child Labor amendment were adopted, these rich publishers would have to

hire persons above 16 years of age, and they don't want to do that unless they are forced to. You see, it's the great question of self-interest. For that reason, don't expect the newspapers to help in getting this humane, decent, civilized amendment added to the Constitution.

* * *

What was Shay's Rebellion?

This event in American history is usually glossed over in the school text-books, so that it is difficult for the average reader to get the cause explained honestly. In brief, our Revolutionary War was, in part, financed through the sale of bonds to Massachusetts business interests at a discount so large that the revolutionary government realized only a few cents on the dollar. The bonds bore a lucrative rate of interest, so that after the war business men realized their complete investment on the mere payment of interest over a two- or perhaps three-year period. The Massachusetts farmers saw themselves taxed in order to compensate these war profiteers, so they revolted. They demanded that the bond holders be paid nothing, in view of the fact that they had paid hardly anything for the bonds and besides had received their money back several times over in the form of interest. The bond holders themselves paid the bills for crushing the rebellion. It was a sad and sordid incident in American history.

* * *

When the Governor of a State calls out the troops who pays the bill?

The National Guard is subject to any Governor's call, but its expenses are paid by the federal government. It therefore follows that when the troops are used to break strikes (as in the case of the textile workers) the blame rests with the War Department. The U. S. government, through its control of the finances, could deny any Governor the right to use the National Guard to shoot down strikers.

* * *

Did the right of free press get established in England before the United States?

It was not until the 1820's that the press in England won its full right to freedom of expression, sub-

ject only to libel and obscenity. It was a slow, long fight before the British crown surrendered. Prior to 1820 all printers were compelled to obtain a license to publish, which served as a powerful means of censorship on criticism or comment uncomplimentary to the government. In the United States, the right to a free press was written into the Constitution when the fundamental law of the republic was first written. Free press therefore appeared in our country first.

* * *

What is the mortality rate among our World War veterans?

They are dying at the daily rate of 80, or about 30,000 yearly, according to the veterans' administration, which adds that the average age of these veterans is now around 40, as against an average of 88 years for Civil War veterans. 18,030 Civil War veterans were on the pension rolls as of July 1, 1934, which is expected to be cut in half during the next year, because of deaths. There are 366,895 World War veterans on the pension rolls.

* * *

How many states have sales taxes?

This iniquitous form of taxation is in force in 17 states, as of July, 1934. It is a direct tax on the poor. Most of these states claim that the tax is intended only during the period of emergency, but it is felt that the tax will be collected permanently, unless the consumers raise a big squawk, something which consumers rarely do. Consumers, through decades of conditioning, usually take it on the chin.

* * *

What is the cost of soil erosion?

H. H. Bennett, director, Soil Erosion Service, Department of the Interior, estimates that our farmers and ranchers suffer a yearly loss of \$400,000,000 from soil erosion, which, of course, is in addition to immense losses suffered by roads, railroads, silted reservoirs, rivers, ditches, etc. Soil erosion is caused by either the washing away of the valuable top-soil or its being blown away by the wind. Once the top-soil is washed away the land becomes practically worthless. Erosion is like a disease, in that once it starts it spreads rapidly, because

the absorptive top-soil being gone the clay-like subsoil fails to absorb the water, which proceeds to wash away still more top-soil. In tonnage, Mr. Bennett figures that "at least 3,000,000,000 tons of soil material are washed out of the fields and pastures of America every year." He puts it dramatically, as follows: "To load and haul away this incomprehensible bulk of rich farm soil would require a train of freight cars long enough to encircle the earth 37 times at the equator."

Please give your attitude toward the Jeffersonian principle of "State's Rights."

When this country was primarily agricultural and boasted of only the most primitive industries, there was some logic to the policy of State's Rights. But with the growth of capitalism, with the concentration of wealth, nation-wide utilities and corporations, it is nothing less than archaic to hope for the balmy days of State's Rights. In matters of police protection, education, etc., it is possible to defend the policy of State's and City's Rights. But not in matters of national economy. The Standard Oil Co. is not limited to a single state. Nor is Cities Service, or General Motors, or Wall Street, or the Santa Fe Railroad, or the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, or the U. S. Steel Corporation, or a thousand other great aggregations of economic power that rule beyond municipal and state lines. If these capitalistic enterprises rule nationally, it follows logically that the power to rule them must be nationally centered. Socialists who look forward to the great day when large-scale industry will be socialized certainly have scant patience with this Democratic slogan of "State's Rights." When socialization comes in the United States, it will be centered in Washington, and not in 48 State Capitols.

What is the status of the Platt Amendment?

The Platt Amendment was written into our treaty with Cuba, in 1903, which permitted the U. S. to intervene in Cuba's internal affairs, even to the extent of armed

expeditions. This has been an endless source of dissatisfaction, unrest and discord. In May, 1934, a new treaty was signed by Secretary Hull and the Cuban ambassador, Marquez Sterling, which annulled the Platt Amendment. The treaty surrenders our right to intervention. Cuba at last has achieved sovereignty.

* * *

Do you prefer the dole or relief as at present administered?

The dole is not an accurate description of England's system for handling the unemployed. It would be more accurate to describe the method as Unemployment Insurance. Such insurance is far superior to our method of charity relief. Instead of handing out baskets of food, orders for coal, supplies of vegetables, etc., we should grant an unemployed person an outright sum each week, to be spent in a dignified manner, without the stigma of charity. The federal government is the proper medium for Unemployment Insurance, because this problem is too great for any local agency. It is logical to assume that if a person needs work and is unable to get work, then it falls on society to take care of such a person until work is supplied. If work is offered and it is refused, then he should be cut off the list and made to hustle for himself. The funds should be raised by taxing payrolls of employers, with additional sums drawn from the funds of the federal government. There is a certain amount of hardship at first, in getting such an insurance fund started, but once it gets going the plan works smoothly and without the taint of charity. However, to make the Unemployment Insurance plan a sure and permanent success it is absolutely necessary to carry it on during periods of recovery, when industry and the government can easily stand the expense, thus building up a vast cash reserve that may be drawn upon in times of adversity. It is unjust to say that the unemployed in England prefer their "dole" to wages. It has been shown hundreds of times that each advertisement for help is answered by a ratio of something like 20 to one. In some cases even hundreds

of unemployed appeared in reply to an advertisement for only a few workers. The unemployed may always be depended on to prefer a job and wages to a dole or Unemployment Insurance. This disproves the libel that Unemployment Insurance pauperizes the workers.

* * *

Has the government worked out a definite policy with regard to the future of our railroads?

Joseph B. Eastman, Federal co-ordinator of transportation, delivered on January 20, 1934, a 350-page report to the Interstate Commerce Commission, in which he drew the conclusion that the long-term solution of the railroad problem is for the U. S. government to step in and run them, with full ownership by Uncle Sam.

However, because of financial considerations, Co-ordinator Eastman takes the position that the change to government ownership should be postponed for the present. In this we agree with Mr. Eastman, because the first act of socialization should not be the railroads but the banks. In fact, the railroads should remain as they are—in private hands—until the government takes over the banks, the telephone and telegraph systems, and the power plants. When the work of nationalizing these industries is concluded, there will be time enough to begin nationalizing our transportation system.

In his report, Mr. Eastman properly calls attention to the fact that there is nothing inconsistent with Americanism for the government to take over the railroads. "The early charters," he writes, "often contemplated the possibility of such a policy. It has always been recognized, notably by the Supreme Court, that a railroad is a public industry, and that it performs a function of the state."

If the government were to decide to take over the railroads, little opposition may be looked for from the financial interests involved. In the past they opposed the idea of government ownership because they were making large profits from dividends and inside financial manipulation. But since the profits have melted away and financial bandits

no longer can use the railroads as sources of new hundreds of millions of stolen dollars, the sentiment has drifted to indifference or support for the policy of a huge system of nationalized transportation.

It is safe to say that, at the proper time, the U. S. government will be able to take possession on its own terms. In fact, as Eastman points out, there is a surprising amount of lukewarmness on both sides.

On the public's side, this lukewarm attitude may be the result of the notion that the railroads are doomed to early extinction because of the extensive development of competing agencies, particularly from buses, motor cars and trucks, with that extinction accelerated by the construction of thousands of miles of concrete roads yearly.

The answer to this is that the railroads are here for a long time. They may lose even more passenger traffic and less-than-carload freight, but that doesn't dispose of the fact that railroad transportation is still the best, quickest and most economical for heavy freight.

Competition has curtailed railroad profits, but there is no evidence that the country could survive industrially without the services of the railroad system. Instead of being indifferent, the thinking public should encourage Roosevelt to do the logical thing with regard to the railroads—take them over, run them by the government, eliminate waste and duplication, serve the people with a view to helping stimulate industry rather than merely to make a profit. In fact, each showing of a profit should be taken as a strong hint that the time has come to improve the service or lower the rates. It may be a little premature to take over the railroads at this time, but that doesn't alter the fact that the best opinion of the world has it that the correct solution, ultimately, is: **let the people own the railroads.**

* * *

What is meant by "balancing the budget," and "trade balance"?

When a government takes in enough money through taxation and other means to pay its expen-

ses, so that there is no deficit at the close of the year, it has balanced its budget.

When a government reports that its exports to a certain country were \$1,000,000 and its imports from that country were \$500,000, there is a favorable trade balance of \$500,000. But when the government exports \$500,000 to a certain country and imports \$1,000,000, there is an unfavorable trade balance of \$500,000.

* * *

Do any countries resort exclusively to barter in foreign trade? I know that a certain amount of this is practiced by most governments.

Russia and Turkey now do all their trading on the basis of barter. They used to use money, but now money does not enter into the transactions. Both countries are on an extremely friendly basis and find this system of barter efficient.

* * *

What is the indebtedness of our federal government?

Our national debt, on June 30, 1934, was almost \$30,000,000,000. This is a gigantic amount of money, but quite modest when compared to the governments of the United Kingdom, Belgium, Australia, France and Canada, on the basis of per capita indebtedness. On the basis of our population, in 1931, we owed only \$136 per capita, while Belgium owed \$904 per capita. The others, per capita, as of 1931, were: United Kingdom, \$801; Australia, \$777; France, \$452; Canada, \$136.

It has been estimated that the United States could assume an indebtedness of over \$32,000,000,000 and yet be in line with other governments that are still enjoying good credit.

In the face of these figures, it seems plain that the great to-do about our spending a half dozen billion dollars to care for the needy and unemployed is just so much calamity yelling by capitalistic interests that do not want to assume even part of the load of caring for the needs of our stricken people.

Billions will be required for necessary programs of social insurance, home building, public works and old-age pensions, but it is absurd

to say that this great and rich country cannot carry the load. We haven't begun to approach the volume of debt of nations like Great Britain, and yet the United Kingdom enjoys the best credit facilities.

An increase in our national debt (if used for purposes of real social protection) will be a sign of health and decency, instead of an indication that we are approaching bankruptcy. Politicians will make a great noise about the cost of necessary social protection, but their motive is plainly that of wanting to gain political prestige in the eyes of the holders of Wall Street's money bags.

The United States government can, if it wants to, go right ahead with a tremendous program of social amelioration, without in any manner endangering the nation's credit or its resources. What we need is the social vision and consciousness that the time has come to make the government an instrument of social upliftment. It will cost money, but it's the best way to spend money. The country has had too much of the Hoover philosophy that it is not the government's concern if its people are starving, if its willing workers are without jobs, if its old are without support. That philosophy must not be permitted to become a permanent policy. We need rather to look on government as a mechanism for bringing protection to the weak and comfort to the needy. It has the power to bring the masses the last degree of social protection, if only the people learn to demand action, and are willing to back up that demand with mass demonstrations.

A government is always deaf to a mutter; it hears only a roar. It whiffs at a bit of wind, but it cowers before a cyclone. Demand and ye shall receive!

* * *

What does the 1934 bill for government amount to?

It is \$17,000,000,000, based on the following estimates: \$7,000,000,000 for Federal; \$2,000,000,000 for State; \$8,000,000,000 for Local. This vast sum is being used, mainly, to prop a system that should be discarded. The competitive, capitalist system makes for waste, destruc-

tion, militarism, senseless advertising, commercial competition, useless occupations, duplicated services, etc. In addition, most of the crime bill is the result of the economic injustices of the present chaotic system. The above sum, properly administered by social-minded people, could be used to bring about socialized industry, in which case the investment would pay dividends in greater purchasing power, scientific distribution and full utilization of our capacities for wealth production. The objection to the 1934 estimate is not that it is so large but rather that it is so wasteful and planless. A Socialist government would probably spend twice as much money, but it would be used to put millions of men and women to work, supervise the production of necessities by large-scale industries and see to it that the workers received the full social value of their labor. Such a program would cost money, but it would be productive instead of destructive, scientific instead of muddled.

* * *

Since you favor nationalized, socialized industry, please explain why the postoffice operates at a deficit?

That's a fair, honest question and it deserves a direct answer. It is not true that the postoffice has always run in the red. But during the last two decades almost each year has found a great financial loss to the national government as a result of postal deficits. The gross deficiency was \$205,550,611.09 in 1932. This loss dropped in 1933 to \$112,374,892.05, which means a \$93,000,000 cut in the deficit. Our postoffice is still the biggest industry in the world. It took \$587,600,000 in gross income during 1933, with 235,573 employes on the payroll. Why does such a vast, necessary enterprise operate at a loss?

First of all, it is not necessary to lose money year after year. This is shown by the fact that very few postoffice departments in other lands show a loss. In fact, most of them show large profits. I have at hand the official report of the British postoffice, which shows a profit for 1933 amounting to \$55,000,000,

despite the depression. It should be added at this point that the British postoffice also owns the telephone service, a policy that should be adopted in this country at the earliest opportunity, with the further inclusion of the telegraph and radio systems. The British telephone service obtained 70,000 new subscribers during the past year, while in the same period the United States and other nations suffered a decline in telephones used, roughly estimated at 2,000,000.

The U. S. postoffice department could be made to show a handsome profit each year if it were taken out of politics. The postoffice loses \$50,000,000 each year because of its foolishly low second class rates. Second-class mail consists of magazines and newspapers, which are carried at 1½¢ per pound, while the cost of handling them is around 10¢ per pound. Great houses which publish such periodicals as the Saturday Evening Post, American Magazine, the great metropolitan newspapers, and the smaller institutions dump thousands of tons of printed matter into the postoffices of the land, and the government idiotically handles this matter at a tremendous loss. As a publisher, I believe the second-class rates should be adjusted immediately, so that the publishers will pay what the service is worth instead of getting graft from the U. S. amounting to about \$1,000,000 per week.

When the government decided to carry second-class mail at a loss, some 75 years ago, the policy was sound, because at that time it was necessary to give aid to a small, struggling industry, and the best help the government could give was to expedite the delivery of printed matter to subscribers at a great financial loss to the government. But conditions have changed since then. The printing industry is now well on its feet and it could pay its way without injury to the ideal of a strong, far-reaching press.

In addition, the government should fire thousands of postmasters, who are on the payrolls of the department because of their political affiliations instead of their usefulness and service. A postmaster in a first-class postoffice never

works. He isn't hired to work. His duties are attended to by assistant postmasters and superintendents of the mails. Take out these parasites and you will see an immediate change from the red to the black. This one change, added to the elimination of the second-class graft, would wipe out the department's deficit almost immediately.

If you come to examine the postoffice department you will find a wonderful set of men and women doing their jobs honestly and loyally. I have sent millions of pieces of mail through the local postoffice at Girard (which, by the way, is the smallest first-class postoffice in the country, from the viewpoint of Girard's population of only 2,400) and I can add in all sincerity that I have always found the average postoffice clerk and official courteous, efficient, honest and entitled to every penny paid him or her. The department is run by able men. The problem is to get rid of the parasites. Once the graft and parasites are out of the way, these same postal workers would give a quick demonstration of efficiency, scientific management and profitable operation. Knowing these facts, we are absolutely safe in entrusting that department to the expansions that the times demand, once the necessary changes are made in method and managerial personnel.

Make the newspapers and magazines pay their way, chop off the parasites, unite the telephone, telegraph and express systems with the postoffice department and you will see the U. S. postoffice department making a hundred dollars of profit for every one made by the British system.

* * *

Is the postoffice deficit caused by first- or second-class mail, or both?

In 1931 there was a postal deficit of \$146,000,000. Not a dime of this deficit was caused by first-class mail. The letters Mr. John Citizen mails brought the postoffice department a profit of \$47,000,000. The deficit was caused, in the main, by the following classifications: second-class mail (dispatching newspapers and periodicals) \$97,000,000,

which amounts to a direct government subsidy to the publishing industry; air mail subsidy \$17,000,000; subsidy to steamship companies \$19,000,000; franking congressional mail, government mail, etc., \$12,000,000. If the politicians were to take the graft out of the postoffice department by compelling the publishers to pay the value of the services they receive, and if the other grafts were eliminated, the postoffice department would show a large profit, as indicated by the fact that the real job of the postoffice department—carrying Mr. John Citizen's letters—shows a profit of almost a million dollars per week. The newspaper and periodical publishers never stop complaining over the "waste" of government money in giving relief to the unemployed and starving, but they are always ready to defend the vast graft they steal from the government. The postoffice department is a wonderfully useful institution, but it is in serious need of new administration policies.

* * *

Is it true that our mail to foreign countries involves graft to the ship-owners?

It certainly is. Our official reports show that the U. S. postoffice department has been paying \$10,000 per pound for mail carried from our Gulf Ports to Helsingfors and Saloniki. Rich ship-owners get \$10,000 for carrying just one sack of mail to Russia. We have shipped mail from the Pacific Coast to Tampico, at \$2,377 per pound. This same mail could have gone overland four weeks faster at an immense saving. Remember, letters to foreign countries cost 5c per ounce, and some at 3c per ounce. Figure it out for yourself. It's graft, and no other word can be made to fit the case. That explains why Postmaster General Farley insists that domestic letters should carry the 3c rate, instead of 2c. The old rate of 2c per ounce paid the department a substantial profit, but more money was demanded from the public. Why? Was it to pay \$10,000 per pound for hauling mail that could be turned over to foreign ships at a rate hardly more than a few dollars per pound? The public

should insist on an end to this graft to shippers and a return of 2c postage for domestic mail.

How much does the government pay the ship-owners as subsidy for hauling mail and how much would it cost on a pound basis?

The Postoffice Department pays more than \$27,500,000 each year to the ships favored with mail contracts. If this mail were carried on a pound basis the cost would be less than \$3,000,000. It is such graft that makes it necessary for the P. O. department to charge 3c for first class domestic letters. These letters could be carried at the old 2c rate and still leave a profit. By putting foreign mail on a pound basis the department would be well on the way to getting out of the red. Every time you pay 3c for a first class letter you are helping the ship-owners in their yearly graft of almost \$25,000,000.

How many municipally owned electric plants are there in the U. S. A.

1,802. There shouldn't be a privately owned electric plant in the country. The Power Trust is one of the nation's worst exploiters.

How does the U. S. compare with the British in shipping?

Of the world's tonnage of 64,000,000 tons of ships, 15,000,000 are British and 10,000,000 are under our flag. World tonnage of ships has increased 10,000,000 since 1914, which means that shipping is growing at the rate of almost 1,000,000 yearly. Despite a heavy overproduction of ships, the U. S., France, Germany, Italy and England continue to add to their merchant marines. This, of course, is because each country considers its merchant marine as an auxiliary navy. Today, when competition is keen for business, England launched a new ship, weighing 73,000 tons, by far the greatest ship ever built. Other countries are planning to meet this record. This, as I said, is because each country's navy considers liners as future transports or plane carriers. Today, all big ships are built with the aid of war and navy experts, who offer designs with a view to availability in war times.

This goes on at a time when there are already far more ships sailing the seas than can be supported profitably by current volumes of travel or freight. The governments find different ways of covering the losses. In the U. S., our merchant marine subsidy amounts to \$25,000,000 yearly.

Are the government-operated business establishments in the Panama Canal Zone successful?

The U. S. Government owns and operates 12 department stores, modern in every respect, groceries, bakeries, laundries, and other enterprises, in order to provide for the needs of tens of thousands of residents of the Canal Zone, mostly employes of the government. These commissaries have been operated by Uncle Sam for 25 years and the results indicate achieved success. Thus far, the government's profit has been from five to 11 percent on capital investments, despite the fact that government goods and services are better in quality than those offered by private interests, and the further important fact that government prices are lower than those charged in private institutions in the same section. It is the desire of the government to hold down its profit to 3 percent. This is felt necessary in order to keep from making too much money from these government-run businesses. Attempts have been made to cut prices even lower, but here the government has been held back by the vociferous protests of private business concerns.

Is Iowa making any money with its liquor?

During July, 1934, the Iowa Liquor Control Commission made a profit of \$33,196.76 from its 28 state-owned liquor shops.

How is Washington state's liquor board doing?

In the State of Washington liquor is sold by the liquor board. Recently it learned that its stores were making a profit of 20 percent. Not wishing to make that much money, prices were cut, making them now among the lowest in the country. New prices (for fifths): gin, 75c;

straight domestic whisky, 90c; Bourbon, 95c; genuine Scots whisky, \$2.35; domestic wines, \$1 per gallon, with the jug thrown in; imported sherry and port (20 years old) \$1.30. As this is written the day after election (in which Kansas voted to retain its prohibition amendment) I feel a little jealous. However, on second thought, Joplin, Mo., is only 45 miles away, with its numerous well-run saloons. One drug store sells excellent liquor and serves a shrimp cocktail that tastes great. I talked to the cook responsible for this delicacy, and he told me he went about his shrimp cocktails in a most elaborate way. He throws the shrimp into a huge pot and cooks them along with a ham bone and Irish potatoes. The potatoes are supposed to absorb the shrimp's fishy taste, while the ham bone is supposed to do something equally mysterious. He throws away the ham bone and the cooked potatoes when they have served their esoteric ends. His later mixture is of catsup, horse radish, Louisiana peppers (just a dash of this terrifically hot stuff) and some other palate ticklers, along with a glass of Seagram's rye on the side—and you are ready for a quick journey to paradise. The shrimp cocktail (almost enough for a meal) costs but two bits, while the whisky costs 30c, the latter being only a "gentleman's glass" holding an ounce and a quarter, which is hardly a swallow for so much money. I tried to convince the waiter that I am not a gentleman, but he laid this to eccentricity.

Have you any data to prove that government-owned telephones are cheaper than those privately owned?

There is an abundance of evidence, the latest being the cut in evening long distance calls in England, where the system belongs to the postoffice department. It is now possible to call anywhere in all England for only 25c. Try to match that in the U. S.

Is it true that Colorado has outlawed chain stores?

No. Colorado merely passed a

special taxation law, which provides that individuals owning a single store are to pay \$2 per year, but chains of two or more stores are to pay \$300 per year on each unit. Already there are signs that the chain stores will evade this legislation. In the case of filling stations, owned by Standard Oil, the company is going through the motions of a fake sale, putting each station in the name of an employee and thereby evading the tax. Other chains are expected to follow suit. It is poor public policy to outlaw or tax out of existence chain stores, because they are sound, economically and socially, the only fault being the fact that they are owned by private corporations instead of the people. It would be better to let them alone while they are growing, meanwhile educating the workers and farmers in the principles of socialized industry. Then, when the people are ready for Socialism these efficient and well-run distributing agencies could fit perfectly into the new social order. Taxing chain stores out of existence is on a par with passing laws against new industrial inventions, or destroying crops, or putting curbs on production. All such measures are proofs of economic illiteracy.

* * *

What is a "yellow dog contract"?

Many large employers, in order to maintain an anti-union shop, frequently make workers sign a contract when getting employment, in which they agree to refrain from joining any union. Such an agreement is called a "yellow dog contract." Such contracts are illegal in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Ohio, Illinois, Arizona and California.

* * *

What is the world's mightiest engineering project?

It is Boulder Dam, which is now being built and which is to contain 4,400,000 cubic yards of concrete, of which 3,000,000 have already been set, as of January 1, 1935. To give you an idea of its vastness, consider the lone fact that it will form the world's largest artificial lake. It will have more than 500 miles of shore line and be 125 miles long.

From two to five years will be needed for the water to flow into the lake. The engineers report they are a little more than a year ahead of schedule. And remember, this greatest of all engineering jobs is being done by the people, through their government, and not as a private capitalistic enterprise. The motive here is not profit, but social service. Who was it said that Socialism can't get things done?
* * *

What is the meaning of that pro-

vision in the Constitution which denies Congress the right to pass any law for the "establishment of religion"?

The U. S. A. did a great thing when it wrote into the first amendment of the Constitution the will to keep State and Church apart. According to Cooley's "Constitutional Law," the establishment of religion means "the conferring upon one church of special favors and advantages which are denied to others."

The Roman Catholic Church

Your statement that Hitler, Pilsudski and Mussolini are all Catholic-fascist dictators is accurate, but is it not a fact that the leader of the British Black Shirt fascists, Sir Oswald Mosley, is not a Catholic?

While it is true that Mosley is not a Catholic, it would be well to consider his recent statement: "We have very many Catholic members, and a very good understanding with the Catholic Church."

The Catholic Church is the sworn foe of liberalism, democracy and freedom of conscience. It prefers to see its good sons lead in wars against social and intellectual progress, but will give aid (as in the case of Mosley) where the locale is overwhelmingly non-Catholic.

In Austria, the Catholic Cardinal was one of the bitterest enemies of the Socialists and egged on the late Dollfuss and his bloodthirsty henchmen in the final assault on Social Democratic cooperatives, freethought societies, radical newspapers and periodicals, and trade unionism. After the Socialists were defeated by the military forces of the Catholic-led *heimwehr*, the Cardinal sent packages of food to the beaten Socialists, but they spurned such aid from so low and contemptible a source and returned the packages unopened.

One of the great reasons for the hatred of the Catholic Church for the Socialists in Austria, Germany and Italy is the fact that they are almost invariably Freethinkers. Dollfuss, acting under an agreement with the Vatican, laid violent hands on the Freethought Union, of which there was a membership of 170,000. The secretary of the organization was arrested for "rebellion," by which Dollfuss probably meant rebellion against the intellectual tyranny of the Catholic Church.

Of course, this does not mean

that Protestantism is the nursery of democratic ideals. It too can be seen on the side of reaction, but its forces are not as united as the Catholics, nor has it had Catholicism's long experience in crushing freethought and intellectual freedom. The Catholics are more dangerous because they are more skillful.

And while we are on this subject, let us not forget that King Alfonso's fascist regime in Spain received the enthusiastic support of the Catholic hierarchy in Spain and Rome, and it was this black record that accounted for the wave of violence against the Catholic Church when Spanish fascists were finally defeated and forced to abdicate.

Wherever you see reaction striving for power, there will you see the Catholic Church giving aid and comfort to the enemies of civilization. For centuries the hands of the Popes have been red with the blood of martyrs. Let us not forget the amazing words of Cardinal Gasparri, in September, 1932, when, speaking as the representative of the Pope at a Eucharistic Congress, in Italy, he said: "The Fascist government of Italy is the only exception to the political anarchy of governments, parliaments and schools the world over." It would be well to study those words carefully. The sentence is one mass of lies, but it shows with crystal clarity the likes and dislikes of the Catholic Church in matters of government.

* * *

The Catholic writer, George N. Shuster, in his new book, "Strong Man Rules: An Interpretation of Germany Today," says that some day Europe, purged of both Fascism and Communism, may return to Christian democracy. Please comment.

I wish Mr. Shuster would explain

what he means by "may return to Christian democracy." When did the Church establish "Christian democracy"? Can he point to a single Catholic document that supports democracy and opposes Fascism? Did the Catholic Church in Central Europe help kill democracy? The record is plain. The Catholic Church was a part of the conspiracy to destroy the new republics in Central Europe and is now seeking to extend the power of the Fascists so that the entire world will return to dictatorships. There never was such a thing as "Christian democracy." The Popes have all consistently fought democracy, republicanism, Socialism, free speech, free press, free thought and every other expression of political, industrial and social unorthodoxy. The Church has been a powerful prop of mass exploitation and tyranny. What Mr. Shuster should say is that the world is waiting for Europe to purge itself of Christian Fascism, which would mean the destruction of clericalism.

What concessions did the Roman Catholic Church get in Austria?

Fascism, which is a natural ally of Catholicism, has been the favorite objective of the Vatican because of its effectiveness in destroying democracy and liberalism, outlawing radical economics, Free-thought propaganda and the advocacy of anti-militarism. The Catholic Church helped destroy the Austrian Republic and was one of the prime movers in the bombardment of Socialist apartment houses, thus killing hundreds of women and children. The Catholic Church, through its cardinal in Vienna, allied itself with the late Dictator Dollfuss, a devout Catholic, and forced a bloodthirsty campaign of extermination on Socialism, Freethought, Trade Unionism, Pacifism and Consumers' Cooperatives. And now the Catholic Church has received its concessions (or rather, rewards), so that it is even stronger in its entrenched privileges than it was 50 years ago, under the monarchy.

The Concordat with the Vatican, which was ratified on May 1, 1934, gives the Pope the following ad-

vantages in Austria: 1. The Roman Catholic Church is now the favored state religious organization. It enjoys privileges and favors denied to every other religious body. 2. The Pope's church is now guaranteed an important place in the government itself. 3. The Church is now assured the most generous possible freedom of action. 4. The Church is made the beneficiary of large material, financial, educational, and propagandistic support. 5. The Church is now given a monopoly on religious instruction in every educational institution supported in whole or in part by the state. 6. The Church is to be supported in its program of using various means to force religious instruction from the Catholic viewpoint on non-Catholic people, particularly the young. 7. The treasury of Austria is to be drawn on for funds to support confessional schools. 8. Confessional schools are formally accepted as the "ideal" educational institutions of Austria. 9. The full powers of the state will be used at all times to crush all Free-thought educational work, organizations devoted to Freethought propaganda, or any kind of criticism of religion or opposition to clericalism. 10. Religious orders, like the Jesuits, etc., are to be given the greatest measures of freedom, and moral and financial support. 11. The Church is not to be expected at any time to give an accounting of the funds it handles. 12. Press censorship must apply to all secular newspapers, magazines, and books, but the products of the Catholic press are to be exempted. 13. Priests, nuns, bishops, etc., including representatives of open and secret religious orders, are to have free and unrestricted entrance to all schools, orphan asylums, hospitals, prisons and every other institution of the state. This is to be an exclusive monopoly for the Roman Catholic Church and it is to have the right to do as it pleases in furthering its own propaganda and temporal interests.

From the above one gets a glimpse of what happens when the Roman Catholic Church gets its clutches on a state. It means the end of civilized methods, usurpation by

the priesthood, the rise of clericalism, the end of freedom of intellect, speech, press and assemblage. Catholicism is now in a world conspiracy to advance Fascism, because this political and economic philosophy of tyranny fits in better with its ambitions and enables it to function far more effectively than in the case of a democracy, where other religions are tolerated and none is given the official sanction of the state. The Roman Catholic Church is now in an open fight to the death to return civilization to the Dark Ages, in order to protect itself against the devastating effects of modern ideas on religious obscurantism. The Church knows it is a case of fight and win now or lose out forever. That explains why Central Europe—Germany, Austria, Poland, Italy, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, etc.—are all in the hands of Catholic dictators.

The poison is being spread to other countries. The United States now has a Fascist movement led by Catholics, particularly men like Herbert Agar, Paul Elmer More, Allen, Tate, R. A. McGowan, H. Robbins and R. C. Beatty. The Fascist-Catholic movement in the United States has its magazine today, entitled **The American Review**, in which Fascism is being proposed as a substitute for American democracy and constitutionalism.

Fascism is Catholicism's political weapon. It is Catholicism's "remedy" for world-wide democracy and freedom. And if Catholic Fascism triumphs in the United States, we will wake up some morning and see this country ruled by a concordat similar to the one ratified in Austria.

* * *

Please explain why the Catholic Church is able to report substantial increases in membership since the massacre of the Socialists in February, 1934?

The Dollfuss government decreed that employment would be given on the basis of 80 percent to members of the Christian (Catholic) trade unions. This means that one must be a Catholic, at least nominally, in order to make a living in Austria.

The Catholic Church will not be

able to do much with such increases in membership. The motive is not religious, but economic.

Also, in the matter of relief to the destitute, all applicants must declare their religious affiliations, which means that if one is to expect food one must prove membership in the Catholic Church, which is now the state church of Austria. By such despicable methods do the priests increase their congregations.

However, Vienna was, before the downfall of the Socialists, the greatest freethinking city in Central Europe, perhaps in all Europe. Atheism was strong, because the Socialists quietly and efficiently taught their followers to understand the absurdities and obscenities of religion. This has always been a sore spot with the Catholic hierarchy, and it took revenge when the late Dollfuss began firing on the workers' apartment houses, killing men, women, and even children.

The Church stood behind Dollfuss and was a party to the mass murder. In this, the Catholic Church was true to its historical record. The Catholic Church is fighting desperately to regain its lost power and prestige, after suffering such terrific defeats in France, Mexico, Russia, and Spain. It looks greedily at Central Europe, where it held undisputed sway for so many centuries, to the degradation of those unfortunate lands. It is entrenching itself in Italy, Austria and other neighboring countries, but it is safe to say that the victory for superstition will be short-lived. Rationalism will assert itself in the end, and the Catholic Church will be given the punishment it has so richly earned.

In Germany, its Hitler is a good Catholic son, and the civilized world stands aghast at his barbarous treatment of all dissenters. The headsman's axe, blessed by the Catholic priests, is chopping off the heads of men whose only "crime" is their belief in a different social order.

There is something of a fight on between the cardinal and the Nazis in Munich, but this doesn't mean that the Catholic Church is against

Hitler's persecution of Jews, Socialists, Pacifists, Freethinkers, Communists and others. Hitler, in order to maintain a semblance of "consistency" can't quite stomach the Old Testament when he is killing and torturing Jews, so he wants to kick out that part of the Church's hogwash. But the Church says **no**. It doesn't want to lose an iota of its superstition.

Also, the Hitlerites say a baptized Jew is still a Jew, and as such should be persecuted. The Catholic Church doesn't care a rap about the orthodox Jews, but it wants to see the converted Jews given better treatment, because a Jew converted to Catholicism is a good customer for Catholic wares. That explains the Catholic protest against Hitler's racial theory. It isn't Hitler's bloodthirstiness that appalls the Catholic Church; it is merely that Hitler stubbornly refuses to give protection to Jews who have been won over to Catholicism.

Hitler, of course, is a good Catholic; if he weren't the Pope would have excommunicated him long ago. From this it is apparent that the Catholic-Hitler feud is not fundamental. It will be patched up when Hitler accedes to Catholic policies in matters of race and the Old Testament. After all, the Catholic Church can never stomach Hitler's claim that the Latins and other races are inferior, because the Catholic Church has customers in Africa as well as Italy, in Asia as well as France. It daren't offend its great, but wavering, clientele.

Is the Catholic Church's support of Fascism in Austria theoretical or practical?

Theoretically the Catholic Church has always been Fascist. Long before there was such a word as "Fascism," the Catholic Church fought freedom of thought, press, speech, democracy and enlightenment. But the Catholic Church never stops at mere moral support. It digs in and helps for its side, whenever there is an opportunity to promote reaction and obscurantism. In Austria, for example, the Vatican gave direct financial support, as the evidence clearly shows. In proof of this I refer readers to

the statement of Franz Winkler, former Austrian vice-chancellor, on August 30, 1934. Speaking in Praha, Czechoslovakia, Herr Winkler, according to the Associated Press, said the Vatican was among the contributors to Von Starheimberg's Fascist Heimwehr (home guard). He also named Mussolini as a heavy contributor to this Austrian Fascist, having given him "not less than \$1,000,000 since 1929 to do Italy's dirty work in Austria." In contributing to Von Starheimberg's war chest, the Vatican became a party to the February, 1934, bombardment of the great Socialist apartment houses in Vienna, where 1,500 men, women and children were massacred because of their firm belief in democratic principles. Where the Vatican gave money, the Catholic Cardinal in Vienna gave direct managerial services in the terrible slaughter. This is common knowledge among persons in touch with conditions in Central Europe. Wherever Europe is in agony, slowly bleeding to death as its precious institutions of freedom and civilization fall in defeat, look carefully and you will see the black robes of the priests and the red caps of the cardinals.

When did the Catholic Church lift its ban on the works of Copernicus?

The Copernican theory was officially on the **Index of Forbidden Books** until 1822.

Is the Latin used in the Catholic mass the same that was used in ancient Rome?

No. It is the Latin of the slave and trade population during the first five centuries of the present era.

What is the meaning of "Pontifex Maximus," as applied to the popes?

The ancient Roman emperors, who were builders of great roads through much of Europe and Asia, were called "Pontifex Maximus," meaning "chief bridge-builder." The popes simply took over this pagan designation.

By what authority do the Catholics claim Jesus' mother was a virgin?

Catholic theologians do not like

to hear that question asked, for it is upsetting to those who worship the "Virgin Mary." According to Mark 6:3, Jesus had four brothers and an undetermined number of sisters. The passage reads: "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us?"

* * *

How strong was the Catholic Church in France before the Revolution?

In 1762, there were in France almost 500,000 priests, monks and nuns, controlling property worth, in our money, \$10,000,000,000, producing an annual income of \$700,000,000.

* * *

Please comment on the Pope's blast against nudism.

Nudists could answer the Pope by referring to his own Bible. Adam, Eve, Saul, Isaiah and Simon Peter were practicing nudists, which would make them sinners in the eyes of Pius XI. Genesis 2:25 says: "And they were both naked, the man and his wife (Adam and Eve), and were not ashamed." First Samuel 19:24 says: "And he (Saul) stripped off his clothes also, and prophesied before Samuel in like manner, and lay down naked all that day and night. Wherefore they say, Is Saul also among the prophets?" Isaiah (according to Isaiah 20:3-4) "walked naked and barefoot three years." That means summer and winter, so he was a greater nudist than the worst modern, who saves his nakedness for the warm, sunny days. The same passages say that others went about "even with their buttocks uncovered," which means there were times when icicles hung from those parts.

* * *

What is the cathedratium?

It is the Catholic Bishop's cash levy against each parish, to cover the expenses of his diocese. "Peter's pence" is the money each parish must send to the pope each year. In *The American Mercury*, March, 1935, Lester P. Elliot estimates that until 1929, about \$4,000,000 was sent yearly by American Catholics to the Vatican. The same writer

places a valuation of \$2,000,000,000 on the property of the Catholic Church in the U. S. The hierarchy never issues balance sheets informing the public, or its own members, of its receipts and expenditures. It must be up in the hundreds of millions, though the depression has done damage to the Church's finances. The Church has been well described as the "world's greatest real estate corporation."

* * *

H. G. Wells, in his Outline of History, comes to the Crusades, and in a moment of admiration says: "Here for the first time we discover Europe with an idea and a soul! Here is a response of indignation at the story of a remote wrong." Please comment.

I have already published a great deal of matter on the Crusades, particularly by Joseph McCabe. To give the point of it all: The Crusades were led and joined in by the worst bunch of bandits, cut-throats, rapists, thieves, moochers, beggars and crooks that worked together in the entire history of Europe. The whole record is one of pillage and loot. The Popes blessed them, and shared in the swag. Adventurers, too sensitive to go in for plain piracy, joined up to despoil the lands, rob the homes and steal the wealth of non-Christian people. The Crusades constitute a black page in history. Wells has a way of saying a lot of plain, painful truths about the Catholic Church and then suddenly turning around and saying something like the above, which is without authority in history and a rejection of the plain facts of the record.

* * *

Please comment on the Borah resolution on Mexico.

Senator Borah's resolution in the Senate proposes that a committee be appointed to investigate the Mexican government's religious policies. If passed, the senatorial committee would have to do one of two things: 1. Enter Mexican territory and make inquiries among the government heads and church officials. That would be on a par with a declaration of war and would most likely result in a curt order to get out of the country and cease in-

terfering with a neighboring country's internal affairs. 2. If the committee were to sit in Washington, we would have to ask the Mexican government to send its spokesmen to subject themselves to an official inquiry. Such a thing is inconceivable, for no self-respecting government could lay itself open to such an impertinent denial of its sovereignty.

Senator Borah has the reputation of being something of a liberal, so it is difficult to understand his mental processes in this instance. One is accustomed to hearing the heads of the Catholic Church in the U. S. scream for intervention, boycotts, etc. But for a man like Borah, who is supposed to be above such partisanship, to ask our government to interfere with Mexico's private affairs is a display of sheer political unrealism. If he went this far, then why doesn't he ask for a senatorial committee to call Germany on the carpet and demand that it explain its policies dealing with the Jews? Why doesn't he ask for another committee to call Mussolini to Washington to explain his actions in the Ethiopian affair? Why doesn't he ask for Japanese—but why continue? He keeps his hands off all such questions. They are none of our business, officially, though we may all hold private opinions on the policies of the Hitlers and the Mussolinis. In the present case, it is clear that the Catholic Church in this country is so strong that it can bulldoze supposedly liberal senators into asking for explanations from Mexico because that country is comparatively weak and its properly disciplined church very powerful, though it can't, for the present, compel Mexico's government to give the priests the power, privileges and honors they enjoyed for so many generations, to the injury of the country and its people.

The Catholic Church in Mexico is quick to cry persecution when it is made to obey reasonable and just laws (considering the history of the priests who are being made to respect the rights of the secular revolution), but once these Catholics get control of a country, as in Italy today, they are the first to

begin persecuting all liberals, democrats, Freethinkers and libertarians. In other words, when the church is in the minority, it is for liberty; when it is in control, it is for tyranny. Protests and complaints from such a dishonest source should leave all intelligent lovers of freedom untouched. The Catholic Church in Mexico is not fighting for freedom, but for the right to deny the Mexican people the intellectual freedom which took them many years to capture. The church is thinking of its lost prestige and its power to control education, publishing, and inquiry. It refuses to accept what the Mexican people had a perfect right to establish. The Mexican government is not persecuting the Catholic Church; rather is it struggling to keep the Church from persecuting Mexico. The church's history in Mexico is a black, appalling record of robbery, exploitation, persecution, bigotry, reaction, barbarism, and studied miseducation of the masses. With that knowledge fresh in the minds of the people one doesn't wonder why the intelligent people south of the Rio Grande don't want to see the priests returned to their old seats of power.

* * *

Is it true that the Catholic Church's bonds have never defaulted?

There have been numerous failures to meet interest or principal, particularly since 1930. Heavy issues have defaulted in Galveston, Texas, St. Augustine, Fla., Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Fresno and Monterey, Calif., and numerous other places. The Church in the big cities of the East has had better luck.

Most of the bonds issued by the Catholic Church were sold to Protestants, as it is a well-known fact that Catholics are almost invariably reluctant to buy securities of their Church, for fear of being called upon to turn the principal into contributions to the priests. So Protestants, innocently believing that "no Catholic bond has ever defaulted," bought the "sure-fire" paper—and lost. No new bond issues are now being offered, for the suckers are wary. An issue of \$11,000,000 in the Detroit diocese can be had at 50 cents on the dollar, but

there are no buyers. The University of Detroit's bond issue of \$2,500,000 went to Protestant investors at par, and now they can't get 30 cents on the dollar, because both interest and principal are in default.

The Catholic Church sees a ray of hope—inflation. That explains the amazing cavortings of Father Coughlin. He, as a mouthpiece of Bishop Gallagher and the other Catholic financial wizards, would like to provoke an orgy of inflation in order to pay off interest and principal with cheap, inflated currency. To understand Father Coughlin's financial propaganda one must have knowledge of the financial difficulties of the Church. A \$2,000,000,000 Church corporation has much to gain from reckless inflation. Its tremendous real estate holdings will leap in value, while the obligations against those holdings will be wiped out at perhaps a few pennies on the dollar—if Father Coughlin can put over the Church's scheme.

* * *

Did Wallisch, the Austrian Socialist who was hanged by the late Dollfuss see a priest before his execution?

Wallisch, like the other Socialist martyrs of the February, 1934, uprising, was an Atheist. A few minutes before his death, Wallisch was asked if he would care to see a priest, to which the brave leader laughingly replied: "Why should I want to see a priest when in a few minutes I'll be seeing the priest's big boss?" His grave, in the cemetery of Leoben, has no cross. Wallisch and the other Socialist martyrs were true to their ideas of Free-thought to the end. They knew they were victims of a combination of Fascism and Catholicism—they fought back with all their strength and gave the supreme sacrifice in loyalty to a great humanitarian idea.

* * *

What has become of Vienna's famous school system?

Vienna's schools, under the Socialists, were the pride of the educational world. The Catholic Church and the Dollfuss Fascists overthrew the Socialist municipal-

ity through blood and terror, and, after massacres that shocked the civilized world, the Catholic Church presented a concordat which was ratified. We now learn that soon after the Catholics put over their concordat with the Fascists, the Vienna public school system was attacked with all the fury of a crew of pirates. The greatest achievements of the Socialist administration in the public schools have been undone by the priests. The Catholic Church is now in absolute control of the schools, which means nothing less than decay and ruin. World-famous educators, including the distinguished Bertrand Russell, have sent a protest to Austria's Minister for Education, objecting to the woeful corruption of this great system "for the welfare of the children and the progress of pedagogic science." Professors at Geneva, London, Paris and other centers of education joined in the memorial. The Catholic Church, for the moment, is the victor, but there will be a day of reckoning. The priests, along with the Fascists, will be driven from Austria, for the Socialists are secretly organizing their forces and will strike at the right time. European Socialists know what the menace of Catholicism amounts to. They have no illusions about "religion being a private matter," especially when organized religion (Catholicism) is a part of the Fascist conspiracy to destroy civilization, liberty, democracy and enlightenment.

* * *

Does the religious question enter into the Yugoslavian situation?

Yes, strongly. The Croats and Slovenes are Roman Catholics, while the Serbians are Greek Orthodox Catholics. I don't have to tell my readers how such differences can lead to intrigues, conspiracies, murders, assassinations and persecutions. The Crpat who shot King Alexander was a Roman Catholic. On this point, let me quote the following significant sentence from the October 24, 1934, issue of *The Christian Century*, page 1334, bottom of second column: "There is even intrigue in central Europe looking toward a linking up of a solid bloc of Roman Catholic states

from the Adriatic to the Baltic." Of course, I have said this dozens of times in these columns, and will continue repeating it until I feel I have done my little part in informing the intelligent believers in democracy and social justice of the menace of Fascism in cahoots with Catholicism.

* * *

Why did the Governor of the State of Sonora, Mexico, expel its priests?

On May 21, 1934, Governor Rodolfo Elias Calles closed all Catholic churches and ousted the priests when it was discovered that the priesthood, under orders of the hierarchy in Mexico and Rome, were advocating a revolt against the republic, with a form of fascism as its objective. The Catholic Church, in all countries, is planning the destruction of democratic and liberal ideas of government and economics. In the countries of Central Europe, great reactionary forces have been put into power as a result of the conspiracies of the capitalist dictators and the Catholic Church. The next two objectives are Spain and Mexico, in which countries the priests were once in control, with a state-supported church. Spain alone, before the revolution ousted King Alfonso, supported 100,000 priests and nuns. In Mexico, under the dictatorship of Diaz, the Catholic Church was one of the means of keeping the people in intellectual and political slavery. Governor Calles, who is a son of former President Putarco Elias Calles, permitted priests to function in the cathedrals in his state until he saw there was a conspiracy to poison the people against the republic. He then took drastic action, on the theory that a political democracy has a perfect right to defend itself. There is no reason why the officials of a democratic state should put a dagger into the hands of Catholic-Fascist conspirators and say: "Here, stab the republic with this."

Why is the Catholic Church interfering with Mexico's program of education?

For four centuries, the Catholic Church had complete control of Mexican educational institutions.

To show how successful this regime of the priests was one need only consider the overwhelming fact that in 1910 the people of Mexico were illiterate to the extent of 85 percent. Since then the secularized government of Mexico has succeeded in reducing illiteracy to 35 percent, with the chance that the next decade may see the complete eradication of this social handicap. Such a record in only 14 years enrages the Catholic hierarchy, who seek the return of their ancient powers to keep the masses in ignorance, superstition and enslavement. The tyrannical government of Diaz, under which the Mexican masses were kept in peonage, found the Catholic Church to be its most ardent and powerful supporter. Naturally, when the revolution was victorious, a new policy was inaugurated—secularism in education and anti-clericalism in the realm of politics. The priests squawked, but the revolutionists stuck by their guns. For years the Catholic Church has conducted intrigue against the revolutionary government, as it has striven for the destruction of democratic ideals in countries like Italy, Poland, Spain and elsewhere. It happens that the Mexicans do not shudder at the sight of a priest or archbishop. They tell them where to get off, down below the Rio Grande, and that's anathema to the black-robed brethren. The government has produced documents—letters written by the archbishop at Mexico City—warning Catholic laymen that they will be denied communion if they persist in sending their children to the secularized public schools. A government so close to peonage and medievalism cannot afford to let enemies of progress have free sway in carrying out their conspiracies to destroy forms of government unacceptable to the Vatican. Mexico will not be bulldozed into abandoning its program of keeping the Catholic priests out of the public schools, basing education on science, freethought and working class philosophy, as against the obscurantism and superstition of the Pope.

* * *

Is there any chance of President

Roosevelt establishing diplomatic relations with the Vatican?

Yes, there is. It is agreed by well-informed persons in Washington that Postmaster General Farley's recent visit to the Pope had something to do with the reestablishment of diplomatic relations.

It is more than 60 years since an American ambassador has been accredited to the Vatican. Congress refused to appropriate further money for the upkeep of the embassy, so the American State Department had to recall its ambassador. This was Congress' way of telling the President that it did not want the U. S. government mixed up with a religious institution.

Until now we have been getting along very well without an American embassy in the Vatican or a papal embassy in Washington. If we are going to send an ambassador to Rome, why not send one to the Church of England, to the Lutheran Church, to the synagogues in Jerusalem? Why begin and end with the Catholic Church? There are other religions and churches, and to recognize one politically at the expense and neglect of others will only make for confusion and trouble. Also, why insult the free-thinkers, secularists and anti-religious elements of this country by having our government cut away from its traditional attitude of independence toward institutions of religion?

Recognizing Rome can do the United States no good. We will be drawn into the secret, dangerous, anti-liberal, reactionary policies of the most dangerous and corrupt religious body in all history—the Catholic Church. You can see the fine hand of Rome in European political affairs, if you will make only a superficial examination of the facts. Look at this matter of fascism. Is it merely a coincidence that Europe's three greatest fascist dictators—Hitler, Mussolini and Pilsudski—are all members of the Roman Catholic Church?

Germany, Poland and Italy are tyrannized by three Catholic brutes, relics of barbarism. These Catholic tyrants murder without compunction. They have no respect for culture, science, education, free in-

vestigation, free speech, democracy and liberalism. True to the traditional policies of the Catholic Church, they strangle liberty and murder the supporters of free institutions.

Behind the red hands of the fascist dictator one sees the black robe of the priest.

If Roosevelt recognizes the Vatican diplomatically, he will live to rue the day. Of course, he has the power to do this, and he may exercise that prerogative. If he does, the only way to stop the plan will be to prevail on Congress to refuse to appropriate the necessary funds to maintain an embassy.

At such a moment a vast flood of letters from the folks back home should have a good effect.

* * *

Why did we find so many high officials of the Roman Catholic Church opposed to the recognition of Russia by the United States?

The first reason, of course, is found in Russia's anti-religious policy. Russia is the world's first atheistic state, and that, needless to say, is the worst sin in the eyes of the Catholic Church, which thus sees its right to easy graft and power threatened. A workingman, educated and influenced by the Russians, is not an easy mark for designing priests. Of course, the Soviet Union allows freedom of worship, but this is not enough for the Catholic hierarchy. It hates tolerance, liberalism and freedom of thought. In the world of economics, the Catholic Church is always on the side of the exploiters of the masses, regardless of whether the masters are slave-holders, feudal barons or capitalists. Its entire history reeks with the blood and sweat of the toilers. It has always been on the side of the social and economic exploitation of the working class, and as Russia has a working class economy it hates Russia's economic program as much as it loathes its atheistic philosophy. The Catholic Church permits a few of its lesser lights—ordinary priests in a few, rare cases, and laymen like Al Smith—to say a good word for democracy, but this in no way commits the church itself to liberalism in politics, industry or social

relations. The Catholic Church's historic position is deathless opposition to every progressive idea in the direction of freedom, democracy, libertarianism and humanism. The Catholic Church is man's oldest institution of hatred, intellectual poison gas and reaction. It is man's worst enemy. Humanity won't feel safe until it has shorn this vast organization of all its political and social powers.

* * *

It is claimed that without the Roman Catholic Church there would have been no art. Please comment.

This is an appalling statement to make. First of all, man's greatest artistic achievements were made before there was a Catholic Church. I refer to the great art of the ancient Greeks and Romans. It is true that after a thousand years of swinishness and disgraceful barbarism—during the centuries of the Dark Ages when the Catholic Church was in control of most of Europe—a move was started by certain "bad and immoral" Popes to finance artistic creativeness. But this was done only after secular, commercial cities had shown the way. The Church—rolling in unearned wealth—hired artists and architects, in the same way that great corporations today hire artists and architects, to create beautiful works of art and magnificent skyscrapers.

The artists were available then, as they are available now, for those with the money to pay. Artists don't stop to ask whose money is to be taken. They do their work for anyone who will pay the price. The greatest artists of the renaissance were Freethinkers and Skeptics.

There were a few exceptions, of course, but by and large the Church did nothing to create art; it merely availed itself of the services of artists who were ready to build a new city hall today for a group of politicians, a new and beautiful building for some commercial interests, or a structure for a rich church. I remember having interviewed—some 25 years ago—the owner of a beautiful house of prostitution in a large American city, having been sent there in the

interest of my city editor who wanted a certain story. While there I was impressed with the beauty of the place—works of art, stained glass, sculptures, priceless decorations, tapestries, mosaics, fountains and numerous other expressions of man's creative impulses. It happened that this keeper of a brothel had plenty of money and good taste in art—so she called in the nation's finest artists and paid them for their services. The artists asked no questions. They rendered her the same devoted services they gave to the Catholic cathedral they may have been working on the week before. Maybe better. The Pope and the Prostitute had the money—and that explains everything.

* * *

Why is Torquemada considered such a monster?

Because this Dominican monk was one of the worst fanatics in the history of the Catholic Church. Considering the record of that church, one has to be pretty awful to win distinction for brutality. Torquemada caused 8,800 persons to be burned alive. In addition, 9,000 were sent through the torture chambers, maimed, broken, imprisoned for life or exiled, with their property confiscated. All because the Catholic Church was not accepted as "the one and only."

* * *

Didn't the Catholic Church make Rome the great city it is?

Catholic propaganda here is again wrong. Rome, in the days of Julius Caesar, had a population of 1,200,000. It was a magnificent metropolis, with almost frantic activity in statesmanship, philosophy, the drama, architecture, engineering, art, dancing, education, law, commerce, and numerous other expressions of civilization. In the Middle Ages, when the Catholic Church's rule over Europe became almost completely dominant, Rome's population dwindled to only 20,000 inhabitants—a cesspool of decadence, sloth, superstition, persecution, reaction and barbarism. It was only with the Renaissance that Italy began again to take on life and throw off the chains of Catholic superstition. Rome was among the late cities to enjoy the

New Birth, because of the closeness of the Vatican. When money poured in by the millions, the Vatican called artists and architects from the other cities, mainly humanistic Florence, and began its gradual return, though it was careful to avoid progress in science and culture. It was only after the Vatican suffered severe defeats and was slowly deprived of temporal powers that Rome, under non-Catholic influences and the benefits of a scientific approach to life, took on real vigor and went forward rapidly, so that now it has a population somewhat in excess of 1,000,000, but it is still smaller than Milan.

* * *

How did the Catholic Church meet the claim that the world is a ball?

It fought scientific geography for centuries after the educated accepted the world's roundness. It is hardly more than a century since the Catholic Church surrendered to this scientific fact. Through its inquisition it burned and tortured thousands of people for accepting this piece of heresy. Magellan sailed around the world in 1519, but this final proof meant nothing to the church, so deeply was it buried in ignorance, superstition and hatred of science. The most amusing "argument" against the earth's sphericity was advanced by the "great" and "learned" St. Augustine, who held that the Lord would never permit such a condition because those living on the opposite side could not see Jesus returning for the Second Coming!

* * *

When were the Roman Catholic Church's seven sacraments first formulated?

Only about 800 years ago, in Peter Lombard's book, "Sentences."

* * *

The Rev. Dr. Ignatius W. Cox, professor of ethics at Fordham University, in a sermon at the Roman Catholic Church of St. Ignatius Loyola, N. Y. C., said, on March 4, 1934: "It is absurd to conceive religion as the 'opiate of the people.' Human liberty was born with the advent of Christianity and is dying today with the progressive apostasy from Christianity." Please discuss.

This is just one more proof of the way priests and preachers have of talking the most amazing rot and getting away with it. The notion that Christianity brought human liberty to the world is astonishing piffle. Why, there is still one more Christian country—Abyssinia—in which human slavery is an established institution. It is only a few generations since slavery was recognized as legal and Christian in the United States, with the Catholic and Protestant churches doing their utmost to stand by the slaveholders. The anti-slavery wing of the northern church was an insignificant minority, with the large, orthodox religious institutions opposing abolition. The Catholic Church was the greatest slave-owning class in all Europe in the Middle Ages, and it was the Catholic Church that helped spread slavery into the new world, particularly in South America.

Every advance in social relations—human liberty—had to be fought and won against the combined opposition of the various followers of Jesus. And today, with the industrial and political worlds in turmoil, it is the Catholic Church which is tirelessly on the side of human slavery and reaction.

Has the Vatican ever said one word for democracy and intellectual freedom? Has the Vatican shown by word or deed that it is opposed to the liberty-crushing policies of its Catholic sons in Germany (Hitler), Poland (Pilsudski), and Italy (Mussolini)? Was it not the Catholic Church that made Mussolini turn over the public schools of Italy to the Catholic Church, so that freedom of thought and conscience might be strangled and the new generations brought up in mental darkness? Is not the Catholic hierarchy in the United States doing its utmost to kill the humane constitutional amendment that aims to do away with child labor?

Karl Marx was never more right when he uttered those immortal words, "Religion is the opiate of the people." History proves the correctness of his characterization. Christianity, particularly in its main institution (Catholicism), has been

an unmitigated, endless curse to humanity. It has put back the race at least 1,000 years. Humanity won't be safe in striving for human liberty until it finally strips the Catholic Church of its power to shackle and crush mankind.

Civilization today is not dying, though there are difficult issues facing us. There is no room for this sort of wild talk. Man is getting closer and closer to a solution of his economic problems, despite the efforts of our Catholic dictators in Central Europe. As bad as things are today, the condition of the lower classes is better today than it was in the days of Catholic control during the Dark and Middle Ages.

As we get away from religion and Catholic control we get closer to political and industrial emancipation. Christianity is dying, as the Rev. Cox infers, but that in itself is a sign of progress. It means that we are to have one less enemy to deal with. Central Europe, too long under the control of the Catholic Church, is in chaos, but let us not forget that autocracy and tyranny have been "normal" conditions in those countries for centuries.

* * *

Please comment on the argument of the Catholic Church that the Rhythm method of birth control is moral because it is natural?

It takes a fine-spinning Jesuit theologian to think up such a piece of tripe. If it is "moral" to take advantage of a woman's sterile days, why is it "immoral" to use chemicals? Didn't the good old Jehovah make the chemicals as well as the sterile days? If Rhythm is moral then chemical birth control methods are equally moral. Besides, chemical methods are surer, because they work regardless of the calendar. One who depends on the Rhythm method may get his dates mixed, with the result that he may be the father of a mess of quintuplets when he had in mind a bag full of zeros. Science says it is true there are sterile days—and nights—but it adds that it is wiser to be open-minded about all methods, whether "natural" or chemical. The Church forgets its old argument. Its priests used to repeat

endlessly that sexual intercourse was intended by Gawd Almighty to people the earth, and that should be the only reason for indulgence. What becomes of this holy doctrine when we are told by these same priests that it wouldn't be wrong to sneak a look at the calendar and fit in the act with the rhythm of the woman's cycle. If a couple watch the calendar year in and year out are they any different from those who put their faith in a 50-cent contraceptive?

* * *

It is claimed by the Pope and his American cardinals and bishops that the boycott of the moving picture industry will result in an improvement of morals. Please comment.

The Pope and his saints are not sincerely interested in morals. They are more concerned with retaining power over the minds of their dupes. Suppressing some pictures showing Mae West, Greta Garbo and Joan Crawford won't do a thing for real morals.

If the Pope were sincere, he would go to the roots of bad morals—vile economic conditions. If we were able to improve man's economic situation so that all who would work would be guaranteed a job, and that all who work will receive the full social value of their labor—if we were able to do this, mark you, we would need no fanatical drive on movies.

Man's morals are improved by good environment. The great sociologists of the world have agreed on this simple fact. And yet, the Catholic Church—which claims to be the caretaker of man's morals—does nothing to strike at the conditions that make for crime, vice, social evil, degeneration, exploitation, parasitism and all the other symptoms of a diseased social order.

The truth of the matter is that the Catholic Church is one of the props of the present rotten system, and it therefore follows that the Church is one of the greatest forces for immorality in the world today.

Mark you, I do not use the word immorality in its theological sense. By immoral conduct I do not mean

a sex affair, but rather conduct that includes greed, cruelty, obscurantism, deceit, exploitation, profiteering, speculation with the necessities of the people, destruction of labor's aspirations to economic emancipation. These things are really immoral, and not a word of protest from the great "moral" Catholic Church.

Was the Catholic Cardinal in Vienna moral when he conspired with Dollfuss to bombard the apartment houses of the Socialist workmen and slaughter 1,500 men, women and children? Was it moral when the Catholic Church decided on its reactionary policy of crushing democracy and freedom, and giving free scope to the barbarous designs of the Fascists?

The Catholic Church grows eloquent when it sees unhappy men and women freed from matrimonial chains through the humane divorce laws of many of our States, Russia, Mexico and other civilized countries. But this is sheer hypocrisy. Divorce is not an evil—it is a cure. Individuals who have made a mistake are now given a chance to free themselves, in many lands. That is against the dictates of the Catholic Church, but that doesn't make it immoral. It would be much more immoral to compel unhappy couples to continue suffering in their self-created misery.

The Catholic Church claims it is immoral to tell a workingman's sick and starving wife how to avoid having any more children. But intelligent, humane people do not consider this immoral—they look on it as the very heart of true morality.

The whole movie drive of the Catholic Church—with the help of protestant preachers and rabbis—is a flagrant piece of jealousy over the power for entertainment now held by a secular group of cinema businessmen. These movies are bad artistically—in the main—but it isn't bad art that worries the Church. It is loss of its own power and prestige. So it raises the smoke screen of "morality" when the whole intelligent world knows that true morality has always been fought by these "gentlemen" of the cloth.

Has there ever been a war that was not blessed by the priests, preachers and rabbis? Is not war a disgracefully immoral thing? If it's morality the Pope is worried about, let him get his Fascist darlings together in Central Europe and teach them a few lessons in common decency. It is the Freethinkers, Socialists and radicals who are trying to civilize Central Europe—not its priests.

* * *

Why is the Catholic Church resorting to the boycott in its fight on the movies, instead of insisting on censorship?

The Catholic Church would be ready to ask for federal censorship if it thought there was any chance of having pictures censored according to Catholic "standards." With the country Protestant and secular, which leaves the Catholic Church in the minority, there would be no opportunity for Catholic control of movies, as would be the chance if the Church were either a majority or a ruling minority. In European countries, where the Catholic Church is in control, there is no hesitancy about insisting on censorship. To say that the Catholic Church does not believe in using the State in matters of morals is to utter rank nonsense. The Catholic Church does not hesitate, even in the United States, to fight Birth Control and Divorce through the instrumentalities of the State. The Church also tries to impose its will on the State in attempts to suppress free literature.

* * *

Why do we find so many high officials of the Roman Catholic Church opposing the proposed Child Labor Amendment to the Constitution of the United States?

There should be no cause for surprise. We see cardinals and bishops everywhere opposing this humane, decent, liberal and civilized proposal to take our youth out of the clutches of the exploiting capitalists. The Catholic Church may always be counted on to stand by the forces of reaction and brutal exploitation. It opposed the establishment of public schools, public libraries, education, free press, free-

dom of thought and speech, democracy, labor unions, tolerance, free investigation, civil rights for unbelievers, etc. The Catholic church is a vast political, economic machine, which gives its best efforts to the side that hopes for the continuation of social injustice, poverty, misery, slavery and mental backwardness. The Catholic Church knows that once the gates are thrown open to the light of freedom and genuine progress, the priesthood will be forced to take a back seat. With the people kept in political, economic and intellectual darkness the reign of the priest has a better chance to endure. Once the record of the Catholic Church is known and understood there ceases to be cause for wonderment in its attempts to defeat the Child Labor amendment now before the several States.

* * *

Did the Catholic Church ever condemn physics?

Yes. Pope Alexander III, in 1163, issued a decree against the teaching of physics. The scientific method of studying nature was hated by the church because it contradicted the Bible. Chemistry was another forbidden science for long centuries. Pope Paul II gagged Porta when he learned (in the 16th century) that this chemist had done important work on metallic oxides. The record is appallingly barbaric.

* * *

Are any of Mark Twain's works on the Roman Catholic Index Expurgatorius?

No. You will find very few modern works on the Catholic index, for the simple reason that the recent books are too rich in Free-thought, heresy, Atheism and skepticism to make it possible for the index to even list them. This amazing book (which is in itself evidence of the Church's hatred for science, knowledge and intellectual inquiry) is still published by the Vatican, but it really stands as nothing more than a symbol of the Church's past attitude towards intellectual freedom. When the Church was tremendously powerful in most of Europe, more than a century ago, the index meant something, but now even Catholics

pay little heed to this volume. In the old days, when printing was new and censorship was much stronger than it is today, it was possible, within limits, for the Church to outlaw certain kinds of books. But not now, though there is no telling what the future holds for enlightened civilization. The disease that has struck at Italy, Austria, Germany, etc., may spread, and if it does we can look for a new Index covering not only many of the works of Mark Twain (who was a materialist and a Freethinker), but such outstanding figures as Einstein, Bertrand Russell, Joseph McCabe, and literally hundreds of other truth-seeking authors, investigators, scientists and social philosophers. Those who are interested in this subject are advised to read Joseph McCabe's recent book, "The History and Meaning of the Catholic Index of Forbidden Books." It is a readable, amusing and highly informative work, written in McCabe's best style, for McCabe misses few opportunities to have fun with the amazing crudities, stupidities and insanities of the Vatican's index.

* * *

Please reprint the secret oath of the Knights of Columbus.

I have seen copies of this oath. About 10 years ago, millions of copies were circulated by the K. K. K., but the oath's authenticity was never established. In fact, this so-called oath is as plain a forgery as the Protocols of the Elders of Zion now being circulated by anti-Semites. While it is true that the Catholic Church is the sworn foe of democracy, liberty, free speech, free inquiry and the like, it should be fought with the weapons of truth, not with faked documents. In my criticisms of the Catholic Church I am always careful to draw on authentic sources. If I can't verify a fact or a date, I don't mention it. Thus far, no Catholic editor or priest has been able to "call" me on any of my statements. This is because I stick to the record.

* * *

Was there ever an English pope?

Yes. In 1154, Adrian IV (Nicholas Brakespeare) was elected pope. He was an Englishman, born at

Abbot's Langley, near St. Alban's. It would be difficult for anyone but an Italian to be elected pope today because of the policy of the college of Cardinals to meet hurriedly for the purpose of electing a pope, thus making it impossible for cardinals from distant countries to get to the Vatican in time. This makes it pretty settled that Italian cardinals can hold down the job as long as they please, though they could, as a matter of expediency, decide formally to give an American a "break" at the job, in order to promote papal policies in the United States, the most profitable source of cash for the pope's treasures. But it would have to be an overwhelming urgency, for this job carries tremendous honors, powers, positions and rewards.

* * *

Granting that the medieval Catholic Church owned slaves, what is the attitude of the modern Church in this question?

The year 1888 is modern, and it was in that recent year that Pope Leo wrote to the Bishop of Brazil, as follows:

"When amid the slave multitude whom she has numbered among her children, some led astray by some hope of liberty, have had recourse to violence and sedition, the Church has always condemned these unlawful efforts, and through her ministers has applied the remedy of patience. . . ."

What this amazing sentence means is very clear. Slaves are accepted into the Catholic Church, but they must be taught patience—patience with slavery! They must not rebel—the Church disapproves. This also means that if slavery were reestablished in the United States, Mexico, South America and Europe, the popes would help keep the slaves in chains by teaching "patience."

* * *

How many nuns are there in the U. S.?

Until recently no authoritative reports were available, because the Catholic Church did not seem to want the facts known. However, we now know the truth, thanks to the Russell Sage Foundation, which

drew on the Catholic National Welfare Council. There are 123,304 nuns in this country, which is an astonishingly large number. About 63,000 of these nuns are engaged as teachers in Catholic educational institutions. There are 10,000 Catholic schools in this country, with an attendance of 2,500,000 children. The above facts are taken from E. Boyd Barrett's article, entitled "The Sociology of Nunneries," in the February, 1935, *American Mercury*.

* * *

The Most Rev. Thomas E. Molloy, Bishop of Brooklyn, in a pastoral letter to his clergy, February 1, 1935, said the system of taxation which requires Roman Catholics to pay taxes in support of public schools while at the same time supporting their own parochial school system is "unethical and indeed un-American." Please comment.

This argument is used frequently by spokesmen for the Catholic Church, in an attempt to have their school system (of which there are 10,000 units in the U. S.) supported and financed by the states or the federal government, thus having the American people pay the expenses of the public as well as the parochial schools. The argument, is, of course, weak because no Catholic is compelled to support the parochial schools. Such support is voluntary, and if he wants such institutions he should not complain because he is called on to foot the bills. If the government is to pay the expenses of parochial schools, then what is to prevent our assuming the costs of all other private educational systems, religious or secular? We would then be made to pay for our public schools, Catholic parochial schools, Ethical Society schools, Jewish, Protestant, Mormon, Seventh Day Adventist, aristocratic private finishing schools, etc. Our public school system stands ready to absorb every willing pupil, and by providing such facilities the government has met fully its obligation to provide free instruction. Catholics have the right to start their own schools, of course, but that right does not imply they may switch the cost to the people who

are not interested or may even be opposed, to such forms of education. Of course, the Catholic Church, in other countries (including Canada), is able to put pressure on the government and receive subsidies, but such a condition would be unconstitutional in this country and in violent opposition to the country's tradition of separation of church and state. For a Catholic to pay his own costs is not to impose double taxation, for the bill he assumes is a voluntary one, as already stated. The remedy is for the Catholic to abandon his separate school system and avail himself of the superior public school institutions of the land. Parochial schools are merely weapons of the Roman Catholic Church to make sure of a steady supply of religious dupes. In scholarship, the parochial schools stand very low. The output is uniformly inferior, as shown by the fact that Catholics in *Who's Who* stand on a par with Seventh Day Adventists and other intellectual cripples. Catholic scholarship, about which we hear so much, is just another one of those myths. An educational system that controls 2,500,000 children and produces nothing of an outstanding nature in science, literature, poetry, research, etc., is in itself evidence of failure and it would be a crime against the nation to have its bills paid by general taxation.

Does Catholic literature contain reports of collaboration between saints and animals?

Beginning in the fourth century and until the 12th, Catholic literature contained numerous statements of how the saints and dumb animals cooperated. Today, one rarely hears of such fairy tales, even among the more ignorant dupes of the Catholic Church. But the printed record is there and no priestly magic can erase it. Perhaps the most amusing incident in all Catholic literature is the report of Saint Colman that he had a mouse that always woke him up in time for mass and a house fly that walked down the pages of his books and sat down on some particular word in order to keep the reader's

place while he went to the toilet. On his return, St. Colman would begin reading at the spot marked by the fly, which would begin journeying again from line to line as the saint proceeded with his literary endeavors.

There are numerous other reports, but none quite as amusing as the one about St. Colman. St. Pachome, for example, used to cross rivers on the backs of crocodiles instead of ferries. St. Kevin had a blackbird fly into his hand and lay an egg there, whereupon the sainted one held it there until it hatched. And so on. How plain it is that Catholicism was born in credulity, nurtured in superstition and grew to manhood in dark ignorance. All these reports would be of little more than academic interest if the Catholic Church were not a living, powerful, menacing institution today, determined to destroy the best fruits of civilization and give a new lease on life to medievalism and Fascism.

* * *

Please comment on Governor Curley's threat of action against justices of the peace in Massachusetts who conduct marriage ceremonies.

Governor Curley is a fanatical Catholic and seeks to compel religious marriage ceremonies in his state. In Italy, the Catholic Church got a monopoly of the marriage business through a concordat with Mussolini, but in Massachusetts a Catholic governor escapes the necessity of a concordat by using his executive powers to force non-religious people to abandon civil marriages. It happens that more than 40 percent of the people in this country profess no religion. Have they no right to a civil marriage, if they prefer such a ceremony? Has the Catholic Church, and other religious institutions, the right to compel non-religious people to give up secular practices and adopt religious mumbo-jumbo? Such incidents clearly show the tendency towards religious absolutism in this country. The powers of reaction are in the saddle, and riding hard, determined to regain powers they lost through the growth of rationalistic ideas and principles. All persons who still believe in civil lib-

erties should be on the alert to resist such movements. Secular, democratic principles are in danger, and if there isn't a spirit of eternal vigilance we will soon find ourselves ruled by a combination of dictators in the political world and theocrats in the religious sphere. This isn't mere calamity howling but a warning regarding a situation that is alarming. It wasn't so many years ago that Americans were forced to contribute tithes (a tenth of their income) to the church; compelled to attend services; denied secular rights in amusement, education, printing, free press, etc. Those tyrannies were thrown off by sturdy Americans who refused to bow before the "divine" might of priests, preachers and rabbis. That spirit is too precious to die now. Indifference must be thrown off. The danger is real, and if we are not on guard we will soon slip back into the Dark Ages.

* * *

What is Vatican City?

The official name is State of the Vatican City, which was created on February 11, 1929. This re-creation of the Papal State resulted from a treaty, signed by Italy and the Vatican, recognizing the pope's complete sovereignty in Vatican City; a Concordat granting the Vatican control of all education throughout Italy, the agreement to punish any individual who even criticizes the Catholic Church anywhere in Italy or her colonies, and, in addition, a vast financial settlement, which Joseph McCabe properly calls a bribe, paid by Mussolini to win the Catholic Church's support for his Fascist state. Mussolini paid in cash 750,000,000 lire (a lire

is worth about 8c of our money) and 5 percent Italian State bonds of a face value of 1,000,000,000 lire. This compensation was supposed to reimburse the pope and his church for "losses" sustained when temporal power was ended in 1870. This money and bonds were turned over to the Vatican on June 7, 1929, when the treaties were finally ratified.

The State of Vatican City (Citta del Vaticano) covers an area of 108.7 acres, including St. Peter's Square, the latter remaining subject to Italian police powers. Elsewhere in Vatican City the pope is granted complete legal, executive and judicial powers. The pope appoints a governor, directly answerable and responsible to himself, to assert executive powers. Judicial power rests with a papal tribunal, to begin with, subject to an appeal to the *Sacra Romana Rota*, and finally to the supreme tribunal, the *Segnatura*. The State of Vatican City conducts a foreign office to deal with other states, under *Segreteria di stato del Sommo Pontefice*.

The State of Vatican City owns its railway station, postoffice, newspaper and publishing plant, radio, etc. In addition, Vatican City is given extra-territorial rights over 13 Roman buildings outside the papal state. On December 17, 1929, Vatican City took a census of its population, which showed 528 inhabitants, of the following nationalities: 389, Italian; 113, Swiss; 11, French; 5, German; 2, Spanish; 1, U. S. A.; 1, Belgian; 1, Norwegian; 1, Austrian; 1, Dutch; 1, Abyssinian (a Christian country which still tolerates chattel slavery); 2, native-born. The census also showed 230 foreign residents.

Mussolini

Why is Mussolini often referred to as "duce," and how is the word pronounced?

The word means "leader." It is pronounced: **ell doo-che.**
* * *

How long has Mussolini been in power?

Since October, 1922.
* * *

Now that Mussolini is beginning to pick on Abyssinia, our interests begin to turn to Africa again. How many independent nations are left in Africa?

Very few, considering the vastness of the continent. They are Abyssinia (Ethiopia), South Africa, Liberia, Egypt (in a limited sense) and the small dominion of Southern Rhodesia.

Abyssinia (which is about three times the size of New Mexico) contains perhaps 10,000,000 population, though no census has ever been taken. Back in 1896 this black country gave Italy the beating of its life, sweeping the Italian army off the plains, after cutting parts of it to pieces and taking thousands of prisoners. Mussolini, long aching for a war, is afraid of France, merely blusters at Germany, and makes faces at Yugoslavia, so he picked out the Abyssinians for the trouble he seems determined to find. But even there he had better take a second thought, for those black Abyssinians are not a gang of savages, as so many people imagine. They are well-armed, with the latest rifles and machine guns, and can put a million men into the field.

Mussolini will find that his mechanized war will depend on many Milan and Turin skilled mechanics, and they are known to be anti-fascist and anti-imperialist. When the big fascist boss gets them down in Africa he may find them doing things his plans didn't call for. They certainly aren't going to

throw themselves away willingly, just to please a terrorist who wants to drive them into a land that frequently has a temperature of 140 degrees and very little water. Those Negroes can stand that climate, and get by with a pint of water a day, but what will Mussolini's pawns act like when they get into that inferno? It's all very interesting, and Mussolini certainly can't claim to have the answer. He may learn something before he gets very far.

The Abyssinians don't want trouble with Italy, but driven to desperation they will fight heroically, for their cause is assuredly a just one. Nothing would please me better than to see those black fighters give Mussolini the drubbing he has so richly earned.
* * *

The Italian press now claims that Italy's defeat at the hands of Abyssinia, in 1896, was really the prelude to a glorious victory to come in 1935. Please comment.

The Abyssinians took an Italian army of 13,000 men and cut it down to 3,000. And Mussolini calls that a "glorious victory." The Abyssinians then drove the Italians out of their country. And Mussolini sings an ode to victory. It reminds me of the fellow who boasted: "Oh, boy, how my nose made that guy's fist bloody!"
* * *

What is your opinion of the Italian army?

Clemenceau, in one of his inspired moments, said there were three unimportant things—the opinions of Poincare, the love affairs of a man of 80, and the Italian army.
* * *

Who was Matteotti?

Giacomo Matteotti was a powerful opponent of Mussolini's fascism, and as a Socialist member of Italy's Chamber of Deputies he spoke fearlessly against the anti-democratic,

repressive, tyrannical, liberty-killing policies of the leader of the Black Shirts. Mussolini was determined to silence this brilliant Socialist leader, so on June 10, 1924, he had his henchmen kidnap and murder him. When criticizing Hitler for his brutalities, let us not forget that he went to Mussolini's school of murder and assassination.

* * *

You can knock Mussolini all you want to, but you'll have to admit that he saved Italy by giving it a superior economic position.

He certainly has done nothing of the sort. You have fallen for the cheap publicity of the propagandists of the dictators. The facts tell the opposite. During 1932, there were 21,000 bankruptcies in Italy, which was five times the number of those in Great Britain.

The 1932-33 budget showed a deficit of over \$300,000,000. This alone could have brought about Mussolini's collapse through bankruptcy had he not been able to draw on funds gathered in the days before Mussolini became dictator and put aside for social insurance. Mussolini stole this money that was intended for social insurance and in that manner was able to wriggle through, but naturally this practice cannot continue indefinitely.

It is argued by his propagandists that the cost of living has dropped in Italy to the extent of 15.73 percent since 1927. Why do they fail to add that wages dropped even more. In many occupations wages dropped as much as 40 percent. Denied the right to have free unionism, the Italian workers have been forced to accept cut after cut, until now, according to the International Labor Organization and the annual report of the British commercial agent at Rome, Italy's standard of living is the lowest in Europe, and perhaps in the entire world, with the single exception of the orientals.

A great to-do is made about Mussolini's public works program. The answer to this is that if you were to add up the figures for the last 10 years they would fall far below the yearly loans made in Great Britain for local public works. The fact of the matter is

that economic conditions in Italy are worse than they have been during the past generation, except during the worst of the World War. But dictators must justify themselves, so they strive to give the world the impression that their benevolent feudalism has brought order and prosperity to their lands. But the facts prove them to be falsifiers.

The order they boast about is the order of a terrorized community—scared into silence by the guns and tortures of Mussolini's private murderers. But the country itself is seething with anger and hatred for this destroyer of liberty. The peoples of Italy, Austria and Germany have not the power to throw off their dictators today, but their day is coming. A free people, with a representative government, with free speech and the other rights of decent citizenship, can always outstrip commercially a country ruled by dictatorship and terror. The facts prove this assertion. England and the United States have nothing to gain from dictatorship. We have many serious issues facing us, but we cannot remedy them by resorting to the policies of a Mussolini, especially since it is plain that Mussolini's policies have sent his people deeper into the mire of economic backwardness and depression.

* * *

Premier Benito Mussolini declares: "It is better to live one day as a lion than 100 as a sheep." Please comment.

It might be good sense to remind Mussolini that as we are men we should strive to live like men. Mussolini frequently strives to roar like a lion, but a sensitive ear often detects the bray of the ass.

* * *

Enclosed find clipping of a speech by Homer Albers, dean of Boston University, who says Italy's working people are happy. Please comment.

This American Fascist says Mussolini has brought happiness to the worker, but in the next paragraph he says that the dictator of the Black Shirt murderers cut the average pay of the workers in Italy to eight cents per hour. If that's

happiness, give me a dose of carbolic acid and get it over with. By his own words Homer Albers admits that Italy's toilers now "enjoy" a standard of living only one degree better than that of coolies in China.

* * *

It is claimed that since Mussolini took charge of Italy the trains have been running on time. Please comment.

This is one of the favorite arguments of the supporters of Italy's regime of economic and intellectual tyranny. One would imagine that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness (to quote an increasingly unpopular document) can be shelved if only the trains can be made to run on time. It happens that the trains in the United States and England run pretty well on time, despite the handicaps of political democracy! But, to return to Italy, what are the facts with regard to her trains? Robert Dell, writing after a visit to Italy, tells his readers in *The Nation*, June 13, 1934, that he took a crack **rapide** (one of Italy's best trains) from Genoa to Turin, and it took nearly three hours to cover the 104 miles. The regular "express" takes about four hours. He says he has no report on what a slow train does, as Mussolini and God prefer to say nothing on this score.

* * *

It is true that Italy, under Mussolini's Fascism, is rapidly approaching bankruptcy?

Mussolini is a great showman and knows how to impress the world with the illusion that he is a truly great man who is reconstructing Italy economically and showing the way to security and prosperity. He looks very impressive in the newsreels, and the crowds he addresses in Rome look even larger than our typical football gatherings. But, alas, the science of economics deals with realities and not with stirring phrases, so we must shut our ears to the wild cheering and stare at balance sheets, tax schedules, budgets and all the other dry, but vitally important, phases of a nation's political, financial and industrial life.

New figures are now coming out

of Mussolini's concentration camp (for all Italy is now nothing less than a concentration camp) and they show the price 42,000,000 Italians are paying in order to satisfy the insane ambitions of an egotistic tyrant. Mr. Frank Knox, editor and publisher of the **Chicago Daily News**, himself a conservative of the Hoover stripe, cabled from Rome, on May 13, 1934, the dismal news that Italy was just about bankrupt and that the nation is headed for disaster. Let's look at a few of his figures:

1. The public debt has grown to the bewildering total of 102,000,000,000 lire, according to official reports. The lire, at current rates of exchange, is worth 8.53 cents in U. S. money, which is about 11.7 lire to the American dollar. Another 50,000,000,000 lire must be added to the above figure, even though Mussolini's statisticians omit the item. This means a total public debt of more than 150,000,000,000 lire. It was 111,000,000,000 lire in 1929.

2. The government's budget for 1933 showed 3,663,000,000 lire as the deficit. The deficit and public debt show definitely that Italy is run by a busted government and that it is only a matter of time before Mussolini's house of cards topples over.

3. We talk about high taxes in the United States, but just think of this: In 1933 Italy's taxes ate up approximately 38 percent of the nation's income from all sources. Think what it means when the people of Italy expend 38 percent of their energy for the upkeep of a government and even then find that the public debt is growing and the deficit is greater than ever before.

4. The unemployment figure for 1930, in Italy, amounted to 500,000; in January, 1934, it grew to 1,150,000.

As Mussolini is the cleverest of all the fascist dictators, and as he is among the first to steer his country into bankruptcy, it is safe to predict that the same economic plight awaits Germany, Austria, Poland and Yugo-Slavia. Fascism doesn't pay. It is unable to deliver the goods. And, remember, these

bad reports come at a time when the countries enjoying political democracy are making substantial headway in the direction of economic recovery.

It is the claim of Socialists that political democracy is not enough to bring parliamentary countries entirely out of the bog of depression. Political democracy is a desirable institution, and shows real benefits in general morale, social effectiveness, productivity, etc., but this does not cover the problem. We must extend political democracy to industrial democracy. The means of wealth production, distribution and exchange must be operated socially for the good of the entire community, in order to destroy the greatest force that makes for economic reaction. Political democracy is a good beginning, but only a beginning. The real goal is a social order in which economic autocracy will go the way of political autocracy. That is the only answer to rugged individualism, which is America's curse, Fascism, Hitlerism, Nazism and all the other expressions of concentrated authority.

* * *

Did not Mussolini do a magnificent job in clearing the Pontine Marshes?

I have looked into the facts and don't find much to get enthusiastic about. If this is the flower of fascism's "constructive" side, let us continue to enjoy the "evils" of democracy. The Pontine Marshes covered 103,000 acres, where mosquitoes spread malaria. Mussolini had the land cleared and then laid it out in small farms around two new cities. The whole Pontine Marshes job cost \$20,000,000, which is about one-fourth the amount Uncle Sam is spending on the San Francisco-Oakland bridge. Democratic United States—with all its limitations—would be ashamed to blow over such a puny job. The whole thing looks like a first-rate county project. The smallness of Mussolini's public works plans may be judged from the fact that from 1922 to 1933—11 years—he spent only \$480,000,000, a mere \$43,000,000 per year. Put that alongside the slum clearance program of the

London Socialist administration and you begin to see what a blow-hard Mussolini is. The fact of the matter is that Italy is busted and fascism is a failure. With all its shortcomings, Democracy gets more done, and with less ballyhoo.

* * *

Granting your claim that Fascism has about bankrupted Italy, what is the situation with regard to the cultural life of the country?

A decade of Fascism has been as devastating in the sphere of culture as it has been in economics. Today, Italy has only one first-rate thinker—Senator Croce—who did his work long before the world ever heard of Mussolini. Today, he is Italy's most famous anti-Fascist, though he is compelled to keep his criticism to himself because of Mussolini's ruthless censorship and heartless brutality.

After a decade of Fascism—with the country in the complete control of Mussolini's Black Shirts—we cannot find a single poet, philosopher, novelist, essayist, composer, artist or critic who is doing anything outstanding. There are local figures scattered about, but they are all small-fry and cannot take their place with foreign world-figures who are almost too numerous to mention.

Italian scholarship is in a state of coma. Fascism and Catholicism are the twin blights of culture. The arts cannot thrive in an atmosphere of repression. Freedom is build mighty edifices of artistic creation, thought, beauty and intellectual progress. Philosophy withers under the threat of the policeman's club.

Italy has destroyed free speech, free press, free thought and free assembly—and Italy is paying the price in cultural sterility.

* * *

What does Mussolini mean by his "Corporate State"?

It is Mussolini's economic policy to make the state a partner in the nation's business establishments. Italy will permit and protect the principle of capitalism (the private ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange), but in order to guarantee the sys-

tem's "efficiency," Mussolini's fascist state demands the right to become a part of the great corporations.

Once Mussolini's state is represented on a corporation's board of directors and owns a certain amount of stock, the state guarantees a minimum dividend. There is no maximum.

The "corporate state" is not Socialism, because its purpose is not to obtain for the workers the full social value of their labor, through industrial democracy. Instead, the "corporate state" is the worst form of industrial autocracy. The workers are denied the right to join free unions. They are stripped of all political rights. They are permitted only to work, and at rates of pay dictated by Mussolini or his henchmen.

Mussolini, through his "corporate state," guarantees the continued system of capitalist exploitation, with the fascist organization a partner in the economic structure. If a certain industry operates at a loss, Mussolini will tax profitable industries in order to guarantee the deficit-laden industry's minimum dividend. The "corporate state" is the last word in economic slavery, equal if not superior to Hitler's "totalitarian state."

These fascists think up ornate phrases for their activities, but underneath the pretty, high-sounding speech is stark, brutal, calculating, merciless exploitation and slavery. Fascism is the world's greatest reaction against decency and civilization.

With all his tremendous powers, Mussolini has yet to show that he can bring his country genuine economic order. He has had 10 years in which to bring Italy to the heavenly heights he promised, but the country is still in the depths of despondency, its government is bankrupt, its thieves are beginning to lack for victims, its labor is on a par with oriental coolies, its state is all-powerful but still unable to place capitalism's economic house in working order.

A nation of slaves are poor material on which to build a civilization. One is reminded of the economic waste that prevailed during

our slave-owning days in the south. At first glance it seemed that with labor owned bodily, the slave-holder had a powerful advantage over the employer of free labor in the north. It was shown by actual facts and statistics at the time that the south's slave policy spelled economic suicide and that in time the entire south would go bankrupt from the load of slave labor that it was carrying. Slave labor is inefficient, expensive, wasteful and destructive. A northern employer could undersell a southern slaveholder any time and any place, provided of course that the article, commodity or service could be produced in his climate.

The same situation exists in the world today. The slave workers of the dictators are not building a sound economy. The fascist governments are not sounder than the democratic nations. The free workers are superior to the conscripts, even when the conscripts toil for a bare subsistence. This is because a dictatorship entails so much "overhead" that the saving from slave labor is more than lost before the country is able to render the services that the world is ready to pay for. The "corporate state," like the south's "slave state," will fall because of its inefficiency and injustice.

* * *

Is it true that Mussolini and Hitler have eliminated the class struggle?

This is merely another of fascism's great howlers. It is on a par with Hitler's racial theory, which, by the way, isn't accepted by a single outstanding professor of anthropology in the entire civilized world. Mussolini and his fellow-dictator have not eliminated the class struggle. Instead, they have made their corporative state so powerful for the capitalist class that it is a completely destructive weapon in the war on the working class. So, instead of erasing the class struggle they give new emphasis to it.

* * *

Did not Mussolini conduct a national election in 1934 and win an overwhelming majority?

Mussolini held a typical Fascist election on March 25, 1934, and, of

course, got the votes. It was even worse than Hitler's election in August. With half of Italy's manhood in uniform or serving as spies, Mussolini has the country terrorized. The election, if you can disgrace the word by applying it to anything Mussolini might do, was conducted along the following lines: A "voter," on entering a polling place, was handed two ballots, each on paper of different colors. One color meant "yes," and the other meant "no." You marked your ballot "secretly," and dropped it into a box, but before leaving the place you had to deliver the unused ballot to one of the officials. Who would dare vote freely under such conditions? The thing to remember at all times is that Mussolini, like Hitler, is nothing less than a gangster. Never expect anything honest or decent from such vile sources.

What is meant by Mussolini's "demographic battle"?

It describes an organized propaganda for increases in population.

Does Mussolini insist on a bachelor's tax because he wants to strengthen the institution of marriage?

Mussolini is more concerned with his treasury than he is with the state of matrimony. Bachelors are taxed heavily, but if they marry to escape this tax they are greeted with what is known as the "family tax." Each head must pay 25 lire for each individual in his family. Mussolini gets them whether they are married or single. He taxes everything in sight. For example, the owner of a horse cart must pay 100 lire yearly. If you own a hog, you pay Mussolini, and if you decide to kill the hog, you have to pay Mussolini before you can get that done. Salt and tobacco are state monopolies and cost outrageously. A package of 20 cigarettes costs four lire, which means that the average worker must toil almost half a day just to get a few cigarettes. You cannot use farm implements without first paying a tax. Mussolini is nothing more than a legalized Al Capone, except that Capone got most of his money from the

rich. To get a picture of what it means to be a workman in Italy, let me put it this way: Our CCC boys who make \$30 per month, with board, lodging and shelter provided by the U. S. government, are better off by far than Italy's skilled workers who are steadily employed.

Are strikes legally forbidden in fascist Italy?

By an adroit piece of jesuitical legerdemain, Mussolini has decreed that the workers may strike only when given express permission by the government. What it really amounts to is the enslavement of labor. A strike engineered by a fascist government is an impossibility. The fascist state is used to crush, not strengthen, the workers.

Are Mussolini's policies helping or hindering Italy's foreign trade?

They can't be helping any, because an official report for 1933 shows exports totaled \$516,719,000; imports totaled \$641,130,000. This made a deficit of \$124,411,000.

Are Hitler and Mussolini aching for war?

Hitler is pouring Germany's energies into war preparations. Every industry that can be used in some form or other for war necessities is on a war basis. The people are being militarized through clever propaganda, but Hitler must remember that there were almost 20,000,000 people who voted against him before he took power and that they are not going to be won over completely, however smartly his propagandists may work. Mussolini is also oiling up the war machine, his latest move being to militarize even the children. Both look forward to the day when the nation will march as a man to die for their dictators. And yet, there is doubt and fear. As Professor Gaetano Salvemini, exiled Italian intellectual, said so aptly, "if you arm a people for war, you also arm them for civil war!" In other words, putting guns into the hands of those who are quietly opposed to Hitler and Mussolini may result in their being turned in the direction of enemies at home.

Imperialism

Are we headed for war? If so, from what sources?

There are two danger spots today—Japan and Hitler's fascism.

The Japanese imperialists are determined to follow up their spoliation of China with a great invasion of the Soviet Union's territory in Siberia, and then, after finishing with Russia, turning on the United States for a settlement of the issue of who is to rule the Pacific.

The Nazis, on the other hand, have openly declared that it is their aim to strike eastward into European Russia, taking over great sections of Russian soil for German colonization and expansion. Such an act will provoke a European war.

If both Japan and Germany strike at about the same time, we'll see another world war. Such a conflagration is almost certain to spread.

On both sides—Germany and Japan—we see capitalist imperialism at work. Russia will fight to the death to protect its domain. It will not surrender an inch of soil to the capitalist invaders from the east and the west.

What can be done to prevent such a world war? The first requisite is the complete abolition of capitalism, for with the end of capitalism will also disappear capitalist imperialism. If the workers of the world could be brought to an appreciation of socialization, and if they were to install such a Socialist economy, the reason for imperialistic war would disappear.

If you believe in peace, the best way to work for it is to work for Socialism. Socialism is the only hope for peace and security, and at present it is a race between Socialist economy and capitalist imperialism. Which will win? That depends on the intelligence of the people of our civilized lands. If

they are dumb, driven cattle, they will do nothing while capitalist imperialism stages another great war. Then they will have nothing to do but go into the trenches to die in order to make the world safe for imperialism.

If capitalist imperialism puts over another world war it will mean just about the finish of capitalism. The first world war almost ruined the world, what with deaths, destruction, mutilations and debts.

The governments of capitalism haven't finished paying for their first world war and here they are setting the stage for another one. If it comes, it will mean that capitalism, through its own greed, will gut itself. It will blow itself off the face of the earth, but the danger is that it may blow civilization to powder at the same time.

Wouldn't it be more intelligent to head off imperialistic wars by putting a quietus on capitalism? It can be done, if the people can be brought to an intelligent understanding of the great social problems facing us.

* * *

Why does Soviet Russia work so consistently for peace?

Russia's peace policy is a part of its Socialist economics. Russia's classless society is not based on imperialism. Imperialism is a part of capitalism. Imperialism is the policy followed by exploiting classes and nations. As Russia is owned by the workers and is against class exploitation on either national or international scales, it follows logically that Russia can never gain anything from a war. A war is conducted by interests seeking new fields of exploitation. Socialism is not based on social or class exploitation. In fact, it means the end of such exploitation, so we see that everywhere Socialists work for peace and harmony. Japan and Germany are both capitalistic

states, so they seek to satisfy their greed through imperialistic policies. If such countries were socialized, they, like Russia, would follow the pursuits of peace. It has long been the contention of Socialists (and history supports them) that the best way to end imperialist wars is to bring about the rule of Socialism.

* * *

Is Japan's position in Manchuria secure?

Japanese military authorities admit it is going to take at least 10 years to establish themselves permanently in Manchuria. The Japanese in Manchuria still feel as though they were trying to sit on their bayonets. Manchuria is a large country—the size of France and Germany together—and her population of 30,000,000 are almost unanimously against continued occupation and control by the Japanese. Manchuria's sturdy peasant population will most likely never be reconciled to Japanese rule. The solution will probably get its start in Japan itself, where the working class may at some time in the future be expected to revolt against Japan's militarism and Capitalism. It is admitted in high Japanese circles that the campaign in Manchuria was dictated by the necessity of diverting home interest from revolution to imperialistic expansion. The Japanese proletariat is not as meek as propaganda would have the world believe. An explosion will come there some day, and when it does it will mean good-bye to Capitalism and hello to Soviet Russia.

* * *

What has Russia done to keep Vladivostok safe from Japanese imperialism?

As Russia has practically no navy, the important city of Vladivostok has been given a strong series of coast batteries. The harbor has been dotted with numerous mines. A number of submarines are now in the harbor, having been transported overland in parts and put together in the Far East. The Trans-Siberian Railroad has almost finished its strategically important task of double-tracking. About 150,000 soldiers are station-

ed on the border between Manchuria and Siberia. More can be moved to the scene of action, should Japan decide to attack the Soviet Union.

The best journalistic brains of Russia are now giving great publicity to the fact that Japan is now economically unable to stage a long war against Russia. They point out the tremendous costs, which Japan certainly cannot stand because of her vast budget deficit and debts, and the further fact that Japanese labor is growing more radical and may be expected to revolt and overthrow the government should Japan attempt to dig her teeth into Siberia.

In addition to the means of protection listed in the first paragraph, Russia, in the Far East, has an immense number of up-to-date bombing planes, large and fast enough to fly to Japan's match-box cities and play havoc with them. The lowest estimate of bombers is 400, while some authorities claim 1,500. It is also believed that Russia has numerous armored trains on the Far Eastern front.

* * *

Is there any possibility that Alaska will play a part in a Pacific war?

There is some evidence that it will be a battlefield, should Japan and the United States go to war, which is by no means an impossibility. For a somewhat detached view it would be interesting to see what Russia's best informed opinion has to say on this subject. "Pravda," the organ of the Communist Party, published in Moscow, in an extremely interesting article, on October 12, 1934, said that Japanese imperialism is looking greedily at the vast resources of Alaska. Japan has already built naval bases in the North Pacific, while the United States, moved to action, is now developing naval bases in the Aleutian Islands. This means that both governments consider Alaska as a likely battle-ground in "a future war of the Pacific." "Pravda" calls attention to Alaska's seemingly limitless supplies of gold, tin, iron, graphite and other minerals, which the United States has hardly touched. "Pravda" adds ominously that its own observers

have reported to Moscow that Alaskan shores have been teeming with fishing boats, flying the flag of the Rising Sun, which are nothing less than "floating scouts of Japanese imperialism."

* * *

Do missionaries in China mix in political affairs?

Protestant and Catholic missionaries keep their hands off Chinese political issues so long as the capitalistic, imperialistic elements are in control, but whenever there is a Communist uprising of the poor these same missionaries are invariably found lined up with the Japanese and world imperialists in a campaign to crush any movement that is aimed at the destruction of capitalism. This was shown recently when the Red Army got to the gates of Foochow. At once the missionaries and the Japanese came to the "rescue" of China's defenders of the present system.

* * *

If the Austrian crown prince hadn't been assassinated in Serbia would there have been no World War?

To blame the World War on that famous pistol shot is to betray an appallingly superficial knowledge of European political, economic and social history. For years prior to the assassination, Germany's foreign policy was founded on the "Berlin-to-Bagdad" scheme of expansion. The continued attempts to achieve that sphere of influence would have brought on war, regardless of what happened that June day in Serbia, 20 years ago.

Since Hitler's theft of power, Europe has heard again the ambitions plan to have Germany's military might carve out new territorial expansions, particularly eastward, through Poland and into Russia. This goal is more than the vague dream of Hitler's days before assuming power; it is the expressed policy of responsible government heads. It was this "ideal" that led the German foreign office to refuse Maxim Litvinoff's offer of a non-aggression pact. The least move in the direction of aggression will mean another World War.

Hitler's program included the absorption of Austria, slices of Czecho-Slovakia, the Polish Cor-

ridor and Russia's rich farm country. As this is written, Hitler has halted in the campaign on neighboring countries, mainly because he does not feel able to break down the resistance of powerful European governments. But the objective is there, and it, like the Berlin-to-Bagdad dream, can mean only one thing—another World War. Before Hitler came into power and destroyed the German Republic, Germany's international position was in process of constant improvement. Russia was friendly and stood almost as an ally, with the additional good-will gestures of vast purchases from German industries. Today Russia is distinctly unfriendly to Germany, and as for its purchases from Germany, they have been reduced almost 90 percent, with promises of complete elimination. Instead of standing with Germany, Russia is now allied with France, Austria and Hungary, before Hitlerism went into power, were friendly, but now they are distinctly unfriendly. The same goes for Bulgaria.

The map of Europe shows Germany again encircled, only worse than was the case in 1914. The stage is set for war, and Hitler is the one who must make the first move. Will he dare? Who knows? Things are not going well in Germany. Foreign trade has almost disappeared. Hitler's promises have not been kept to the unemployed. The scale of living has been reduced almost to coolie standards. Prices are mounting. The Storm Troops are seething with discontent. The big industrialists are now afraid of their pet. Germany's bonds have been repudiated. Germany's credit is worth less than nothing. Germany's industries depend on raw materials from foreign sources, but as she has no gold or credit, the situation is really grave. A war might result in revolution, once Hitler put guns into the hands of the people. In every sense, Germany today is an outlawed nation. This comes from letting a group of homosexuals, dope-fiends, sadists and degenerates grab power.

* * *

What is the theory of Satyagraha?
This theory is Gandhi's, derived

partly from Tolstoy's non-resistance to evil. Gandhi applied it to the nationalist movement in India, where policies of non-violence to imperialistic brutality, non-cooperation with British government, and pacifistic sacrifice of self as a weapon over tyranny and force were proposed as the means towards liberation. Gandhi also calls this theory "Soul Force." Another name for it is "Civil Disobedience." Gandhi frequently separates non-violence from Soul Force, calling it the policy of Ahimsa.

His record shows him to be friendly only to Hindu nationalism, for during the Zulu and Boer wars Gandhi stood by British imperialism. Gandhi's reputation as a "liberator" is entirely fraudulent; he is really a defender of Hindu capitalism and an opponent of British imperialism. His hatred of British imperialism is not because of his great "love" for the masses of miserable workers and peasants, but results from British capitalism's attempts to hold down the growth of Indian industry.

For decades it was almost impossible for capitalists in Calcutta, Bombay and other large centers to start factories, but this repression was partly lifted during the World War, when England was so sorely in need of supplies. After the war, the Indian capitalists and members of the middle class realized they needed a mass leader who would scare the British government into granting a continuation of the old industrial concessions and permission to expand even further. Here Gandhi was used as the direct, willing tool of Hindu capitalism. He has never been a real leader of the masses in the war for economic emancipation. He is a reactionary of the first caliber.

Intellectually he is crammed with religious superstition, mysticism, Theosophy, the Hindu Vedas, bunk and all round eccentricity. He doesn't hold a candle to the real working class and peasant leaders of modern China who are fighting for the end of Capitalism and the inauguration of a Socialist state.

Whenever the Hindu movement reaches a stage where it begins to

threaten the rule of Indian Capitalism, Gandhi may always be depended on to side with the reactionaries, though he will veil his movements with cries against British imperialism. He has never said a word or done a thing to oppose exploitation of India by Hindu capitalists. His great to do over the Salt Law was nothing more than a move to confuse his followers and keep them from going forward to real economic independence, for the Salt Law represents only a British monopoly and the tax collected on it is almost insignificant. Lifting the Salt Tax would mean no more in the direction of social emancipation than would the lifting of a tax on baseball bats in the U. S. bring the masses closer to a social order ruled by workers and farmers.

There are millions of Hindus who are ready to go forward to genuine freedom, but they are being held back by Gandhi's reactionary and hypocritical tactics. This saint stinks to heaven, and history will most assuredly put him down as one of the worst traitors in the long record of the people's attempts to free themselves from Capitalism at home and imperialism abroad.

Much is made of Gandhi's "battles" for the Untouchables, those Hindu classes that are downtrodden and despised by India's aristocracy, denied any rights, unrecognized by law and cast out of everything decent and civilized. Many an American liberal preacher has orated himself into a lather over this "Christ-like" character fighting for the Untouchables. But what's it all about? Does he strive to lead the millions of Untouchables in the path of industrial democracy? No. He insists, with all the fervor of a martyr and the bravery of a fearless hero, that the Untouchables are to have the right to enter the temples of superstition and pray along with everybody else! What a measure of freedom! Freedom to pray to the Great Mumbo-Jumbo—in a world shuddering from the effects of economic tyranny and exploitation. What is this but a demagog's red herring?

The International Scene

What is the policy of the Revisionists in Palestine?

There is a small group among the Jews which proposes that the Balfour Declaration be revised in order to remove protection from the Arabs, who are in the majority in that country. They are vocal extremists who would oust the Arabs completely, leaving all of Palestine to the Jews alone. Such a policy, if carried out, could result in nothing but violence and wars. However, they are, as I have already stated, a small minority and do not seem to have much chance of increasing their following. The Arabs, who outnumber the Jews three to one, do not intend to be pushed out of the country. Zionism is a utopian, sentimental scheme, which seems doomed to eventual failure.

* * *

Has the government in Palestine balanced its budget?

Palestine gets some money for its oranges, but its best "crop" is the money that is poured into the country by Jews throughout the world. During the past 12 years, \$60,000,000 has been contributed by Jews everywhere, \$20,000,000 of this money coming from the United States. The budget will be balanced as long as that keeps up. In addition to oranges, the country produces grapes, wine, olives and various fruits and nuts. Land given to oranges is very expensive, bringing about \$2,500 today for acreage that recently sold at \$500. The orange district is about 150 miles long and 20 miles wide, most of it fed by expensive irrigation systems. Potash and other minerals are extracted from the Dead Sea under reasonably successful conditions. Strong efforts are being made to educate the Jews away from speaking Yiddish, the objective being the general use of Hebrew. The country is becoming a beautiful place, and

cultural work is being promoted generously and sincerely, but there is no evidence that the project is economically sound. One would not care to predict what would happen to the budget—and to everything else in Palestine—if foreign money were to be withheld.

* * *

Do the Chinese eat wheat?

The average person looks on the Chinese as rice-eaters, regardless of the fact that China for 1934 was the largest wheat-producing country in the world. The 1934 preliminary figures showed that China expected a total wheat crop of 850,000,000 bushels, which beats U. S. production by several hundred million bushels. The people in south China make rice their main article of food, but all of north China depends on wheat. Despite this huge crop, China will still need to import a great quantity of wheat. In 1931, for example, China imported 65,000,000 more bushels of wheat than it exported.

* * *

What did Kemal do?

Mustapha Kemal, in 1925, led a revolution that ended the Mohammedan regime and replaced it with a strictly secular Ottoman State, of which he is the head. He has moved Turkey forward a thousand years.

* * *

What's left of the king business?

After losing thrones in China, Russia, Germany, Austria and Spain, the king business, as you call it, is left to the following:

George V, Great Britain; Victor Emmanuel III, Italy; Gustaf V, Sweden; Haakon VII, Norway; Christian X, Denmark and Iceland; Leopold III, Belgium; Wilhelmina, reigning queen, Holland; Boris III, Bulgaria; Carol II, Rumania; Peter II (11 years old and ruler through a regency), Yugoslavia; Zog, Albania; Hirohito, Japan;

Fuad I, Egypt; Ras Taffari, Abyssinia; Mohammed Nadir Khan, Afghanistan; Mirza Reza Pahlavi, Persia; Kang Teh, Manchukuo. Though subject to French Indo-China, Monivong, of Cambodia, and Bao Dal, Annam, are entitled to be listed among practitioners in the king business. This, I believe, covers the complete list. If I've misse^d any, let me know. It is by no means an impressive band, though a few stand out as fairly strong characters. They look as though they expected to get fired any day, even if it's true that many are banking on a last spasm of fascism before surrendering to progress. We may live to see both the king racket and Capitalism relegated to the scrap heap, where out-dated and useless institutions are thrown.

* * *

Please tell me something about the Royalist movement in France.

France's royalist party is known as the Action Francaise, and is led by three picturesque, able men, as follows: Leon Daudet, son of the celebrated novelist, the editor of the French royalist newspaper, *Action Francaise*, and a writer of great power and persuasiveness; Jacques Bainville, historian, who writes mainly with a view to supplying the royalists with arguments in favor of a monarchy for France; Charles Maurras, the theoretician of royalism, who is also an able writer.

The royalist movement in France is not great numerically, but because of its brilliant showmanship and clever leadership it succeeds in making a great deal of noise and attracting much attention. This movement has been making some headway of late, mainly because of the growth of Fascism in Central Europe, the ideas of Fascism being, in the main, acceptable and in some instances the creations of French royalists. It is well to remember that during the last thousand years France has had only 70 years of parliamentary government, in the sense that we know it today. For that reason, the royalist movement is able to keep its policies before the people, appealing to the old who even have mem-

ories of royalty, and to the young, who are "thrilled" by the spectacular adventures that are supposed to be part and parcel of the institution of monarchy.

In addition to seeking to suppress democracy, republicanism, Free-thought, Socialist agitation, free press, free assembly, etc., the royalists in France aim to establish a totalitarian state along the lines of Hitlerism. They really are nothing less than Fascists. A victory for them would mean a long step in the direction of social and intellectual reaction, anti-Semitism, and chauvinistic nationalism. The Duc de Guise is the choice of the royalists for the throne, when their following is strong enough to crush the Republic.

The royalist movement is strongly clerical and proposes the re-establishment of a State Church, and in this is being fought by the radicals and Freethinkers who do not want to return to the corrupt days of Louis XIV. The opponents of royalism are the Socialists, radicals, Freethinkers, anti-clericals, the labor unions, various wings of the conservative, but somewhat liberal, parties, and the general run of intellectuals, libertarians, democrats, etc.

The French royalists, while still weak in numbers, always cause concern among leaders of liberal and radical thought. They are adroit and shrewd, so eternal vigilance is necessary. They do not hesitate to resort to violence and sensationalism, and the enemies of the doctrine of royalism must always be ready to resist their conspiracies.

* * *

What is the correct pronunciation of Goemboes?

Hungary's premier, Julius Goemboes, pronounces his name "Goom-boosh."

* * *

Where is the Levant?

It is the eastern Mediterranean region.

* * *

Why did Italy repudiate her agreement to fight with the Central Powers in 1914?

A look at the map gives one good answer to this question. Italy is

virtually an island, and as such is a target for the guns of a great naval power. England, with free access to Italy's long coast, through her control of Gibraltar, the front door to the Mediterranean, could have done some right smart bombarding had Italy decided to stick to the Kaiser's cause. Italy remained "neutral" some months and then joined the side she thought would win—the Allies. So long as England is Europe's first naval power, Italy will look to that country's friendship, knowing her geography to be what it is.

* * *

Why didn't Austria and Germany merge, before the advent of Hitlerism, when both countries almost unanimously favored such a policy?

Such a program could not be carried out because it was forbidden in Articles 88 and 80 of the Versailles and St. Germain treaties.

* * *

What is meant by the description of Austria as a country with a head and no body?

When the Allies, at the Peace Conference, decided to cut Austria into several nations, particularly Czechoslovakia and Hungary, it left Austria with a vast head—Vienna—but no supporting country. Vienna soon began to wither, because the bodyless head had no industries to speak of and hardly enough agriculture to feed her population. Foreign loans had to be arranged in order to keep the monstrosity alive. It is as though New York City were made the center of a few counties surrounding Manhattan. How long could such a country—a head without a body—survive? The Peace Conference's treatment of Austria was a combination of malice, stupidity and greed.

* * *

Why are Bolivia and Paraguay at war?

These two South American countries have been at war for two years, with losses of thousands of men on both sides, scores of millions of dollars in property, and hundreds of millions of dollars in munitions. The fighting has been

taking place in the jungle wilds of the Gran Chaco.

Behind the two nations at war are powerful British and American interests, mainly the Rockefellers and England's Royal Dutch Shell Co. Oil, tin, and Bolivia's attempts to get access to the sea are the economic reasons for the struggle.

Our Rockefellers have 7,000,000 acres of rich oil property in Bolivia, extending as far south as the Chaco, and naturally Standard Oil is backing Bolivia. In addition to oil, Bolivia has enormous deposits of tin, of which the United States is the world's greatest customer. Tin is available in only a few spots in the world and is much sought after.

With empires of oil and tin, Bolivia is in a bad situation because of her geographical location. A glance at the map shows that Bolivia is completely surrounded and has no means of reaching the sea. Bolivia is a long distance from the Atlantic and its western line is walled in by the Andes mountains. In order to get her tin out of the country, Bolivia must use mule-packs to haul the ore over the Andes, whence the tin goes to England to be smelted and then reshipped to the United States.

Paraguay controls the Paraguay River, which is navigable by large steamers right into the Chaco. If Bolivia can win the right to use this river, she will solve the problem of her geographical isolation. The United States interests, including the Rockefellers, are therefore supporting Bolivia, because of oil, tin and a free road to the sea. But Paraguay says "no," and has been backing up her "no" for two years, even though her population and resources are very small.

Paraguay is being supported by Argentina, and Argentina, in turn, is being backed by Great Britain. England doesn't want to see the Rockefellers get Bolivia's oil out at low costs, because that would be against the interests of the British oil barons. Also, tin is one of England's profitable sources of income, and if Bolivia breaks through her barriers she will be able to mine her tin, do her own refining with

her home-developed fuels and then ship the finished product direct to the United States, without a cent of profit to English capitalism. That is a crime against the great God Profits, and such blasphemy must be resisted to the death.

Britain, with her usual diplomatic cunning, has given the world the impression of late that she is interested in stopping the shipment of arms and munitions to both countries in order to bring about peace. An examination of the facts proves England's position to be motivated by selfishness. It happens that Bolivia has no munitions factories, while Paraguay has them. Also, Bolivia cannot reach the sea, so if there were to be an embargo on arms Bolivia would be in a bad pickle, while Paraguay, with its own factories and access to the sea, would be able to carry on despite an embargo. England's suggestion of an arms embargo is nothing more than a plan to crush Bolivia and enable British capitalists to make holy profits.

Does Poland, like Czechoslovakia, enjoy political democracy?

Poland is ruled by a military dictator, Marshal Pilsudski, with recognition of the Catholic Church written into the Constitution, though it is true that other religions are tolerated.

Poland is supposed to be a democratic republic, with a President, Moscicki, and a parliament, but all this is merely window-dressing. The real ruler is Pilsudski, who maintains a vast military force and compels the impoverished Poles to pay the bills of increased armaments to the extent of a third of the nation's budget.

Pilsudski and his military clique took over the country in 1926. The country cannot continue to carry its load of militarism, so the people suffer untold agonies and endure a standard of living that is so low as to be unbelievable to Americans.

While Pilsudski, with the support of the army and the Catholic Church, is still securely in the saddle, there is vast discontent among the masses of peasants and workers, so that it is possible there

may be an uprising among the population of 32,000,000.

The Jews are treated with pitiless brutality. Pilsudski is every bit as bad as Hitler; in fact, worse, if such a thing is possible. The difference, of course, lies in the fact that Hitler attacked well-to-do Jewish business men, professionals and intellectuals, while Pilsudski's victims have all been poor and unable to tell the world about their terrible sufferings.

Poland's population is growing, and it is expected to reach 40,000,000 in about 10 years. At that time, it will be in condition to cross swords with Germany, depending, of course, on friendly France for support. The present peace pact between Germany and Poland is considered as being merely a means of giving both nations sufficient time to get ready for a real war, instead of attempting a third-class scrap at this time. Poland's dictator, Catholic Pilsudski, and Germany's dictator, Catholic Hitler, hate each other (which is in strict accord with Catholic political tradition), so they will, in time, be at each other's throat, and both looking to Rome for the Pope's blessings, which will be forthcoming, as usual.

On the other hand, Czechoslovakia is a truly civilized land, where freedom of thought, speech and press are respected. This country of 14,000,000 people is surrounded by fascist enemies, but it continues bravely to hold its own. It is the brightest spot in all Central Europe. Its president is a true liberal, who stands firmly for political democracy and rationalism. This old warrior has fought many battles for Freethought, and he has always won. The Catholic Church gobbles up the countries surrounding Czechoslovakia, but this little country holds out against surrender to political reaction, Catholic superstition, fascism, persecution and all the other manifestations of the darker side of public life.

Czechoslovakia has her troubles in the field of economics, as have we all, but she stands as a shining beacon in the madness of Nazism, a beacon of sanity, decency and

honor. When the other Central European fascist countries were persecuting the Socialists, particularly in Germany and Austria, Czechoslovakia threw open her doors and invited them to safety. Today, in Carlsbad and Prague, you will find thousands of brave refugees from Hitlerism, all permitted the most complete liberty of speech, press, assembly and propaganda against the medievalism from which they escaped.

Czechoslovakia will always be remembered for the way in which she permitted the Socialists to enter without so much as a passport. They were literally fleeing for their lives—many of them wounded—and Czechoslovakia dressed their wounds, fed them, housed them and now treats them like civilized human beings. While we cannot say anything too bad about today's Germany, Austria, Yugo-Slavia, Italy and Poland, let's not forget to take off our hats and cheer:

"Hurrah for Czechoslovakia!"

* * *

Which countries constitute the Little Entente?

Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Rumania.

* * *

How large is Mexico, compared to the U. S.?

Mexico, with a population of 16,500,000, is one-fourth the size, in territory, of the U. S.

* * *

On what grounds does the Mexican government expel bishops and archbishops?

The first reason, of course, is their interference with Mexican domestic policies, particularly with regard to the control of the public schools, long the monopoly of the priesthood. The second, and equally important, reason rests on the fact that the Mexican Constitution plainly holds that loss of nationality will follow should any Mexican citizen accept from any foreign state any kind of an appointment, commission or distinction. That is the basic law of the land. How does this law apply to the Catholic hierarchy? Simply this: The Catholic Church, through the Pope, on February 11, 1929, established the State of Vatican City

through the Lateran treaties signed with Mussolini, thereby ceasing to be a church and becoming a State. The Pope becomes, in addition to the head of his institution of religion, the head of a State, like any other monarch. These facts, and they are established, form the basis of Mexico's determination not to permit the spokesmen, representatives and officials of this foreign State to interfere with Mexico's internal problems. In view of these facts I fail to see wherein the Mexican government is in the wrong.

* * *

Is there any substantial sentiment in Canada for union with the U. S.?

A few newspapers, particularly the Vancouver Sun, seem to favor such a program, but it isn't general enough to have any weight. Recently the students of McGill University, Montreal, were asked if they favor such political union and the answer was: 70 for union; 190 against. If this is representative, and it seems to be, it follows that union is remote.

* * *

As a Canadian, I would like to know your opinion of our Liberal Party.

The Liberal Party of Canada is by no means as reactionary as the Conservative Party. In fact, it tends towards the more moderate elements in Roosevelt's New Deal. Canadian Liberals certainly have nothing in their program as leftist as our FERA program of government-operated factories for the creation of primary commodities to be distributed among the needy. The Liberal Party is progressive, but in a thoroughly unscientific spirit. It approaches the evils of Capitalism with sincere protestations but it operates on the assumption that good men in control of capitalism would result in good conditions for the common people. That is vague, utopian sentimentality. So long as the Liberal Party of Canada maintains that Capitalism can be made to work by asking capitalists to be less greedy, so long will it be an island of fatuousness surrounded by futilities. I don't doubt in the least that the Canad-

ian Liberals, in the near future, will follow some of the ideas of the New Deal. In other respects it will operate according to its own notions. It will limit a certain amount of production in exportable grains. It will probably set minimum prices on essentials that are intended for home consumption. But it will defend to the death the profit motive in business, and in that it will serve as a prop to Capitalism.

* * *

What is your opinion of the Province of Quebec?

Canada would be able to make great economic progress in the direction of socialized industry and unionism were it not for this difficult section in eastern Canada. It is a world within itself, unfriendly to the rest of Canada, and completely dominated by the Roman Catholic Church. This French-speaking province takes its orders from the priests, with the result that even working class organizations are controlled by the Church. Catholic Unionism in this province is even worse than company unions in the U. S. These unions are being used to disrupt and destroy even the conservative unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and as for the Canadian Commonwealth Federation, with its socialistic policies, it is hated and fought in Catholic Canada. The French Canadians, who belong mentally in the 13th Century of Catholicism, are breeding like rabbits, the latest reports showing that they are increasing 50 percent faster than the balance of Canada. This population increase will accentuate the problem, some holding that in time English speaking Canada (which is more liberal and radical) will be favorably disposed towards union with the United States, in order to escape the reactionary powers of the Catholic Church in Canada. The C. C. F. (Canadian Commonwealth Federation) is less than two years old, and yet it has made wonderful headway, mainly in the west, where the workers and farmers are more open-minded about Socialism. This organization, with its strong trends towards Socialism, would be able to capture the gov-

ernment if only it did not have the combined opposition of clericalism and Capitalism. It would beat Capitalism alone, but with both elements working together, the progress will be slower than at first expected, but this does not mean the situation is hopeless. Canada can be led into the paths of Socialism, especially if the British Labor Party takes control in England—and that is likely to happen sooner than many conservatives care to admit. Canada, like the United States, needs Socialism, and needs it soon. As to how it will come, only time can tell. At present there does not seem to be any move in the direction of Fascism, though the Catholic Church would like to get such a movement going. The attitude of the people everywhere (except the Province of Quebec) is to tolerate and even encourage Socialist discussion of economic conditions.

* * *

Are Great Britain and England the same?

No. England is a part of Great Britain. England, Wales and Scotland comprise Great Britain.

* * *

What is Runnymede?

Runnymede is a place near Windsor, England, in the Thames Valley. More than 700 years ago it was the scene of the signing of the Magna Carta by King John. Magna Carta (Great Charter) limited the powers of the British crown and guaranteed definite rights to the subjects of the king. Runnymede was therefore the birthplace of modern political liberty. The Bill of Rights in our Constitution grew from what happened at Runnymede. In these days of Hitler, Mussolini and the other tyrants, it is well to remember Runnymede and preserve what it gave the modern world.

* * *

What is meant by the Means Test?

In England, the unemployed (about 2,000,000) entitled to social insurance are forced to undergo a careful examination as to their means, the income of their dependents, and in other ways forced to stand the severest scrutiny, so that the government may admin-

ister cut after cut in relief funds. This is called the Means Test. It works serious hardship on the unemployed and keeps them just an inch from the starvation line. It is one of England's most serious causes of dissatisfaction. The government haggles over pennies intended for the unemployed, but does not hesitate to cut the income tax 10 percent. As England today boasts of having balanced its budget, the Means Test is nothing more than a weapon to keep the workers at the lowest possible point of subsistence.

* * *

What is England's coal production?
207,000,000 tons a year.

* * *

Which of the great powers stands weakest in agriculture?

England. Only 7 percent of her inhabitants are engaged in that industry. England would starve in a short while if the outside world failed to ship in a sufficient supply of food.

* * *

What is your reaction to the Spanish revolt?

The October, 1934, uprising of the Socialists, Communists and other Leftists was crushed, but a more careful inquiry indicates that the October fighting was only a prelude to the real revolution which is yet to come. Conditions indicate that we may soon expect a real revolution in Spain, a tremendous civil war against the Fascists and Clericals who would destroy the republic and return its people to the bondage of monarchy, Fascism, Clericalism and economic exploitation at the hands of the landed aristocrats and the great industrialists. The Spanish workers are not through, by any means. The war is still to be fought, the issue being Fascism versus Socialism. Which side will win I cannot say, but if it is the Fascists they will have to crush a tremendous mass movement before they will be able to enforce their reactionary mandates.

* * *

Did the Balfour Declaration guarantee the Jews a Zionist State in Palestine?

Balfour, as Great Britain's for-

eign minister, in 1917, issued the now-famous Declaration with regard to the future of the Jews in Palestine, as follows: "His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish People, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of that object, it being understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country."

A careful examination of the above shows, in several ways, that England bought the world-support of the Jews for the side of the Allies with a promise that doesn't say very much. Notice that he used the words "National Home." Just what does that mean? Merely that they are to have the right to live there. They are not promised a National State, or a sovereign government. At the same time, the Arabs in Palestine are given certain broad protections. As there are 750,000 Arabs in Palestine, and only 250,000 Jews, it is plain that England's policy has been to play the Jews against the Arabs in order to rule both. The Jews, through their Zionist organization, will pour in new hundreds of millions of dollars to follow the vast funds already poured into that small, poor semi-desert, but they will never have autonomy, under the Balfour Declaration. Just what the Jews can hope to accomplish in Palestine is the subject for endless debate, but considering the country's lack of natural resources, geographical position, and grossly unfriendly neighbors, it seems safe to predict that sentimental Jews will spend themselves in fruitless endeavors. The country will never take care of many Jews, unless they are able to command a certain amount of economic support from the outside. It seems to me that the Jewish National Home in Palestine will always be nothing more than a charity institution.

Personal Estimates and Criticisms

What is your opinion of William Allen White?

He oozes sweetness and light, charm and unction, sanctity and virtue. A fair writer and a good second-rate reporter, he is always on the side of the angels. Intellectually, he stands with Henry Ward Beecher or Lyman Abbott, two notches above William Jennings Bryan and three below the famous (I can't remember his name) author of "Acre of Diamonds." He slings a snappy line of phrases, but in this game he can't hold a candle to General Hugh S. Johnson, the snappiest slinger of verbiage in these United States. In politics, he is always for the "peepul" until it begins to look as though the working people are going to do something about it—then he turns tory. He is a pacifist in peace times, radical in times of prosperity, progressive in times of boom, reactionary in times of depression, patriotic when the Stars and Stripes are threatened in the Baltic or Flanders Field, tolerant when everything is hunky-dory, and Fascist when things are stirring. He is the perfect small-city newspaper capitalist—benign, kindly, a good citizen, a booster for the town's best commercial interests, and a glad-hander all round. He is a Godly do goodster, horrified by people who do not accept their codes of behavior from the Methodist-Baptist Vatican, says grace before meals, believes he will meet his loved ones on the other shore, thinks Billy Sunday lacks the dignity of Bishop Pureofheart, would hate to live in a town that didn't have any churches (particularly big ones), and writes pieces that are supposed to reflect the ideas of the common man but really is only the spokesman of the middle class. Bill White is the backbone of his town, the salt of his county, the character of his state and the con-

science of his nation. He is a dry, but never dull. He is a combination of Rotarian and lover of Beethoven, moralist and wag, with a heart as big as all out doors and a brain the size of a pea. Muddled, sentimental, contradictory, proudly provincial, facile and plausible—there he stands, William Allen White, the Confucius of the Sticks.

* * *

What is your reaction to the Hauptmann verdict?

I didn't follow every word of the seemingly endless reports sent out by the news associations. Life's too short and there's worthier work to be done. I was more than disgusted to see from four to six solid pages given each day in great metropolitan dailies, as though the case were epoch-making, which it wasn't. The Hauptmann trial was entirely over-publicized, giving new evidence of the cheap vulgarity of our press. I'd say the trial was worth from one to three columns a day, at the most, but the newspaper editors, listening to the circulation department, felt differently, and I assume they know their business. From what I've read of the case, I feel the jury was right in finding him guilty, though there is a slight possibility that the murderer had help from someone on the inside, but here there was no real evidence to support the conclusion. I was convinced of Hauptmann's guilt from the day of his arrest, when he was found with one or two of the Lindbergh bills on his person. Had he come by this money innocently, Hauptmann would have told the police immediately where they could find the ransom money in his garage. That's what an honest, innocent person would have done. I also feel that the ransom notes were in his hand. In other words, Hauptmann got Lindbergh's \$50,000, which connected him with the crime but certainly didn't es-

tablish the murder. Here we meet up with a great deal of circumstantial evidence, some good and some bad. As I sift what I read, Hauptmann made the ladder, using a board from his attic. He came down that ladder with the child. For some reason, perhaps the added weight or his hurry, the ladder broke and the child fell to the ground, receiving wounds that caused his death. I don't believe Hauptmann meant to kill the child, but this, of course, is no defense, for it's murder just the same, even though the actual death was accidental. The press has given the impression that Hauptmann is some sort of a super criminal, but as I look at it I can see the German carpenter only as a super bone-head. He laid himself open from start to finish. It was a dumb crime. I don't believe there's been a miscarriage of justice in this trial. He did it, and, while I'm opposed to capital punishment, I do believe that so long as a state has laws providing capital punishment they should be carried out.

What is your opinion of the magazine "Fortune"?

The publishers of this scrumptious magazine are shrewdly aiming at the check-books of the corporation executives (and would-be executives) who have a combination of the Napoleonic and inferiority complexes, if such a thing isn't an outrage on psychology. Big Business likes to put on the dog. When Woolworth finished opening about a thousand five and tens, he built himself a skyscraper as a monument to himself, and put in a suite of offices that would have shamed Louis XIV, Madame DuBarry, Cleopatra, Nell Gwyn and a Hollywood star rolled into one lump. "Fortune" magazine is the same idea, only on a dollar scale. It flatters the super-salesman and the big boss to read about the doings of other super-salesmen in a magazine too big to hold, too heavy to carry and too elaborate for good sense. After all, what does "Fortune" write about? It tells how a certain corporation built up its business in milk bottles. Very good. That is worth reading about. But why put

on so much class? Wouldn't a simple 25-cent magazine be good enough to tell the big, brainy executives about their doings? But then, an intellectual's magazine is usually printed with severe, chaste simplicity, and here's a chance to shame the intellectuals by flaunting a super-Babbitt publication that looks ritzy, fat with advertising, and a great deal more expensive. Since it costs more, it naturally must be better, or rather, the best. It's all that simple. But intelligent people know that the most beautiful magazines are really the simplest in format, typography and make-up. "Fortune," appealing as it does to swell-headed supermen, is a perfect expression of our capitalistic civilization. But, you say, it pays dividends. Can a paying racket be wrong? I leave it to you.

* * *

Is Henry L. Mencken a futilitarian?

He likes to give that impression at time, but I recall a sentence in one of his essays that I think worth quoting. It is: "I believe in the capacity of man to conquer his world, and to find out what it is made of, and how it is run." I share that belief, and I don't consider myself even remotely sympathetic with futilitarianism.

* * *

Is Henry L. Mencken an Atheist?

He most assuredly is. He has written several books in support of Atheism, though he avoids the word. He rejects religion because it is "based on falsehood and trumpery." It is his claim that religion can't give meaning to life. His "Treatise on the Gods" is a devastating attack on Theism, Christianity, priestcraft, and religious institutions.

* * *

Why has Voltaire received more recognition than Paine and Ingersoll.

Paine was a political rebel and a theological critic. He functioned only in those two fields. Ingersoll dabbled in politics, but his real work was in popularizing Free-thought. Both did magnificent jobs. But Voltaire sought and won wider pastures. He was great in poetry, the drama, criticism, essays,

articles, letters, philosophy, biography, history, intellectual liberty, skepticism, pamphleteering, encyclopedia writing and a number of other fields. He was a world-scholar, one of the greatest minds in the history of the race. Naturally, a man of such vast caliber would, and should, win higher acclaim than that accorded simpler geniuses like Paine and Ingersoll.

* * *

No shooting now, but how about a brief biographical sketch of yourself in the Q's and A's? I'm sure that I don't stand alone among your readers on that point. Let's see what makes you tick. You wouldn't want anyone to picture you as a senile old duffer who never broke 120 in golf. Would you? Now you're a Socrates; now a Schopenhauer; now a combination of Oscar Wilde, Gene Morgan, a battery of 75's, and a college editor pounding out a story slamming an issue that'll toss him out on his ear. Only you don't toss. You don't have to appease some commercial account. Now: do we get it?

I'm afraid I'll have to disappoint this reader. I don't believe I'll ever let myself get into the autobiographical jitters. About all I can tell you (and perhaps all you ought to know) is that I was born in Philadelphia, Pa., on July 30, 1889, where I spent the first 17 years of my life. I went to public school in that city, but, alas, I never finished the eighth year, having found it necessary to go to work. My father was a bookbinder of the old school—a splendid craftsman, who did fine work, but never made any money. And besides, there were other children—a brother and four sisters, Abraham Lincoln and I belong together in one sense—we were both self-educated. But there's a difference. He went into politics, where education is often a handicap. While I went into writing and publishing, where lack of education is a handicap. But I tried to make up for that condition by reading the kind of books I thought would help me develop my mind. As a result, my mind is crammed with a hundred subjects, upon none of which I am an expert. I have preferred to generalize, rather than to

specialize, and it's been lots of fun. My own struggle to get what I might call an "education" led me to figure out the program of a library of little books, and my work in this field has attracted international attention. I believe, modesty aside, that I could not have edited the books for millions of persons seeking self-education if I hadn't gone through the mill myself. And that struggle explains my endless patience in dealing with men and women who are groping for knowledge. I try never to be snobbish, uppish or intellectually overbearing. Instead of getting mad when I meet some new (or old) manifestation of bunk or superstition, I decide to write a piece myself or hire someone else to do a pamphlet for me, which I issue in the hope of settling that problem for all time, though later I am compelled to admit the problem isn't solved that easily. I long ago made up my mind that I would make my work tell the story of my life, which, of course, would make it unnecessary for me to write an autobiography. I believe I have lived up to that idea pretty well so far. Instead of bothering about me—the man—I put before the world the work that I think is important. I hope to keep at this work as long as there is fighting to be done, because I do not look on the printing press as a pretty toy but as a weapon—something with which to fight social injustice, religious obscurantism, superstition, bunk, bigotry, persecution, racial hatred, militarism, class exploitation, parasitism and intellectual dishonesty in general. I'm not important personally—just a small-town printer who happens to think that ideas are important. I'm willing to fight for what I consider to be the Truth. I prefer to make my presses work for the masses, not the "aristocrats." I believe in the gospel of popularized knowledge, even though that gospel can be shot through with faults. It's better than nothing. And if this world is ever to become a better place for all humanity, it will come because hundreds of thousands of men and women—sons of the farm, the factory, the mine and the mill—

thought it worth while to capture some of the glories of thought, philosophy, science, history, culture, literature and the other movements of creative man. I have a horror of any kind of a social revolution based on fear, hate and ignorance. The social revolution the world is waiting for must rest on a solid foundation of Truth, free inquiry, honest thinking and, again, Truth. Ignorance usually is in command, because it is easier to be ignorant than to be intelligent; easier to believe than to know; easier to accept notions than to dig for ideas. That's why the priests, preachers and rabbis have had such an easy time keeping the masses in mental bondage. It's the line of least resistance—for the masses—to take ideas ready-made and adopt them as gospel truth. On the other hand, self-education is an endless fight. It is hard, trying, at times discouraging. The powers that thrive on ignorance know how to fight back, and always there is the danger that they will gain control and bring civilization back to the Dark Ages, with freedom dead, education crushed, speech, press and inquiry denied. I don't mean to give the impression that I am something superior because I fight for the cause I think worth struggling for. The fact is I wouldn't know how to do anything else. I have never sold out to any of my intellectual enemies. At the same time, I must honestly add that no one has ever offered to buy me out. I have been left alone, to say my little say. You see, when you ask me to speak about myself I immediately pour myself into a discussion of my work. It couldn't be otherwise. It's the work that's important, not the individual. If, when I'm ready to quit, I can point to a mountain of knowledge that I made available to the people everywhere, that'll be my autobiography.

What is your opinion of Harvard University?

I'd put it among the half dozen greatest institutions in the world, and surely the first in the U. S. We have perhaps four or five really admirable universities in this

country, but none can compare with Harvard in academic freedom and scholarship. A Harvard professor is as free as any instructor in the finest institutions in the world. (Until recently Germany stood as high as Harvard and a few other universities, but that is all gone now and Germany's professors stand on a par with the teachers of church history in a one-building Methodist or Baptist college in the sticks.) There's one thing about Harvard that always riles me, and that's the way they condition so many of their young men into what is called the Harvard accent, probably the most ruthless butchering of the English language next to the "youses, thesemes and thoses." If only Harvard's department of English would decide to kill that awful, affected blend of Oxfordese and Bostonese!

* * *

Are you guilty of "special pleading"?

I understand a "special pleader" to be one who presents the best possible picture of only his side of the question. If this definition is accurate, it cannot be said that I am guilty. I am a critic, and as such I present the best arguments of the other side of any question I happen to support, with a view to reaching the truth. I try tirelessly to tell the other side's position with scrupulous fairness, in order to strengthen my argument, for I have long felt that the most useless thing a critic can do is to erect straw men in order to knock them down. My two fundamentals—Free thought and socialized industry—are supported by reason, fairness, logic, facts and history. I may be wrong in my interpretation of a set of facts, but it cannot be said that I indulge in "special pleading." One of my pet aversions is Fascism, but it can never be argued that I ignore the facts and viewpoints of the supporters of Fascism. Democratic principles can best be maintained by full, free and honest discussion, and there is no room for "special pleading" in such a program.

* * *

I would suggest a little less severity in personal criticisms, but no less

careful (and fair) scrutiny of policies.

I grant that I am given to severe language when criticizing individuals who, in my opinion, deserve castigation. I find that when I am forced to deal with a crook, I simply have to call him a crook, except when he is a liar, in which case I call him a liar. I'm too old to change. When dealing with a swine like Hitler, I simply refuse to abide by the amenities. The dirty homosexual pig isn't entitled to polite speech. I am always courteous when I differ with one who impresses me as an honest, sincere person. I don't pose as a little pope who is always right and if you don't agree with me you're a blankety blank. But when dealing with a bunk-shooter and a quack, I refuse to be choicy about my language.

* * *

You seem to have the illusion that consistency is a virtue. In mass movements it is wise to do what seems right at the moment, regardless of consistency.

You'll pardon me for disagreeing with you. I still hold to the old-fashioned notion that consistency is something worth seeking. Let me give you an example. Some time ago I had a famous Socialist on the staff of *The Freeman*. He wrote earnestly and vehemently, bawling out the capitalists as a lot of thieves, exploiters, deceivers, liars, and what not. His articles and editorials seemed to indicate a character whose heart was bleeding for the poor, who wanted to see fraud and deception erased from the hearts of men. But, alas, this great fighter for justice and social righteousness devoted only his mornings to such worthy work. His afternoons were spent in another office, where he operated his own mail order business. Believe it or not, it was a salve he offered for sale—a salve guaranteed to “cure” eczema and other ills our flesh is heir to. He ran ads in the newspapers and magazines. “Cure guaranteed” and all that sort of stuff. It happens that skin diseases cannot be cured by salves of any kind. Only X-ray and quartz lights can give relief, and in some cases cures. But he wasn't selling ultra-

violet rays and that sort of thing. He was selling a salve that cost him a few pennies, but which cost the suffering public dollars. There isn't a medical society in the world that would endorse such a patent medicine. And yet, our great revolutionary teacher of working class economics went ahead—writing editorials attacking dishonest capitalism in the morning and peddling eczema “cures” in the afternoon. I felt like a hypocrite. It hurt me to the depths to think that I could use the editorial services of such a man. I felt keenly the disgrace of being so inconsistent. And when I was finally rid of such services I felt like floating through the air. I could look my readers in the face again. I am not the least ashamed of my desire for consistency. It is my old-fashioned code that a person who presents himself as a “savior” of the working class should not try to get rich selling them a patent medicine that science does not recommend.

* * *

What is your opinion of Cornelius Vanderbilt, Jr.?

I've been following his articles, and a few of his nine books, for years. His latest work, “Farewell to Fifth Avenue,” is a fascinating piece of writing that holds one's interest from first to last word. I read my copy in an afternoon and evening, to the neglect of piles of correspondence. He writes with sure simplicity, painting broad pictures with a few words. His characterizations are shrewd, and frequently humorous.

This book is a saddening work—an appalling record of parasitism, uselessness, waste, snobbishness, social climbing, exploitation, unearned wealth, again waste, extravagance, show-off, greed, vanity and again waste. Vanderbilt seems to have the idea that this period in American social life died with the inauguration of F. D. R., but I don't think I can share his optimism. It's still here, and if one is to judge by the dividend and earning reports of the large corporations, the unearned wealth is again pouring into the laps of these dumb, vicious, elegant parasites.

Vanderbilt hates their life—he

prefers to earn his own living through his writings—but his unsure grasp of sociology and economics leads him to make broad generalizations that the facts do not support. He seems to have the notion that everything is going to turn out well since Hoover was dismissed by the voters and F. D. R. put into the White House. He seems to carry the enthusiasm of a zealot, but what's it all about? I'm ready to grant Roosevelt's sincerity, honesty and fearlessness, but crises in capitalist society need something more than that. We are yet to see a Roosevelt who tackles poverty, unemployment and exploitation with the weapons of social science—a move to the real Left, with socialized industry as the goal. Roosevelt believes in Capitalism—with all his heart; and it is his desire to correct and reform that system.

I'm positive that Vanderbilt is not competent to delve into the great problems of industrial and commercial life. His approach is superficial, with the lightness and quick intelligence of an able reporter, but that's all. Personally, he is all charm. I remember his visit here for an afternoon and evening, driving some 400 miles out of his way to look us over. One could not help liking and admiring him, and his conversation (as is this new book) is sprinkled with the names of the world's great and near-great. I don't suppose there's an important figure anywhere in the world that Vanderbilt, Jr., hasn't interviewed. He is a tremendous traveler, but judging his interviews by what he tells in his book, I don't think such quick glimpses of figures like Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler and many others have real value. They are all too sketchy. He gets an appointment, rushes to an airplane, flies a thousand miles, rushes to see Mr. Celebrity No. 1, and goes away with a few polite phrases that give no suggestion of the character's philosophy or place in the world. But that doesn't make Cornelius Vanderbilt, Jr., any the less interesting as a writer. His pages are fascinating even when he approaches the giant with a feathery pen and can record only a sentence or two. One

could never accuse him of overwriting.

But the real point of the book—his description of Fifth Avenue, Park Avenue, Newport, Washington, Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco, Richmond and Boston society are vivid and annihilating. He has caught them in poses that don't look so impressive in print. They are—as he says—useless, swinish, bigoted bores and bores. The sooner their social plane is undermined and they are made to join the workers in honest efforts at a livelihood the better it will be for civilization. They are a disgrace to the nation, and a civilization that tolerates them isn't worth defending. This author is still a young man—something like 35 years of age—and he has a long future before him as a writing man. If he doesn't mind my assuming the pompous airs of a teacher, let me suggest that he stop traveling a while and dig into history, science, economics and philosophy for a good spell. He needs a deeper intellectual background.

* * *

Why is it that our shopgirls and workers generally like to read about the doings of Princess Barbara Hutton Mdivani? Doesn't this mean that they have a deep affection for our rich playboys and play-girls?

All people, rich and poor, can read about this pair of parasites without letting it be understood that they approve of them. It certainly is a disgraceful spectacle, to have this busted Russian "prince" sell himself to an American heiress. He never did a useful day's work in his whole life. He and his brothers have been making a business of marrying rich women for no other purpose than to live parasitically. This Barbara Hutton girl is the granddaughter of the merchant prince, Woolworth, of 5-and-10c chain store fame.

The old man died and left this empty headed female something like \$40,000,000, which she came into on her 21st birthday, with an additional income of \$2,000,000 per year from the dime stores that one sees everywhere. With this vast fortune she and her rotten "prince"

have put on a disgusting show in a time of misery and starvation. They traveled across the country in a special car and then hired about half a deck of a big liner, for a trip around the world.

If that Russian "prince" Mdivani were in Russia today he'd do honest work digging ditches or starve. But great America takes him up and pours its millions into his useless hands. Think of the thousands of shopgirls in the Woolworth stores, working hard for a few dollars a week, and then picture what they do it all for—a corrupt "prince" who gives the world a lesson in useless living and wanton spending.

I happen to remember how the Woolworth stores howled in Washington when they were called on to establish a labor code. At that time, according to information I received from an official of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Kans., the Woolworth store employees in that city of some 20,000 population were receiving as low as \$3 per week, with \$5 per week as the top wage. Since then, as a result of the NRA, the wages have gone up and the hours of labor have gone down. There's no getting away from that fact. They are getting \$11 per week, and working far fewer hours. But that didn't come through the efforts of Barbara and her stinking "prince." Her company fought to the end. It gave in because Roosevelt wouldn't have anything else.

The next step should be even more drastic. The federal government should use its tremendous power to strip such parasites as Barbara and her "prince" of the money they stole from the sweat and blood of thousands of overworked, starving, helpless girls and women. The best way is to start off with a stiffer income tax and then slap on an inheritance tax that would make impossible the spectacle of a 21-year-old girl taking over \$40,000,000 that she never moved a finger to earn.

A just social order would never tolerate such an outrage. It is a disgrace to civilization. Millions of men and women out of work, insecure, afraid that tomorrow may mean eviction, loss of what little

they have, and on the other hand a slip of a girl copping \$40,000,000 and hopping away with a Russian "prince."

This certainly is a grand argument for a classless society, which can only come through an economic order based on socialized industry. Only a socialized order can do away with such contrasts. Until the people become the social owners of the means of wealth production, distribution and exchange expect to see the continuation of this Barbara Hutton Mdivani scandal.

* * *

What is your reaction to the nudist colonies in the United States?

While I am not a nudist myself, and perhaps will never be one, I have nothing but respect for those who practice nudism. I have met several nudists and have always found them to be fine, clean, upright, intelligent people. Some months ago I saw a movie of a number of nudist colonies in Europe and I was impressed with the decency of it all. Of course, there are great economic interests that cannot tolerate this movement, so we may expect to see the nudists ridiculed and hounded, but they will win tolerance in time. Nudism is comparatively new in this country, but it is making headway. The notion that it is a means of satisfying erotic impulses is without foundation. Persons who join a nudist colony in order to contact available sex instruments soon learn that it is easier to put on plenty of clothes and go out into the haunts of the "respectable" and the "decently clothed" to get their chances to let off emotional steam. I hope to see nudism grow.

* * *

What is your opinion of Oberammergau's Passion Play?

I have never seen the Oberammergau performance, but some years ago I was condemned to the inhuman torture of attending the Passion Play of the Freiberg players, in Convention Hall, Kansas City. I shall never forget the boredom of that expensive and stupid evening. As I left (long before the close) I reflected on how better and more intelligent it would have

been for me to have spent the time and money in a bootleg joint.

I bow to the opinion of that expert on the stage, Barrett H. Clark, who wrote on the Oberammergau racket in the July, 1934, **Panorama**.

Mr. Clark—and he is a capable judge—says the Oberammergau show is nothing less than a commercial racket. The acting is rotten. The music was written by a hack. The singing is appalling. The scenery is awful. The prices are high. The townspeople (all parties to the racket) rob the tourists with Christian piety and zealotry. The hotels are run by hold-ups. The whole thing is worse than Al Capone's graft, because Capone at least was never a hypocrite.

Mr. Clark went to Oberammergau to be stirred by great art; instead, he was disgusted by commercialism, racial hatred and bad art.

* * *

What is your opinion of the Christian Science Monitor?

Its typographical appearance is very pleasing, though I do not consider it superior to the **Kansas City Star**, which, to my notion, is the best-looking newspaper published. Both papers have efficient pressmen. Editorially, the **Monitor** strives heroically to give the impression of superior intelligence, but a careful reading over a long period does not support this assumption. Within its limits, it does a very good job, but one would be twisted and warped if he got his picture of the world only from the columns of the **Monitor**. Not so long ago it ignored deaths, murders, assassinations, crimes, etc., but of late there has been a change in policy, the result being that when King Alexander, of Yugoslavia, was assassinated in France recently, the **Monitor** "recognized" the incident. Five years ago it would have considered it improper to report such a happening. Some years ago I was told by a Christian Science practitioner that he knew for a fact that a toy repairer in Topeka, Kansas, was denied the right to run an inch advertisement in the **Monitor** because he called his establishment a "Doll Hospital," which struck me as a

mildly amusing incident. Maybe, since assassinations are reported, the **Monitor** will stoop to advertising a "doll hospital." This paper has correspondents in every important news center in the world, and it strives to report the international scene, but its foreign news is not always reliable. It leans over backward to say good things about Mussolini, and is careful to be unfriendly to the Soviet Union. These policies are unconscious, for the paper is thoroughly capitalistic in its economics. The **Monitor** appeals to a prosperous, bourgeois public, which shudders whenever the New Deal decides to spend more money on the poor. Perhaps the unemployed are just so many "errors," or really non-existent, though I notice that the **Monitor**, like the Christian Science Church itself, has a healthy regard for so material and gross a thing as money. These people are shrewd, clever money-getters, perhaps among the most dignified in the land, and they always get the kale.

* * *

The Hearst papers out here (California) sure did raise hell with Upton Sinclair, calling him a free-lover, etc. Please comment.

I've seen some of the clippings, so I know you are not exaggerating. Hearst sure is a fine judge of free love, what with having Marion Davies as his sweetie. The funny thing about it all is that Hearst is really a free lover while Sinclair is one of the worst puritanical prudes that ever lived. I know for a fact that he has had only two women in his entire life—his first wife and his second wife. Some record, for a rank free lover!

* * *

During the Upton Sinclair campaign I heard a number of preachers quote you over the radio and from their pulpits to the effect that Sinclair is no Atheist. Were you quoted accurately?

I don't know what you heard, but I do know exactly what I said. During the campaign a California preacher wired me for my opinion, which I wired back as follows:

"It is ridiculous to call Sinclair an Atheist. He is a Theist or one who accepts the God idea. He is not

even an Agnostic. The Sinclair who wrote such a devoutly Christian book as 'They Call Me Carpenter' certainly cannot be classed among Atheists. I define him as a critical Christian, one who criticizes the abuses in Christian institutions but who accepts the basic assumptions of Christianity."

* * *

Who, in your opinion, is the world's ablest journalist?

It seems to me that the world's ablest newspaperman is Karl Radek, who is a regular writer for the "Izvestia" and carries the most authority when he speaks for the Kremlin. Radek writes with simplicity and clarity. His influence is more than Russian; it is world-wide, for the thinking people of the entire world listen when Radek speaks. His knowledge of international affairs is encyclopedic. I never consider myself "hep" on some subjects related to international affairs until I know what Radek thinks about them. I don't always agree with him, but I always respect him. Radek is important and sincere, which is more than we can say for our highest paid journalist, Arthur Brisbane, who deals in the superficial, dabbles with subjects about which he knows little, plays to all sides of every question but always ends up on the reactionary note, and half the time has only the haziest notion of what's going on in this exciting, thrilling, dramatic age. As for Walter Lippmann, he is an able craftsman, but rarely comes to grips with his material. He has considerable influence at home, and quite a little abroad, but alongside a Karl Radek he looks like a sophomore.

* * *

Your description of Karl Radek as the world's greatest journalist interests me, but as he is an editorial writer you should tell us who, in your opinion, is the greatest reporter.

Reporting is a difficult, exacting profession, and while there are many capable craftsmen in this vocation it seems to me that the best is a Communist, John L. Spivak. He is, to my notion, the most thorough, conscientious and reliable reporter in the United States.

His long article in the November, 1934, **American Mercury**, exposing the Red Cross, is a masterpiece of reporting. He makes no statements without offering clear proofs, and that is the first requirement of a great reporter. His articles in **The New Masses**, exposing the shirt movement, pogrom makers in the U. S., anti-Semitic propagandists and secret Nazi conspirators, place him at the head of his profession. I gladly endorse the suggestion of Isaac Goldberg, well-known critic, that Spivak be given the Pulitzer prize for the best reporting of the year, but it is a question whether the judges will so far overlook their class interests as to recognize and reward a radical practitioner, however able he may be. My guess is that he'll be ignored, but that won't alter the fact that Spivak can out-report the best reporters in the country. He is a combination of good writer, Sherlock Holmes, secret service operative and well-trained pugilist.

* * *

I agree with your statement that John L. Spivak is the best reporter writing today. His book, "The Medical Trust Unmasked," is a masterpiece equal to his expose of the Red Cross and still you worship the medical profession. How come?

The writer of the above, William Plampin, State Secretary of the Socialist Party of Texas, read too much into my comment on Spivak. I based my praise strictly on his Red Cross exposure and his series of articles describing the activities of the leaders of the shirt movements in the U. S. I had no occasion to go into the man's history, even though it is familiar to me. I look on Spivak as a reformed reporter, one who was very bad during his earlier years, capable of any kind of mischief, and even prostituting his pen, but who, happily, is changing his methods. Spivak's book on the so-called medical "trust" is on my shelves, sent to me by Macfadden's organization, which paid Spivak to do this dirty, dishonest job. I suppose every other editor in the country received free copies.

I know for a fact that when Spivak went to the office of the American Medical Association, he

frankly told the doctors in charge that he had been hired by Macfadden to write the stuff. He added the confession that Macfadden was a rank faker and charlatan, but he (Spivak) would be paid good money for the material and that he wasn't going to pass up this chance to get some of Macfadden's money, of which there is plenty. I can't imagine anything more dishonest, especially in a writer who is supposed to give the reading public facts honestly gathered and fairly interpreted. Let us now turn to the book itself.

I haven't space to review the entire work, but I can speak about one paragraph, on which I am able to place the brand of falsehood and dishonesty. I refer to the following, from Spivak's book:

"The million dollar citadel of the medical trust. This steel and concrete headquarters of the American Medical Association was so constructed as to withstand attacks from any source. Built strategically at the corner of North Dearborn Street and Grand Avenue, Chicago, it is invulnerable from the corner sides, and the adjacent buildings on either side are at least one foot away so that no entrance can be effected by tunneling from one building to the citadel. The doors within this extraordinarily guarded building are made of steel and the glass partitions are interwoven with steel netting. The doors lock automatically and can be opened only by the release of an electric contrivance guarded by an employee. Papers disclosing the trust's operations are stored in tempered steel cabinets which are kept in reinforced concrete and steel vaults."

Does one have to read more to be able to say that Spivak's exposure of the medical "trust" is an exposure of his own dishonesty? I have been through the building, and I never got the impression that I was in some sort of a million-dollar fortress. I saw a plain, substantial, well-run office building. I'm sure it would be an easy matter for two or three cops to break

in at any time of the day or night. Just why the association should want to fortify itself is beyond my understanding. I'm positive that my Chicago readers, who know the location of the above-described building, will agree with me when I dismiss Spivak's sentences as pure bunk. He is just a liar—reformed, at last.

To know the Spivak who wrote this disgraceful book on the doctors (before he confessed his sins) one should read his article in the July, 1934, *American Mercury*, entitled "The Rise and Fall of a Tabloid." In this frank work, Spivak describes himself as a Macfadden tabloidist capable of any kind of journalistic faking, dishonesty and corruption. He brands himself as an intellectual prostitute. A reading of this article would lead one to expect the author to be equally unreliable in the almost simultaneous writing of his book exposing the medical "trust." And yet, despite his shady record, I say that Spivak did two good jobs recently—I've already mentioned them—and since he seems to have given up his evil ways of tabloid and Macfadden days, I can only say that we should let him go forward "like an honest woman," even though he did step from the paths of righteousness and innocence in his more youthful, wayward days.

What do you think of H. G. Wells?

Wells is one of my admirations. He has always shown a tremendous, enthusiastic, intelligent interest in ideas, and he has done a great service to humanity in popularizing those ideas. The early Wells—in his novels and stories—was the great artist; the present Wells—in expository studies—is the great teacher and guide. Wells has done as much, if not more, than any other person in modernizing thinking in the field of history, science, economics, militarism, social behavior, feminism and marriage. In religion, he has veered towards mysticism, which weakens his usefulness greatly. In Socialism, he once was a Fabian and was active in that small but tremendously influential society. His ideas about God, explained in "God, the Invis-

ible King," are unworthy of an intelligent schoolboy. His "Outline of History" is a masterpiece of erudition and popular education. He took history away from the stodgy, dull pedants of the history chairs in the universities and showed that it could be served up to the reading masses with all the excitement of a "best-seller." All his life he has been dusting away mental cobwebs. He has helped make thinking fresher. His usefulness is almost beyond calculation. Future historians may say that he did the most in the great work of leading the people to a more realistic approach to the problems of thought, behavior and social maladjustments. Wells is always readable, and he will stimulate thought even among those who do not agree with him. He is a great intellectual agitator.

* * *

H. G. Wells and God.

I recently wrote a short estimate of H. G. Wells, mostly in admiration of his genius. In a few sentences I mentioned his writings on the God idea, telling how they lessen his value as a thinker. Now, from his "Experiment in Autobiography," I learn that Wells regrets having written so much about God, for, says he, he has always been an Atheist. It's a little late to find that out, but that doesn't make it less welcome news. I've always felt that Wells' religious writings were his least valuable expressions, and it is more than a pleasure to see him repudiate in a few sentences the whole mess of mystical nonsense.

* * *

What do you think are the best stories of H. G. Wells?

Most of his early scientific stories are still worth reading, but I prefer to put at the head of my list of Wells stories that great tale, entitled "The Country of the Blind," one of the greatest stories in the English language.

* * *

What is H. G. Wells' opinion of Marx?

In his new "Experiment in Autobiography," Wells tells that he first was attracted to Socialism in 1903, when he joined the Fabian Society, that powerfully influential group

of British intellectuals who believed in gradualism rather than violence or revolution, who rejected the theory of the class struggle, and who aimed at saturating all political parties with socialistic ideas rather than organizing an independent Socialist political party. Prior to his meeting up with the Fabians, Wells had written socialistic essays on capitalism's waste and faulty distribution (in 1888, when only 20 years old), and another paper on the necessity of organizing an international state, which was published in 1900. So Wells' interest in Socialism may be said to cover all of his mature life, but he is careful to deny any admiration for Karl Marx, the founder of scientific Socialism, mainly because of Wells' refusal to accept the theory of the class war. "We should be far nearer a sanely organized world system today if he had never been born," writes Wells. Marxian Socialists, particularly Lenin, had, or have, little respect for Wells' views on economics, classifying him, as Lenin did after their famous meeting in the Kremlin, as one saturated with middle-class delusions and ideas of reform rather than social revolution. (If I may inject a personal opinion (and who's to stop me?) it seems obvious that the world would be considerably poorer and more intellectually muddled if Marx had never lived.)

* * *

Is there anything to the report that Mary Pickford is a fascist?

Yes. The little lady—formerly the nation's sweetheart and now rapidly becoming the nation's mentor—is beginning to become a most profound philosopher, if you'll pardon the deadly satire. Some time ago she wrote an article on religion, which appeared in **The Forum**, and I thought for a while that I'd answer it, but finally gave up because I concluded her spasm of Hollywood theology wasn't worthy of serious consideration. She is a Christian Scientist, which is enough to convince the most skeptical what a tenth-rate brain she has.

In the matter of politics and economics, I notice that she attended a fascist celebration in the

Hotel Ambassador, New York City, on March 24, 1934, and said some stupid things in praise of Mussolini. She seems to think that Mussolini has put Italy on her feet, when the facts all indicate that he has floored the olive-skinned lady. After congratulating the Italians on having their dictator, she closed with this: "Viva Fascismo! Viva Il Duce!" Which means that in addition to being a nut on religion she is a supporter of fascist dictatorship.

* * *

Granted that Mary Pickford slops over with religious notions and Fascism. Why expect anything else from movie nuppets?

I fail to see why movie actors should be expected to be mouth-pieces of obscurantism and reaction. One has a right to look for intelligence even from that source. I remember having met Charlie Chaplin years ago in Los Angeles, dining, talking and wandering around with him for several days, and I was greeted by a personality of rare charm, candor and intellectual honesty. He impressed me as a well-read, quiet, deep thinker, and I'll never forget the pleasure I got from his company. In matters of politics and economics I found him on the side of the workers. I'm sure Chaplin would write no articles supporting stupid Christian Science or giving three cheers for Mussolini and Fascism, as did Mary Pickford. And Chaplin is not alone in this matter of being in sympathy with the workers in their struggle for economic emancipation. Groucho Marx has, in a newspaper interview, criticized the framed imprisonment of Mooney, the attempt to railroad the Scottsboro Negroes to the gallows, and the general injustices of our capitalist economy. He spoke highly of the Soviet Union, saying that he hoped to see the idea of socialized industry accepted in the U. S. Not all of Hollywood mouths 13th Century theology and hopes for the day when democracy will be crushed.

* * *

Is Shaw a Socialist?

George Bernard Shaw was one of the most important figures in the British Fabian Society, a socialistic

organization of great influence for more than a quarter of a century. For something like four decades this great playwright and wit has called himself a Socialist, and in large measure he is, though it is necessary to add that Shaw's Socialism is more Shavian than Marxian. To Shaw, Socialism means:

"... the complete discarding of the institution of private property ... and the division of the resultant public income equally and indiscriminately among the entire population."

I don't know of a single Socialist party anywhere that would accept such a definition. They all agree in supporting personal property (even in the Soviet Union) but invariably oppose private capital, the former being the product of capital, the latter being the medium for the creation of personal possessions. Nor does any Socialist party propose equality of income, distributed indiscriminately, as Shaw proposes. Returning to the worker the full social value of his labor does not mean equality of income, for a Socialist society takes into consideration differences of ability, productivity and usefulness, with commensurate rewards.

Shaw, with all his genius, is amazingly inconsistent. In one speech he praises Mussolini; turns around and slams political democracy and winds up with a boost for social democracy. It's all done to brilliant intellectual fireworks, but with poor logic and no science at all. As a Sociologist, Shaw is confused and confusing, though I always admire his great literary and dramatic ability. And no matter how unsound his ideas may be on economics, theism and science, he is always stimulating, interesting and humorous. He is a magnificent artist—one of the outstanding men of the 20th Century. His plays and prefaces will command attention and respect for many years, even though his knowledge of scientific Socialism is hazy.

* * *

What is your opinion of George Sylvester Viereck?

Viereck is Hitler's paid propagandist in this country, receiving

\$1,750 weekly for prostituting himself in the cause of Germany's great homosexual. I have a pretty low opinion of a homosexual's prostitute.

Recently, while testifying before a congressional committee, Viereck had the astonishing gall to say that Hitler was not persecuting the Jews, but rather that the Jews were persecuting Hitler! Hitlerism is a disease that makes for insanity, whether in or out of the Reich.

* * *

The capitalistic press praises and mourns Dollfuss extravagantly. Was he more of a martyr than those Socialists who died in Austria? What did he do for Austria?

Dollfuss was a murderer who was assassinated by his own kind—fascists. He stood for Austrian fascism as against Hitler's fascism, so he was shot by Nazi fanatics. No decent person can find any cause for mourning in the death of this contemptible murderer of the liberties of republican Austria and the massacre of more than 1,500 Socialist men, women and children in their apartment houses, last February. Those Socialists died to preserve the ideals of democracy—not only in politics but in industry as well. They are the real martyrs. Dollfuss slaughtered them as "traitors," but it was Dollfuss who was the traitor to civilization and humanity. The world is better off without him, but the fact remains that many of his character still reign in Central Europe. They must be disposed of before that part of the world can again become civilized.

* * *

What's your opinion of Emma Goldman?

While I do not accept her social philosophy, I have the keenest admiration for this doughty little fighter. She has a keen wit, a sharp tongue, a smashing right arm, solid courage and brilliant literary ability. As a creative thinker, however, she has contributed practically nothing. Her literary criticisms, while shrewd, are hardly more than the echoes of greater critics. Her philosophical anarchism is an attractive, romantic, artistic ideal, but it has no more to do with cur-

rent life than has the animism of a black savage.

Pure individualism cannot be made to fit into a social order based on machinery, large-scale industry, credit and the other developments of modern industrialism. Anarchism—which is a utopia devoid of government and authority—may be a possibility in some far Eden, but in this workaday world of harsh realities one must have law, authority, government, and even force.

Force is an ugly thing, but what is one to do with the anti-social elements? Tolerate them? I think not! Government at its best is an evil compromise, as Thomas Paine so well showed in one of his famous pamphlets, but there is nothing to indicate that we can dispense with this necessary evil. Governments have been used thus far as weapons of exploitation and enforced submission, because society has thus far been based on classes, with owning classes exploiting producing classes. But this does not mean there need be no use for government when society becomes advanced enough to do away with classes and make all the people producers of one kind or another. And it is more than likely that even in a classless society there will be need for the force of discipline to make anti-social elements obey the will of the community.

Anarchism is too much of a counsel of perfection. Emma Goldman, Kropotkin, Berkman and other anarchists work out what they conceive as a perfect social life and then expect 2,000,000,000 humans to fit into it without a hitch or a slip. I don't doubt that I could, in five short minutes, work out a plan for a perfect society—on paper. I could tell you how to make every individual a perfect member of a perfect social order, but what would be the value of such utopianism? After all, social plans must consider the people who are to live under them. The plans must jibe with common life. When one builds a house one doesn't put the door in the ceiling. One puts it where it can be used conveniently and efficiently. The same goes with

society. We build institutions that we can live under and by and with. It can't be perfect, because man won't be perfect for many thousand years to come.

I don't question that in the far, far future, man will finally know an end to anti-social behavior, but we can't build today's life on that assumption. We must figure that the savage in man will pop up at the most unexpected times and places, and the wise social philosopher will prepare for such conduct.

In brief, I believe that Emma Goldman is just about 10,000 years ahead of her time, and that is not said in the sense of a compliment, because I believe that only fools and geniuses care to be 10,000 years ahead of humanity. One can be so far ahead of man that one can't see a person with a 200-inch telescope. There's no sense in that. The wise leader stays close enough to keep everything in sight. The sage says five or 10 years ahead is plenty good enough.

* * *

Is there any truth in the Communist version that Lenin was always a consistent, uncompromising, Marxian revolutionist?

By no means. The man's record is one list of compromises and changes. In December, 1914, he wrote a newspaper editorial entitled "The National Pride of the Greater Russians," which, of course, appeared during the World War. "We are filled with national pride," he wrote in this article that was intended to be read by the workers of Russia. "National pride" certainly does not jibe with Marxian internationalism. Lenin talked internationalism later, abusing those who had been nationalists, forgetting, of course, that he himself had joined in that sad chorus. In 1915, Lenin wrote in support of a republic along democratic lines. This is surely out of line with the policy of a proletarian dictatorship! However, I do not recall hearing any Communist orator or journalist refer to Lenin of 1915 as a social-fascist! In the same year he proposed, quite seriously, a policy of collaboration and coalition with the lower middle class that held democratic ideas. All these

things are thoroughly out of line with the picture one gets of the man in Communist literature. Lenin was an opportunist of the first order, ready to chuck any set of ideas that did not seem promising at any particular time.

* * *

Did Lenin ever discuss the question of freedom of the press?

If you will refer to Lord Riddell's "Intimate Diary" you will find the following citation from a speech by Lenin, in 1920:

"Why should freedom of speech and freedom of the press be allowed? Why should a government which is doing what it believes to be right allow itself to be criticized? It would not allow opposition by lethal weapons. Ideas are much more fatal things than guns. Why should any man be allowed to buy a printing press and disseminate pernicious opinions calculated to embarrass the government?"

This sounds amazingly like the argument used by the Catholic Inquisition in the Middle Ages, when the Catholic Church used its full powers to stamp out heresy and infidelity. The argument ran that since the Church had Truth—divine Truth—it was only the evil, wicked and corrupt who wanted to speak and write in criticism of this revealed Truth, and therefore to tolerate such freedom was to endanger man's immortal soul. Thus it became a matter of "good morals" to torture, murder and steal for the greater glory of God. Lenin is seen to hold the identical views of the Torquemadas and the Loyolas, except that he puts his case on the grounds of secular truth instead of divine revelation. Of course, the answer to Lenin is very simple. His first assumption that he and his government are right and every critic wrong is not valid. Lenin made many blunders, some of which he admitted publicly. He would first have to prove himself infallible in matters of economics, industry and government before he could safely claim the right to consider criticism a social offense. He crushed many opponents who were later found to be right, as his own

changes in economic policy proved. If Lenin was right in his medieval notion that criticism is *per se* a social crime, then what can one say in criticism of the suppressions furthered by the Mussolinis and Hitlers. They believe themselves right and are ready to kill and maim those who would speak against their barbarities. They base their case on the argument of public safety, which was Lenin's case. But it isn't social safety they really mean; it is merely a case of being afraid to see their policies analyzed by perhaps superior and more scientific minds. If the Catholic Church were to regain temporal power comparable to what it held 400 years ago, we would find the Church using language strangely similar to Lenin's as it went about the work of crushing criticism, distorting history and imposing black mental reaction on a world that is struggling for light and knowledge.

* * *

Maybe one reason why you attack the American Communists with your poison darts is because you can't stand their consistency on the class struggle.

Mebbe so, mebbe no. Speaking of consistency, let's take a peek at the case of William Gropper, the Communist cartoonist who works on the Communist scandal sheet, *The Daily Worker*, probably the rottenest, most dishonest paper that ever disgraced the profession of journalism. This Gropper is a good cartoonist and never tires of exposing Roosevelt as a fascist, and the N.R.A. as a devil's weapon of fascism. It happens that a department of the N.R.A. is assigned to the work of helping needy artists, so for the first time in American history the national government is doing something to help the creators of beauty. If you look on the payroll of the PWA ("fascist outfit intended to corrupt and degrade labor," etc.) you will find the name of Gropper. He's there for a weekly salary on fascist Roosevelt's NRA, to the extent of \$38.25 every Saturday. When I first heard about it I had a good laugh, and I chuckle every time I think of it. Priests and communists have one thing in common—they are always ready to

take the devil's money for holy ends.

* * *

I see in the press reports that Leon Trotsky is organizing a Fourth International. In what way will it differ from the Third International?

The Third International, with headquarters in Moscow, is pledged to the policy of introducing Socialism at the rate of one country at a time, beginning with Russia. Trotsky's Fourth International (if it is organized) proposes to bring Socialism by international action. This makes Trotsky much more extreme than the Russian Communists.

It might be well to mention that Trotsky can always command a vast amount of publicity, because of his picturesque, colorful personality, but when it comes to counting actual followers he is weak. In the United States it is estimated he has a following of from 1,000 to 3,000. They publish a weekly in New York City, "*The Militant*." Their organization is called the Communist League of America, of which Arne Swabeck is secretary, with headquarters at 126 E. 16th St., New York City.

Max Eastman, the translator of Trotsky's works, is himself a distinguished author, with solid achievements in literary criticism.

The leaders of the Third International, including Stalin, look on Trotsky and his followers as "counter revolutionists." But their calling him names can never conceal the prodigious services he rendered Russia when the country was in the throes of civil war and was being attacked on 13 fronts along 7,000 miles of fighting line. He organized an efficient fighting force of 1,500,000 men in about a year, an achievement that drew warm praise from Lenin.

Lenin knew what policies to follow, but he was dependent on Trotsky's quick powers of action in a field completely unknown to Lenin. When Lenin sent Trotsky out to build up an army and save the revolution, he signed his name at the bottom of a blank sheet of paper, handed it to Trotsky and told him to go ahead and write in

any order or set of orders he felt necessary. This, from the absolute head of the Soviet government, showed Trotsky's position.

It was only after Lenin's death that Trotsky began to lose power and prestige. From 1923 to 1927, Trotsky was made the target of numerous conspiracies against his place in the revolutionary government, and finally Stalin (jealous of Trotsky's greater hold on the masses) got him exiled to Siberia. He would have shot him, had he dared. Later Trotsky was removed to an island belonging to Turkey.

From 1927 on, Trotsky has been the target of an unprecedented attack through every instrumentality of Stalin, his party and the party's government. This organization propaganda, without equal in history, has made Trotsky, in the minds of the Russians, a creature on a par with the late czar and his black hundred. However, I predict the day will come when Russia will erect monuments to Trotsky's memory.

* * *

What do you think of Lindbergh?

That he is a wonderful flier must be granted, and that his solo flight to Paris was a triumph must also be admitted. But here one must stop. There is nothing more to be said about him in praise, at least in the view of this writer. He has sold himself as the "front" for the worst gang of boodlers in present-day industry—the airplane interests. He has never, by word or deed, shown the slightest interest in the welfare of the poor and oppressed, but when President Roosevelt threatened the profits—rather, the graft—of these air-mail thieves, Lindbergh rushed to their defense and tried to whip up public sentiment against the President and for the air-mail crooks.

He has shown himself indifferent to tremendous publicity of a personal nature, but he has never shown the slightest indifference when he saw within reach a bucket of gold.

When Sacco and Vanzetti were being railroaded to the electric chair for a crime they never committed, an attempt was made to get Lindbergh to say a word in their

behalf. At that time, a telegram might have done something to save those two martyrs. But he refused. He could not bother about a question of social morality, but when his profits were threatened he sent the President a wire bristling with malice over the fear that he and his fellow grafters might lose their contacts with the U. S. treasury.

What a difference in characters, when one compares young Lindbergh with his father, now deceased. When the elder Lindbergh was a member of the U. S. Congress, his voice and pen were constantly lifted in defense of the rights of the ordinary citizens. During the stupid and unnecessary Wilsonian war he spoke so freely that he was the object of official persecution, to the extent that his book, which exposed the war profiteers, was suppressed. It took real courage in those days of war hysteria for a man to speak out against the patrioteers, but Lindbergh's father stood the gaff. He never achieved his son's fame, but he outstripped the son ten thousand miles in the race for character and honesty.

* * *

What do you think of Joseph Lewis?

I have great admiration for this useful, clever, able publisher. He has done a great deal of good in popularizing the sexological writings of Dr. William J. Robinson, one of the greatest authorities in this field of science. Mr. Lewis' free-thought publications are also of great value, including his own readable and helpful books. This man is a gifted practitioner in one of the most difficult fields of business activity—the ability to sell things by mail. That's a business that always looks so easy and simple, but try it once if you think it's a cinch. You may learn something. I consider myself a mail order bookseller, but I'm frank to admit that I am rarely more than 10 percent efficient, by which I mean I try out nine ideas that are appalling flops before I hit on the tenth idea that even pays the cost of its postage, let alone the cost of the books, circulars, labor, etc. It's a great, fascinating business, and I

more than enjoy it, because it beats crap games, poker, bridge and the Irish sweepstakes all rolled into one. I have sold hundreds of millions of books via the mail order route, but I am free to confess that I know very little about the art and try to pick up new ideas as I go along. That's why I am quick to spot and appreciate a master mail order seller like Joseph Lewis. Mail order men are a breed to themselves. They are cagey, secretive, and like to pooch-pooch their successes, perhaps to throw other mail order men off the scent. A mail order man will go on for years promoting an idea that is making money and all along calmly insist that he is still "trying out" the idea! I know, because I've talked the same spoof myself! There are only a couple hundred good mail order men in the entire country, and I am not conceited enough to include myself among them. I'm still trying to make the grade, while Joseph Lewis got there long ago.

* * *

Would you say that Lindbergh is the world's greatest hero?

By no means. He did a right clever stunt, but nothing that showed the genuine heroism of the Bulgarian Communist, Dimitroff, who went through the Reichstag fire trial in a manner that astounded the world. He fought a nation of lunatics—calmly, even humorously. He was a stranger, who had to learn German and law as he went through his trial, and his simple, direct candor made curs of his enemies, including the "great" Goering, Prussian Prime Minister, who promised to chop off his head if given half a chance. Alongside a Dimitroff, Lindbergh stands as a mere stunt flyer and as a willing tool of reactionary financial interests. Lindbergh is prose; Dimitroff is of the stuff of poetry. Dimitroff is now in Russia, where he has been admitted to Soviet citizenship, after having won what is probably the greatest individual triumph in all history.

* * *

You say Shakespeare, Socrates, and Leonardo Da Vinci were homosexuals. Can you prove this?

A great deal of research has been

devoted to this subject. Oscar Wilde wrote a brilliant book on Shakespeare's Sonnets, in which he showed the great bard's love for a youth. The best little work on this subject is J. V. Nash's Little Blue Book, No. 1564, entitled "Homosexuality in the Lives of the Great."

* * *

What is your interpretation of the character of Robespierre?

Robespierre was a religious fanatic, and that, in great measure, explains why he inaugurated the Reign of Terror. For almost four years the French Revolution, guided by Freethinkers and Atheists, went forward in a sane, orderly, civilized manner. The guillotine was unknown until three years after the revolution started. The real Revolutionists of that period had great ideals and went about the task of reconstructing society in what we might call a scientific spirit. Humanity was in the saddle. Then came Robespierre, with his pious talk about God and the Church and his blind hatred for the Atheists. His fanaticism whipped new hatreds into line, the result being an orgy of murder and destruction, all for the greater glory of God. He protected priests, who, of course, had been the mainstays of feudal privilege and royal savagery. When you hear false historians talk about the terrible Atheists of the French Revolution, be sure to tell them that heads did not roll into the basket until Robespierre's religious mania enabled him to get control of France and lead it from humanitarianism and civilization to darkness and persecution.

* * *

What are the 25 best short stories you ever read?

I'm sure I couldn't give you a cut-and-dried list, but I can mention a few of my favorites. I found great merit in Thomas Hardy's "The Three Strangers," Poe's "The Fall of the House of Usher," a few tales by Frank Harris, the titles of which have escaped my mind at the moment, Mark Twain's "The Mysterious Stranger," Massuccio's "The Comedy of the Saint's Pants," Twain's "Jumping Frog," Gorki's "26 Men and a

Girl," several stories in Harris Merton Lyons' "Graphics" (a fine collection that deserves the attention of those who admire the short story at its best), a few pieces by Leonard Merrick, almost anything by Anton Chekhov, Boccaccio's "The Falcon," and probably a half dozen other Boccaccio stories, many of the stories that appeared in the old **Smart Set**, some of Ben Hecht's sketches that he wrote when he was young and handsome in Chicago before he became a movie magnate, and that's about all I can think of at this time, though I believe it would be an easy matter to swell the list with a hundred or more additional specimens of the fascinating, difficult, ever-charming medium of the short story. (While I think of it, let me add that I don't care at all for the art of O. Henry. The man was clever and snappy, but he had a bag of tricks and played them to the point of weariness. The O. Henry trick ending is artistic fraud and I never fell for it, even in the days when O. Henry was the rage and a cult, with thousands of imitators who merely wrote countless millions of words to prove that an imitation of something that isn't quite good is bound to be bad, no matter how clever the practitioner may be.)

* * *

What are the 25 best essays you ever read?

I have derived pleasure and reward from the essays of Montaigne, Bacon, Huneker, Lamb, Paier, Emerson, Bertrand Russell, Anatole France, Shaw, Macaulay, Voltaire, Poe, Lenin, and dozens of other great writers, but I don't feel like selecting 25 and calling them the best. In the case of Anatole France, the "essays" were reviews and articles; in the case of Shaw the "essays" were prefaces; in the case of Lenin the "essays" were editorial articles, but I dump them all into the essay class, and can say in all sincerity that they have been of real intellectual value.

* * *

What, in your opinion, are the 100 best novels ever written?

I'm sure my opinion wouldn't be worth much, since I'm such a poor novel reader. During the past two

years I recall reading only two novels, one being "The Oppermanns" because it was frankly propagandistic on the question of Hitlerism, and which I enjoyed for that reason. I prefer to spend my time reading books on philosophy, science, biography, history, economics, international affairs, sociology, etc., to the sad neglect of poetry, fiction and the drama. I was deeply impressed by Dreiser, Wells, Conrad, Upton Sinclair, Sinclair Lewis, Hardy, and a few others, but I've never considered myself much of a novel fan, so for that reason I don't feel competent to answer so big a question. I don't care at all for light fiction, love stories, romances, westerns or detective yarns. I don't believe I've ever read a western or a detective novel, though I've made several stabs. I know many intelligent people who get real pleasure from mystery novels, but I just don't happen to like them, so that's that. The sophisticated problems of sexual behavior among the high-toned aristocrats never got a fall out of me, so that leaves out another section of popular literature. If I ever do settle down to a novel, I prefer to have it meaty, with characters who mean something. The best novel I ever read, and which I never quit praising, is Voltaire's "Candide," and that's a philosophical story.

* * *

Who is your favorite movie star?

At the moment it is Charles Laughton. However, my loyalties in movie stardom are not permanent, so it is possible that by the time this gets into print I'll be transferring my affections elsewhere. I thought Laughton was delightful in his portrayal of Henry VIII. And he was almost as good in "The Barretts of Wimpole Street." An earlier picture, "Payment Deferred," didn't attract much attention, but I thought it one of the best pieces of acting I'd ever seen.

My pet dislike in the movies is Will Rogers. He impresses me as nothing less than a ham. He is so everlastingly respectable, good, kind, moral—his pictures of sticky, creeping righteousness always give me a pain in the usual place. His homely

philosophy is just so much crap. As for his "literary" work, he's a talkative ass. His humor is flat, his observations are trite and his philosophy is inferior to the kind I've heard around a dozen cracker-barrels. I'll trade him any day for a roll of ordinary toilet paper.

As for the women, Marlene Dietrich is always superbly beautiful, but she impresses me as being dumb. Maybe it's her director's fault. Her last picture, "The Scarlet Empress," struck me as an elaborate attempt at nothing. It was the most pretentiously empty picture I'd seen in a long time.

I like anything directed by Ernst Lubitsch. There's a keen, civilized wit. I like his piffle. He gets good work out of his cast, even with the most feathery material.

I've never been disappointed in Charlie Chaplin, though one doesn't think of him much because of his reluctance to get down to work. It's undoubtedly a case of having too much money. I often sigh for a good Chaplin comedy. There's a report out that he's at work on another picture, which I hope is true. Some of the happiest hours of my life were spent with Chaplin pictures.

The news reels always interest me, even though I know they are almost devoid of news. I'm completely fed up with fires, baseball, football, airplanes, parades and the other clap-trap of news reels. One rarely sees something that is actually newsworthy. But still I sit through them.

I don't care for the animated cartoons, though I enjoy the Silly Symphonies. Mickie Mouse is moderately amusing, and I suspect he has a reputation entirely out of proportion to his genius.

Cecil De Mille is the cleverest charlatan in the movies. He understands the yokels better than any other director. His manner of taking religious themes and swilling them with sex, bare legs, vast bathtubs and various other nerve tinglers, impresses me as shrewd commercialism. The churches are welcome to any good they get out of De Mille.

The movies fascinate me, even though I have to suffer through 10

pictures before I get to a good one. I notice that when a movie is bad, it's bad from the very first scene. They're never just bad in spots. And usually a good picture starts right off being good and stays that way to the finish.

* * *

Who's your favorite movie comedian?

Bearing in mind, of course, that we hardly have a chance any more to see the great and incomparable Charlie Chaplin, I turn to W. C. Fields for my heartiest laughs. I chuckle no sooner than I look at him. He seems to have stepped out of Dickens' *Pickwick Papers* or some of the Dickensian novels. I'm hoping Hollywood will catch up to this screamingly funny man and really feature him, instead of poking him here and there for what is hardly more than a bit part. I last saw him in "Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch," and I thought I'd collapse from boredom, until, some 20 minutes before the close, the great Fields came into view. I, with the rest of the audience, woke up with a start. There was a gasp of joy, after almost an hour of insufferable sentimentality, gush, tear-jerking and crappy philosophy intended to show how a poor family can be "glad, glad and glad." After Fields I like a little of Stepin Fetchit. Now here I feel it would be unwise to give us too much of this slow, drawling, moronic colored gentleman. A bit part, here and there, is about all we can stand, but what there is of it is almost always a source of genuine pleasure. Joe E. Brown doesn't hit me right at all. His recent picture, "The Clown," didn't bring a laugh in 90 minutes, which is some record for a "comedy." Laurel and Hardy are pretty fair, though they pace their work a little too slow and seem to have a too limited number of gags. They do not hit the spot like a Fields, who's funny even when he's doing nothing. The Marx brothers are always worth seeing, especially Harpo and Groucho. The piano-thumping brother doesn't give me any laughs. His musicianship is mediocre and his "jokes" are all cheap puns. Harpo, on the other hand, is a great comedian,

one of the finest of the masters of pantomime. His brother, Groucho, has a line of crazy patter that pleases me, though I should be ashamed to admit a liking for such low-brow humor. I can't think of any women comedians on the screen. Zazu Pitts' old bag of tricks (the use of those helpless, straying hands) strikes me as having worn thin years ago. Gracie Allen's "humor" tempts me to get up and yell murder. The women aren't as funny as the men, either on the stage or the screen.

* * *

What do you consider the 12 best plays ever written?

I recall so many fine, powerful plays that I doubt I could limit my selections to 12 "best" plays. I have keen admiration for almost everything by Ibsen, Hauptmann, Sudermann, Shakespeare, Shaw, Gorki, Andreyev, Galsworthy, Moliere, Euripides, Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Sophocles, Eugene O'Neill, Elmer Rice and a bunch of others whose names don't happen to pop into my mind as I write this paragraph. Ben Hecht and Charles MacArthur's "Front Page" pleased me, as did Rice's "Street Scene." I've nothing but praise for O'Neill's "Mourning Becomes Electra," "The Hairy Ape," "The Emperor Jones," "Desire Under the Elms," and "Strange Interlude." Ibsen stands high with me, particularly his "Peer Gynt," "Ghosts," "Doll's House," "Hedda Gabler," "An Enemy of the People," "The Master Builder," and a few others I don't recall at the moment. (Oh, yes, I must mention "The Wild Duck," a truly great dramatic masterpiece.) I should have included Oscar Wilde in the above list, for my admirations are "Lady Windermere's Fan," "The Importance of Being Earnest," and several other of his fine comedies. I have rarely been disappointed in Shaw. "Man and Superman," "The Devil's Disciple," "Mrs. Warren's Profession," "John Bull's Other Island," "Candida," are only a few of my favorites in the Shaw collection. I put Shakespeare at the head of the list. He is the supreme master—the Beethoven of the drama, or the Michael Angelo, or the Phideas, as you prefer. (Speak-

ing of Shaw, a few sentences back, reminds me of something that happened 20 years ago in New York City, where I met a restaurant proprietor—one of the famous leaders of this tribe of artists—and he was blue as he sat down at my table. "I've had a rotten evening—went to see a show, by a feller named Bernard Shaw, called 'Man and Super-man' because I thought it was about the cafe business, but it wasn't that at all.")

* * *

What do you think of Gertrude Stein?

I got many a chuckle out of her charming autobiography. She pleased me and held my interest. As for her poetry, I have no opinion, because I don't care to discuss what I can't understand. Others say they're wild about her poetry, and seem to mean it. I ask, politely, what it's all about, and they go into reams of words, about nothing. She's supposed to be experimenting with words, or something like that. I'm always suspicious of anything that isn't clear and understandable.

* * *

From what source did Thomas Jefferson get his political ideas?

Jefferson was a great reader, perhaps the greatest in the America of his time. He turned to many sources for his ideas of government and democracy, but it might safely be said that the French writers influenced him most deeply, particularly Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvetius and Montesquieu. He also drew on Hobbes, Sidney, Locke and Hume. Jefferson was a very fine student.

* * *

1. In your judgment, who were the three greatest Presidents of the U. S.? 2. Who were the three smallest Presidents of the U. S.? 3. The three greatest poets? 4. The three greatest prose writers? 5. The three greatest orators? 6. The three greatest historians? 7. The three greatest statesmen?

1. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln.
2. Harding, Coolidge, Hoover. 3. Whitman, Poe, Carl Sandburg. 4. Emerson, Poe, Mark Twain. 5. Ingersoll, Debs, J. Stitt Wilson. 6. We have produced several good second-rate historians, but none to

be compared with Gibbon, Macaulay and Joseph McCabe, so I prefer to leave this question unanswered. 7. Benjamin Franklin showed great statesmanship when he was our ambassador to France. The late Senator Robert M. LaFollette showed statesmanship in his anti-war stand and in his post-war program of social and political policies. I can't think of anyone else. Bryan was a backwoods bigot, though he tried to keep us out of the World War. Had Bryan been less the fundamentalist and blue-nosed reformer and more the Bryan who tried to keep America sane during Wilson's brain-storm, I could include him. Elihu Root was a clever politician but no statesman, because his policies were invariably reactionary and in support of capitalist exploitation.

* * *

What musical composition do you consider to be the greatest? What sentence in literature strikes you as the most beautiful?

1. Beethoven's 5th Symphony. There never was anything written since that masterpiece was created that is greater music, though there are several symphonies that come near the mark. 2. Shakespeare's, as follows: "Gilding pale streams with heavenly alchemy." Incidentally, I remember once, in conversation with the late Frank Harris, my asking that amazingly picturesque character which word was Shakespeare's favorite, and he replied immediately with "gilded." Notice that the word Harris spotted is in Shakespeare's gorgeous sentence just quoted.

* * *

Who is your favorite composer?

You should not try to pin me down to one favorite. I have many, and I wouldn't care to say which comes first. They are all firsts with me. So here they are: Bach, Beethoven. Brahms, Wagner and Richard Strauss. Along with these giants I accept much of Mozart, Haydn, Johann Strauss, Schubert, Schumann, Smetana, Dvorak, Debussy, Goldmark, Caesar Franck and Tchaikowsky. I don't care much for Italian operas. Nor do I care for modernistic music. I don't see that the old masters exhausted

their medium, so for that reason I don't appreciate the new school's experimentations, though in this I may be wrong. I simply don't feel myself moved by them. Nor does modern popular music mean a thing to me, except to annoy. Any of Beethoven's symphonies will shake me down to the roots, and that's what I like when I come in contact with great music. I want it to move me. I never go to music for mere entertainment. Brahms' first symphony is one of the most glorious compositions ever created. Strauss' "Ein Heldenleben" is a deathless masterpiece. Franck's B minor symphony (the only one he ever wrote) stands with the best creations of the greatest masters. I also like the songs of Stephen Foster, especially "Uncle Ned." Hill-billy music drives me nuts. The Bing Crosby type of song makes me break out in sweat. Rudy Vallee makes me positively sick. The music in the song movies is thoroughly unintelligent, even at their best. George Gershwin doesn't mean much to me. Nor does Irving Berlin and the other popular song writers. I prefer, above all, to listen to a great symphony orchestra, especially when it is being led by a genius like Toscanini. Next to a symphony, give me a Wagnerian opera. I don't care a lot for recitals, though Lawrence Tibbett always makes me feel like cheering. I heard Marion Talley the other night in Joplin, Mo., and it was the most gosh-awful evening I'd spent since the night I had to listen to Cal. Coolidge make a radio address. I am especially fond of good string quartets, the best of which I heard many times when I was a boy in the city of my birth, Philadelphia—the Kneisel Quartet. They did wonders with Beethoven, Brahms and a half dozen other masters. I run away from brass bands. Every morning, while shaving, I listen to two or three records on my machine (always the music of the masters) and that starts my day off fine. It also lets them know downstairs in the kitchen to put on the eggs, coffee and bacon, and perhaps squeeze an orange.

* * *

When you speak of Peary as an imposter fully as rank as Dr. Cook, I

who thought myself moderately informed about the world's bunkshooters (thanks in considerable degree to your help) must admit astonishment, to say the least. May we hear more about this?

Robert Edwin Peary never reached the North Pole in the spring of 1909, according to impressive evidence published in "Has the North Pole Been Discovered?" by Captain Thomas F. Hall, a book of 539 pages which was completed in 1917 after eight years of study. This book is unanswerable, and in time will be accepted, though it had to be published by its author and was ignored by reviewers generally.

In this brief note I can give only a few of the book's highlights. In short, after 17 years, during which he made five unsuccessful attempts, Peary set sail in the **Roosevelt**, in July, 1908. On March 1, 1909, Peary was six degrees and 53 minutes from the Pole, or 413 nautical miles (475 statute miles). From here he ordered four parties to venture ahead, each to build camps and haul supplies so that Peary might save his strength for the final venture. These parties all made good time, during 32 days of travel, the average a little less than nine miles daily.

At the farthest camp, Peary began his great, immortal "dash"—133 miles to the Pole, and, of course, the same distance back—accompanied by no other white man. He had with him a Negro and four Eskimos, who, of course, did not have the slightest notion what Peary was doing, except that they "were going somewhere." To all five of them, the Pole was just another chunk of ice.

Now watch the superman get into action. On April 2 he skipped a mere 25 miles. On April 3, another trifle of only 20 miles. The next day he snapped the whip and hit another 25 miles. Then came 63 miles on April 5. On April 7 he "circled" the Pole and began the return trip, with a mere 63 miles. He averaged 28 nautical miles daily. The closer he got to the Pole the greater the speed, a record which no other explorer would admit humanly possible. Nansen always thought it worth while to cover six or seven

miles in a day. Once he imagined he went 25 miles. Another time he did make 20 miles, but that wasn't near the Pole. Shackleton, an honest explorer, got near the South Pole and with the wind behind him, aided by sails, and driving his sleds over land instead of chaotic ridges of ice, and going down hill all the way, averaged 20 miles a day for five days, which he thought wonderfully lucky, as it was. But Peary could be near the North Pole and waltz over 63 miles of broken, dangerous ice in a single day.

Another amazing point to note in Peary's astonishing story is that his book gives one to understand he made no detours on this quick excursion to the Pole. He seems to have traveled in a straight line, for otherwise the record of miles per day would have to be longer or he would need more days to take care of the numerous detours amid the great ice ridges.

Captain Hall calls attention to Peary's dubious pictures. He shows that Peary claims they were taken when the shadows were at seven degrees, but Hall proves the shadows were around 30 degrees, which puts an entirely different light on his "evidence." It is further shown that the National Geographic Society, which sponsored the exploration along with the **New York Times**, did not do more than give Peary's evidence a passing glance. His instruments were "looked at" in the baggage room of the Pennsylvania Station, in Washington, D. C., and can one imagine anything more indifferent and unscientific! A committee of three, appointed by this fake Society because they were known to be friendly to Peary, did not even look into Peary's log or notebooks. Peary's simple say-so was considered enough for this outfit. Later, when questioned before a Congressional committee, Peary read from what he claimed to be several pages "torn from his notebooks," but it was shown that those pages were clean sheets of paper while the note books were soiled and covered with grease, giving one the right to assume that these several sheets were written long after his return.

The world's greatest geographers

and explorers agree that Peary is a fake. But his say-so was accepted, and the House of Representatives, by a vote of 153 to 34, voted to promote him to the rank of admiral because of the clever lobby work of the National Geographic Society, which, as one Congressman put it, "is not National, because it does not belong to the National Government, is not geographic, is not scientific, and is not a society, but is only a private publishing house."

* * *

If Peary and Cook didn't discover the North Pole, then who did?

I believe Admiral Byrd and Floyd Bennett deserve the credit. Since writing a rather lengthy piece, in which I gave reasons for doubting Peary's claim, I have seen the Associated Press report from London, October 31, 1934, which quotes the famous polar historian and geographer, J. Gordon Hayes, to the effect that Admiral Peary "never was 50 or less miles from the North Pole."

Hayes is prominent in the Manchester Geographic Society, a real organization of students of geography, instead of a fake outfit like our own National Geographic Society. Shortly after Peary's return, the Manchester society made him an honorary member, on the strength of our National Geographic's endorsement, for at that time its true character was unknown to the English geographers, but when the facts were realized the society took steps to correct its blunder. Since then it has held steadily that Peary was a fakir.

"There have been many critics of Peary's claim on both sides of the Atlantic," writes Mr. Hayes, "and all disinterested inquirers have come to the same conclusion—that he didn't reach the pole. . . . Peary said he returned from his camp at the pole to latitude 87 degrees, 47 minutes north, in no more than 56 hours. This is a distance of 150 statute miles, apart from the deviations over pack ice and drifting floes. Hence, a man 53 years old either walked considerably more than 75 miles a day for two days over a rough surface, or he never came near the pole.

Hayes says that Dr. Cook's reports relating to his explorations are accurate, except the one which has him actually reaching the pole. Since this Hayes report was published Dr. Cook, now living in Snyder, near Buffalo, says himself that he doesn't believe he got within 10 miles of the pole, because of the impossibility of getting absolute accuracy from the instruments then, and even now, available. "I do not claim to have stood on the exact stop of the North Pole," Dr. Cook said on October 31, 1934, when interviewed.

* * *

Is Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes a Marxist or a reactionary?

He is neither. Dr. Barnes may be classed as a liberal, reflecting somewhat the mental awareness and breadth of spirit of the best types of social, political and cultural libertarians. He stands high in scholarship, especially in history, crime and social questions. In religion, he inclines more to agnosticism than Atheism. I have published many of his works and have always found them to be keen, accurate, authoritative and libertarian, though one couldn't put him alongside a Joseph McCabe. In politics I would, at a guess, put him somewhere near left wing democracy, or to state it in other words, a radical Rooseveltian. In questions of free speech, free inquiry, free press and the other precious heritages of advanced civilization, Dr. Barnes will always be found on the side of complete liberalism. The man is a prodigious worker, and as an editor I have always found my contacts with him to be delightful and stimulating.

* * *

What is the meaning of the scene between Peer Gynt and the Button-Moulder?

Henrik Ibsen's great poetic drama, "Peer Gynt," is a study of the Norwegian people, and presents the life of Peer Gynt, of whom it might be said that he is a "Yokel-Hamlet." Ibsen sees this rustic hero as a piece of worthless, human trash. When Peer is ready to die, the Button-Moulder (Death) looks on him contemptuously. He isn't worth destroying, because he

was incapable of committing a really great sin. "It requires power and earnestness to commit a sin," is the thought expressed by Ibsen, and poor, helpless Peer "must be cast into the waste-box and be moulded over again." I'll never forget Richard Mansfield's portrayal of Peer Gynt, at the Garrick Theater, in Philadelphia, about 25 years ago. What a glorious performance that was. He helped turn me into an incurable Ibsenmaniac. "Peer Gynt" is one of the supreme masterpieces of poetic literature. Only a giant could have created it.

Was Victor Hugo an Atheist?

Hugo always seemed to be headed in the direction of Freethought, but invariably let himself be deflected by muddle-headed mysticism and a romantic enthusiasm for Deism and Pantheism. He suffered from a terrific religious hangover, which he couldn't escape, though he would make weak attempts. Of course, he never was orthodox in religion, even in his most ecstatic moods. His deliriums never took him that low.

Who is Henry Thomas?

This is the pen name of Henry T. Schnittkind, Roxbury, Mass., author of "The Story of the Human Race," one of the most popular works I have ever issued. Mr. Schnittkind is a Harvard Ph. D. In addition to several Little Blue Books and the "Story of the Human Race," Schnittkind has done "Weavers of Words," a useful and interesting review of the world's great literary figures, what they did, what they stood for, and what the world owes them.

Please give your estimate of Mark Twain.

I have frequently expressed my deepest appreciation for this amazing genius. I've read almost everything he wrote, and look on him as a superb artist, a great humorist, a keen observer, a fearless Free-thinker and a tireless hater of shams, frauds and obscurantists. His "Mysterious Stranger" should be read by every Materialist and Freethinker. It is one of the masterpieces of Freethought literature.

But I mustn't begin listing Mark Twain's books—there are so many, and I love every page in every book that came from his prolific pen.

Please give your opinion of Hendrik Van Loon's books.

This writer is always worth reading. His is a readable style, and his own illustrations are an endless source of delight. Van Loon's books on the human race, history, geography, biography and his general opinions on current life are witty, wise, learned and accurate. He is a great lover of freedom and never fails to defend those who have dared to break away from the beaten paths in the realm of thought and philosophy. Yes, this big fellow (he is a physical giant) is one of my admirations.

Please reprint the enclosed tribute.

It is a pleasure to quote a sentence from Vivian Phelips' article in the December, 1934, **Literary Guide** (London's distinguished organ of Rationalism) as follows: "If a fraction of the time and money now spent annually on the dissemination of superstitious nonsense were spent on the exposition of true facts which we find in the writings of Mr. Joseph McCabe, Reason would prevail tomorrow."

Did Elbert Hubbard originate the famous saying about the mouse-trap?

The evidence shows that when Hubbard first offered the famous sentence, he credited it to Emerson, and later, when it created something of a minor sensation, he said it was his own and that he merely palmed it off as an Emersonian epigram for the sake of emphasis, whatever that may mean. Before discussing the tempest in a teapot, let me quote the much-discussed sentence. It follows:

"If a man can write a better book, preach a better sermon, or make a better mouse-trap than his neighbor, though he builds his house in the woods, the world will make a beaten path to his door."

Burton Stevenson, in his new compilation, "The Home Book of Quotations," which, by the way, is

a monumental work, claims he has traced this sentence to its source, which really was Ralph Waldo Emerson. Emerson is supposed to have spoken the line in a speech in either San Francisco or Oakland, in 1871. It appeared in print after Mrs. Sarah S. B. Yule jotted it down and included it in her book, "Borrowings," which was published in Oakland, in 1889. She gave Emerson credit. Later, many years later, Hubbard used it, with Emerson's name attached, but when students of Emerson claimed they could not find it in any of Emerson's literary works or lectures, he withdrew the credit and offered it as his own creation. It was plain literary theft.

Mr. Stevenson traces other famous Hubbard epigrams and shows them to be plagiarisms, particularly "Home is where the heart is," which belonged to Livy; "Life is just one damn thing after another," which seems to belong to the late Frank Ward O'Malley, one of New York's most famous reporters, and "The reward of a good deed is to have done it," which is a direct steal from Emerson's "The reward of a thing well done is to have done it." This Emersonian epigram, Stevenson further claims, came from Seneca.

* * *

Is patriotism admirable?

Strip patriotism of its orations, brass-band bellowing and hysterical flag-waving, and we find its international use to be nothing more than a studied attempt to hypnotize the noble people of Tweedledee into believing they are better than the barbarians of Tweedledum. It is never considered that good taste and common decency might lead a nation to act with a fair degree of modesty. Every weapon of education—propaganda is a better word—is brought into action to "prove" that Tweedledee is filled with history's greatest heroes, the race's best blood, the world's deepest thinkers and most profound geniuses. Frankly, it is my hope to see Tweedledee assume genuine modesty, though, of course, in this I'll be disappointed. This is another brand of patriotism—not boasting and bragging, but an hon-

est seeking for the honest, truthful, modest, decent estimate of ourselves. Frankly, I don't look on Americans as the greatest people in the world. Americans have done great things, but so have others. I don't look on one American as being as good as five Frenchmen. There are good Americans and good Chinese. And there are bad ones, too. We stand high in industry, finance and invention. But Englishmen, Frenchmen and Russians stand higher in other important things. We have done fairly well in literature, but alongside English literature we are pretty weak. We can point with pride to our Poe, Emerson, Thoreau, Whitman, Twain, Dreiser, Lowell, Howells and a dozen others. But what about Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Pope, Sterne, Beaumont, Fletcher, Sheridan, Steele, Dr. Johnson, Coleridge, Gibbon, Lamb, Hazlitt, Dickens, Thackeray, Shelley, Byron, Keats, Fielding, Burns, Macaulay, Arnold, Swinburne, Browning, Hardy, Meredith, and others too numerous to list? They're good too, eh? We've produced some good artists, but the Italians, Hollanders, Belgians, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Japanese, Chinese, Greeks and Romans weren't so gosh awful at that. In musical compositions we have been infantile, compared to the Germans, Austrians, Bohemians, Letts, Frenchmen, Italians and Russians. We have done well in science, but no better than Newton, Galileo, Copernicus, Darwin, Kepler, Lamarck, Harvey, Einstein, Pavlov, Huxley and a hundred others. Patriotism is a menace to culture and civilization when it leads us into the morass of provincialism and conceit. Better is it by far to have less patriotism and more appreciation for greatness regardless of boundaries. We have a lot to learn—and unlearn. Let there be less noise and more tolerance, sympathy, appreciation and understanding. I close my little sermon with the following sentence from Bertrand Russell: "When a man writes his autobiography he is expected to show a certain modesty; but when a nation writes its autobiography there is no limit to its boasting and vain-glory."

Capitalism

Which appeared first, the institution of property or the State?

That question troubled sociologists for decades. Lester F. Ward, who still stands among the great sociologists of all time, boldly declared that the State came after property became an institution. By property no social scientist means a personal possession, such as a spear, a shield, a fishing net or something of that sort. Primitive man was able to hold and guard his simple personal possessions, and if they were eyed covetously by someone else, he fought it out then and there, and if he lost, the possession's ownership changed. But thousands of years later, property came into existence, and by property is meant possessions of a valuable nature that the owner could not always carry with him and defend if threatened. With personal possessions, each individual was his own state, or his own policeman. But when property appeared it was necessary for it to be defended and guarded as in the case of personal possessions. For each man to guard his own property meant he had to be his own policeman, and that was wasteful and uncertain. Instead, the group which owned property appointed guards, or protectors, or "policemen" to stand by and ward off the attacks of those who had designs on that which the owners thought worthy of protection. That protection to property owners became a social service, and thus the State came into existence, primitive at first, to be sure, but with time it became more complex; it evolved into the State. For countless generations the State was looked upon as nothing more than the official, recognized protector of property. As man became more civilized, as humanitarian impulses grew to maturity, the State's functions were widened. Now the State not only protects property but

serves as a means of justice (when true to its functions), giving relief to the suffering, rushing aid to victims of disaster, organizing to fight fires, epidemics, plagues, defending individuals in their right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. When injustices are found in the modern State, the fault lies not with the idea of a State but in the fact that it considers property as more important than human life. When property of a capitalistic nature is finally socialized, the State will shed its function of being the policeman's club for the rich. It will devote itself more than ever before to the humanitarian functions of a State in a classless society, helping those who are in distress, assuring a job to those who want to make a living, protecting workers against having their labor exploited by parasites in human form, and in a thousand other ways doing socially what the individual can never do for himself. The State appeared after property, but this does not mean that the State must disappear when capitalistic society is transformed into a cooperative commonwealth. Then the State will protect socialized wealth, as, in the past, it protected private capital.

* * *

When did Capitalism begin?

That is an extremely difficult question to answer. There is a wide difference of opinion here. Some say it happened in the last century, when capitalism began to assume monopoly proportions. Some say it came earlier in the same century, when capitalism put into fairly complete form the system of division of labor. Some say it came in the 18th Century, when the Industrial Revolution sprang into existence with the factory system and the discovery of economical and efficient forms of power production. Some say it came with the invention of the steam engine.

Some say it came with the first signs of capitalistic imperialism. And yet, when you examine all these arguments, you detect the same viewpoint. All agree that capitalism is an industrial system that uses science in the production of goods, pays wages to workers who own nothing in the shape of capital or equipment, seeks an ever-expanding foreign market for the consumption of its over-production of commodities, produces goods only with a view to making a profit, constantly expands its capacity for production in an attempt to increase profits, and never consciously gives its workers the full social value of their labor. These signs identify Capitalism—the system based on the private ownership of the large-scale means of production. It is impossible to set a date and say, "On this date Capitalism was born." It was a slow growth. It took decades for the system to take root. And then, suddenly, we began to see the picture in its entirety and called the thing Capitalism. It was unlike anything in previous industrial history. It was based on free labor, which is totally unlike feudalism or chattel slavery. When did it begin? I'd say it was about 200 years ago, but then you can argue otherwise and I won't talk back.

Will it be possible to do away with religion under Capitalism?

Religion is one of the props of class rule, and as such it helps maintain Capitalism, but this does not imply that religion must survive as long as the present system endures. It is a simple historical fact that Capitalism—a scientific form of industrialism—functions without religion, and furthermore that religion grows weaker as Capitalism grows older. Within its limits, Capitalism uses the best scientific brains of the world, which means that religious ideas do not help materially to maintain the operation of the system itself. Religion helps teach the masses patience and humility, which is an aid to Capitalism, but by no means an essential one, for Capitalism rests on materialistic science and not on supernatural notions about

God, etc. Capitalism is merely tolerant of religion, throws it an occasional bone, and lets it go its way. Under absolute monarchies religion was a necessary part of the system because religion helped the tyrant establish the notion that he ruled by divine right. But under political democracies rulers are in power by the consent of the ruled, and not because of some divine edict. Nowadays, under Capitalism, when anything goes wrong we don't set up days of prayer, fasting and lamentations. We buckle down to worldly, economic, political governmental, financial and scientifically practical means of getting out of the mess. This shows the trend. We are not depending on the good will of some being in the skies. Our problems are down-to-earth. At that, I believe that religion will endure under Capitalism, even though in a weakened state. But under a completely scientific social order, with education controlled by materialists, religion would quickly die.

* * *

How many are unemployed in the capitalist nations of the world?

The best figure I can get puts it at 30,000,000.

* * *

Have you any facts on the concentration of wealth?

Of our population of 125,000,000, two percent of the people own 87 percent of the wealth. That fact alone condemns the present system to eternal oblivion. Millions of toilers have slaved their lives away in order to pile up the nation's wealth into the hands of an insignificant minority. The remedy for this outrageous concentration is not division of wealth (dividing up) but rather a scientific program of political and industrial action with a view to socializing the means of large-scale production, distribution and exchange. Then, with the workers getting the full social value of their labor, the millions will be consumers as well as producers. Capital (production equipment) would be concentrated in the hands of society (the people), while consumption goods would be available in almost limitless quantities for all who are not parasites. Such a

system would do away, once and for all, with the present system's insane concentration of wealth.

* * *

Is it possible to have a planned economy under Capitalism?

There can be no real planned economy under a system of private ownership and competition. Capitalism can regulate itself, through the government, but it cannot plan its economy in the sense of deciding the exact degree of production, distribution and exchange. So long as there is private ownership of large-scale industries it follows that self-interest and the profit motive will undo anything the government might essay in the shape of outlining how much, what, where and when wealth is to be produced and sold.

Under a system of socialized industry, in which the machinery of production will belong to the working class, planned economy is logical and inevitable. Under such an industrial order society is able to dictate exactly how many shoes are to be made next year, how many houses and apartments are to be constructed, how many miles of new railroads are to be built, how many million bushels of wheat, oats, corn, etc., are to be raised, how many yards of cloth shall be woven, how many ships shall be launched, how many mines shall be opened, and so on. It can miss its estimate by a percentage here and there, according to accident, emergency and inefficiency, but by and large it can, and must, operate as a planned economy. There being no competition, no individualism, no profits to capitalists, the reason for social and industrial activity simmers down to the sole one of servicing the needs of the useful members of the community. Finally, there being no owning class to live off a producing class, we have the ultimate reason for industrial chaos removed once and for all.

President Roosevelt likes to talk about planned economy, but so long as he stands at the right and tolerates private banking, private railroading, private manufacture, private control of credit, so long will commerce and finance be scrambles

for profits and dividends. Rent, interest and profit will undo the finest phrase-mongering.

Planned economy is a beautiful ideal—it must come, if humanity is to be rescued from material insufficiency—but it cannot come when we tolerate social conditions that make for blind competition, rampant individualism, greedy profits, monopoly, and all the other evils of capitalist society.

Capitalism is in itself the enemy of planned economy. Its economy is a system of exacting a maximum profit for the least service to the community. It hires labor not because the workers need food, but because there is a chance to make a profit from the energy expended by the wage-workers. It is the fruit of planlessness, and a million Roosevelts could not make it otherwise so long as they tolerated a system of corporation and private ownership of socially necessary implements.

* * *

Can there be a classless commonwealth if we recognize skilled labor by giving it greater rewards?

It is clear from your question that you do not understand what is meant by a classless society. A classless society does not, of necessity, imply equality of income. A classless society means nothing more than this: that one class shall not be compelled to live by selling its labor power to another class, which lives through ownership of the means of production. A classless society would present a social organism in which there would be no capitalist class living from rent, interest and profit. All would be workers in the sense that all would be making useful contributions to society, gaining their livelihood by the application of labor power, be that power of the brain or the muscles. In such an economy, the industries and the other expressions and departments of a scientific civilization would be the property of society, which would pursue a policy of operating those various departments with a view to supplying the needs of the people instead of striving to satisfy the desire of a small owning class to amass profits. In such a society, it would not be

necessary to establish equality of rewards. The objective is equality of opportunity to make a living, but for some time (and just how long no one can say) it would be necessary to reward the workers according to their ability and productiveness. Such inequality of income in no way establishes the principle of capitalistic exploitation. No class will be living off the sweat and blood of another class. The economic evil facing us is found in the fact that one class, through mere ownership, is able to enslave and exploit another class.

* * *

Has anyone proposed a halt on invention as a cure for depression?

Yes. Sir Josiah Stamp, British economist and capitalist, has proposed a moratorium on inventions. Such a policy would be as undesirable as the present attempts to improve the working of the capitalist system through the destruction of crops, hogs, cotton, etc. These suggestions come from ignorance of the problems of capitalism. It is a mistake to attempt to reduce production or invention as a cure for the evils of the present system. There's nothing wrong with new inventions that save labor and increase production. The evil lies in the uses to which the system puts machinery. If the machinery of production were socialized, increased production would mean increased consumption, and a child knows that the human family hasn't even begun to consume the commodities which it is able to use for comfort or luxury. Under a sane social system inventors would be encouraged to produce greater and more efficient machines, knowing that their economies would result in greater consumption and reduction of the hours of labor.

* * *

As Abraham Lincoln confiscated the slaves of the south and achieved immortality, why shouldn't the modern revolutionists follow his lead and confiscate the industries?

Lincoln did not confiscate the slaves. If he had taken over the 4,000,000 black slaves and used them in involuntary servitude, it would be accurate to speak of confiscation. He no more confiscated the slaves

than the federal government confiscated the breweries and distilleries when the prohibition amendment was added to the Constitution. What really happened was that the right to hold slaves was outlawed, in the same way that brewers and distillers were denied the right to operate their plants.

Lincoln would have been much wiser if he had arranged to buy the slaves. It would have been cheaper in the end. Think what the Civil War cost! We in the North spent \$4,000,000,000, killed about 500,000 men, disrupted our commercial, political and industrial life for a generation, and brought terror and ruin to a great portion of our population. The 4,000,000 slaves, at about \$500 each, would have cost \$2,000,000,000, which could have been covered with a bond issue. Instead, the North and the South went to war, and we know what it cost. Of course, the political slogan was to preserve the Union, but even a casual student of American history knows that if there had been no slaves in the South there would have been no Civil War.

Our position today is not quite similar. By this I mean that capitalism is too weak numerically to be able to fight the government, should the federal Constitution provide for socialized industry. There has been such vast concentration of wealth in the hands of a few that the possibility of armed resistance from the beneficiaries of capitalist exploitation is remote, because they are too few in numbers to dare stand out against the will of the people. They would have to get others to fight their battles, but it is doubtful if they could get enough to resist the full powers of the federal government, once it became clear that the workers and farmers were agreed on the philosophy of socialized industry.

When we are ready for Socialism (which I believe will be very soon), we will not be in Lincoln's position of wanting to outlaw the industries of capitalism. We will need those industries, if we are to provide for the wants of the people. All we will have to do is to write into our Constitution the provision

that capitalistic exploitation of labor is unlawful and that the large scale industries are to belong to the workers, through their State. It then is to be decided just what we are to do to the capitalistic idea of private property. Would it be wise to let each industry sell stock to the federal government based on the actual value of the industry, and then have the federal government issue new money to that amount, for the purpose of compensating the capitalistic owners? I think that would be the sanest method to follow. New money would be better than bonds, for the money would not bear interest and would not constitute a drain on the earning powers of the people. The capitalists could then spend their money as long as it lasted, and when they died there would be a stiff inheritance tax to take care of what is left. Such a program sounds matter-of-fact and practical, and maybe that is why it is opposed by those lovers of adventure and romance who would like to put on a big, exciting theatrical show. Sanity dictates caution and reasonableness; sanity bespeaks as orderly and painless a change as is humanly possible.

This does not mean that the capitalists are to be given to understand that the people will not, under any circumstances, resort to direct action. I'd put it this way: If the capitalists start off with violence, they they will have no one to blame but themselves when the people, in righteous anger, rise in their might to enforce the will of the producers of wealth in farm, factory, mill and mine. Socialists have never denied themselves the right to violence, if it becomes evident that the will of the people will be frustrated by the combined action of the capitalists and their henchmen. But I don't believe such a flourish of action will be necessary when the time for a great social change arrives. We have the political power, and we can use it to establish economic and industrial power. Our immediate job is to prepare the masses for the great social change by conducting a campaign of education, so they will know in which direction to turn.

Once the people understand the merits of socialized industry there will not be any power on earth strong enough to keep them from their goal.

* * *

You frequently use the word "Capitalism," but I've never seen you define it.

Capitalism is the current system of society in most countries, except the Soviet Union, displacing chattel slavery and feudalism. Chattel slavery was a social order in which masters owned the bodies of their workers. Feudalism was a social order in which the masters owned the land, and through its ownership they exploited the tillers of the soil, thus making feudalism a system of greatly modified chattel slavery. During both of these periods in human history industry was simple. However, gradually there developed division of labor and the application of science to industry. By applying physics, chemistry, engineering, mass production and productive efficiency to the work of producing goods, a new social order came into being. This we define as capitalism. Capitalism means primarily the glorification of the machine. Vast machines produce wealth, but these machines do not belong to the workers who tend them. These workers are not chattel slaves, nor are they feudal serfs, because they have the right to leave their employment, should they choose to. Such workers belong, scientifically, to the proletariat. They operate machines to produce wealth; their reward is not the wealth thus produced but a system of wages. The wage does not equal the value of the wealth they produce, which means that what Socialists call "surplus value" goes to the capitalist owners of the machines. This surplus value constitutes profit, once the wealth produced by the wage workers is disposed of through capitalistic salesmanship. Perfect capitalism is the operation of such machines as are able to defy competition in their respective fields of production. This brings up the point that the owner of a little job printing press is in no manner to be compared to the really capitalistic owner of the

presses of, let us say, the **Saturday Evening Post**. Since capitalism implies the application of science to industry, it must follow that that science must be the latest and best. Thus, true capitalism embraces the large-scale means of wealth production, distribution and exchange. That is why true Socialism demands only the socialization of the large-scale industries. Thus do we find the reason for its refusal to consider small-scale business as worthy of socialization. Because of this policy, we find the program covers taking over the competition-defying machines, but leaves to private ownership the dinky machines and mediums of business, such as small stores, garages, etc.

What is your opinion of Hoover's new passion for liberty?

I haven't read Herbert Hoover's "Challenge to Liberty" in book form, but I've read enough of his material in his **Saturday Evening Post** articles, taken from the book, to be familiar with the line. His "passion for liberty," as you phrase it, is a little bewildering. When he was our President (remember?) he was not finicky about the liberty of the press, the liberty to petition one's government, the liberty to assemble, etc. In the matter of the press, The American Freeman felt his strong, Fascist right arm when it said some "mean" things about his record before he became President. In fact, two issues of The Freeman were suppressed and destroyed, because they contained statements unpleasant to Lord 'erbie's refined ears. All during his administration, particularly during the last two years, we never knew what would happen whenever we delivered an issue to the postoffice. There wasn't much liberty of the press in that. Since he left the White House (to become the Forgotten Man) not a single issue of The Freeman has been molested, so as an editor I'm not much worried about 'erbie's warning about the threat to our freedom of the press. The Great Hoover didn't think the soldier boys had a right to petition their government when they gathered in Washington to demand the bonus. He had them gassed and

threatened with bayonets. As for the right of assembly, Communist and other demonstrations were broken up at his personal order. Hoover's cry for liberty sounds hollow. What he really craves for is the unlimited "liberty" to rob and exploit the workers and consumers and that's a kind of liberty we can very well get along without.

What is your opinion of Hoover's argument that FERA should not open factories but should give this work to private industry?

Your question refers to a paragraph in Herbert Hoover's article in the **Saturday Evening Post**. In brief, he says the contracts for canned goods, mattresses, socks, dresses, bedding, etc., should go to the capitalistic owners of industry, who will then be in a position to give more employment. The same point has been made in numerous newspaper editorials.

Hoover's concern is not with the fact that there are unemployed. He wants the capitalists to make their profit. Dividends are Hoover's prime interest, for his is the voice of reactionary Capitalism. The reason FERA wants to make its own supplies for the needy is the desire to avoid paying the capitalists a profit. By doing the work themselves, the unemployed, in government factories, keep the hands of the owning class out of the treasury of Uncle Sam. The capitalists, through Hoover, voice a desire for blood-money obtained from the misery of the masses. Under the present FERA plan the saving of corporation profit will enable the unemployed to get just so much more food and other necessities.

It is not true that these government factories will injure present markets, for, as frequently explained, these unemployed are already without purchasing power and can't patronize the manufacturers and cannery. FERA plants enable tens of thousands, who are without purchasing power, to make needed commodities, at wages, for millions of unemployed, who couldn't buy a dollar's worth of goods in any man's market. The capitalists are not losing this market, because they haven't had it

since the depression swelled the army of workless. If private industrialists were to get these great orders, they would, of course, give a certain amount of employment to men and women now out of jobs, but this would be only a drop in the bucket compared to the number who now are in, and later will be added to, FERA plants. The prime "sin" of FERA is that it refuses to bow down in worship to the Great God Profit.

* * *

Please comment on American Liberty League.

Liberty has become a new synonym for Capitalism. It isn't polite to talk about the inalienable right of the Capitalist class to exploit the public, rob its workers and live off unearned wealth. So its henchmen, in and out of politics, now speak of Liberty and the Menace of Regimentation!

The American Liberty League is dyed-in-the-wool plutocracy's reaction to the nation's move toward the Left. Radicalism is in the air. The masses are beginning to demand that the government do something to protect life, even if it must be done at the expense of property.

The organizers of the American Liberty League belong to the old school of rampant individualism and the sacredness of private capital. Men like Irene DuPont, Al Smith, John W. Davis and others—Republicans and Democrats—are now throwing a new herring across the road—Constitutionalism versus Socialism! They are going to draw to their organization the reactionary elements of both old parties, and what the outcome will be no one can tell.

DuPont is a multi-millionaire who employs thousands of men in the war-chemical industry. Al Smith was supposed to be a progressive at one time, but he and Raskob (another Liberty Leaguer) are pals, and anything that smells of Socialism is anathema. Raskob is high in the profit channels of the DuPont interests and General Motors, with many an excursion into Wall Street speculation and skyscraper building, along the lines of the \$50,000,000 Empire State Build-

ing. John W. Davis is the attorney for the J. P. Morgan banking partnership.

These men are out to defend the Constitution, which means, of course, that they are out to defend property. They are not worried about the unemployed, but they are worried that the unemployed may do something to their wealth, by way of government relief. This group was received with a burst of enthusiasm from the capitalist editors everywhere. The sentiment seems to head in the direction of the political, economic, industrial and financial regimentation of wealth to head off socialistic policies. Such regimentation is always "constitutional" and thoroughly moral. It's when the government tries to get something done for the needy that these same regimentationists begin to howl. They consider it perfectly proper to regimentate industry, leaving the workers without protection, without unionism, without the right to ask for a decent living. That's constitutionalism and all round proper.

All the American Liberty League needs now is to admit the late, unlamented Herbert Hoover to its board of directors. He belongs in that outfit. His article, entitled "The Challenge to Liberty," in the *Saturday Evening Post*, for September 8, 1934, sounds like the platform of this League of Exploiters. He never mentions Capitalism once. It is the order of Liberty that is at stake. He never asks for reaction, always Liberalism! By Liberalism he means the right to continue a dictatorship in industry, which, of course, is worse than a dictatorship in politics. Imagine Hoover worried about the future of Liberalism!

* * *

Capitalists and their editors claim the "dole" will demoralize the poor. Please comment.

They ought to know, since the capitalists have been getting the lion's share of the government's doles. In less than 2½ years, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has doled out more than \$4,000,000,000 to the financiers and industrialists. They have made no complaints about being "demoral-

ized" and "deprived of their individualism." The RFC official report, covering the time from February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1934, shows that the federal treasury has turned over exactly \$4,101,081,563, in cash, to bankers and industries. Most of this money went to the bankers and trust companies, 7,214 such institutions receiving \$2,045,553,972 in authorized loans. The railroad officials received \$411,645,844. Only \$58,261,276 of this sum was repaid up to June 30. Insurance companies received \$89,332,463. Building and loan companies received the tidy sum of \$114,420,823. So far there hasn't been a single squawk from any of these big boys, except those who didn't get as much as they asked for. And these are the fellows who bemoan the fact that the starving unemployed have been permitted to "grab" a little "graft" in the form of working in the hot sun for something like 40 cents per hour, and being given only a limited number of hours at that rate. The "dole" is good business when it goes to the big capitalists. It helps recovery, and all that sort of thing. But a "dole" to the victims of the capitalists' depression is corrupting, degrading, demoralizing and all round pestiferous.

* * *

Do you think for a moment that a Socialist country will ever come about through the ballot? Never, never. Do not forget—no ruling class ever gave up its possessions without a struggle.

I wish you Communist Marxians would stop talking about Marx long enough to read his works. If you read more and talked less, maybe you could learn something, instead of mouthing phrases that appear to be Marxian but aren't at all.

The International Congress held at The Hague in 1872 heard the following words from Karl Marx: "We do not deny that there are countries, like England and America, where the worker may attain his object by peaceful means. But not in all countries is this the case."

The Great Karl himself recognized more than a half century ago

the value of constitutional methods in such countries as our own. Of course, there was no machinery for expressing the will of the people in Russia, so what was there for the Russians to do but to unseat the Czar through direct, violent action? That went over big in Russia, and I was glad to see the revolution, but that doesn't prove the value of the same methods in the U. S. A., where every citizen has the right to vote on every question that goes into the Constitution, or Congress, or the White House.

If the people haven't sense enough to vote for Socialism, why do you assume they will fight for it? Why not follow a sane, intelligent policy of educating the masses to an appreciation of the advantages of socialized industry instead of throwing over the ballot and the other weapons of democracy and thereby making possible the installation of a dictatorship?

If you knew a little more history you would not utter that clap-trap about the ruling class never giving up any of its possessions without a struggle. If you mean violent struggle, you are all wrong.

Did the brewers and distillers erect barricades when the 18th Amendment put them out of business?

Did the British bosses of the slave trade put over a revolution when the British parliament outlawed that vile business more than a half century ago?

Did the Russian land owners revolt against the rule of the czar when, in the middle of the last century, the Russian bureaucrats put serfdom out of business by decree?

Did Serfdom put up a revolution when Capitalism gradually put it out of business?

Did Agricultural America grow violent when Industrialism wrested power and became the dominant force in American economic life?

If the people pass the proposed Child Labor Amendment to the U. S. Constitution, do you really believe that the exploiters of child labor will fight the U. S. government to protect themselves in the

right to live off the labor of boys and girls?

The lesson of history is this: Where the people have the right to vote, it is possible to settle great social questions by discussion, legislation and orderly government. It is only when the people are treated like slaves that there is danger of violence every time an attempt is made to effect economic changes.

It is reasonable to expect the American people, once educated to an appreciation of Socialism, will inaugurate the new society by sane, orderly, legal means, instead of resorting to violence. As for the beneficiaries of the old system, they will abide by the decision of the people, because the people will have the power and the might to bring about any social system they want.

Let us suppose that President Roosevelt had the authority from Congress to socialize the railroads, power plants, banks, and the various systems of communication. Let us suppose that the President took steps tomorrow to bring about the will of the people. Do you imagine for a moment that the owners of these utilities and monopolies could do anything to frustrate the plain policy of the American people? Do you think a small clique of capitalists could resist the declared wish of the people and their government? I don't. I can envision the transformation from capitalism to Socialism without the firing of a shot, without a single riot, without a trace of resistance. They might talk and protest—yes, but that wouldn't be violent action. We'd let them talk, but if they reinforced their talk with violent action, they would soon learn that the President and Congress are backed up by mechanisms of tremendous power.

I frequently read in capitalistic editorials that America has no proletariat. Please comment.

These apologists for the system of capitalist monopoly should read "America's Capacity to Consume," published by the Brookings Institution, where they will find that 76.3 percent of United States inhabitants have an income far below the needs of decency, let alone

comfort. Who are these submerged millions? Capitalists? Professionals? Bondholders? Executives? If they aren't members of the proletariat then how should they be classified?

* * *

Please comment on the campaign of Chicago Tribune and other capitalistic mouthpieces to disfranchise all who are on relief rolls.

Nothing was said about denying the right to vote when the RFC was handing out millions, even billions, to the capitalists who control big banks, railroads, insurance companies, trust companies, etc. Thousands of manufacturers have been, and are now, receiving full relief from the federal government. Yet no one questions their right to vote. But once the government begins handing out canned goods, mattresses, clothes, coal and other forms of relief to the unemployed, these same capitalistic, reactionary interests set up a howl and demand that these workers shall not be permitted to vote. It is an incredible demonstration of gall. Mr. Dawes quit the RFC and rushed to Chicago with \$90,000,000 he took from the federal treasury, in order to "save" his busted bank. So far, less than \$30,000,000 of this money has been paid back, the balance, over \$60,000,000, being in default for almost two years, with even the interest unpaid. The government, after coming to the rescue of Dawes and his gang, is holding the sack with German bonds and Insull securities, which Dawes was crooked enough to foist on the RFC. But Mr. Dawes is a "good citizen" and will not be denied his right to a vote—he took millions. But the poor workingman who gets pennies to Dawes' millions is told, in so many words, that he isn't a good citizen because he is broke and therefore shouldn't squawk when his vote is taken away from him.

* * *

Why should conservatives fear Upton Sinclair's plan, since it is intended to make the people on relief self-supporting, thereby making it unnecessary for public funds to provide for them?

While it is true that state-owned

factories and farm colonies will reduce the pressure for relief appropriations, it is not a fact that the conservatives are pleased with Sinclair's program. The capitalists who make profits from supplying the markets with shoes, clothes, housing, food, etc., do not relish the idea of millions of men and women being put to work making necessities for themselves, with no profit for any individual or class. I have seen a copy of a telegram sent to President Roosevelt by the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Manufacturing Co., protesting against the plan to process the government's tremendous supply of hides (as a result of the great slaughter of stocks in drought states) and make shoes in government plants for distribution among the needy. This company, and 800 other concerns engaged in the shoe industry, are violently opposed to the FERA's manufacturing project. They do not stop their protests because of the possibility of millions of men, women and children being supplied with needed articles and thereby, to that extent, taken off the direct relief rolls. They prefer the direct relief to direct manufacture of shoes. And that fact holds right down the line. The conservatives are too wise to look placidly on while thousands of idle factories are opened up and hundreds of thousands of workers get busy producing for use instead of profit. The experiment is too dangerous, from the viewpoint of unbridled Capitalism. It smacks of Socialism. It is, in truth, a step in the direction of the Cooperative Commonwealth, via State Socialism.

* * *

Is it a fact that depressions are inevitable under capitalism?

Yes. Boiled down, here is the argument of the scientific Socialists: Mr. Worker has nothing to sell but his labor power, in order to make a living, because the capitalists own and control the machinery of production, distribution and exchange. Mr. Worker is therefore compelled to accept wages in return for the energy and time he is willing to give his employer. But Mr. Worker cannot get all he produces—that is to say, its full social value

—because Mr. Employer is not in business for his health. The profit motive is as important an element of capitalism as is the principle of private ownership of socially necessary equipment. Thus, if Mr. Worker produces, let us say, \$10 worth of wealth per day, he must be satisfied with, again let us say, \$5 in wages. Mr. Worker therefore has a purchasing power of only \$5, but has contributed \$10 worth of wealth to the system's wealth. This in itself would soon cause an overabundance of production—a depression.

But there is still another feature of capitalism that drives inevitably in the direction of industrial depressions. It is the fact that the employer who took profit from Mr. Worker—Socialists call this Surplus Wealth—cannot consume all he gets in the form of profits. Mr. Employer buys costly foods, clothes and shelter, but the higher outlay is not usually sufficient to dispose of the surplus created by Mr. Worker. As a result, Mr. Employer builds up a surplus of wealth—savings. Mr. Employer, being ambitious and acquisitive, reinvests his surplus in new machinery, equipment, and other facilities. He may use this capital to buy stock certificates or put it directly into his own industrial or commercial enterprises, but the principle is the same. Thus do we find that Mr. Employer is constantly expanding the facilities of production, which Mr. Worker (the bulk of the consuming public) cannot absorb through purchase.

And there you have the gigantic contradictions of capitalism—1. Insufficient purchasing power for Mr. Worker because he works for wages and produces surplus value; 2. Constant expansion of capitalistic equipment because of the accumulation, and concentration, of wealth in the hands of Mr. Employer and his fellow capitalists. This means only one thing—constant threats of depression and its arrival about every decade.

The remedy is as simple as the diagnosis of the social disease. By socializing the industrial facilities of the country, you do away with the wage system and the profit motive. The production equipment

will, under Socialism, belong to the workers, through their organized instrumentality, the people's state. The worker will be paid the full social value of his labor, because there will be no private owners of monopolies to deduct Surplus Value in the shape of profits. Mr. Worker will then be able to consume all he produces, with the workers' state seeing to it that his article of production is cast into the commonwealth so that he may enjoy the products of other socially owned industries. Expansion will be a natural, logical, scientific procedure under such a system, in order to take care of the needs of Mr. Worker and his fellows.

Under such a social economy, depressions would disappear for all time. But it does not follow that because this is the logical remedy it will be brought about inevitably. There must be the mass will to bring it into reality. That is why it is necessary to agitate, educate and organize.

Socialism will not come of itself. It must be brought about consciously and deliberately. Capitalism could go into collapse and decay, and stay there indefinitely, if nothing were done to bring about socialized industry. That is the reason why it is so necessary for all who believe in Socialism to work tirelessly for that ideal of social economy. Serve your community, your nation and your class by putting your shoulder to the wheel. Your help is needed. Help bring the Socialist's criticism of capitalism to the attention of all workers and farmers. Then point out the remedy. Make liberal use of the printed word, for literature is still the educator's most powerful weapon.

The future of civilization is bright, if only Mr. Worker and his comrades do the essential work of social enlightenment.

* * *

Does socialization constitute propositions to equalize the products of labor?

I don't quite catch your question. I know of no program that aims to equalize the **products** of labor. That would be a physical impossibility. I suppose you mean to ask

whether or not Socialists mean to equalize the **rewards** of labor. The answer is an emphatic **no**. There will always be differences in the value of labor's output, so naturally there will have to be different schedules of reward. However, this does not mean that a man who digs ditches should be kept near the starvation mark while some professional or white collar worker gets the cream of everything. The lowest workers—judged by the value of their services—should be guaranteed enough to live decently, with plenty of leisure in which to develop their talents to the limit. George Bernard Shaw is the only outstanding thinker who advocates equality of income, so far as I am aware, and his position is an eccentric one. I know of no political or economic organization that has endorsed that idea. We take a stand against equality of rewards, but insist on equality of opportunities.

* * *

What were the Luddites?

Early in the last century the weavers in the textile industry of England met the introduction of machinery with riots and sabotage, destroying what they could in an attempt to keep from losing their jobs. They were called "Luddites." Of course, the method was wrong and anti-social. Labor-saving machines should be welcomed as a sign of industrial progress, but their private ownership should be disallowed. Socialism is the remedy for that problem, not the destruction of wealth-producing facilities. The Luddites were unscientific and ineffectual, but Luddism is still with us, this time, however, with the ludicrous support of governmental agencies. I refer to the insane policy of "planned scarcity," through which wheat, corn, hog and cotton raisers are paid for destroying their crops or for agreeing to refrain from further production. The idea of a seemingly intelligent government paying millions of farmers money to do nothing, while millions go hungry, is the last word in idiocy. It is Ludditism, and if the original ones five generations ago were crazy the same must be said for our modern Luddites in Washington, Brazil and other cap-

italistic countries which try to meet the problems of "over-production" with the ignorant measure of destruction.

* * *

Did Karl Marx coin the famous phrase: "Property is theft?"

This phrase was not written by Karl Marx. Its author was Proudhon, the anarchist. The phrase, in the original, read: "*La propriete c'est la vol.*" It was attacked vigorously by Karl Marx, but anti-Socialists continue blandly to say that this principle represents Socialist opinion.

Instead of holding that "property is theft," Socialists maintain vigorously that under Socialism the workers will be protected in their right to own personal property. Only the large-scale industries will be socialized. There isn't the slightest intention to socialize the private property of citizens. They will go right on owning their small farms, homes, automobiles, radios, etc., if they own any at the time of the social transformation from capitalism to Socialism and if they own no property they will be encouraged in accumulating legitimate property through honest work, instead of permitting most of the property to fall into the hands of those who do not make useful contributions to society, as is the case under Capitalism.

* * *

Newspaper editorials and reports claim that the San Francisco general strike could not succeed because there is no record in history of a successful general strike. Please comment.

This is typical of careless or dishonest writing on the part of the kept press. In one column they claim there has never been a general strike, and in another they argue that all general strikes have been failures. The facts demolish this argument.

The greatest general strike was that of Russia's general stoppage in 1905, as a protest against Czarism and political tyranny. That strike was won, for the Czar's government was soon forced to take absolute power from Nicholas II and grant constitutional government. This great strike, which be-

gan on October 26, brought its first results four days later, after the entire nation quit every kind of activity. Every factory, mine and mill closed down. They were joined by the workers on street cars and railroads. Retail shops refused to do business. Even professionals and white-collar workers joined in this mighty strike against a rotten, corrupt state. The strike was a success and laid the foundation for the 1917 revolution (which also followed a general strike in St. Petersburg) and ended both Czarism and capitalism.

There was a general strike in Belgium in 1892 and 1913. There was a suggestion of a general strike in Glasgow in 1820 and in Manchester in 1829, so we see that the idea of a general strike has something of a history, going back more than a century. In 1832, William Benbow wrote a famous pamphlet, entitled "A Grand National Holiday and Congress of the Producing Classes," which had considerable influence among the English workers.

The Belgian strike of 1892 was a success, the objective being an extension of the right to vote at elections. At that time only 138,000 citizens of considerable means were permitted to vote, out of a total population of 6,500,000. The Belgian workers struck again in 1902, but this time they lost their general strike. There was a third general strike in Belgium, in 1913, when the demand was universal suffrage, which, however, was not won until after the war.

The workers of Sweden went out on a general strike in 1902, when they demanded suffrage reform, which they won, but another general strike in 1909 was lost. This was a well-organized strike, in 1909, for even the power plants were shut down, but the result was failure.

In this country we had one general strike before the one in San Francisco. The first was in Seattle, which lasted five days. It was engineered by conservative unionists, as was the one in San Francisco. Winnipeg, Canada, had the longest general strike in history—from May 15 to June 26, 1919. This Winnipeg strike was lost through the vicious

and brutal measures used by the capitalist-controlled government. Argentina's general strike, in 1920, was the scene of many murderous attacks by the government, but the strikers won some of their demands.

The philosophy of the general strike had its greatest development in France and Italy, but it is a strange fact that these countries have never had a general stoppage.

The general strike is a tremendously powerful weapon, best suited for revolutionary ends, when led by able and intelligent leaders. It was a general strike in Cuba that forced the downfall of the Machado government. A real general strike means the paralysis of the government, which usually is the executive committee of the capitalist class. Even in so localized a conflict as the San Francisco general strike one detected signs of a government within a government when the union leaders began issuing permits to restaurant owners, filling stations, food haulers, etc., to do their work of serving the public. The power to permit implies the power to deny, which means that to the extent it functioned the union leaders were the real governors of San Francisco, though this condition was shortlived. A real general strike, led by men who know what they want, would soon cause the transfer of power from the capitalists and the politicians to the working class. However, to be really effective a general strike must move and act quickly. A long, drawn out conflict could hold little chances for success, if one is to learn anything from the numerous instances cited above. It might be said that about two weeks should be the limit of its duration. Fail-

ing to win its ends within that time, the strike should be called off, lest the workers see their organization crushed completely and their prestige and power set back for years, perhaps decades.

Fascism is the last desperate lunge of a frustrated capitalism; a general strike is the last, desperate challenge of the working class driven to frenzy over its difficulties. A general strike, coming at a time when at least 51 percent of the workers have been won over to the economic program of Socialism, would most certainly result in the quick annihilation of capitalism, and the capitalists know this too well. Note how placid they are when the workers in single industries go on strike, and note how panicky they are when there is the least hint of a general walk-out. The workers have a tremendous weapon in sight, but a weapon that must be used for constructive, intelligent ends.

* * *

A Chicago Tribune editorial says that the A. F. of L., in Washington, receives 35c per month from each member. Is this true?

The statement is false. At the rate of 35c per month, this would mean a yearly per capita of \$4.20. The fact is that each member pays only 1c per month, or only 12c per year. The only exception to this 1c monthly tax is the small membership of what is known as the "federal union," an organization too small or too weak to influence a trade, such as clerks and stenographers. The Tribune's exaggerations are merely part of a drive against organized labor and intelligent radicalism in general.

Militarism and Disarmament

Are we heading towards another war?

It certainly looks like it. Every sign points to a big war between the United States and Japan, judging by the way both governments are acting. We are spending more money on the army and navy than at any time during the past 15 years, and Japan is also pouring every possible bit of money into its fighting forces. Roosevelt, deaf to the peaceful wishes of the average American, is a big navy man, and his policies in that direction show that he considers Japan the next country to fight. His ordering the battle fleet to Pacific waters for the next maneuvers will cause untold harm among the Japanese people, who are being psychologized into anti-American militarism by the feudal-fascist rulers of that nation of serfs. Perhaps Roosevelt figures that if the war on the depression at home doesn't produce the desired results, the depression can better be fought with a man-sized war with Japan. If that is his idea—and it seems to be just that—he is blind to the calamitous possibilities he is provoking, for a war will NOT bring prosperity (as the last war proved) and another vast war can easily result in revolution either here or in Japan, perhaps in both lands. From his own class viewpoint he is doing a foolish thing when he sets the stage for a conflict between Uncle Sam and Japan. The American people certainly don't want our country to go to war with Japan, even though we are almost unanimous in disapproving of Japan's ruthless conduct in China.

* * *

Does preparedness prevent war?

One of the favorite arguments of the militarists is that a nation prepared for war is best able to preserve peace. On the face of it there seems to be some logic to the po-

sition, but a more careful analysis of the situation and a glance at history soon prove the contrary. Let us not forget that in 1914 it was the best prepared nations that were first hurled into war. Germany, France, Austria, England, Italy and Russia had vast armies, tremendous stores of munitions, gigantic fleets of battleships, conscription, compulsory training, heavy artillery, efficient general staffs—and what was the result? Preparedness did not prevent the World War. If ever there was a time to prove that preparedness is insurance against war, 1914 was that, and yet look at the results! Today, the world is again preaching the "gospel" of preparedness, and all claim it is being done in the name of peace. Even Hitler argues, hypocritically, of course, that Germany wants to arm, build up a great fleet of air bombers, develop the science of gas warfare—for what? To preserve peace! Believe it if you want to, but try to make these statements jibe with history. It simply can't be done. Preparedness breeds war, first, last and all the time. There is only one sure road to peace—disarmament. But can disarmament come in a capitalistic world, in which groups of capitalists, divided by nations, are in an endless war for markets and commercial advantages? The objective is an impossible one. Capitalism breeds war because it is based on violence and exploitation, at home and abroad. It robs its workers at home and shoots the daylights out of foreigners, all in the name of business and profits. Disarmament can come only when capitalism is eliminated and the civilized world reorganized on a classless basis, in which the principles of socialized industry and production for use instead of profit will prevail. Disarmament will then be logical, because there will be no motive for class or national exploi-

tation and subjugation. A step towards Socialism means just one more step in the direction of permanent peace. The best peace insurance in the world is the assurance that Socialism will prevail. What possible motive could there be for a war between the working class of Russia and the working class of Socialized America? War, under international Socialism, will be an impossibility. Preparedness will disappear, because there will be no reason to prepare to slaughter one another, since all will be functioning in a classless society that will know nothing about social robbery and commercial profiteering.

* * *

What is a preventive war?

H. R. Knickerbocker, in his book, "The Boiling Point: Will War Come to Europe?" defines a preventive war as a "war you think you can win today to prevent a war you fear you may lose tomorrow."

* * *

What is the economic significance of our great exportation of scrap iron?

The tremendous increases in scrap iron shipments to foreign countries can mean only one thing—their munitions industries are getting ready for war, because most of this metal goes into the war machine. According to the U. S. Dept. of Commerce's report for September, 1934, we shipped 225,212 tons of scrap iron to Japan, Italy, Poland, China and a few other customers. The total shipments of iron and steel products amounted to 301,330 for that period. We get an idea of what is in store for us when we see that most of this tonnage is scrap metal. Japan bought most of this scrap, taking 161,401 tons during September, 1934. Japan, Italy, Germany and other imperialistic, capitalistic and fascistic governments are getting ready to spring another world war.

* * *

Do you believe another World War would mean the end of civilization?

No. I may be a bad prophet, but it seems to me that another World War will mean the final war and the inauguration of the international rule of the working class. In other words, another World War

will mean the end of capitalism and the birth of a new civilization. Hitlerism, Fascism, Capitalism, limited Democracy, monarchy—all will make room for the real democracy of labor, with the world run as a cooperative commonwealth. A World War will bring the issue to a head. The workers of the world may unite, refuse to fight to maintain rotten Fascism and Capitalism and enlist in a fight to bring about a classless, warless civilization in which the workers will be free citizens instead of wage slaves. If I didn't hold to that hope I'd be the worst kind of a pessimist when presented with the prospect of another World War. My belief in the principle of socialized industry serves to give me hope for the future of man, culture and civilization.

* * *

I have read Japan's denial that the scrap iron it is buying is intended for munitions. It says scrap is never used in that industry. Please comment.

This is a piece of jesuitical hairsplitting. It is true that the munitions industries do not buy scrap iron and steel. They merely buy new iron and steel. But the steel mills buy the scrap to make new steel, which, in turn, is sold to the munition makers. So there's what the Japanese denial amounts to.

The growth of scrap exports from the U. S. is unbelievably large. In 1931 we shipped out only 50,000 tons. In 1933 we sold abroad 550,000 tons. In 1934, we exported 1,500,000 tons. These figures come from Benjamin Schwartz, executive secretary of the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel. Of the 1,500,000 tons of scrap sold in 1934, Japan bought 1,000,000 tons. That, as I wrote before, can mean only one thing—war.

* * *

What was the total cost of the World War?

Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, says it was 30,000,000 lives and \$400,000,000,000. He has done some careful figuring to show what could have been done with this wealth. Believe it or not, here is the result, and it would be hard to disprove it: A house worth \$2,500, furniture worth \$1,000 and

five acres of land could have been given to each family in the U. S., Canada, Australia, the British Isles, Belgium, Germany and Russia. That isn't all. There would be enough left over to give every city of more than 20,000 inhabitants in the countries just listed a library worth \$5,000,000 and a university worth \$10,000,000. Wait, there's more. For there's still enough money left to buy every bit of property in France and Belgium, as their property stood before the World War. That gives you an idea of the insanity of war. And yet, despite all this, lunatics like Hitler, Mussolini, Japanese imperialists, and capitalist governments everywhere are getting ready for new wars. When one studies such figures it becomes plain that capitalism—which was the cause of the war—isn't worth saving.

What does the U. S. spend for armaments each day?
\$2,000,000.

Which country is the most militaristic?

If one considers militaristic ideology—that is, nationalistic fanaticism and artificially aroused militaristic impulses, Germany would come first. In the matter of actual arms and reserves, in proportion to population, France comes first, with 6,952,213, or 144.83 per 1,000 of population. In the matter of actual numbers, Russia comes first, with army and reserves of 16,004,000, or 96.58 per 1,000 population. Of the great powers, the United States is the least militaristic, with an army and reserves of 445,453, or only 3.57 men per 1,000 of population.

What is Hitler's military strength?

Hitler's propagandists will deny this, but Germany's present armed force consists of 2,500,000 men. This is reached as follows: storm troops, 460,000; personal guard, 200,000; steel helmet society, 200,000; reserves, 1,640,000. The above divisions will be admitted by official Germany, but it is argued on their part that the men do not represent actual soldiers. That is true, but it is also a fact that Germany, because of treaty agreements, is forced to

hide its actual war strength. But, subterfuge and evasion aside, Germany has a military strength of 2,500,000 and the chances are there will be twice as many in another four or five years. This can mean only one thing: war. An English commentator has properly described Germany's policy as "a peace to end peace"; in other words, Hitler is talking peace, and maintaining peace, in order to get ready to break the peace. However, Hitler has one great fear: he dreads the idea of putting arms into the hands of millions of Germans who hate him, but who are now afraid to act. A war might mean revolution in Germany, a civil war with terrible losses.

Is Germany ready to go to war again?

Every report indicates feverish activities in Germany's munitions industry. It is said, by both conservatives like Winston Churchill, in England, and radical Dr. Julius Deutsch, leader of the Austrian Socialists, that Germany's armaments are as extensive, or even greater, than in 1914. Hitler is gutting Germany's economic, financial and industrial institutions to keep the war business going greater than ever before. There is no doubt that Germany is arming. The cries of alarm that come from France, England and other countries are not mere ballyhoo. They are genuine, serious warnings of impending disaster. War appears inevitable, unless the working class comes into early power, which is unlikely.

Are war-provoking conditions at present better or worse than those in 1914?

So far as Central Europe is concerned, conditions are worse, because of the influence of such men as Hitler and Mussolini. These men are more provocative than the kaiser ever was in 1914. On the other hand, there is room for a measure of optimism because of the fact that Russia today is solidly behind peace moves and earnestly against any action that might be construed as warlike. Thus, balancing Central Europe against the Soviet Union I'd say the scales are

slightly in favor of peace, though this could be erased in a fraction of a second by some new insanity by those twin beasts of reaction and savagery, Hitler and Mussolini.

What is Europe spending on armaments?

During 1933, Europe spent \$3,000,000,000 on its war machines. This is about 16 percent of all governmental income. The outlay in 1933 was a record for peacetime expenditures, despite the fact that it was a depression year. Germany's budget for 1934 was \$357,000,000 for its army, navy and air fighters. This is an increase of \$89,000,000 over 1933, which shows what is on Hitler's mind. Germany is doing this at a time when its industries are slowly dying for lack of raw materials. Germany has no gold or credit for her industries, but she manages to divert plenty of money for war purposes.

Is there any insurance company in the U. S. that sells a policy protecting a man against being drafted for military service in war or peace times?

There is no such policy available in this country. The only country I know of that sells such a policy is Japan, where conscription policies worth 767,233,000 yen have been written. When one realizes that the total of life insurance in Japan amounts to 9,409,422,000 yen, one gets the impression that the Japanese common people are not as hot for the militarism of Japanese imperialists as their press propaganda would give one to understand.

Did the U. S. ever fight a defensive war?

Our wars on England, Mexico, Spain, and the Central Powers in the World War were all of an offensive nature. We are great talkers for peace, but in practice we are war-like.

There is a great deal of peace talk going around today, even in standpat capitalist newspapers. The preachers are saying many solemn things about "no more war," but I notice the Army and Navy both continue to have their

full quotas of chaplains, who wear uniforms and bless the work of training men for organized murder.

The clergymen in this country (as in others) are notoriously committed to violence, though they cover up their treachery to humanity and civilization with oily words of peace and righteousness. Those sections of our country where lynchings are most prevalent are centers of church-going, Bible-thumping, hell-roaring evangelistic drives and lather-raising Wednesday night prayer meetings. Norman Thomas has called attention to the fact that he has heard clergymen in the South defend lynching.

When such elements continue in positions of power, it seems pretty certain that nothing of a realistic nature may be expected from preachers and other "respectable" leaders. We are in no danger of invasion from any source, so if war comes it will be the result of our efforts in that direction. If we have no designs on other nations, then why are we pouring billions of dollars into preparedness? It looks as though we are going to continue the policy of seeking wars of aggression whenever our interests dictate such ventures in slaughter.

We are on good terms with our neighbors, in that there is no suspicion on either side. To the north, we have 3,000 miles of border without so much as a single fort. That shows there is no danger from that source. To the south we also go placidly ahead without building forts or trenches, which also proves that our Mexican neighbors are peacefully inclined. As for Japan, how in the world could she conduct a naval or military war on us so far from her base of supplies? The thing is fantastic.

And yet, we go ahead with gigantic war preparations. Why? It can mean only one thing: We must have in view another campaign of aggression. It is a trite old commonplace (but it is true, nevertheless) that anyone looking for trouble will find it in a hurry. The man who loads up with all kinds of automatics and machine guns usually manages to work up a scrap before long. The same applies to

nations. We'll build the world's greatest navy, and then we'll go out and use the shiny toys. Who will they be used against? I don't know. Maybe Japan.

* * *

Is Roosevelt friendly to disarmament?

His words and actions do not jibe. In his message to Congress, President Roosevelt attacked the munitions interests sharply, but let us not forget that he took \$238,000,000 from the PWA funds to pay for the construction of 31 warships, and also signed the Vinson bill which gives the President the power to spend \$1,000,000,000 on a naval program. The munitions interests are not afraid of mean words so long as they get their hands on the vast sums just mentioned. President Roosevelt properly says that the armaments race of other nations may well result in war, but does not this logic apply also to the United States?

* * *

Why is du Pont attacking the opponents of the munitions interests?

The answer is simple. Mr. Irene du Pont, vice-chairman of the board of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Company, of Delaware, wants to protect the financial interests of his great company, which has, for decades, made money from wars and war scares. Du Pont profits soared nearly 1,000 percent during the World War. The facts are as follows: the average yearly net profit of his company was \$6,091,673 during the four years prior to the World War. During the four years of the war, du Pont annual profits averaged \$58,936,810. That's a hike of almost 1,000 percent. Another World War—or a hefty localized war—would send du Pont earnings climbing again. A strong peace policy would send du Pont depression profits even lower, perhaps down to a deficit. In order to meet this issue, Mr. du Pont issues a statement charging the Third (Communist) International with responsibility for world-wide peace propaganda, because of its desire to weaken and destroy capitalistic nations. Dr. Johnson's famous definition of patriotism, as the last refuge of a scoundrel, is still true. He

might add today, if he were alive, the further remark that red-scares are the favorite weapons of profiteers in danger of losing some of their profits. Mr. du Pont's company has a financial interest in legalized murder, and he is true to his purse. If there were no profit in war, Mr. du Pont wouldn't waste breath talking against peace advocates.

* * *

What is your opinion of the peace protestations of the clergy?

Ray H. Abrams, Ph. D., Department of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, wrote a book, "Preachers Present Arms," which was published last year. He shows, with a wealth of material that covers 300 pages, that of the 200,000 priests, preachers and rabbis in the United States, only 90 lifted their voices against the World War.

Most of these 90 peace advocates were members of minor church organizations, such as the Unitarians, Universalists and similarly unorthodox sects. Not a single Catholic priest in the entire United States said a word against the war. Very few of the orthodox Protestant groups—Methodists, Baptists, etc.—opposed the war. A few rabbis joined the anti-militarists, but nothing near a majority, or even a fair-sized minority. The book is devastating. It quotes hundreds, even thousands, of statements that were made by the pious brethren. The author's case is perfect and it establishes beyond doubt that the preachers, priests and rabbis were the willing tools of the militarists.

Now that we are at peace, the preachers are beginning to take stock and they realize that something must be done to "undo" their crimes of recent critical days. But can they do this with peace resolutions? Can they be trusted? The only real anti-militarists were the radicals in economics, who are also Freethinkers in overwhelming numbers. The anti-religionists gave the preachers a lesson in real brotherhood, and they don't like it. Now, when nothing is at stake, the voices of God talk about peace, but is there any assurance that they will desert the militarists at the first sign of war?

It is interesting to note that the

clergy pensions board, in London, on May 16, 1934, voted to withdraw its investment of \$50,000 in the armament firm of Vickers, Limited. This sum has been drawing dividends for superannuated preachers for 40 years. During all of these years the preachers have been partners in the business end of war. Isn't it hypocritical to take out this money at this late date and put it into something else, possibly fire-trap tenements, along the lines of Trinity Church Corporation in New York City?

Many of the worst disease-breeding, fire-trap tenement houses in New York City are the property of Trinity Church, an organization that belongs in the class of big business with its \$50,000,000 of investments. I'm sure that the preacher at Trinity Church waxes eloquent when he talks about Jesus as the friend of the poor and oppressed, but this doesn't do away with the picture of Trinity as a partner in the crimes of capitalism.

The spectacle of the London pension board withdrawing its investment, after 40 years of profit from the war machine, will cause the most cynical expressions from those who know the black war record of the church and how it has always been willing to bless the war banners, lie for the war propagandists, deceive the victims of legalized slaughter with visions of a happy eternity in heaven for the heroism shown in the trenches, and prod the growing youth of the land to take their places in the trenches and die for the glory of the armament profiteers.

The church cannot live down its history with a few pacifistic speeches and resolutions.

I am an anti-militarist of military age. Would you advise me to be a conscientious objector in case of war?

The last war produced thousands of heroic martyrs who resisted the war mania by announcing themselves as conscientious objectors, but there is nothing to show that they did anything to solve the problem of war. During times of hysteria it is very easy for a strong government to handle the small

minority of protestants. I would not advise you to be a conscientious objector. Mind you, I am as much opposed to militarism as the most emphatic objector, but I like to face cold facts. I believe the best policy for you to pursue is to wait until you are drafted. Once you are inducted into service, against your will, use your opportunity to educate your fellow soldiers in the crime of war and the best way to eliminate the ancient wrong. Teach your comrades how imperialism and capitalism bring on war after war. Show how the greed of capitalism causes newer and greater wars. Show what will happen when the world is placed on a classless basis, the industries are socialized, the profit motive is taken out of large-scale industry, and the workers are given the full social value of their labor. Show tirelessly how Socialism will make wars a thing of the past. In such a position you will be doing concrete, definite things for peace and the new social order. On the other hand, if you rise to make an individual protest, if you offer yourself as a lone victim to imperialistic militarism, you will be made to suffer and at the same time you will be doing nothing to make future wars impossible. Of course, if millions and millions of soldiers acted as you do there would be no war, but how can you find that out if you do not get in and mingle and work with them? The day will come when the ruling class will think twice before it arms an outraged and angry working class with the modern weapons of war. It will be afraid that the workers will turn those guns on their real enemies. Such conduct would result in social revolution, with the inauguration of a new society, if only a proper educational campaign is conducted along the lines just indicated.

As a student at a large State university, I am compelled to take military training under the R. O. T. C. As I have conscientious scruples against such drill, would it be possible for me to refuse such training and still retain my studentship?

Thus far, students in universities

in Ohio, Missouri, California and other states have been expelled for refusing to take compulsory drill. However, the question has never come before the Supreme Court of the United States. That body will pass on the question of forced drill in peacetimes, when Attorney John Beardsley, of Los Angeles, makes his arguments before it. This will be the first time the Supreme Court has even consented to hear such a discussion. Mr. Beardsley's case will depend on a new angle, which is provoking great interest in legal circles. In short, it runs like this:

Mr. Beardsley's two clients, Albert W. Hamilton and W. Alonzo Reynolds, students at the University of California, were ousted from the student body because they said they had religious objections to compulsory drill. Mr. Beardsley will base his plea under what is known as the "privileges and immunities theory." This theory is being applied for the first time in such a case, on the grounds that the R. O. T. C. (Reserve Officers Training Corps) is a federal institution, under the direction of the

War Department and is in no way under the control of the states. As Congress has not given any body the power to compel service in any military arm—in the army, navy, or marine corps—such service is, in peacetime, voluntary. There is no power in the federal government or the states to compel military service. It follows, therefore, that it is a citizen's "privilege and immunity" to accept or reject military training, so long as Congress has failed to pass a specific act to the contrary. Thus, under the 14th Amendment to the constitution, Mr. Beardsley will argue that no State has the right or power to pass a law abridging such "privilege and immunity," and, therefore, the California law is unconstitutional.

Mr. Beardsley brings in a second argument, in his appeal to the Supreme Court, which is to the effect that where students have moral or religious scruples against military training, to compel such service is to violate the constitutional provision which assures every American absolute religious freedom.

INDEX

- Abrams, Ray H., wrote "Preachers Pres-Barth, Karl, why he was dismissed, 27.
ent Arms," 116.
- Abyssinia, may give Mussolini surprise, 57.
- Routed Italian army in 1896, 57.
- Action Francaise, organ of French Royalists, 68.
- Africa, contains few independent nations, 57.
- Aged persons, number in U. S., 3.
- Alaska, will it play part in a war of the Pacific, 64.
- Its shores teem with "scouts of Japanese imperialism," 65.
- Albers, Homer, fatuous speech on Italy, 58.
- American Federation of Labor, gets only 12c per year from each member, 111.
- American Freeman, suffered from Hoover's fascism, 104.
- American Liberty League, a league of exploiters, 105.
- Was organized by exploiters, 105.
- Its "defense" of Constitution means defense of private property, 105.
- Seeks to regimentate wealth against Socialism, 105.
- Should make Hoover a director, 105.
- American Medical Association, its building not a "citadel," 83.
- American people, giving serious thought to social questions, 5.
- American Review, organ of Fascist-Catholic movement in U. S., 42.
- "America's Capacity to Consume," shows income distribution in U. S., 107.
- Anarchism, too much a counsel of perfection, 86.
- "Anschluss," definition of, 20.
- Arms embargo, would crush Bolivia, 70.
- Artists, work for anyone who has money, 49.
- Austria, union with Germany forbidden by treaties, 69.
- Why called a head without a body, 69.
- Austrian Socialists, Catholic Cardinal was their bitter foe, 40.
- "Autarchy," definition of, 3.
- "Balancing the budget," what it means, 33.
- Balfour Declaration, used to buy Jews' support of the Allies, 73.
- Banks, should be socialized before railroads, 33.
- Barnes, Harry Elmer, what is his political creed, 96.
- Is a prodigious worker, 96.
- Barrett, E. Boyd, wrote "Sociology of Nunneries," 54.
- Barter, used exclusively in trade between Russia and Turkey, 34.
- His opposition to Hitler based solely on theological dispute, 27.
- Clings to Jewish Scriptures, 28.
- Does not oppose Hitler's anti-Semitism, 28.
- Beardsley, John, defends student objectors to compulsory drill, 118.
- Beethoven, his 5th Symphony a supreme masterpiece, 94.
- Bennett, H. H., estimates cost of soil erosion, 31.
- Birth Control, chemicals are as "moral" as "Rhythm," 51.
- Bolivia, why at war with Paraguay, 69.
- Seeks an outlet to the sea, 69.
- Is backed by U. S. interests, 69.
- Borah Resolution, is an insult to Mexico, 44.
- Borah, Senator, was bulldozed by Catholics, 45.
- Boulder Dam, world's mightiest engineering project, 38.
- Statistics of, 38.
- Brakespeare, Nicholas, an English pope, 53.
- British postoffice, shows a profit, 35.
- Reduces toll on long distance calls, 38.
- Bruno, Giordano, would suffer a second martyrdom in Germany, 15.
- Bryan, William J., was a bigot, 94.
- Butler, Nicholas Murray, estimated cost of World War, 113.
- Calles, R. E., why he closed Catholic schools in Sonora, 47.
- Canada, does it desire union with U. S., 71.
- Canadian Commonwealth Federation, opposed by clericalism and capitalism, 72.
- Capitalism, difficult to trace its exact origin, 99.
- Has made State's Rights archaic, 32.
- Will be finished by another World War, 63.
- A vicious circle of over-production and depression, 108.
- Was a slow growth, 100.
- A system based on private ownership of means of production, 100.
- Can function without religion, 100.
- Rests on materialistic science, 100.
- Is incompatible with planned economy, 101.
- Can't be saved by discouraging invention and restricting production, 102.
- Too weak numerically to resist federal government, 102.
- A sane and orderly way to liquidate it, 103.
- Definition of, 103.

- Does not give workers full value of their product, 103.
 Its profit lies in "surplus value," 103.
 Brought new social order by application of science to industry, 103.
 An illustration of how it brings about depression, 108.
 Its gigantic contradictions, 108.
 Isn't worth saving, 114.
Capitalists, got dole from RFC, 105.
 Favor RFC, but howl because needy are given relief, 106.
 Could not resist will of the people, 107.
 Prefer direct relief to FERA, 108.
Cathredraticum, what it is, 44.
Cervantes, would be called upon to write Nazi propaganda, 15.
Chain stores, evade tax in Colorado, 38.
 Poor policy to tax them out of existence, 38.
Chaplin, Charlie, is on the side of the workers, 85.
 Is reluctant to get down to work, 92.
Chicago Tribune, seeks to disfranchise unemployed, 107.
 Prints false statement about A. F. of L., 111.
Child labor, newspapers among worst offenders, 10.
China, greatest producer of wheat in 1934, 67.
Christian Century, exposes Catholic intrigue in central Europe, 46.
 "Christian democracy," a contradiction in terms, 41.
Christianity, is dying, 51.
Christian Science Monitor, strives to give impression of superior intelligence, 81.
 Appeals to a prosperous, bourgeois public, 81.
 Has changed its editorial policy, 81.
 Refused to carry advertisement of doll "hospital," 81.
Church, has always blessed war banners, 117.
Citrine, Walter M., predicts end of Hitlerism, 19.
Civilization, is not dying, 51.
 Can't be built on nation of slaves, 61.
Civil War, cost of, 102.
Clark, Barrett H., calls Passion Play a commercial racket, 81.
Classless society, definition of, 101.
 All would be workers under, 101.
 Does not imply equality of income, 101.
Clery, were willing tools of the militarists, 116.
Communists, were largely to blame for collapse of German republic, 17.
 Cooperated with Nazis to embarrass republic, 17.
 Opposed united front with German Socialists, 28.
 Earned the persecution they suffer under Hitler, 17.
 Called German Socialists "social fascist leaders," 28.
 Helped bring on Hitler's fascism, 28.
 Will, like priests, take the devil's money, 88.
 Talk about Marx, but never read him, 106.
Composers, who were the greatest, 94.
Compulsory drill, can students refuse to take it, 117.
 Arguments against it before Supreme Court, 118.
Confucius, would be beheaded by Hitler, 14.
Conscription insurance, not available in U. S., 115.
 Large volume of sold in Japan, 115.
Consistency, is worth seeking for, 78.
 A Socialist leader who does not practice it, 78.
Consumers, usually take it on the chin, 31.
Convicts, should receive union wages, 10.
Cook, Dr., says he did not claim to have reached North Pole, 96.
"Corporate State", is not Socialism, 61.
 Is last word in economic slavery, 61.
 Is comparable to slave state, 61.
Cox, Rev. I. W., claims liberty born with Christianity, 50.
Crusades, are a black page of history, 44.
Curley, Governor, would outlaw civil marriage, 55.
Czechoslovakia, a truly civilized land, 70.
 Gave sanctuary to Socialist refugees, 71.
Dated Money, what it is, 10.
Dawes, Charles G., got federal "dole" for his bank, 107.
 Foisted worthless securities on government, 107.
Debs, Eugene V., statement on Socialist policy, 7.
Defensive war, has never been fought by U. S., 115.
Dell, Robert, reports on wage conditions in Germany, 18.
 Article on Italy, in *The Nation*, 59.
"Demarche", definition of, 29.
De Mille, Cecil, cleverest charlatan in movies, 92.
Democracy, has a right to defend itself, 47.
 Must be industrial as well as political, 60.
 Gets more done, with less ballyhoo, 60.
Dictatorship of the proletariat, would it allow non-workers to vote, 29.
 Would eliminate exploiters, 29.
Dietrich, Marlene, beautiful but dumb, 92.
Dimitroff, fought a nation of lunatics, 90.
Disarmament, cannot come in a capitalistic world, 112.
Divorce, is not an evil, 52.
"Dole", a misnomer for England's system of relief, 32.
Jollfuss, a murderer assassinated by his own kind, 86.

- A traitor to humanity and civilization, 86.
- Domestic mail, why it costs 3c per ounce, 36.
- Douglas, Major C. H., originator of Social Credit Plan, 8.
- Du Pont, Irenee, why he attacks opponents of munitions interests, 116. His company made colossal profits from war, 116.
- Blames Third International for peace propaganda, 116.
- Eastman, Joseph B., advocates government ownership of railroads, 83.
- Eastman, Max, translated Trotsky's works, 88.
- "Effort Money," proposed by Utopians as monetary reform, 8.
- Eliot, Lester P., article in *American Mercury*, 44.
- England, annual coal production, 73. Stands weakest in agriculture, 73.
- EPIC, how it plans to end poverty, 7.
- Essays, difficult to select 25 "best," 91.
- Europe, what is it spending on armaments, 115.
- "Farewell to Fifth Avenue," a saddening work, 78.
- Paints plutocrats in unbecoming poses, 79.
- Fascism, is an expensive "luxury," 22. The last desperate resort of Capitalism, 111.
- FERA, its program will not injure present markets, 104. Its policies smack of Socialism, 108.
- Feuchtwanger, Lion, wrote "The Oppermanns," 17.
- Fields, W. C., seems to have stepped out of a Dickensian novel, 92. Is funny even when doing nothing, 92.
- Ford, Henry, statement on government, 29. Can talk like a blithering idiot, 29.
- Fortune magazine, it flatters the super-salesmen, 75. A super-Babbitt publication, 75.
- Founding fathers, many were young, 29.
- Freedom of press, has been won by fighting editors, 30. Established by U. S. Constitution, 31. Not won in England until 1820's, 31.
- Freethinkers, gave clergy a lesson in brotherhood, 116.
- French army, its allegiance has been varied, 24.
- French Revolution, guided by Freethinkers in its early stages, 90.
- French royalist movement, facts about it, 68. Makes headway because of clever leadership, 68. Is fascist and clerical, 68.
- Gandhi is not a liberator, 66. A willing tool of Hindu capitalism, 66. Always sides with reactionaries, 66. He stinks to heaven, 66. Would give Untouchables "privilege" of worship, 66.
- Gasparri, Cardinal, lauds brutal Italian dictatorship, 40.
- General strike, has one ever succeeded, 110. Successful in Russia in 1905, 110. Various instances of, 110. In Seattle, and in San Francisco, 110. A tremendously powerful weapon, 111. Could bring transfer of power to working class, 111. To be effective, must be short in duration, 111.
- "Gentleman's glass," not enough for the money, 38.
- George, Henry, his solution inadequate, 4. Defended interest and capital, 4.
- Germany, its "unity" that of a penitentiary, 16. Is it feeling effects of boycott, 17. Its working class in deplorable condition, 18. Has lost its feeling for progress, 18. Workers will not find bugle-call liberating, 19. Outlaws time clocks, 19. Boycott is having effect, 19. Wages are very low, 19. Claims union with Austria on basis of common language, 19. Hitler would ban elections if they went against him, 20. Has gone deeper into depression since Hitler took power, 20. Does not count Jews among unemployed, 20. Economic inferiority to U. S. proved by number of cars, 21. Does not count Pacifists, etc., among unemployed, 21. Not enjoying world-rate of industrial recovery, 21. Drastic decline in publishing, 21. Falsifies unemployment figures, 22. Amount of its foreign debts, 22. Foreign trade continues to decline, 23. Depends on imports for raw materials, 23. Seeks substitutes for cotton and wool, 23. Textile employees face lay-off, 23. Stocks of woolen clothing running low, 23. Cannot compete in world trade with substitutes, 24. String-saving will not solve economic problems, 24. Oil substitutes more costly than natural product, 24. Why Reichswehr swore allegiance to Hitler, 24. Does not recognize habeas corpus, 25. Legal safeguards have disappeared, 25. Great decline in university enrollment, 25. Led by perverts, lunatics and drug addicts, 26. Is again encircled by enemies, 65.

- Persecution explained by sadism of leaders, 26.
 Is the most militaristic nation, 114.
 Its present military forces, 114.
 Its policy "a peace to end peace," 114.
 Is it ready for war, 114.
 Industries die while money is diverted for war material, 115.
 Glendon, J. F., originator of Dated Money Plan, 9.
 Goemboes, how pronounced, 68.
 Goering, Herman, exposed as dope-fiend and lunatic, 26.
 Goldman, Emma, an estimate of, 80.
 Has contributed little as a creative thinker, 86.
 Is 10,000 years ahead of her times, 87.
 Government, cost of in U. S. for 1934, 34.
 Is necessary to discipline anti-social elements, 86.
 Much of its spending is wasteful, 35.
 Great Britain, what composes it, 72.
 Gropper, William, a shining example of Communist "consistency," 88.
 Haldeman-Julius, E., shuns the autobiographical jitters, 76.
 Prefers to generalize, 76.
 Wants work to be his autobiography, 77.
 Refuses to be choicy about language, 78.
 Hall, Thomas F., wrote "Has the North Pole Been Discovered?" 95.
 Picks many flaws in Peary's evidence, 95.
 Harvard accent, a ruthless butchery of English language, 77.
 Harvard University, estimate of, 77.
 Refused gift from Hitler henchman, 25.
 Hauptmann, Bruno, his actions indicated guilt, 74.
 A suner-bonehead, not a super-criminal, 75.
 Hauptmann trial, was over-publicized, 74.
 Hayes, J. Gordon, claims Peary did not reach North Pole, 96.
 Points out discrepancies in Peary's account, 96.
 Hearst, William Randolph, a good judge of free love, 81.
 Hitler, Adolf, is he a menace to civilization, 13.
 Germans must obey him or die, 13.
 Stole power by firing Reichstag building, 13.
 Murdered and tortured unoffending Jews, 13.
 A list of his shocking crimes, 13.
 Supported by a murder mob, 13.
 His infamy knows no limits, 13.
 Murdered every manifestation of democracy, 14.
 Degraded Germany's womanhood, 14.
 Gagged the press, 14.
 Would martyr greatest leaders of race, 14.
 Is the enemy of culture and humanity, 15.
 Never advocated real Socialism, 16.
 Mouthed Socialism to dupe workers, 16.
 Draws greatest support from capitalists, 16.
 Has enslaved the workers of Germany, 16.
 Has he given Germany solidarity, 16.
 Heading Germany towards war, 17.
 Is as "sincere" as any gangster, 17.
 Claim to racial superiority based on inferiority complex, 18.
 Wants big baby crop for cannon-fodder, 18.
 May be succeeded by military or radical dictatorship, 18.
 His elections are a farce, 19.
 How long will he last, 19.
 Why he calls elections, 20.
 His "enobled democracy" is bunk, 20.
 Stole billions from Jews, 21.
 His regime will collapse, 21.
 Ignored promise of land reform, 21.
 Stole vast sums from labor unions, 22.
 Has not outlawed taking of interest, 22.
 Kept promises based on racial hate, 22.
 His "substitute" campaign is a joke, 24.
 Has not made Germany a Garden of Eden, 24.
 Has no place to go but down, 25.
 Hates education and culture, 25.
 Would use sterilization against his enemies, 25.
 Should sterilize himself and colleagues, 25.
 He and other Nazi leaders are degenerates, 26.
 Was Roehm's partner in perversion, 26.
 As a sadistic homosexual, he is not fit to hold power, 26.
 Suppressed nudism on ground of morality, 27.
 Why he suppressed public manifestations of homosexuality, 27.
 Resents talk about his vice, 27.
 Can't stomach Old Testament, 43.
 Making feverish preparations for war, 62.
 Plays old game of German imperialism, 65.
 Hitlerism, a disease that makes for insanity, 86.
 Homosexuality, not always sadistic, 27.
 Hoover, Herbert, his passion for liberty is bewildering, 104.
 His concern for freedom of press is hypocritical, 104.
 He craves "liberty" to exploit, 104.
 Raps FERA because it eliminates profiteering, 104.
 Is a mouthpiece of reactionary Capitalism, 104.
 Hubbard, Elbert, did he originate saying about mouse-trap, 97.

- Hugo, Victor, was he an Atheist, 97.
 Hutton, Barbara, why workers like to read about her, 79.
 An empty-headed female with \$40,000,000, 79.
 Put on a disgusting show, 80.
 Her case a grand argument for a classless society, 80.
 Imperialism, is heading world toward another war, 63.
 At work in Germany and Japan, 63.
 Index Expurgatorius, lists few modern works, 53.
 Individualism, not compatible with the machine age, 86.
 Inventors, would be encouraged under a sane social system, 102.
 Iowa, makes money from sale of liquor, 37.
 Italian army, Clemenceau's opinion of, 57.
 Italy, has lowest standard of living in Europe, 58.
 Public debt and taxes enormous, 59.
 Fascism has devastated its culture, 60.
 Its scholarship in a state of coma, 60.
 Forbids strikes by jesuitical decree, 62.
 Why it failed to join Central Powers in World War, 68.
 Japan, prepares for war with U. S., 112.
 Working class will eventually revolt, 64.
 Position in Manchuria not secure, 64.
 Cannot stage long war against Russia, 64.
 Bought most of our exported scrap iron, 119.
 Statement on scrap iron imports is jesuitical, 113.
 Japanese imperialists, plan world conquest, 63.
 Looks greedily towards Alaska, 64.
 Jefferson, Thomas, source of his political ideas, 93.
 Jesus, was his mother a virgin, 43.
 Jewish National Home in Palestine, will always be a charitable institution, 73.
 Jews, Nazis libel them on the score of criminality, 18.
 Kemal, Mustapha, what did he do, 67.
 Kept press, an example of its dishonesty, 110.
 Kings, how many are still in business, 67.
 Knickerbocker, H. R., wrote "The Boiling Point: Will War Come to Europe," 113.
 Knights of Columbus, "secret oath" a forgery, 53.
 Knox, Frank, gave figures on Italy's financial condition, 59.
 LaFollette, Robert M., showed statesmanship, 94.
 Laughton, Charles, an outstanding movie star, 91.
 Lenin, was he always a consistent revolutionist, 87.
 Advocated nationalism in 1914, 87.
 Was an opportunist of the first order, 87.
 Condemned freedom of the press, 87.
 Used same arguments as Catholic Inquisitors, 87.
 Tried to assume the mantle of infallibility, 87.
 Catholic Church would use similar language if it regained temporal power, 88.
 Had complete confidence in Trotsky, 88.
 Levant, where is it, 68.
 Lewis, Joseph, a clever publisher, 89.
 Popularized works of Dr. W. J. Robinson, 89.
 His freethought publications of great value, 89.
 Is a master mail order seller, 90.
 Liberal Party of Canada, estimate of, 71.
 Liberty, has been fought by religion, 50.
 A new synonym for Capitalism, 105.
 Lincoln, Abraham, did not confiscate the slaves, 102.
 Would have been wiser to have bought slaves, 102.
 Lindbergh, Charles A., tried to whip up sentiment for air-mail crooks, 89.
 Refused to intercede for Sacco and Vanzetti, 89.
 Greatly inferior to his father in character and honesty, 89.
 Is he world's greatest hero, 90.
 A willing tool of reactionaries, 90.
 Lippmann, Walter, seldom comes to grips with his material, 82.
 Literature, is educator's most powerful weapon, 109.
 Little Blue Books, how the idea was conceived, 76.
 Little Entente, which countries constitute it, 71.
 Long, Huey, a genius in art of rabble-raising, 11.
 Not interested in serious questions, 12.
 Understands psychology of ignorant voters, 12.
 His capital levy plan fantastic, 12.
 Is as ignorant and brazen as Hitler, 12.
 Lubitsch, Ernst, a keen, civilized wit, 92.
 Luddites, who were they, 109.
 Ludditism, is still with us, 109.
 Macaulay, Lord, theory of revolutions, 30.
 Machine, its increased productivity should benefit Society, 10.
 Mail order business, is not a cinch, 89.
 Its practitioners are secretive, 90.
 "Man and Super-man," does not deal with cafe business, 93.
 Marley, Lord, brands Nazi leaders as degenerates, 26.
 Marx brothers, are always worth seeing, 92.
 Marx, Groucho, is for socialized industry, 85.

- Marx, Karl**, his thought was scientific, 4.
 Anticipated the Technocrats, 10.
 His immortal words are true, 50.
 Admitted revolution could come by peaceful means, 106.
 Did not say, "Property is theft," 110.
Marxian Socialists, do not respect Wells' economic theories, 84.
Matteotti, Giacomo, tragic fate of, 57.
McCabe, Joseph, wrote work on Catholic Index, 53.
 Tribute by Vivian Phelps, 97.
Mdivani, "Prince," would dig ditches if he were in Russia, 80.
Means Test, how it works, 72.
Mencken, H. L., is he a futilitarian, 75.
 Brands religion as "falsehood and trumpery," 75.
Merchant marine, an auxiliary to the navy, 37.
Mexicans, tell priests where to get off, 47.
Mexico, its size compared to U. S., 71.
 Education has advanced under secular government, 47.
 Why it expels Catholic clerics, 71.
Militarism, statistics of various countries, 114.
Missionaries, aid imperialists in China, 65.
Molloy, Thomas E., urges federal support of parochial schools, 54.
Money question, tinkering with it will not solve our problems, 9.
More, Sir Thomas, wrote "Utopia," 4.
Mosley, Sir Oswald, has "good understanding" with Catholic Church, 40.
Movie actors, can one expect intelligence in them, 85.
Movie boycott, will it improve morals, 51.
Movie censorship, should liberals fight it, 29.
Movie magnates, won't fight for free expression, 30.
 Deserve what they are getting, 30.
Movies, are never just bad in spots, 92.
Municipal electric plants, number in U. S., 37.
Mussolini, why he is called "duce," 57.
 Supported Von Starhemberg in Austria, 43.
 When did he take power, 57.
 Has not "saved" Italy, 58.
 Stole social insurance funds, 58.
 His public work program insignificant, 58.
 His policies have intensified depression, 58.
 Brays like an ass, 58.
 Has he made trains run on time, 59.
 Is he heading Italy towards bankruptcy, 59.
 His Pontine Marshes job not "magnificent," 60.
 Facts about his "Corporate State," 60.
 He and Hitler have not eliminated class struggle, 61.
 His "elections" are a farce, 61.
 Explanation of his "demographic battle," 62.
 Why he insists on a bachelor's tax, 62.
 Is a legalized Al Capone, 62.
 His policies result in foreign trade deficit, 62.
Nation, The, has referred to degeneracy of Nazi leaders, 26.
National debt, increase not cause for alarm, 34.
National Geographic Society, made no real effort to check Peary's "evidence," 95.
 "Is only a private publishing house," 96.
National Guard, federal government pays expenses of, 31.
Nationalization of railroads, not inconsistent with Americanism, 33.
 Public is lukewarm towards, 33.
National Socialism, has no relation to true Socialism, 16.
 Nothing more than capitalistic fascism, 16.
Newspapers, why they oppose Child Labor amendment, 30.
North Pole, who really discovered it, 96.
Nudism, is it immoral, 27.
 Is making headway in U. S., 80.
Nudists, can find justification in Bible, 44.
 Do not seek erotic thrills, 80.
Nuns, number of in U. S., 54.
O. Henry, played his tricks to point of weariness, 91.
Old-age pensions, are they inevitable, 3.
 Should be on federal basis, 3.
 Aged workers are entitled to them, 3.
Old masters, did not exhaust their medium, 94.
O'Neill, Eugene, suggests slogan for Hitler, 27.
Orators, who were our three greatest, 93.
"Outline of History," took history away from dull pedants, 84.
"Over-production," is really underconsumption, 9.
Palestine, is its budget balanced, 67.
 Foreign contributions keep things running, 67.
Papacy, a preserve of the Italian cardinals, 54.
Paraguay, supported by Argentina and Great Britain, 69.
Passion Play, estimate of, 80.
Patriotism, is it admirable, 98.
 Is not incompatible with modesty, 98.
 Is a menace when it leads to conceit, 98.
Peary, Robert E., was he an impostor, 95.
 Had no white companions in "dash" to Pole, 95.
 Claimed to have traveled with incredible speed, 95.

- Peer Gynt, meaning of scene with But-ton-Moulder, 96.
A supreme masterpiece of poetic literature, 97.
- Perkins, Secretary, favors old-age pen-sions, 3.
- Pickford, Mary, is she a fascist, 84.
Has a tenth-rate brain, 84.
Whoops it up for Mussolini and fasc-ism, 85.
- Pilsudski, persecutes Polish Jews, 70.
Preparing for war with Hitler, 70.
- Planned economy, is it possible under Capitalism, 101.
Logical and inevitable under social-ized industry, 101.
Would remove causes of industrial chaos, 101.
Cannot be inaugurated under present conditions, 101.
- Plato, his utopia based on slavery, 3.
- Platt Amendment, its present status, 32.
- Plays, difficult to select 12 "best," 93.
- Poets, who were our three greatest, 93.
- Poland, is ruled by a military dictator, 70.
Standard of living unbelievably low, 70.
- "Pontifex Maximus," what it means, 43.
- Pope, not interested in real morality, 51.
- Popularized knowledge, will emancipate the race, 76.
- Preachers, talk peace, but do nothing to advance it, 115.
- Preparedness, does it prevent war, 112.
Did not prevent the World War, 112.
Is a breeder of war, 112.
- Preventive war, definition of, 113.
- Printing press, a weapon, not a toy, 76.
- Progress, is not a delusion, 18.
Attacked by haters of freedom, 19.
- Proletariat, does it exist in U. S., 107.
- Property, did it come before the state, 99.
- Prose writers, who were our three greatest, 93.
- Proudhon, said, "Property is theft," 110.
- Province of Quebec, dominated by Cath-olic Church, 72.
Its Catholic population breed like rabbits, 72.
- "Putsch," definition of, 20.
Is used inaccurately by some writers, 20.
- Rabelais, would weep in Hitler's mad-house, 15.
- Radek, Karl, is considered world's abl-est journalist, 82.
Knowledge of international affairs is encyclopedic, 82.
- Railroads, still best for heavy freight, 33.
Let the people own them, 33.
- RFC, has lent over \$4,000,000,000, 106.
- Red scare, a favorite weapon of profit-ers, 116.
- Religion, can it be done away with under capitalism, 100.
Will quickly die under scientific so-cial system, 100.
- Revisionists, what they want in Pales-tine, 67.
- Robespierre, was a religious fanatic, 90.
Was responsible for Reign of Terror, 90.
- Roehm, was an admitted homosexual, 26.
- Rogers, Will, his philosophy is crap, 91.
- Roman Catholic Church, hates Socialists because they are Freethinkers, 40.
Supported Alfonso's corrupt regime, 40.
Seeks to extend power of Fascists, 41.
Helped to destroy Austrian Republic, 41.
Terms of Concordat with Austria, 41.
Exempt from press censorship in Aus-tria, 41.
Receives direct support from Aus-trian government, 41.
Fights for a return to Dark Ages, 42.
Promotes Fascism in U. S., 42.
Why membership increased in Aus-tria, 42.
Supported Dollfuss in murder of So-cialists, 42.
Blesses headsman's axe in Germany, 42.
Would protect only converted Jews, 43.
Feud with Hitler will be patched up, 43.
Has always been Fascist in policy, 43.
Banned works of Copernicus until 1822, 43.
Uses Latin of slave population, 43.
Strength in France before Revolution, 44.
Property in U. S. valued at two bil-lion, 44.
"World's greatest real estate corpor-ation," 44.
Seeks to regain corrupt power in Mexico, 45.
Would deny Mexicans intellectual freedom, 45.
Its protest in Mexico is dishonest, 45.
Its bonds have often defaulted, 45.
Why it wants monetary inflation, 46.
Its real estate would benefit from in-flation, 46.
Now controls Vienna schools, 46.
Fomented revolt in Mexico, 47.
Controlled Mexican education for four centuries, 47.
Has allegiance of Europe's dictators, 48.
Why it opposed U. S. recognition of Russia, 48.
Is always on the side of exploiters, 48.
Oldest institution of hatred and reac-tion, 49.
Has it been an inspiration to art-ists, 49.
Did nothing to create art, 49.
Did it make Rome great, 49.
When were its sacraments formu-lated, 50.
Fought claim that world is round, 50.
Was always an enemy of liberty, 50.

- Endorses Rhythm method of birth control, 51.
Is a prop of present rotten system, 51.
Was it moral in aiding Dollfuss, 52.
Its movie drive based on jealousy, 52.
Why it resorts to boycott of movies, 52.
Why its officials oppose Child Labor Amendment, 52.
Is a vast political, economic machine, 53.
Did it ever condemn physics, 53.
Attitude towards slavery in modern times, 54.
Would teach slaves "patience," 54.
Did its saints collaborate with animals, 55.
Was nurtured in superstition, 55.
Would force religious mumbo-jumbo on all, 55.
Accepted bribe from Mussolini, 56.
Fights labor unions in Canada, 72.
Roman Catholics, reluctant to buy their church's bonds, 45.
Not compelled to support parochial schools, 54.
Make miserable showing in *Who's Who*, 55.
Rome, degenerated under rule of popes, 49.
Roosevelt, Pres. F. D., will he recognize Vatican, 48.
A firm believer in capitalism, 79.
Is a big navy man, 112.
Is he friendly to disarmament, 116.
Root, Elihu, his policies were reactionary, 94.
Ruling class, will it give up possessions without a struggle, 106.
Will hesitate to arm workers for war, 117.
Runnymede, what happened there, 72.
Russell, Bertrand, comment on patriotism, 98.
Russian Revolution, violence was inevitable, 106.
Sales tax, in force in 17 states, 81.
Is favored by Wall Street, 6.
Salt tax, an insignificant issue, 66.
Salvemini, Prof. G., comment on Mussolini's militarism, 62.
Satyagraha, theory of, what it is, 65.
Scott, Howard, merely echoes other economists, 11.
Criticizes, but offers no constructive plan, 11.
Secularism, endangered by clericalism, 56.
Shakespeare, was he a homosexual, 90.
Supreme master of the drama, 93.
Did he write most beautiful sentence in literature, 94.
"Share-the-wealth," a preposterous plan, 11.
If put into effect, civilization would collapse, 12.
Shaw, Bernard, is he a Socialist, 85.
His definition of Socialism, 85.
Is amazingly inconsistent, 85.
His social theories are eccentric, 109.
Shay's Rebellion, an account of, 81.
Shipping, comparison of British and American, 37.
Short stories, some favorites, 90.
A difficult, ever-charming medium, 41.
Shrimp cocktails, an expert tells how to make, 38.
Shuster, George N., predicts return of "Christian democracy," 40.
Sinclair, Upton, did not endorse Townsend Plan, 5.
Proves himself a master politician, 7.
Urges widespread adoption of EPIC, 9.
Is no free lover, 81.
Is not an Atheist, 81.
Accepts basic assumptions of Christianity, 82.
Why do conservatives fear him, 107.
Single Tax, originated with Physiocrats, 4.
Is as dead as the dodo, 4.
Its advocates are economic illiterates, 4.
Would be a blessing to greedy capitalists, 4.
How it would affect today's plutocrats, 5.
Would fall mainly on middle class, 5.
Slavery, was supported by churches, 50.
Social Credit Plan, its theory and aims, 8.
Is based on monetary reform, 8.
Would leave capitalism untouched, 9.
Socialism, takes real thought to understand it, 12.
Will not outlaw industries of capitalism, 102.
Does not demand socialization of small industries, 104.
Can it come without violence, 106.
American people will inaugurate it by orderly means, 107.
Necessary to agitate and educate for it, 109.
Workers will have power to consume all they produce, 109.
Does not seek to equalize rewards of labor, 109.
Insists on equality of opportunity, not reward, 109.
Its inauguration is the only path to peace, 113.
Socialist government, would spend more, but get better results, 35.
Socialist party, does not advocate equality of income, 85.
Socialist Party of California, its attitude towards Utopians, 7.
Attacked Sinclair and EPIC, 9.
Socialists, have plan to eliminate bad features of machine economy, 11.
Do not advocate "dividing up," 11.
Begged Communists for united front in Germany, 28.
Organizing secretly in Austria, 46.
Do not deny themselves the right to violence, if necessary, 103.
Defend personal property, 110.

- Socialization**, the only remedy against war, 63.
 The only remedy for concentration of wealth, 100.
 Will be inevitable when people understand its merits, 103.
 Would eliminate wage system and profit motive, 108.
- Social revolution**, must rest on foundation of truth, 77.
- Soil erosion**, tremendous cost of in U. S., 31.
- Soviet Union**, why it works consistently for peace, 63.
 Protects Vladivostok from Japanese, 64.
 Has many fighting planes in Far East, 64.
 Was friendly to Germany before Hitler's theft of power, 65.
 Is solidly behind peace moves, 114.
- Spanish revolt**, directed against priests and fascists, 73.
- "Special pleading,"** definition of, 77.
- Spivak, John L.**, is he greatest reporter in U. S., 82.
 Exposed Red Cross and shirt movements, 82.
 Should be awarded Pulitzer Prize, 82.
 Wrote "The Medical Trust Unmasked," 82.
 Did a dirty, dishonest job for Macfadden, 82.
 Was eager to take Macfadden's money, 83.
 A liar—reformed at last, 83.
 Wrote "The Rise and Fall of a Tabloid," 83.
- Stalin, Joseph**, secured Trotsky's exile, 89.
- Stamp, Sir Josiah**, proposes moratorium on inventions, 102.
- State**, was at first merely the guardian of property, 99.
 Its functions widened with advance of civilization, 99.
 Will not disappear under socialized economy, 99.
- State of Washington**, cut its liquor prices, 37.
- "State's Rights,"** is it still a sound doctrine, 32.
- Stein, Gertrude**, an estimate of, 93.
- Stevenson, Burton**, compiled "Home Book of Quotations," 97.
 Exposes Elbert Hubbard's plagiarism, 98.
- Students**, should not be forced to accept employment, 10.
- "Surplus value,"** an important factor in depression, 108.
- Technocracy**, an estimate of, 10.
- Technocrats**, are in error on job problem, 10.
- "The Militant,"** organ of Trotskyites in U. S., 88.
- "The Oppermanns,"** a graphic portrayal of Germany under Hitler, 18.
 A frankly propagandistic novel, 91.
- Thomas Henry**, who is he, 97.
- Thomas, Norman**, tells of hearing clergy defend lynching, 115.
- Torquemada**, why considered such a monster, 49.
- Totalitarian state**, definition of, 16.
 Is being forced on Germans, 16.
- Townsend, Dr. M. E.**, is a visionary, 6.
- Townsend Plan**, its origin, 5.
 Its provisions, 5.
 Poor would become benefactors of aged, 5.
 Is on an unsound financial basis, 6.
 Could not raise funds by sales tax, 6.
 Capitalist press would welcome it, 6.
 Does not oppose capitalism, 6.
- "Trade balance,"** what it means, 34.
- Trinity Church**, owns fire-trap tenements, 117.
- Trotsky, Leon**, plans to organize Fourth International, 88.
 Proved himself a military genius, 88.
 Made the target of vicious attacks by Stalin's organization, 89.
- Twain, Mark**, his works not on Catholic Index, 53.
 Estimate of, 97.
- Unemployed**, number of in capitalist nations of world, 100.
- Unemployment**, suggestions for its solution, 10.
 Would be reduced by pensioning aged, 10.
- Unemployment Insurance**, superior to charity, 32.
 Must be carried on during periods of recovery, 32.
 Does not pauperize workers, 33.
- U. S. government**, its present indebtedness, 34.
 Has comparatively low per capita indebtedness, 34.
 Has resources for vast social program, 34.
 Operates stores in Canal Zone, 37.
 Does not need an embassy at Vatican, 48.
 Should strip social parasites of unearned wealth, 80.
 What it spends for armaments each day, 114.
 Making gigantic preparations for war, 115.
- U. S. historians**, who were three greatest, 93.
- U. S. postoffice**, why it operates at a deficit, 35.
 Loses money on second-class mail, 35.
 First-class postmasters are parasites, 35.
 Would show profit if graft and parasites were eliminated, 36.
 Employees are courteous and efficient, 36.
 Carries first-class mail at profit, 36.
 Items which cause deficit, 36.
 Pays huge graft to ship-owners, 36.
 Pays \$25,000,000 annual graft to ship-owners, 37.
- U. S. Presidents**, who were three greatest, 93.
 Who were three smallest, 93.

- U. S. scrap iron exports, their significance, 113.
- U. S. statesmen, who were three greatest, 93.
- Utopianism, derided by scientific economists, 4.
- Utopians, who and what are they, 6.
Worry business interests in Los Angeles, 7.
- Utopian Society, an interesting experiment, 7.
Outline of theory and aims, 7.
Claims tremendous growth, 8.
Does not promote violent revolution, 8.
Has an involved secret ritual, 8.
- Vanderbilt, Cornelius, Jr., estimate of, 78.
His approach is superficial, 79.
Gives quick glimpses of world-figures, 79.
- Van Loon, Hendrik, always worth reading, 97.
- Vatican City, facts about it, 56.
- Vickers Limited, paid dividends to preachers for 40 years, 117.
- Vienna, once center of Freethought, 42.
Its schools were pride of educational world, 46.
- Viereck, George S., is Hitler's propagandist in U. S., 85.
- Vistra, what it is, 23.
Not a successful substitute for wool, 23.
Many disadvantages in its use, 23.
- Voltaire, Nazis would try him for high treason, 15.
Why he has received more recognition than Paine and Ingersoll, 75.
- Wallisch, did not see priest before he was hanged, 46.
- War, blessed by clerics, 52.
Is the U. S. heading for another, 112.
Will not bring prosperity, 112.
Is it more imminent today than in 1014, 114.
Should one be a conscientious objector in time of, 117.
- A sane method of protest against, 117.
- Ward, Lester F., declared that property preceded the state, 99.
- Washington, is it important to nation's life, 29.
- Wealth, how it is concentrated, 100.
Dividing up not a remedy for concentration, 100.
- Wells, H. G., fatuous comment on Crusades, 44.
A great artist, teacher and guide, 83.
Has done much to modernize thinking, 83.
His "God, the Invisible King," unworthy of an intelligent schoolboy, 84.
Is a great intellectual agitator, 84.
Declares he has always been an Atheist, 84.
Which is his greatest story, 84.
Has had a long career in Socialism, 84.
Has no admiration for Karl Marx, 84.
- White, William Allen, he oozes sweetness and light, 74.
Is a Godly do-goodster, 74.
The Confucius of the Sticks, 74.
- Wilson, Woodrow, did he believe in open diplomacy, 30.
Preached open, but practiced secret, diplomacy, 30.
- Winkler, Franz, said Vatican contributed to Austrian Fascists, 43.
- Women, not so funny on stage and screen, 93.
- Woolworth stores, fought the NRA, 80.
- World War, will a second one mean the end of civilization, 113.
Was it caused by assassination of Austrian crown prince, 65.
Will mean end of Capitalism, 113.
Total cost of, 113.
- World War veterans, mortality rate of, 31.
- "Yellow dog contract," what it is, 38.
- Yugoslavia, religion a source of discord, 46.