

Sixth Series

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

E. Haldeman-Julius

SIXTH SERIES

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

E. Haldeman-Julius

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD :-: KANSAS

Copyright, 1936
Haldeman-Julius Company

Printed in the United States of America

Questions and Answers

How has the speed-up worked in the cigarette industry?

In 1931, 25,000 workers turned out 53,000,000,000 cigarettes. Two years later, only 21,000 workers were employed and they increased production to 117,000,000,000 cigarettes. Meanwhile wages fell from \$727 to \$613 per year.

* * *

Communists everywhere the Soviet Union fight imperialism but what becomes of this policy when such agitation interferes with Russia's foreign policy?

When the French Foreign Minister, Pierre Laval, negotiated at Moscow the Franco-Russian mutual pact of non-aggression, on May 15, 1935, he explained to Stalin his problem at home, where the Communists were opposing an increase in military service and armaments. The French Communists were innocently enjoying the illusion that they were furthering the world revolution. You can imagine their surprise when they learned that Stalin, the man on the flying trapeze, with the greatest of ease, sent word to them, through a formal statement to Laval, that "Stalin understands and fully approves the national defense policy of France in keeping her armed forces at a level required for security." This means Stalin wants the French Communists to stop agitating against French imperialism's military increases. Thus do we get more evidence of Russia's attitude towards the world proletariat. There wouldn't be anything wrong about this, under Capitalism, if Stalin took his stand frankly in the name of Capitalism, which thrives on militarism, but to do this in the name of Socialism and the world revolution is to offer the toiling masses just one more betrayal. Stalin is disarming his French Communist followers, which ends once for all Communism's interna-

tionism and puts Russia right alongside the other imperialistic nations. Now, if Russia and its Communists will only stay there honestly, we can endure the mess, but if they are to do it with a new barrage of "revolutionary phrases" we will have to take time off for another sick spell at the stomach.

* * *

Back in the old days you used to print an occasional puzzle, which I always appreciated. Why not slip one in now and then?

Here's a good one that's been giving New York headaches. Walter Lippmann needed 20 minutes to hit the answer. A newspaper editor needed six minutes. I'm passing this little teaser on in the hope that its workers will keep time and let me know what it was, including the answer, and how they reached it. The puzzle:

"The king wished to choose the wisest man in his country as Premier. To do so, he told three of his wisest: 'I'm going to blindfold you and paint circles in red or blue on your foreheads. When the bandages are removed, if you see a red circle anywhere, raise your right hand. When you have figured out the color of your own circle, lower the hand, and the first to do that will be my Premier.' The king then blindfolded them, painted three red circles, allowed them to see again, watched the three hands go up, and then saw the hand of Mr. Z. descend. How did Mr. Z know his circle was red?"

* * *

Can a Socialist echo the Communists and advocate violence?

The Socialist party has clearly stated that "it is incompatible with membership in the Socialist party to advocate armed insurrection."

* * *

Is the movie industry a liberal or reactionary force?

While there are a few liberal or

radical individuals in Hollywood, the movie business is a conservative, reactionary, orthodox, and, in some of its aspects, a militaristic, fascistic propaganda machine. The pictures lend themselves to every scheme and trick for the promotion of militarism and imperialism, using all the old slogans of Preparedness for Peace," but being in essence a force for navalism and militarism along the most approved Hearstian patterns. Politically, the industry is always on the side of the reactionaries, as was shown when the movie magnates supported conservatism and slandered Upton Sinclair.

In the world of ideas, Hollywood is invariably safely orthodox. In books, pamphlets, a few magazines and in lectures one will find access to heterodoxy in religious discussions, but in the movies I'm yet to meet up with even a hint of Freethought and candid, honest views on religion and church institutions. According to the standards of Hollywood, the priests, preachers and rabbis are all men of God, who speak only sacred truths, who work tirelessly and unselfishly for the spiritual good of humanity. When an unbeliever is pictured, he is usually a drunkard, a liar and a crude vulgarian, ready to smash idols and spit on life's most sacred things. That's Hollywood.

A sweatshop employer, who doesn't want his scab shop turned into a union shop, never announces that he opposes unionization because he wants to make more profits out of his employes. No, that would be too crude. He is always for the "American plan"—true Americanism. The K. K. K. didn't ride up and down the country to terrorize those who held different views from their corrupt, mercenary, maniacal leaders. Oh, no, it was "100 percent Americanism" they were organized to further. And the same goes for these movie Fascists. They hide under pretty words like "true Americanism," but underneath the mask one sees a denial of America's libertarian traditions.

* * *

What was the outcome of the suit

on the Protocols in Switzerland?

The so-called Protocols of the Elders of Zion were distributed by Nazi sympathizers in Switzerland and caused Jews there to file suit for slander. After a long trial, in which an independent court heard millions of words of testimony from both sides, those charged with circulating the slander were found guilty of using a "false and obvious plagiarism" which was "immoral because they (the protocols) propagated hate against part of the population." The decision was handed down at Berne on May 14, 1935. The defendants were fined. Friends of justice and fairness should track down the circulators of the Protocols wherever they are used to injure an innocent people. There isn't the slightest doubt that such court actions would result in convictions against those who are using these exposed "documents" in countries like England and the United States. A Canadian court has already decided one case against anti-Semitic users of the notorious forgeries.

* * *

What effect will Russia's new policy of military alliance with capitalistic powers have on the Communist ideal of world revolution?

The Soviet Union now has an agreement with France which provides for mutually helpful warfare in case either power is attacked. Thus, if Germany were to make a stab at Russia's western border, France would have to attack Germany from the west, or if Germany struck at France, Russia is committed to marching towards Germany. If there were such an eventuality, what would the Communists outside Russia do? That's an interesting question, and it's amusing to watch the Communist journalists squirm when they discuss the matter in such official organs as **The Daily Worker**. If the Communists of France were to strike at France from the rear, they would be injuring Russia's chances of winning the war with Germany. In reply to this, the Communists jesuitically claim they would always fight French imperialism, regardless of time or place. But they surely

realize that their own Fatherland, the Soviet Union, has established an accord with French imperialism, when it agrees to fight in France's support should that powerful country be made the target of Hitler's new conscript army. You can't play both sides at the same time. You have here a case of Russian foreign policy which says "we will help an imperialistic power in order to save our own skins," and you have the Communist followers in countries like France saying they are opposed to imperialism and would crush it at the first opportunity. The best time to strike at an enemy is when he is fighting someone else, and if France's Capitalism is fighting Hitler's Fascism, that would be the logical time for the French Communists to deliver a blow at their own enemy at home. But here the pope of the Kremlin would rush to the aid of French Capitalism, for a French army endangered from the rear would give Germany a free hand to put Russia out of whack. So what? If Communist publicists and politicians were completely candid they would frankly admit they have chucked the ideal of a world revolution overboard, otherwise there could never have been a military alliance with French imperialism. The treaty does even more. It not only abandons world revolution but, indirectly, helps maintain French Capitalism. If France were to go to war with Hitler tomorrow it would find the Soviet Union opposing the French Communists who might want to stab their government in the back while it was fighting in the field. Stalin would, in so many words, say that any attempt to take advantage of the international war situation would be a hindrance to Russia's plans. All of which means that Russia has firmly settled down to a policy of taking care of its own hide, regardless of what happens anywhere else. That explains why Russia agrees to fight for France should Germany send an army towards the west. Yes, Communists, when put to the test, are as sordidly commercial as the worst imperialist.

* * *

What is your opinion of Bryan?

The William Jennings Bryan who used his energies to gag science in states like Tennessee was a clown in the eyes of the intelligence of the world. But that was towards the end of his career. During the time he was our Secretary of State, before Wilson got us into the World War, Bryan was the most unpopular man in the country, to read the newspapers of that time, but an examination of his record and what he said and did should convince the most skeptical that he was the only genuine patriot in Wilson's cabinet. He was right from first to last. Every stand he took was consistently for peace and good-will. Had he remained in this high office he might have saved us from entering the stupid struggle between equally guilty imperialists and militarists. He resigned only when he realized that Wilson and Col. House were setting the stage for our entrance into the European blood-bath. Bryan honestly wanted to keep his country at peace, and, because his policies were all aimed in that direction, he was made to endure jingoistic press attacks that are without equal in the history of the nation. His common sense outraged the militarists, who wanted blood and thunder. When American lives were lost in torpedoed vessels in the war zone, Bryan calmly and properly advised Americans to stay away from such danger spots. When the **Lusitania** was sent to the bottom of the sea, with 143 American lives lost, Bryan had the courage to tell the war-mad patriots that the **Lusitania** had carried 4,300 cases of ammunition, and as such, under the rules of warfare, was a legal target for the submarines, however one might be against war and bloodshed in principle. When the Morgan interests first started to sell British bonds to Americans, to keep the British war machine oiled up, Bryan put his foot down, and it was only when Wilson overruled him that the Morgan bank was able to begin supplying the British imperialists with hundreds of millions of American dollars. Bryan saw that such financing was unneutral and would

inevitably force us into the war. And so on. Step by step Bryan followed a foreign policy that was sane, correct, intelligently idealistic and guaranteed to keep us out of the mess that European diplomats had cooked up. Bryan was certainly wrong on many religious, scientific, educational and political subjects, but he was completely right in his diplomacy, judging him from the viewpoint of the best interests of the common people at home.

* * *

You, with your long-standing admiration for Eugene V. Debs, should remember that he was always a he-man type of Socialist, revolutionary to the core, ready to lead into action at a moment's notice.

Eugene V. Debs, in 1912, when he was candidate for President on the Socialist ticket, found it necessary to let the country, particularly the party's membership, know where he stood on the question of whether or not the workers should depend on political action. He issued the following statement:

"I am opposed to all forms of violence, and that is why I am opposed to capitalism. I am opposed to sabotage and 'direct action.'

"I have not a bit of use for the 'propaganda of the deed.' These are the tactics of anarchist individuals and not of Socialist collectivists.

"My chief objection to all these measures is that they do violence to the class psychology of the workers, and cannot be successfully inculcated as a mass doctrine. To the extent that the working class has power based on class-consciousness, force is unnecessary; to the extent that power is lacking, force can only result in harm."

* * *

I notice that the ancient libel of "ritual murder" still persists among anti-Semites. Has there ever been a court case based on such a libel?

In Winnipeg, Canada, the **Canadian Nationalist**, published by the Canadian Nationalist Party, a Fascist and anti-Semitic organiza-

tion, distributed, in January, 1935, an issue containing a vile article by one A. S. Leese, from which I quote:

"It is an established fact that ritual murder is practiced by Jews and there are scores of recorded cases.

"However unpleasant it may be, Aryans should realize that this pestilential Jewish nation has attained its present world power largely through the great British people. The Jew is essentially different from the Briton; the same Jew who will smile and fawn upon you when he wants something from you will injure you cheerfully if it suits him. No Aryan can have the slightest social contact with Jews without detriment to himself."

This libel was taken before the King's Bench, at Winnipeg, by a local Jew, William Tobias. The publishers of the libel were then placed on trial before Justice Montague, who, on February 13, 1935, decided against those who had joined in disseminating the foul lie of ritual murder. The Judge's decision said:

"The court doth order and adjudge that the defendant, Whittaker, his servants and agents be perpetually restrained from further continuing writing, printing or causing to be printed, circulating, distributing, or otherwise publishing the libel on the Jewish race and those professing the Jewish creed contained in the issue of the **Canadian Nationalist**, Vol. II, No. 6, referred to in the statement of claim or any similar libels injuriously affecting those belonging to the Jewish race or professing the Jewish creed."

There's nothing to prevent Jews in the U. S. from filing suits against the sewer-rats of the Rev. Winrod type who publish brutal, contemptible lies. Their motive is clearly malicious and should be met by proper legal action. American Jews daren't repeat the tactics of the German Jews, who refused to take Hitler's anti-Semitic lies seriously

until it was too late. Had the German Jews fought back with every honorable weapon, they might have succeeded in keeping Hitler from taking power. Those who live in civilized countries like the U. S. should be ever on the alert. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," may sound hackneyed, but its truth can't be questioned.

* * *

I've read several of your comments on the political situation in Canada, and wonder if you have given consideration to the fact that Socialism isn't acceptable at this time because the country is still somewhat primitive in its industrial set-up. It will have to go through further capitalistic development before the principles of socialized industry will mean anything.

Your idea about the state of Capitalism's evolution in Canada is held by many people, but it happens that the notion is at complete variance with the facts. What isn't generally known, even among some otherwise informed people, is that Canada is, in many respects, more monopolistic than the U. S. If anything, Canada is even more ready for Socialism than the U. S., though the latter is, in all conscience, rotten-ripe for the change. Canada's industries are concentrated in the highly developed East and the far West. In between lies the great farming country. Reliable authorities point out that 50 men control 97 percent of Canada's wealth, through interlocking direct- orates and financial control of Canada's banking system, which is in itself almost a complete monopoly. There are only 10 banks remaining in all Canada, the various communities being served, or rather exploited, by an elaborate system of branch banking. This condition of financial inter-relationship enables a mere handful of men to be masters of Canada's economic, industrial and financial life. The farmers are also exploited by this small group through the banks' control of the large credit organizations. Monopolization and trustification have made tremendous strides in Canada, which account for the ready acceptance being

given to the radical solutions proposed by the C. C. F.

* * *

As a Canadian voter, I'm beginning to see the folly of supporting the Conservatives and Liberals and want to help bring Socialism into being. Is the C. C. F. a real Socialist party?

The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, which is only three years old, is a coalition of intelligently radical labor, farmer and Socialist groups and organizations. It is making real progress and is putting a scare into the old parties. In fact, it is expected that the Conservatives and Liberals will merge in order to keep the C. C. F. from winning. If they do, it will be a good thing, for it will mean a line-up on the issue facing Canada—the producers versus the exploiters. The aims of the C. C. F. are expressed in its own literature, as follows:

"To replace the present capitalist system, with its inherent injustice and inhumanity, by a social order from which domination and exploitation of one class by another will be eliminated, in which economic planning will supersede unregulated private enterprise and competition, and in which genuine democratic self-government, based upon economic equality, will be possible."

The program provides for a certain amount of socialization immediately in transportation, power and banking, with complete Socialism as the ultimate goal.

A strong member of the Conservative party, W. G. Ernst, is predicting unity between his party and the Liberals, to fight "the common menace of Socialism." He sees the handwriting on the wall—a struggle between the forces of Socialism and Capitalism for power in Canada. The C. C. F. is glad to see the issue come to a head. It is out to win.

When the Federation held its first meeting in Calgary, in western Canada, in 1932, it worked out a program that was intended to appeal to both the farmers and industrial workers. A representative

national convention was held a year later, in Regina, where the original program was endorsed and expanded. This second meeting covered all of Canada, from Montreal to Vancouver, while the first was composed mainly of westerners. In elections since the Regina convention, the C. C. F. has been hitting along at a fine clip. In the Pacific Province of British Columbia, the C. C. F. is now the second party, the official opposition to the Liberals who now have the government. In the middle western province of Saskatchewan, the C. C. F. elected five members in the provincial election, in June, 1934. Here also the C. C. F. became the second party. Only one member was elected in the Province of Ontario, the center of reaction and conservatism. The C. C. F. will enter the campaign in every section of Canada in the election which must be held in 1935. It sums up the great fight with this simple declaration:

"The C. C. F. is a federation of organizations whose purpose is the establishment in Canada of a Cooperative Commonwealth in which the principle regulating production, distribution and exchange will be the supplying of human needs and not the making of profits."

The newness of the C. C. F. is something of an asset, for it is able to present its mass radical movement without the prejudices that were aroused by the old, and with the program expressed in language that means something to the people of the Dominion, instead of repeating foreign radical phrases that leave the average person bewildered.

* * *

I am a native-born American, of Rumanian Jewish parentage. As a child and young man I recall the numerous stories my parents told me about anti-Semitism in Rumania. Are conditions as bad today?

For more than 50 years, Rumania enforced severely discriminatory laws against the Jews, there being 256 anti-Jewish laws to keep a minority in virtual subjection. The laws were directed nominally against "aliens," but as the Jews were not

permitted to enjoy the rights of citizenship, these "alien" laws were applied exclusively to Rumania's Jewish population. Anti-Semitic societies, led by ruthless demagogues, kept the fires of racial hatred burning. Premier Bratiano used the full powers of his government to compel something like 250,000 Jews to live restricted lives. After the World War, when Rumania's territory and influence expanded, its Jewish population grew to 1,000,000. It was only when the present king, Carol, mounted the throne that systematic efforts were made to dig up the poison weeds of anti-Semitism. It was a slow, hard struggle, but King Carol insisted on his liberal policies, even going so far as to compel the police to discourage and crush every manifestation of anti-Semitism. Today, one still finds a certain amount of anti-Jewish propaganda and action in Carol's country, but it must be borne in mind that such propaganda is conducted without the formal approval of the government, as was the case when Bratiano was premier, and, after his death, when his two sons wielded a great measure of power. Rumanian Jews claim that full credit for their improved economic and political positions must go to King Carol.

* * *

Do the people in our Pacific coast states still entertain anti-Japanese feelings?

Ten years ago, many persons in California, Washington and Oregon were anti-Japanese, but this was because of the steady baiting of the anti-Japanese Hearst press and politicians who wanted political advantages through mass hysteria. But reliable reports have it that this anti-Japanese propaganda is leaving the people cold. Recently a newspaper reporter, interviewing 50 citizens, taking them as they came, and asking them how they felt about a war with Japan, found them unanimously against such a crime. In addition to expressing anti-war sentiments, more than 50 percent of the persons interviewed criticized our government for ordering its 1935 naval maneuvers so far west. The people on the Pacific

coast know that a Japanese attack is impossible. They speak, as though of one mind, against war. On the other hand, reports from accurate, unprejudiced sources in Japan agree that the people over there feel the same way, that a war between their country and the U. S. would be dumb, unprofitable and wholly destructive. But they also have their jingoistic elements—the army-navy crowd—that keep yelling for war on Uncle Sam, while we have the same elements in this country that are trying to whip up sentiment for a stupid war with Japan. If the decision can be left to the people of both countries, peace will continue.

* * *

It's pretty hard to get around Hitler's argument that it's Germany's right to rescue the German population of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Russian Ukraine. Do you accept the justice of that position?

Such an argument, if put into action, can mean an endless series of wars, and nothing else. The fact that Germans went to foreign countries and settled there to raise large families is no reason for Hitler "rescuing" them, which means annexing the land they occupy. If such a policy were justified, what would be the result? There are millions of Germans in Wisconsin, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New York and other states. Would we tolerate for one second any attempt on Hitler's part to "rescue" them by annexing part of our country? The question is too ridiculous to deserve a serious answer. The same question, applied to the lands you mention, can be answered only in the same firm negative. If Germans do not like to live in a foreign country they can return to Hitler's heaven. That would be their right. But there would be neither sense nor justice in their wanting the might of Germany to subdue and take over the countries in which they happen to be living. Grant Hitler's position and we would find Mussolini searching the world for Italians to "rescue." England would want to "rescue" the United States. Spain would want Spanish America.

France would want Belgium. Where would it stop? The proposition is too inane for serious consideration, were it not for the appalling fact that a great country is being terrorized by a mad degenerate who is bent on "rescuing" people better off without him.

* * *

Does Hitler's persecution of non-Aryans include the Japanese?

Hitler has forbidden the inclusion of the Japanese in Germany's restrictions on so-called non-Aryans. This was done in order to help make possible a German-Japanese alliance with the aim of war on the Soviet Union. Hitler hopes to strike from the West and take the valuable Russian Ukraine while Japan strikes from the East and takes an immense slice of Siberia. The Japanese will repeat their adventure in China, where they put a puppet emperor on the Manchukian throne. It is claimed that the Japanese, on taking eastern Siberia, would install a Romanoff as czar. However, such a plan would not be as simple as it sounds. Japan would find herself far from her base of supplies, with a line of communications threatened by millions of Chinese who are aching for a chance to drive the Japanese out of their country. Communism is strong in China and might become victorious if Japanese imperialism were to attempt to control eastern Siberia. Besides, the Russians are powerful in the East, where they are maintaining a great air fleet, the plan being to raid Japan from the air (the return trip takes only six hours) and reduce Japan's flimsy cities to ashes. Japan's air force is weak, and even if it had one as strong as Russia's it would not be effective because of eastern Siberia's few cities and towns. It's a fair bet that Russia could whip Japan in the East. But in the West the situation would be serious, especially if Poland were to join Hitler in the attempt to steal the Ukraine. Russian diplomacy has met this problem, though by no means with a sure solution, through its recently signed mutual assistance pact with France. Should Hitler and the Poles strike towards the

East, France would be bound to strike Hitler from his western border. It is not clear what positions Italy and England would take in such a conflict. All of these capitalistic countries hate Russia's economic policies, but they fear Hitler more. Homosexual Hitler will strike without warning, and unless France keeps its bargain Russia stands to lose a great section of territory. If Hitler could be held off another three or five years the Russians would be strong enough to deal with the Germans in the West as they are now strong enough to dispose of the Japanese in the East, but it seems as though Hitler isn't going to let the Soviet Union have a breathing spell of that duration. Hitler's problems and difficulties are numerous, not the least of them being the economic situation at home where everything is going from bad to worse. It is expected that Hitler would rather go down in a militaristic "blaze of glory" than permit his regime to be kicked out by revolution at home. Rumors of war fill the air; soon the world will see the beginning of war itself. It will be terrible beyond the power of words to describe.

One is naturally shocked at the reports from Nazi Germany, where Fascism uses force and violence to terrorize opposition, but it is gratifying to reflect that such things are unlikely to happen in this country.

That's a very pretty thought, but I'm not ready to accept your assumption. Not only can such things happen here—they actually do. Here is a press report from New York City, which tells of an attack on May 16, 1935, that looks like a scene out of Hitlerland. Michael Califano, Italian artist who has painted a number of anti Nazi canvasses, was attacked by three Nazi hoodlums, and after being tied to a steam pipe saw these thugs go methodically about the crime of cutting his paintings to shreds. These works of art, insured at \$25,000 and worth probably four times as much, were destroyed because Califano had painted and publicly shown one especially impressive picture that was called "The Ig-

nominy of the 20th Century," which portrayed Hitler and a brown-shirted mercenary pillorying Professor Albert Einstein. Nazi-ism resorts to force and violence wherever it shows its ugly head. If the newspapers were accurate in their report of what happened to Califano, we are given a hint of what may be expected should the ideas and methods of Hitler grow stronger in this country, though I feel confident that such hoodlumism will have a harder time getting established in this country than was the case in Germany. Germany knew only a few short years of cultural and intellectual freedom of expression during the life of the Republic (which Hitler murdered), but in this land there is a tradition of free speech that goes back for a century and a half. If the Califano incident is authentic, it should serve as a lesson to those who believe in real freedom.

Please comment on Madame Chiang Kai-Shek's article, "New Life in China," in the June, 1935, Forum.

This American-educated Chinese is the wife of General Chiang Kai-Shek. They both are Christians. The madame's job seems to be of a propaganda nature, writing articles for well-known American magazines, lauding her husband's work as dictator of the Nanking reactionary government. He is leading what is known as the Kuomintang, which once represented Chinese revolutionary sentiment of the great revolutionist, Sun Yat-sen. What began as a great libertarian movement degenerated, shortly after Dr. Sun's death, into a government of tyranny, terror, persecution, robbery and militarism.

To read Madame Kai-Shek's article, with its sweet drippings of rotarianism and Christian piety, one would picture her and her Methodist (or is it Baptist?) husband leading the Chinese lambs—200,000,000 of them in the territory ruled by the General—to the sweetness and light of a Wednesday night prayer meeting. But, alas, the facts tell a bitter story. Her husband, whom she pictures as a second Jesus come to save China from

banditry and Communism, is one of the bloodiest murderers in history. At the head of 2,000,000 soldiers, General Kai-Shek has murdered millions of workers (he and his wife call them Communist bandits) in order to make China safe for Japanese, British and other foreign imperialism, the exploitation of the landless peasants, the enslavement of the workers, and the collection of perhaps \$200,000,000 per year from the opium traffic, now a monopoly of General Kai-Shek's government.

The madame says nothing about opium in her sweet, tender article. Such a subject would be too unpleasant for refined ears. It is only the Communist "bandits" in China who are really fighting the opium traffic. Raising opium in territory controlled by the Communists is punishable by death. In General Kai-Shek's territory anyone caught even expressing sentiments against the vice of opium addiction is beheaded. That's the difference between the "Communist-bandits" and Madame Kai-Shek's Christian husband.

Under the guise of "curing" the opium evil, General Kai-Shek has made opium a state monopoly. In order to "wipe out" the evil, he collects about \$200,000,000 yearly in taxes from this vice. Those who purchase or sell opium through illegal channels are taught respect for the lofty principle of Christian idealism by being beheaded, but those who buy and sell through the regular, legal channels are protected. Thus does the Nanking government get vast revenues to buy munitions to crush the Communist-led peasant revolts and keep its own millions of natives doped with opium and thus immune to the temptations of revolutionary action.

It happens that opium is one of the world's easiest problems to handle. There isn't a government in the world that couldn't wipe out the opium traffic in a few years. But it thrives, because it's profitable—a big business that pays enormous dividends. It is difficult to handle the liquor problem, because the materials used in the manufacture of intoxicants are innocent

fields of grain or grapes, but in the case of opium, there's only one way to raise it and that's through crops of poppy. The fact that there are millions of acres in China given over to poppies proves the Nanking government of General Kai-Shek is a party to the opium traffic, for such fields could be outlawed in a few months, with their visible crops plowed under. But instead of plowing under crops and forbidding future planting, the government subsidizes the crops, squeezes out the opium juice and sells to its natives the material for one of the worst destructive habits that human flesh is heir to. Of course, Madame Kai-Shek has nothing to say about this sordid matter. It's so much nicer and more Christian to talk about Chinese idealism while her husband and his tools sow the seeds of corruption and degeneracy.

* * *

As a Socialist and a Swede, who has lived many years in the U. S., I am delighted to learn that my native country now has a Socialist premier. What are some of the practical benefits Sweden has enjoyed because of its strong Socialist movement?

Sweden's condition, despite the world crisis, is growing better almost daily. Because of a long record of socialistic cooperative societies, government ownership of great utilities, powerful Socialist-led labor unions and a policy of sound money, Sweden finds itself in the enviable position of having its budget balanced, which is no mean achievement in these days when the most capitalistic governments are going into the red by the billions of dollars.

The economic section of the League of Nations has issued a report on Sweden, which shows that this country—one of the most civilized in the world—is showing the rest of the world how to get out of the depression. The level of industrial activity is now higher than it has been since 1920. Unemployment has been reduced, in 1935, to a mere one percent of the working people, which is the best showing made since 1920. To give one an idea of what this means, Sweden

found it necessary to appropriate only \$40,000,000 for unemployment relief, during 1934, but half of this money still remains in the public treasury unspent. No increase in taxation was needed to balance the budget, and the national debt has been reduced to the amazingly low figure of \$10,000,000.

The Socialist-led cooperative societies are doing a tremendous business, with a sales volume, in 1933, of \$91,000,000, as against \$38,000,000 in 1918, and \$7,000,000 in 1912. It is estimated that about 40 percent of the country's wholesale and retail trade is done through these cooperative societies.

Sweden's cooperatives also are engaged in housing projects, there being about 15 percent of the population now living in cooperative houses. Through the influence of these cooperatives and the regular Socialist party, Sweden developed a system of government-owned electric plants. Rural electrification in Sweden now leads the world, there being electrical facilities for three out of every four farm homes. These government-owned plants distribute their power through the consumers' cooperatives. When it was found that the Swedish subsidiary of our General Electric Corporation was charging the public 37c for a 25-watt electric light bulb, the cooperatives got into action and built their own bulb factory, with the result that the private company cut its price immediately to 22c per bulb, but the cooperative product, trade-named "Luma," was offered at 20c each, and guaranteed to burn 500 more hours than the product of the private corporation. Another cooperative grinds grain for a bakery that is also owned by a cooperative, and both are among Sweden's large businesses. Another cooperative went into the business of making tires, rubber shoes and galoshes. Galoshes, for example, now cost 65 percent less than the usual article, with wages as high as those which prevail in the private plants. During 1933, the cooperatives manufactured commodities worth \$20,000,000 in their own factories. The record shows numerous advantages

to both workers and consumers.

Compare this situation, in a Socialist-led country, with that in Germany, where Hitler, when he stole power in 1933, destroyed the great cooperatives and confiscated their treasuries and other assets, in order to return their business to the private, capitalistic interests who hated the idea of Socialist competition.

In this country we put our faith in simon-pure Capitalism, so that the cooperative movement, while it is here, lags, compared with what is being done in countries like Sweden. We producers and consumers seem to prefer a system which shows growing concentration in industry, so that the latest information reveals, in 1935, that 200 corporations, with a directorate of only 2,000, control almost 40 percent of the industrial activities of the U. S. We're just too smart to learn from a lot of Swedes. But we'll get around to it when the facts sink in.

* * *

As a Canadian, I want to know if we have a censorship of literature. Please comment.

You, like millions of other Canadians, don't realize that you are compelled to endure a form of censorship in some respects as bad as that found in Italy or Germany. The only difference I can find between the European and Canadian models is that yours is secret. But it works just the same. The censorship operates mainly with a view to keeping literature from entering Canada. The system functions at the demand of the Catholic Church, which is too strong in Canada for the health of civilized culture and the free exchange of ideas.

The authorities, obeying the dictates of the Catholic Church, give the impression to those who make inquiries that they devote themselves to keeping pornography from gaining admittance, but the way the censorship works out in practice is to keep any kind of literature "offensive" to the Church, and Canadian politicians anxious to obey the wishes of the Church, from entering the sacred domains that must be held pure and unsul-

hied. All of which means that Canadian censorship operates to keep out ideas—books on economics, history, Catholicism, and even science.

That able and courageous member of the Canadian Parliament, J. S. Woodsworth, who, of course, is a Socialist and leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, keeps picking at the authorities on this grave censorship issue, and though he hasn't been successful thus far in breaking the grip of the priests, it is safe to assume that once he and his fellow-Socialists get control of the government an end will be put to Canada's medievalism. On February 27, 1935, Mr. Woodsworth directed the following question at the Postmaster General:

"What books, with titles, authors and publishers, are at present on the list of those not permitted to pass through the mails?"

The Postmaster General, Mr. Sauve, answered:

"It has always been considered that to publish lists of publications, the transmission of which has been prohibited in the Canadian mails, gives them undue advertising, and to that extent defeats the purposes for which they are prohibited."

Canadians who still believe in freedom should study those words carefully. First, note that Canada has a censorship. Second, the censors do not feel obligated to even let a prominent member of parliament know what kind of books they are censoring. It happens that I already know many of the titles of books kept out of Canada, so I do not wonder that Mr. Sauve keeps his silence. The fact is, he's ashamed to list the books for fear of earning the laughter of Canada's intelligent people, of whom there are many.

You Canadians who look down on Italian and German Fascism might be surprised to learn that early in March, 1935, the **Commonwealth**, a weekly published at Vancouver, B. C., was denied the right to import a copy of Fred Henderson's **A Case for Socialism**, which even a Catholic priest will have to admit is not

obscene. Frederick Engels' **Socialism, Utopian and Scientific** is also barred from Canada. So is Scott Nearing's **A Warless World**.

Through court cases, it was learned, at Winnipeg, that the following titles were on the Canadian index of forbidden books: **Fragments from Science**, by Tyndal; **First Principles of Sociology**, by Herbert Spencer; **Howe's The Theory of Banking**; **Ancient Society**, by Professor Lewis H. Morgan, one of the classics of anthropology; **The Mikado** and other plays, by W. S. Gilbert; **The Origin of Species**, by Charles Darwin; **The Unsocial Socialist**, by Bernard Shaw; **Mlle. Fifi**, by De Maupassant. The works just listed in this paragraph were challenged in a court case shortly after the war, when Canadian censorship reached its most absurd heights. Since then conditions haven't improved, but the authorities have been clever enough to practice censorship without the necessity of publicity. And Canadians like to speak of their democracy!

The Truth Seeker Company, in New York City, can't ship into Canada its **Bible Comically Illustrated**, **Heavenly Discourse**, and the anti-Catholic books listed in its catalogue. Other publishers can tell stories equally startling regarding the brazen behavior of the Canadian censors. Canada will not be a free country until it breaks the grip of the Catholic Church. I believe Mr. Woodsworth and the C. C. F. can do it, if the voters will come to their senses.

* * *

Please comment on the Catholic Church's claim that Birth Control is a worse evil than war.

Joseph McCabe answers this argument by calling attention to the fact that the Catholic Church helps Dictator Mussolini fight Birth Control with a view to helping him build larger armies.

* * *

Please comment on the May, 1935, article in Current History praising the fascist record in Italy.

The article you refer to is by Howard R. Marraro, who is connected with the Italian Department at Columbia University, which means,

of course, that the "boost" for Mussolini is nothing more than paid propaganda, because, as every informed person knows, Italian Fascism's publicity work among Americans is being done from this university. It is disgraceful of President Nicholas Murray Butler to permit this great institution to be prostituted to the ends of a murderer and egomaniac like Mussolini.

To read this article, one would imagine that Italy's 42,000,000 people were living in paradise. A study of his "facts" almost leads one to hope for the destruction of democracy and the installation of a dictator in the White House—almost, until one looks a little closer and sees what shoddy stuff can serve a Fascist propagandist.

For example, we are told that Mussolini has increased the average consumption of tobacco, per capita, from 19.11 ounces per year in 1913 to 22.89 ounces in 1932. Fancy that! What with increases in population and the spread of the tobacco habit among women, we actually find that Italians are smoking almost four ounces more each year. Utopia has been achieved.

During 1932, not counting cigars or cigarettes, we in the U. S. A. consumed 347,279,000 pounds of plug, twist, fine cut, pipe and snuff tobacco, which is almost three pounds per capita, or almost 48 ounces. In the same year, we deluded believers in democracy smoked 4,382,723,000 large cigars, 278,748,000 small cigars, and 106,632,434,000 cigarettes. (Our consumption of cigarettes, in 1913, was 15,555,693,000, which was only about one-seventh of what we burned up in 1932.) On the basis of population, our 1932 cigar consumption was about 373 cigars per person, while cigarette consumption was about 853 per capita. Cut these figures to one-third, which compares with Italy's population, and you get a picture of what Mussolini's pitiful 22.89 ounces amount to.

Mussolini's propagandist then boasts about Italy's position in the use of automobiles. We learn, to our amazement, that Italy actually

had 464,888 motor cars in 1932, against our 23,000,000. Italy's entire inventory of motor cars just about equals one month's production of new cars in the land that is cursed by democracy and political freedom.

After this great showing in tobacco and motor cars (others are about as impressive), we are ready to forgive Mussolini his loss of 832,200,000 lire in foreign trade (exports), in 1933, as compared with 1932. The first nine months of 1934 showed an adverse trade balance of 1,830,800,000 lire (a lire is worth about 8c).

The article then boasts about Italy's solution of the Church and State problem, but what this really means is that Fascism, by surrendering a part of its authority to the Pope in order to maintain Mussolini in his dictatorship, slipped Italy back 500 years. It is a "solution" that spells reaction.

Says our author: "If there have been limitations of liberty, the Italian people accept them because they appreciate their necessity and find them to be not the caprices of an autocrat but essentials in the building of a more prosperous and happy nation."

There are several points in this sentence that demand explanation from Prof. Marraro. Is there any evidence that Italy is reconciled to its loss of liberty? Have the people ever had anything to say about their destroyed liberties? If they favor their economic and political slavery, then why must Mussolini deny unofficial Italy the right to speak, print or meet? Why is every fifth person in Italy a paid spy? Why do Mussolini's mercenaries murder and persecute and exile those who do not believe in his policies? Mussolini's propagandists should have the decency to admit that Mussolini rules because he has terrorized the population into accepting his organized banditry.

The best answer to this rosy picture of a people being led to "prosperity" and "happiness" is to be found in Mussolini's own speech, delivered on April 28, 1935, in Rome. "I know you well," he shouted to 15,000 hearers. "I know you are not looking for a comfortable life."

Surely, Italians are like other people—Slavs, Yankees, John Bulls, etc., who frankly want life to be decent, and even comfortable. I've never yet heard of a people that deliberately preferred to lead uncomfortable lives. Continuing, Mussolini said: "Therefore, I announce to you the approach of a hard period which will engage all the force of the Italian people . . ."

Prof. Marraro ought to know that Mussolini would not ask his victims to tighten their belts another notch, if he had really brought them to "prosperity" and "happiness." The facts are altogether different. They show worse misery, and gloomier prospects.

* * *

What is semantics?

The word "semantics" refers to the science which studies the evolution of language.

* * *

What is your opinion of the screen stories of Damon Runyon?

He is an expert in the knack of writing about people who never lived, who say things that never were said, who do things that never were done, in a world that never existed.

* * *

Please compare strength of Socialists and Communists in Denmark.

The latest election was for the rural councils, in which the Socialists received 145,717 votes, while the Communists polled only 821.

* * *

Current History, for May, 1935, contains an article on Italy which says: "Thus all indices . . . uniformly show that the standards of living of the Italian people have improved from 1913 to the present. This improvement is particularly marked during the 12 years of the Fascist regime, and it has not been interrupted by the world economic crisis." Please comment.

I have already given some attention to the amazingly inept statements made by Howard R. Marraro in the article from which the reader quotes above. Fascist propaganda is hard at work in this country; paid spokesmen of Hitler and Mussolini are doing their utmost to give the American public a rosy picture

of their authoritarian states. But rosy pictures soon turn drab and bleak when one gets access to reliable information.

The above statement from Prof. Marraro's article is in striking contrast with the information that comes from honest sources. I have, in the past, given a great deal of space to Italian economic data, all of which contradicts Marraro's attempts to show Fascism as a success. Additional information now comes through a thoroughly reliable source. I refer to an article by Joseph B. Phillips, Rome correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune*. In the April 29, 1935, issue of that newspaper, Mr. Phillips writes:

"Just a year after Premier Benito Mussolini announced that he would reduce the cost of living in Italy as compensation for a 10 percent cut in wages, the general average of prices is shown to have risen about 20 percent. Despite governmental prophecies that the situation is only temporary, the continued upward trend is causing considerable hardship and uneasiness. . . . Italy is suffering rising prices without compensation in rising wages and salaries."

It is unfortunate, from Prof. Marraro's viewpoint, to have his article appear only a few days before Mussolini made a speech in Rome, in which he warned his subjects that they are to expect still another "hard period." In the same speech, Mussolini boasted that this worsening must come in the face of reduced unemployment. He should have added that real employment had not increased in Italy during the past few years. Instead, conditions have grown worse, but the true condition has been hidden by the policy of forcing hundreds of thousands of unemployed young men into the army, of whom 30,000 were shipped to eastern Africa recently for the project against Ethiopia, with perhaps many thousands more to be ordered to that section in the near future. That is a dangerous way of "solving" the unemployment problem,

and that Mussolini knows this is attested by the fact that he plainly warns the people they must not look for "a comfortable life." They won't, so long as he is the big boss of Italy.

Wages have been cut, by decree from Mussolini. But the cost of living has gone up another 20 percent. So how can Prof. Marraro claim an improvement? He should get together with his employer and warn him against making frank speeches predicting still harder times just when his article is appearing in a prominent American magazine. Such bad teamwork must be annoying.

* * *

I heard a propagandist for Mussolini say that labor in Italy receives 25c per hour. Remembering your report that even the skilled workers get an average of 82c per day, I wonder if you have any additional facts.

Italian labor now works from nine to 10 hours per day, for starvation wages. For an independent view, I refer to the editor of *Business Week*, who writes from Italy as follows (see page 47, issue of April 6, 1935):

"The cobweb laces of Venice are exquisite, the skill of the women juggling the bobbins faster than eye can follow is a fascinating thing to watch. Again the terrible habit of asking questions. How much do they earn? 'Seven lire a day, Signor.' That's 56c."

Here we have less than 6c per hour for highly skilled labor. Male skilled workers get about 20c more for a day's work. The statement that labor gets 25c per hour in Italy is wildly fantastic.

* * *

How other than by divine providence can you explain the history of the Jews? They were scattered, by God's will, as the prophecies plainly said. And now they are building a homeland in Palestine, thereby becoming a prosperous nation, also declared in many of the prophecies in the Old and New Testaments.

If God was responsible for the destruction of the Jewish State, in

Palestine, in the year 70 A. D., he must have used a proxy, for history says it was done by the Roman legions. If God was responsible for the persecution of the Jews, especially in Christian Europe during the past 20 or more centuries, he certainly deserves the reputation of being the worst brute in all history. And now, the Zionists are elbowing their way into a tiny country that is almost barren—a step from the desert—and this is supposed to be the hand of God directing the Jews again, this time on the road to prosperity. But if I know my history, the Jews in Palestine haven't God to thank. They must thank British imperialism, which is using them in the far-flung schemes of English capitalism. It was Lord Balfour who wrote the famous letter to Rothschild, in which he promised the Jews the right to establish a national home in Palestine, as a reward for their patriotism during the World War. Are we to understand that Balfour was inspired by divine providence? That's putting a new mantle of mysticism on an old politician, whose ideas were more cynical than devout. And while these Jews are crowding into Palestine, where they are arousing the anger of an Arab population that outnumbers them something like four to one, one must ask why God is giving those Arabs such a harsh deal, especially since they have been living in that country for more than a thousand years? And also, while he is being so "kind" to the Jews in Palestine, why is he doing nothing about the lot of the Jews in Hitler's Germany, in Catholic Austria, in Rumania, in Poland, and other centers of anti-Semitism? And why are anti-Semitism and racial chauvinism growing in the United States under the direction of super-charlatans like Father Coughlin and the various Shirt movements? Alas, this "divine providence" business carries many a flaw.

* * *

We expect a baby in about two months and want to get up a snappy announcement card. Knowing your ability as an advertising

writer and printer, please suggest the wording of a card.

I suggest the following, by an anonymous wag:

THE DOE PRODUCTION CO.
Announces the 1936 Doe "Baby Boy"
Model No. 1, Chassis 8 lbs. 3 oz.

Delivered F.O.B. City Hospital
John Doe, Designer and Chief Engineer;
Regina Doe, Production Manager;
Dr. C. A. Doe, Technical Assistant

Model Released August 31, 1936
Two Lung Power—Free Squealing—
Scream Line Body—Double Bawl
Bearing—Economical Feed—Water
Cooled Exhaust—Changeable
Seat Cover

The management assures the public there will be no new models released during the balance of the year

* * *

What do you think of these elaborate house-organs many corporations send out by the millions?

They're a great break for the printers, but as means of producing business I'm just a little bit skeptical. Let me give you an interesting illustration, drawn from personal experience. As a printer, I use great quantities of linotype metal, which I usually buy in two and three ton lots. About six companies compete for this business, and, as the metal is uniform, it's usually just a question of price. Going through my mail one morning, I came on two communications from metal corporations. One of the biggest in the world, with offices and warehouses in about 50 cities, sent me a beautifully printed booklet, which I read with great interest and profit, for it told me valuable things about the history of printing, types, stereotyping, etc. Its short editorials were well written and inspirational, from the pen of that able business commentator, William Feather. But the most careful scrutiny failed to reveal a schedule of prices. The other envelope, from a smaller concern in St. Louis, contained only a simple blotter (which is a useful article), and across the bottom of it I found what I wanted—a price. So I put the swell brochure on my library shelf for later reading, but sent my

order for two tons of linotype metal (an order for almost \$400) to the St. Louis concern that had done the simple, direct, businesslike thing. I leave it to you. Which company has the better idea of getting orders NOW, not in the remote future?

* * *

As I am one who, of necessity, must follow a course of self-education because of my economic situation, I would like to have you list 25 books, written during the last 50 years, which have an important bearing on today's life, because of their influence in matters of thought, action or emotion.

1. **Das Kapital.** By Karl Marx. (This book did not appear in its complete form until after Marx's death. This gigantic work, published after 1885, has revolutionized economic thought and provoked epoch-making mass action, in Russia and elsewhere. Its influence is growing, instead of waning.)

2. **Looking Backward.** By Edward Bellamy. (This novel of a utopian society approached economics, industry and sociology from the viewpoint of a genius in the sphere of feeling rather than the world of thought or action. The book is not scientific, as Marx's is, but its influence has been, and still is, tremendous.)

3. **The Golden Bough.** By Sir James George Fraser. (This great student of mythology has done much, in this book, to subject religions to scientific analysis.)

4. **The Principles of Psychology.** By William James.

5. A volume of the plays by George Bernard Shaw.

6. A selection of the writings on sex by Havelock Ellis.

7. A selection of the writings of Lenin.

8. **The Foundations of Leninism.** By Joseph Stalin.

9. **The Jungle.** By Upton Sinclair.

10. **Pure Sociology.** By Lester F. Ward.

11. A volume of the best lectures by Robert G. Ingersoll.

12. Joseph McCabe's popularizations and translations of the works of Ernst Haeckel.

13. Dr. William J. Robinson's

writings on birth control, venereal diseases and sex.

14. Professor Albert Einstein's lectures on Relativity.

15. Dr. Freud's books on psycho-analysis.

16. A volume of the plays of Henrik Ibsen.

17. A volume of the fiction by Thomas Hardy, which must, of course, include his great *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*.

18. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. By Thorstein Veblen.

19. A volume of the mathematical studies of Bertrand Russell.

20. *The Psychology of the Unconscious*. By Dr. Carl Gustav Jung.

21. *The Outline of History*. By H. G. Wells.

22. *The Atomic Theory*. By Niels Bohr.

23. Lectures on physics (the theory of heat radiation). By Professor Karl Ernst Ludwig Planck.

24. *Main Street*. By Sinclair Lewis.

25. *History of the Russian Revolution*. By Leon Trotsky.

(I believe I should add, not because I approve of the book's theme but because I recognize the volume's vast reactionary influence, the work entitled *My Battle*, by Adolf Hitler.)

* * *

Statistics show that more than 50 percent of President Roosevelt's advisers are Jewish and that much more than 50 percent of the high government officials in Russia are Jewish and they certainly are not controlling the governments for the benefit of the gentiles.

The first fault I find with the above is the reader's failure to offer better evidence than the flat statement that "more than 50 percent of Roosevelt's advisers" are Jews. The same generalization, applied to Russia, demands evidence, and I insist, after careful research, that there is no evidence to support such a sweeping statement. I have already shown that there are only 30 Jews in national public life, in all Washington, and they include two members of the Supreme Court, 10 members of Congress, etc. There are no Jews in the Senate, or in the RFC, the

Federal Reserve System, U. S. Tariff Commission and other important arms of the government. There is one Jew in the President's cabinet. The "Little Cabinet," which numbers 25, does not contain a single Jew. And so on. The tales of Jewish "influence" are hitleristic propaganda, without the slightest show of evidence. Such a sweeping generalization, as is used by the above writer, and the sources from which he quotes, should give facts, figures, names, etc. The same applies to Russia, where it is a well-known fact that few Jews are connected with the committees in control of the Soviet Union. It is true that Trotsky, a Jew, helped Lenin establish the revolution, but he has been exiled by Stalin, a non-Jew. Stalin's former assistant, now Commissar of Railways, Lazar Kaganovich, and Russia's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Maxim Litvinoff, are both Jews, but there the record stops. Take these two men out of the Soviet Government and you are left without Jews in positions of importance. So there's another favorite dodge of the anti-Semites that falls to pieces once it is put to the test of careful scrutiny.

* * *

Why does James Oneal attack Oscar Ameringer's American Guardian?

Oneal is one of the war horses of the American Socialist movement, with a long record of loyal, useful services as a speaker, writer and editor. I consider him one of the best-informed labor and Socialist writers in America, and it therefore behooves us to listen carefully when he takes the trouble to warn the party regarding the activities of the Ameringer-Fred D. Warren combination in Oklahoma. It is Oneal's sensational (and uncontradicted) charge that Ameringer, after taking something like \$200,000 from the Oklahoma Socialists for the maintenance of the *Oklahoma Leader* (which was to be a Socialist party daily organ), switched from Socialism to the Ku Klux Klan and supported the great kleagle, Walton, for Governor. This was done in the face of the fact that it was Socialist money that

built up the journalistic institution and that Oklahoma then had the best Socialist organization in the United States, with good prospects of capturing the state. As a result of this switch from Socialism to Kluxism, the party was disorganized. When Oneal made this charge against Ameringer, his son announced that charges would be preferred against Oneal before the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party, but many months have passed and no attempt has been made to disprove Oneal's charges. One is, therefore, permitted to conclude that Oneal knows what he's talking about and that it would be unwise for Ameringer to bring the question into the open. In the face of such a betrayal, Oneal alleges that Ameringer's present activities in the Socialist movement may be considered as nothing more than an attempt to organize radical sentiment and then lead it astray—this time not into the fold of the K. K. K. but perhaps into the Fascism of a Coughlin type.

* * *

Please comment on Hitler's claim that Nazi-ism saved Germany and western Europe from the menace of Communism.

I have commented on this argument before, showing that when Hitler stole power in 1933, only 15 percent of the German vote was for the Communist party. New evidence comes as a result of the Free City of Danzig's election on whether or not the city should come under German, or rather Hitler, rule. The election, on April 7, 1935, showed only 6,880 Communist votes out of a total of 232,279. In the same election, the Social Democrats (Socialists) received 37,530 votes. Here is clear evidence that Communism is only one of Hitler's bogeymen. Communism never was a "menace" in Germany; it doesn't make a showing of more than three percent in Danzig. Hitler's claim that he is the "savior of civilization" and the destroyer of the "Red Menace" is plain clap-trap. A free election in Germany today wouldn't give the Communists more than five percent of the vote. The Social Dem-

ocrats, on the other hand, are factors that must be respected, as the Danzig vote clearly demonstrated, and when Germany finally frees itself from the chains of Hitlerism, it will be done by the Socialists, not the Communists. If anything, the record shows that German Communism was one of the direct causes of Hitler's Fascism, with its (Communism's) demands for dictatorship, destruction of liberty, and denials of democracy. By its policies, Communism played into the hands of reaction.

* * *

What was the cause of the Harlem riots in March, 1935?

Harlem, in New York City, is a section that contains more than a quarter of a million Negroes (the largest Negro city in the world), but its business houses, stores, saloons, bootlegging joints, etc., are manned by white employes, and in most cases are owned by whites. It is the feeling among the Negro population, and a number of its organizations, that these stores should hire colored clerks, since practically all of their trade comes from Negroes. This the majority of owners refuse to do. The riots were provoked by a trifling incident (a boy punished for stealing an article worth a few pennies) but the real reason was this resentment against racial discrimination at the hands of businessmen who profit from the Negroes. It is a mistake to describe these riots as anti-white. All during the rioting, white persons walked the streets of Harlem unmolested. The colored people were enraged against the business element and not against the white race as such. There are a few signs of improvement, but the situation in Harlem is still unsolved, being further complicated by dissension among Negro leaders, some of whom want to compromise to the extent of permitting store-owners to employ light-complected Negroes, while others insist the black ones should not be kept out of employment.

* * *

You write a great deal about the big countries, but I don't recall

anything from your pen on Switzerland, my fatherland.

Switzerland is one of the most interesting democracies in the world, probably the most advanced. It certainly stands in amazing contrast to its neighbor, Germany, which has become the madhouse of the world. Switzerland is a republic with democratic institutions that compare with the best, and in some respects are superior to any government in the world. A law can be passed in that country only by the vote of the people. Furthermore, the people have the right to initiate legislation, if they can get a sufficient number of signers to a petition. The country has its troubles, like every other land, but it certainly is not in the mood for a dictatorship.

* * *

What do important figures in European governments think of Hitler personally?

Almost to a man, they think the chief Nazi is crazy, though they can't say it openly. They are compelled to keep their mouths shut, but opinions on so intimate a question will crop up unexpectedly, though usually by inference. For example, here is a dispatch from Moscow reporting a meeting between Captain Anthony Eden, the young and brilliant English diplomat, and Stalin. Among other things, Captain Eden drops the remark: "And he (Stalin) is willing to listen and never shouts at you." When one recalls that Eden had just left Berlin where he spent many hours with Hitler, one gets the meaning of this remark about Stalin. Without saying so, Eden is telling the world that it is impossible to talk to Hitler and that he shouts down those with whom he disagrees. Such a seemingly innocent remark gives one a full-length portrait of Hitler as he goes about the mad race to plunge Europe, and perhaps the world, into a war that will make the last one look like a street brawl. Men like Eden, Sir John Simon, Litvinoff and others know what Hitler is driving at, for the leader who works out Hitler's foreign policies, Alfred Rosenberg, has outlined a Nordic

union that can be achieved only through war. Hitler's Germany, we are told, is to include Austria, Luxembourg, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and the Baltic States, with huge parts of Italy, Belgium, Czechoslovakia and France thrown in for good measure. With such aims plainly facing foreigners, is it to be wondered that their words of comment indicate their belief that Germany is ruled by a super-lunatic? Why, the fact is clear that Hitler couldn't take one acre of any of the countries he has designs on without provoking armed resistance. Every foreign statesman in Europe is scared stiff when looney Hitler's name is mentioned, for those who have met him remember his unwillingness to even hear their opinions and their ears still ring with the shouts from Hitler's hysterical throat. They see his purple face, veins distended and eyes bulging, and they rush back home to tell their associates what stark realities face them now that a great nation is in the grasp of a man who really belongs in an insane asylum.

* * *

How is it possible for men like Mellon and Morgan to make millions and still be able to evade paying their income tax?

The biggest job the government has is to make the richest men pay their full income tax. The little fellow pays to the last penny, but the Mellons and Morgans, through their knowledge of loopholes in the law, can charge off most of their profits. The favorite trick is to make fictitious sales to their holding companies or other corporations. For example, let us suppose that Mr. Mellon had 1,000 shares of stock in a coal mine, for which he paid \$1,000,000. Let us suppose that he owns a mortgage company, a holding company, a bank, or what-not. He can "sell" that \$1,000,000 worth of stock to his hand-picked "company" for \$500,000, thus establishing a "loss" of \$500,000, which he proceeds to deduct from his income tax. It was just such "sales" that served as the basis of the government's suit against Mellon for more than \$3,000,000. Mellon can go into the art capitals of

the world and buy up \$19,000,000 worth of art, but at the same time he can plead "poverty" or "losses" through phony sales to his own corporations. Mellon owns the stock, as before, except that the government has to whistle for its money, and Mellon is hard of hearing.

* * *

I appreciate the space you give to Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin, but as a Norwegian I would like to have some information regarding the status of Socialism in the Scandinavian countries.

It is an interesting fact that the three Scandinavian countries—Norway, Sweden and Denmark are now headed by Socialists, as follows: Th. Stauning, premier of Denmark; Johann Nygaardsvold, premier of Norway; Per Albin Hansson, premier of Sweden. These three countries are among the most civilized centers in all Europe. The Socialists of Norway were not able to take control of the government until March, 1935, although they won the largest number of seats in the Norwegian Storting. The election, which was held in 1933, gave the Socialists 69 seats in the Storting; Conservatives, 31; Liberal Left, 24; Agrarians, 23; Independents, 3. A coalition of those opposed to the Socialists succeeded in keeping them from the premiership, until only recently, when the non-Socialists were compelled to turn over the reins of power. All of the large cities in the Scandinavian countries (including Stockholm) are now run by Socialists. The Norwegian premier is an interesting character, having, through self-development, risen from the position of unskilled laborer to head one of the most civilized countries in the world. He once lived in the U. S., where he was a member of the Socialist party and the I. W. W.

* * *

What was, and is, the status of world trade during the last century?

By world trade we mean, of course, the system of trade which enables countries like our own, Brazil, France, England, Cuba, etc., to export the products of their

fields, factories, etc., buying, in return, the services and commodities of foreign countries.

The grand total of such world trade in 1800 was only \$1,500,000,000. Remember, please, that this represents the total of exports and imports of the entire world, as do my subsequent figures. A half century later, in 1850, the total world trade was \$4,000,000,000. The total grew, until it reached \$20,100,000,000 in 1900. The year 1913, which is important because it was to be followed by the World War, saw a trade of \$41,600,000,000. During the World War a decline set in, but later, in 1924, world trade reached \$63,900,000,000, coming to an all-time high, in 1929, of \$68,400,000,000.

Then came the depression. In 1933, world trade amounted to only \$23,700,000,000, a staggering loss. It is this decline in world trade that is contributing one of the more serious causes to another World War. A study of these figures will explain to the student why so many nations are arming as never before, in peace times. It is the notion of imperialistic capitalism that a successful war for one great capitalist nation, or group of nations, will restore world trade to them and bring them back to the days of 1929 or even better. That's the theory, but a child should know that a tenth of the world isn't going to help itself substantially by destroying the economic life of the other nine tenths. Such a victory will cause eventual bankruptcy for the victors as well as the losers.

And yet, large-scale Capitalism can't endure without world trade. It must, somehow, dispose of the surplus which its own working class produces but is not permitted to consume because of its failure to receive the full social value of its labor. The surplus, real or potential, piles up. There is either an actual over-production of goods or an over-equipment of facilities for the production of goods, and the former must be sold in world trade if the machine is to keep grinding.

The sensible solution, of course, would be to socialize the large-scale industries, have them produce for use instead of profit, and

then move into a condition of perpetual prosperity. If imperialistic capitalism were destroyed, the workers of the world would be in a position to increase their purchasing power, slowly at first but with greater speed as the machine gets oiled up, and that increased purchasing power would mean plenty for all at home, a surplus to ship to other countries (also socialized), which would exchange their commodities and thereby add luxuries to necessities.

Today, we find the workers producing coffee in Brazil, sugar in Cuba, cheese in Holland, dates in Arabia, silk in Japan, chocolate in Java, rubber in the tropics, potatoes in the Dakotas, oranges in California, wine in France, olives in Italy—and yet, all of them living in economic misery. All need what the world can produce, but all are in poverty.

Imperialistic capitalism can't keep the machine geared up. That is why it is an economic, industrial, financial, scientific necessity for the world to overthrow its capitalist system of exploitation and profiteering and turn to a system of socialized industry, distribution and exchange, with a view to making the workers of the countries I have just listed (and many others) produce to the full, knowing that all will be able to enjoy the fruits of the best skill of the world. Such a social order would mean the end of world depressions and a system of constant plenty.

But here the average person runs into a mental difficulty that discourages him. He realizes dimly that this is all a very complicated situation, and he isn't in the mood for the complex. He wants things simplified and changed in a hurry, easily, quickly, miraculously, after the manner of a magician removing a rabbit from a silk hat. Alas, these great questions are complex—extremely complex. It has taken hundreds of years for these capitalistic institutions to evolve. As they grew, they became more complicated.

To change such a system of imperialistic capitalism into democratic, libertarian, socialized indus-

try will require the best skill and intelligence the world has ever known. It is a question of science, knowledge, executive ability—tremendous problems that can't be solved with ballyhoo and clap-trap, but with patience, knowledge, facts, and the lessons of history. It doesn't take a lot of brains to smash such a civilization to bits. But that would be a crime against humanity. The system must be revolutionized—from imperialism to Socialism—but it must be done constructively, scientifically, lest we end up in utter collapse.

In such times as these, when the people of the entire world are in distress, it is easy for the charlatans of the Coughlin and Dr. Townsend type to come forward with some "simple," "sure" "cure-all" which can be applied overnight. Here is a letter on my desk, from an old man who is in distress. He wants Dr. Townsend's \$200 per month. Here he sees a simple, direct, quick solution. He can't understand anything else about economics or sociology. It must be so obvious that a child can understand it. So he asks me, in a hurt tone that touches my heart, why I don't produce a simpler, quicker, easier remedy than that of Dr. Townsend. Poor man, I can't. And that's the point of my argument. I can't, nor can a Coughlin or a Dr. Townsend.

The world isn't going to be helped by a magician who is going to bring us a quick, easy, sure road to utopia. It's going to be hard, slow and complicated, with many disappointments and trials, but the journey can be made in time, the institutions can be transformed, and real, lasting, substantial, scientific prosperity can be inaugurated, if the job is done by scientists and not by political, religious or rabble-rousing quacks.

* * *

Is there a Jewish strain in Hitler?

Newspapers in Europe have published a great deal of material on the question of Hitler's ancestry, the evidence seeming to point in that direction, though the Jews, showing good sense, refuse to press the point, for it certainly would be no compliment to them to be able

to claim him. There are many Jewish families in Poland and elsewhere which have had the name of Hitler for several hundred years.

* * *

Pelley, the Fascist anti-Semite, is distributing quotations which contain fierce attacks on the Jews, supposed to have been uttered by Benjamin Franklin. Please comment.

William Dudley Pelley, who was found guilty of fraud, and who escaped a prison term by paying a stiff fine, is up to his old tricks. As head of the Fascist Silver Shirts, Pelley is doing his worst to provoke hatred for the Jews, circulating the notorious Protocols of the Elders of Zion, which I showed up as forgeries recently, and now Pelley is palming off anti-Jewish quotations from the great Benjamin Franklin, one of the finest, civilized spirits in the entire history of our nation and a man who never permitted himself to indulge in racial hatreds. Being a skeptic in matters of religion, it was easy for Franklin to be tolerant towards minority groups, like the Jews.

Pelley's "quotations from Franklin" have been completely exposed by the famous historian, Dr. Charles A. Beard, who without a doubt is the greatest historical scholar in the United States. In an article in the March, 1935, issue of **The Jewish Frontier**, Dr. Beard charges Pelley with being guilty of forgery. He calls attention to the fact that Pelley claims he got his anti-Jewish quotations from a book of table-talk compiled by a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, Charles Pinckney. Pelley alleges that all copies of this book were destroyed by General Sherman during his march to the sea, but that one copy was saved, from which he quotes.

Now, Dr. Beard is a scientific historian, so he went about the job of tracing these quotations in a spirit of inquiry consistent with scrupulous academic standards. The Pinckney book was never written, and therefore no copies could have been destroyed by General Sherman during his march through Georgia. Dr. Beard directed inquiries

at Pelley, but found it difficult to get him to reply. Finally Pelley admitted he got the "quotations somewhere else," but when he was asked to explain what he meant by "somewhere else" he continued to be evasive. It stands to reason that if Pelley had a copy of the alleged Pinckney book he certainly would have been ready to let Dr. Beard see it and thereby verify his quotations and save his own honor. But honor means nothing to that type of swindler and liar. Writes Dr. Beard:

"All these searches have produced negative results. I cannot find a single original source that gives the slightest justification for believing that the 'prophecy' (Franklin's alleged anti-Jewish quotations) is anything more than a bare-faced forgery. Not a word have I discovered in Franklin's letters and papers expressing any such sentiments against the Jews as are ascribed to him by the Nazis—American and German. His well-known liberality in matters of religious opinion would, in fact, have precluded the kind of utterances put in his mouth by this palpable forgery."

Dr. Beard shows further that the Franklin "Prophecy" could not have been written by Franklin or anyone else in the 18th Century because it contains internal evidence of contemporary authorship, words being used that are of recent origin. Says Dr. Beard: "It contains certain words that belong to contemporary Germany rather than to America of Franklin's period."

Fascist, anti-Semitic Pelley can save his honor (pardon the word when used in connection with this hate-monger) by producing the book itself or at least a photostatic copy of the alleged quotations. But he refuses to do either, preferring to go ahead with his hate propaganda against the Jews. It is such methods that result in the horrors of a Hitler campaign of persecution. It is such "arguments" that can give us an American edition (in the person of Pelley) of the notorious German Jew-baiter and liar,

Julius Streicher, publisher and editor of **The Stormer**, the most disreputable sheet issued in all history. Streicher helped develop a wave of anti-Jewish hysteria in Germany by methods such as Pelley is using today. American scholarship and decency must be on guard to watch for such methods and expose them before they can do any real damage. All honest persons—whether Jews or not—should feel it their duty to do their best to nail these lies as they appear.

* * *

What is the meaning of the Catholic Action campaign?

A mobilization of members of the Knights of Columbus, for the purposes of Catholic Action, has been conducted by William P. Larkin, of New York City, international chairman of the movement. Mr. Larkin is president of the P. F. Collier and Son Publishing company and vice president of the Crowell Publishing company. It is common knowledge that both of these great publishing concerns belong to the Morgan banking interests. This is another tie-up that shows how Wall Street is preparing for Fascism, through the avenues of the Roman Catholic Church, because of that organization's known friendly concern for Fascism, until recently entirely limited to Central Europe, but now being expanded to include the United States, where reactionary elements will be used to destroy democracy and freedom. Catholic Action groups could easily work with Father Coughlin's National Union for Social Justice. Mr. Larkin's drive resulted in a membership increase of 50,000 men, while Father Coughlin's Union is supposed to have more than 5,000,000 members signed up for his slightly disguised program of Fascism, extreme nationalism, anti-Semitism and anti-liberalism. It appears plain now that Wall Street sees its best instrumentality in maintaining Capitalism by force is the reactionary Roman Catholic Church, which is a minority in this country but which is also the country's largest single denomination. Wall Street would not hesitate a moment about using such elements of force

and dictatorship. The situation is serious and there's no telling how soon the powers of reaction will be ready to let loose their storm, which, of course, will be swift and ruthless. Inspired by religious fanaticism and the long experience of the Catholic Church in the work of reaction, it is safe to predict that Fascism would be bloodier, more vicious and terroristic in this country than it has been anywhere in Europe, where new depths of bestiality are reached almost weekly.

* * *

Did the Catholic Church propose draft plans during the World War?

General Hugh S. Johnson, recently in charge of the NRA, and during the World War at the head of the draft machinery under President Wilson, in a speech in New York City on March 4, 1935, said: ". . . the good fathers of Georgetown University helped me work out the mechanics of the draft in 1917."

* * *

I am planning to build a small house for my family of three, for which I am able to spend about \$4,000. Can you give me a few practical hints?

I suggest that you get in touch with American Houses, Inc., before doing anything. This company, which has a 4-room model on display at Grand Central Palace, New York City, ought to be of service to you. For only \$2,500 they agree to put up an attractive house, containing four rooms (additional rooms at small increases), and it's just about the last word in modern, scientific, low-cost housing. The \$2,500 price applies only on a mass-production basis, and as I must assume that you are not located where this company could contract for a large number of dwellings, you would have to pay the single-contract price of \$3,800, all cash. (Payments can be arranged, but this brings the price up almost 75%.) This house is guaranteed to last at least 360 months. It is completely electrified, with air-conditioning in two rooms, electric refrigerator, radio, four built-in electric clocks, up-to-the-minute

kitchen, modern heating system (oil, gas or coal), and indirect lighting. It sounds too good to be true, but I have it from good sources that this concern is on the square. The house is constructed of a combination of metal and asbestos-cement, fireproof and just about indestructible. This house, shipped ready-made, is made in great parts at the factory and needs only a trained erector (the only outside worker) and four carpenters to do the work of putting it up, which shouldn't take more than three weeks. A few slight jobs must be turned over to electricians, masons (for the foundation), heating plant workers and plumbers. It is claimed that mass purchases of equipment enable savings as high as 90% on plumbing parts and outfits. Impressive savings are claimed for other forms of equipment.

* * *

What is the income of a Chinese farmer?

The Nanking University's College of Agriculture, on December 13, 1934, published a report showing that the average Chinese farmer received an annual income of only \$8.60 in U. S. money. Most of the land belongs to the rich. It's no wonder Communism is growing in China. Conditions are ripe for revolution.

* * *

I am a German, many years out of Germany, so I am curious to know how the Hitlerized text-books treat that most famous of German poems, "Lorelei," written by Heine.

The poem is still there, but, believe it or not, the Nazi lunkheads got around the problem of crediting a Jewish poet by inserting a foot-note to the effect that the author is "unknown."

* * *

What is the difference between "preface," "foreword" and "introduction"?

The Bookman's Glossary, by John Holden, says:

The "preface" is a short explanatory note preceding the text of a book and usually touching on the purpose of the book, its sources, scope, etc. "Foreword" is a substitute for

"preface." An "Introduction," however, forms part of the work itself.

* * *

Did the Jews ever enjoy the friendship of any of the great conquerors?

Three names come to mind at once—Alexander, Caesar and Napoleon. Alexander, after he conquered Palestine, attended a Jewish temple and in other ways showed a cordial spirit, so that the Jews in Jerusalem honored that amazing military genius by giving the name of Alexander to boys born during the year of his visit, which accounts for so many Alecks among the Jews. Caesar was usually willing to grant favors to the Jews; they formally mourned his death. Napoleon, again and again, showed his friendship for the Jews by doing away with a number of ghettos in the cities he conquered.

* * *

I am a workingman who has saved up \$3,000, but I have the feeling that we will soon suffer monetary inflation and my savings will become almost worthless. What can a person like myself do under such circumstances?

There is a serious menace of inflation, but no one can predict when it will come, or whether it will really visit us. If it does, your savings will, as you say, lose their purchasing power. Under such circumstances, the person who owns property instead of money is in a better position. Thus, if you were to purchase a \$3,000 home today (supposing that you don't own your own home), inflation could not harm you. In fact, your home's value would increase, in proportion to the extent of inflation. It is a serious problem, and I don't feel able to tell you just what you can do. But if I were in your position, I'd keep perhaps 10 percent of the money and put the balance into a good, saleable home.

* * *

Arthur Brisbane writes: "Los Angeles harbor is the principal shipping point in the United States to countries across the Pacific." Is he right?

I don't know what Brisbane bases his statement on, for official figures

contradict him. I refer Brisbane to the latest U. S. government report, issued under the direction of the chief of the U. S. Army Engineers, showing that San Francisco harbor cleared an annual volume of 23,717,000 tons of commerce by ship, valued at \$1,007,390,000. During the same period, Los Angeles harbor cleared 17,788,000 tons, valued at \$757,119,000. These figures include foreign and domestic trade. Foreign trade exclusively, for a year, shows San Francisco at \$183,795,000 and Los Angeles at \$81,841,000.

* * *

Was the Spanish Armada very large?

It was, for those days, but, according to Hendrik Willem Van Loon's fascinating book, **Ships, and How They Sailed the Seven Seas**, the entire fleet could have been taken on board the **Bremen**.

* * *

How do you manage to write so much and make it seem done so easily?

That's very simple. I merely go to the dictionary (which contains about 500,000 words) and pick out the ones I think I can use, stringing them together to make the sense I want to bring out. I'm reminded of what Rodin, the sculptor, said to a person who wanted to know how he did his creative work. "That's easy," he answered. "I merely grab a block of marble and chip off the parts I don't want."

* * *

Philip La Follette, Governor of Wisconsin, says: "The Socialists want collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution. If this idea were carried into action, our farmers (a farm is a 'means of production') would be deprived of the ownership of their farms and homes." Please comment.

It is the Communists, not the Socialists, who would socialize everything. The Socialist program, as I have explained many times, provides for the collective ownership and democratic management of the large-scale industries and utilities. That is quite different from socializing the holdings of small farm-

ers, peanut stands, cross-road grocery stores, cobblers, etc. Socialists would take over only those industries that are at, or near, a monopolistic stage, which means that the farmers in Governor La Follette's state could go right on owning their farms.

* * *

What is the "law of combined development"?

This doctrine was worked out mainly by Trotsky and means that it is possible for countries, however backward, to skip hundreds of years of economic development. Thus, Russia had no sooner dropped serfdom than it went through a social revolution, despite the fact that its capitalism had hardly begun to function. This was something of a blow to Marxian economics, for the great founder of scientific Socialism had held that Socialism could come only after a country, like the United States, England or Germany, had developed a sufficiently advanced system of scientific capitalistic production. Instead, the world's only really successful revolution against Capitalism came in an economically backward country, which proceeded, almost immediately, to push forward its industries, transportation, agriculture, mining, etc., (through a series of timed campaigns), and now it can be said that Russia is among the world's greatest economic powers, threatening, before long, to get near or at the lead.

* * *

Did Stalin ever explain what he means by a dictatorship of the proletariat?

In his book, **Problems of Leninism**, Stalin said there were several basic meanings, as follows:

1. The utilization of the power of the proletariat for the suppression of the exploiters, for the defense of the country, for the consolidation of the ties with the proletarians of other lands, and for the development and the victory of the revolution in all countries.
2. The utilization of the power of the proletariat in order to detach the toiling and ex-

ploited masses once and for all from the bourgeoisie, to consolidate the alliance of the proletariat with these masses, to enlist these masses in the work of socialist construction, and to assure the state leadership of these masses by the proletariat.

3. The utilization of the power of the proletariat for the organization of socialism, for the abolition of classes, and for the transition to a society without a state.

* * *

Press reports say that Hitler's axemen have introduced humanitarian refinements into the gory job of beheading. Just how?

One of the esthetic, delicate advancements introduced in this Hitlerian era of science and culture is the discovery that a head can be chopped off with comparative painlessness by first icing the axe. Isn't civilization, as developed in Germany, wonderful?

* * *

Is it a fact that the bank that is my depository has legal grounds for considering this money as not really a deposit but something in the nature of a loan?

You probably refer to the fine print found on all deposit slips, in which a number of routine conditions are stated, but which now includes (hidden in its innards) the following significant words: "This bank will not be liable for default or negligence of its duly accepted correspondents, etc." Just what does this mean? In brief, here's the situation: An insignificant portion of a bank's deposits are kept on hand. The bulk of a bank's money will be found on deposit with a "correspondent" (a large bank in a large city), and **should that bank (your bank's correspondent) fail, you could not hold your bank responsible.** Let us imagine, for the sake of an illustration, that your bank has \$15,000 cash in its vaults, \$100,000 in loans and \$115,000 on deposit with its correspondent. If that correspondent goes broke, your bank's assets immediately drop \$115,000, so that your depository has only \$15,000 in cash and \$100,000 in

loans to pay off \$230,000 of depositors' liabilities. In other words, your bank balance has, at one swoop, been cut in half, with a chance of further slashing when the bank attempts to realize on its loans, many of which may or may not be collectible items. This, of course, the bank can't do, so you are made the goat. The bank's money with the correspondent is considered **your money in case of default**, in which case your money goes down the sewer. The bank, according to its printed deposit slip, which you have legally accepted, can politely but firmly inform you that your \$500 bank balance is now only \$250, or even less and you can't do a thing about it, if the officials demand the right to apply the clear, legal terms that you accepted when you filled out your deposit slip. You have, against your will, or perhaps because of ignorance, become an innocent investor in the bank—that is to say, you share the bank's risks but enjoy none of its profits. Another bank panic would find the public holding the sack. This is just one more reason for taking your money to the postal savings system, where you can't lose. If the government's correspondent (the private bank in which it deposits your money) were to default, you wouldn't have to worry, because Uncle Sam would still see to it that you got a hundred cents on the dollar. **You can't be legally sure of that when you leave your money with a private bank.** Of course, those who are in business have to do a certain amount of business with the banks, but it is wise to keep such dealings down to an irreducible minimum. Persons not in business can keep away from the banks entirely, placing their savings in the postal system and paying bills in cash or postal money orders. Of course, you will have to pay the postoffice a small fee for your money order, but that is an entirely reasonable charge, while the service charges fixed by the banks against both the person who writes a check and the person who cashes it are so high (including the additional numerous service charges fixed by the banks) that it

is, in reality, actually cheaper and a good deal safer to do one's out-of-town business entirely through postal money orders or cash. In my own business I notice that fewer and fewer persons are writing checks, while the volume of postal money orders and cash is growing. The people are gradually learning to stay away from the banks and thereby keep their balance from being tapped or perhaps even lost entirely.

* * *

How are Bible sales holding up?

In 1931, there were 4,676,000 copies printed in the U. S. Only 666,000 were printed in 1933, so it looks as though Old Man Depression doesn't even except the holy words of Jehovah.

* * *

What's your opinion of Nelson Eddy?

Having heard him in recital and in his first movie, I thought his voice was more than pleasing, but he's a long way from giving Lawrence Tibbett any real competition, though he's far handsomer and carries from 9.90 to 12.4 percent more emotional thrill for the ladies.

* * *

Do defendants charged with lynching stand much of a chance of being convicted?

Prof. J. H. Chadbourn, of the University of North Carolina, in his recent book, **Lynching and the Law**, shows that a mere eight-tenths of one percent of prisoners charged with lynch murders have been convicted, since 1889.

* * *

What is Blanquism?

Louis Blanc's theory of working class strategy (Blanquism) held that industrial and political power should be captured by a minority. Lenin fought the Blanquists tirelessly, his correct position being that a **coup** was worthless—that power must be taken by a well-organized majority of the proletarian soldiers, workers and farmers.

* * *

Is it true that Canada has no Prime Minister?

Technically, there is no such official. The statutes of Canada nowhere refer to a Prime Minister,

though they do mention, in a few places, a First Minister. The official documents of the House of Commons and the Senate speak always of a First Minister, but common usage placidly insists on Prime Minister.

* * *

Did Lincoln ever believe in dictatorship?

No. He never said a word against the philosophy of Democracy. Here's one of Lincoln's sayings: "No man is wise and good enough to be trusted with irresponsible power over other men." Socialists would prefer to add the thought that it is just as undesirable for a class, bloc or group to exercise dictatorship over the masses who do the work of the world.

* * *

What are "political bedfellows"?

John Garland Pollard, former Governor of Virginia, defines them as "those who like the same bunk," which is a pretty fair pun. This author of many shrewd definitions and characterizations is compiling a book which he will call **A Connotary**, from which he offers a few excellent samples which I'm glad to pass on:

"A politician is one who stands for what he thinks the voters will stand for."

"The New Deal: 'Dictated but not red.'"

"The Supreme Court is a tribunal which corrects the errors of lower courts and perpetuates its own."

* * *

I have just read that the Jews plan to rule the world gold market from Jerusalem. Please comment.

You have met up with some of the silly propaganda that is being circulated by anti-Semites of the Father Coughlin type, though the point you discuss is something of a variation on what the Detroit Rasputin usually hands out. Just how the Jews in Palestine are going to go about ruling the world gold market I don't know, nor do the writers of such inane charges go into details. With most of the gold belonging to the governments of France, England, Switzerland, the U. S. A., the Soviet Union and

others, it is rather puzzling to figure out how the Jews in Palestine are going to gobble it up, especially in view of the fact that the entire wealth of Palestine amounts to about half the wealth of Peoria, Ill.

* * *

If the Zionists are not responsible for the Protocols then what is the purpose of their activity?

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion have been exposed as rank fakes. This "document," which is supposed to refer to an international Jewish plot to gain control of all governments, is used by anti-Semites to serve their purpose of racial discrimination, even though they know they are using falsehoods and forgeries. The Zionists are organized to establish a national home in Palestine, which is in itself an argument against the Protocols, for if the Zionists aimed at world control they certainly wouldn't be wasting their time, money and energies to establish their own government in Palestine.

* * *

What is the best way to achieve self-education?

As you live in a large city, you can easily avail yourself of three mediums. You can read, converse and attend lectures. All three are important, but reading is undoubtedly the direct way. If you were living in a small community, I'd have to leave out the lectures, and in many cases even the conversation. But even there you would still find readily available that great road to self-education—the reading of good literature. The culture of the world—past and present—is waiting for you, if you will feast your mind on good books and other publications. It isn't easy to achieve self-education, but it certainly can be done. While there are difficulties, there are also many rare and beautiful pleasures. It is possible for a person of limited formal education to understand intelligently the greatest branches of learning, history, science, philosophy, poetry, literature, plays, Free-thought, etc. This doesn't mean you must master each branch of sci-

ence. There are about 40 different sciences, and it would be absurd to try to master them. That is impossible because they cover such wide ranges. Nor do you want to master one of them, for that is the job of the specialist. As a self-educated person you should aim to know the meaning of all branches of study, being careful to study only their outlines and general meanings. For example, one book on biology, carefully selected, should be enough for your needs. Do not be afraid to trust some able popularizer. He will save you many a misstep. A popularizer like Jos. McCabe can give you the general outlines of history, philosophy, botany, psychology, evolution, geology, astronomy, physiology, etc., and make each step of the way pleasant, entertaining, instructive, authoritative, accurate and self-developing. Good reading—that is the key to self-education.

* * *

What is the attitude of the Socialist party toward the Townsend Plan?

In a formal statement the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party said: "While the Townsend Clubs are not Fascist in spirit, they are for the most part transient and futile, and their proposal to finance pensions by a sales tax is, of course, utterly repugnant to Socialist theory." At the same time the committee declared:

"To the masses of the American people it is becoming increasingly clear that the New Deal cannot fulfill its promise to end their suffering without any serious disturbance to their accustomed economic system, Capitalism. The predictable result is the appearance of numerous movements making still more fantastic promises of painless cure, based upon still more puerile and impossible economics than those of the New Deal.

"The majority of these movements are strongly tinged with Fascism, or at least with ideas similar to those which marked the early stages of the Fascist

movements now rampant in Europe. Because of their extravagant promises, they are making a tremendous, though doubtless temporary, appeal to the masses, and Socialists are frequently tempted to offer their cooperation, either because they have been confused by some superficial resemblance between the aims of these movements and those of true Socialism or in the hopes of capturing the movement or winning converts to Socialism.

"The N. E. C. issues an emphatic warning against such tactics. There can be no short cut to Socialism, and any diversion of energy into such channels will only confuse and embarrass the Socialist movement, leading to endless disputes, misunderstandings, and disappointments. Utopia, Inc., Share the Wealth, and the National Union for Social Justice are not only futile but dangerous because of their Fascist tendencies, and we declare that connection with any of these organizations is to be regarded as conduct unbecoming a Socialist."

* * *

What did that Englishman mean when he said the Rhine River is now England's first line of defense?

In the past, it has been the custom to refer to the English Channel as the island's first line of defense. But when Stanley Baldwin, now prime minister, put it at the Rhine, he had in mind the fact that aerial warfare has established new conditions. He undoubtedly held that a German air fleet over Belgium and France could not be stopped very well before it made the short hop over the channel. England also feels that John Bull will be made the special target for Hitler's bacteriological warfare, by virtue of the fact that dropping germs on the continent would endanger Germany itself, while such offensive tactics in England might limit the deadly diseases to the population of the island, though this is an assumption on which it

would be wise not to bank too much. The great flu epidemic of 1918 visited the entire world, including the remote settlements in Arctic Canada and Alaska.

* * *

I reject the germ theory of disease as being without scientific proof. Please comment.

Let me quote a few sentences from Dr. William Robinson, as follows:

"He who denies the role of germs as a cause of many diseases puts himself exactly on the same level as the man who claims that the earth is flat and does not move—exactly on the same level. In some respects, he puts himself even mentally lower, because the anti-Gallean and the anti-Copernician cannot see the roundness of the earth and its motion, while the action of germs in causing disease can be visibly demonstrated to the lowest intellect."

That's strong language, but I feel the doctor is justified in expressing himself so vigorously.

* * *

Is Clarence Darrow religious?

Clarence Darrow is anti-religious, a Materialist. In an interview, he said: "I am no longer in doubt. I know now that there is nothing after death—nothing to look forward to in joy or in fear."

He refuses to call himself an Agnostic. "I am a Materialist. It took me more than 50 years to find that out."

Discussing Theism, he said: "All my life I have been seeking some definite proof of God—something I could put my finger on and say 'this is a fact.' But my doubts are at rest now. I know that such a fact does not exist."

Regarding immortality, he gave this opinion: "When I die—as I shall soon—my body will decay. My mind will decay and my intellect will be gone. My soul? There is no such thing."

He prefers to describe himself as a Materialist, rather than an Atheist, though, of course, there is virtually no difference. "I don't like

that word Atheism," he explained. "It has been so badly twisted. I'd rather say I am a Materialist."

"There is no evidence under the sun of a supernatural power. The universe is simply a product of evolution, just as man is," he said.

There are many Atheists who call themselves Materialists, or Rationalists, or Freethinkers, or even Agnostics, to take the "curse" off that "twisted word, Atheism," but that doesn't alter the fact that they are, like Darrow, supporters of the philosophy of Atheism. As I've explained many times before, Atheism is a critical examination, and rejection, of the assumptions of Theism.

* * *

Rev. Gerald B. Winrod writes in his magazine, "The Defender": "If Lenin was not a Jew, why should his children have spoken Yiddish?" Please comment.

This preacher Winrod is one of the leaders of the anti-Semitic movement in the U. S., his main stock-in-trade being the thoroughly discredited Protocols of the Elders of Zion, a forgery which has been exposed hundreds of times but which continues to serve hate-mongers like Winrod, a typical Fundamentalist and disseminator of lies against a persecuted minority. One of his pet subjects is "Jewish control" of the Soviet Union, a "fact" exposed many times as being without authority. In the case of Lenin, the reason his children never spoke Yiddish is because he never had any children.

A real, professional liar who has any sort of a following will go right ahead spreading his lies, even when they are discredited, because he knows the corrections will appeal only to the thinking part of the population, while he is still able to reach out and influence the unthinking majority who, through no fault of their own, are the easy victims of these charlatans. A dressed up lie, as served by a Winrod, is always more exciting than drab, matter-of-fact accuracy, which makes it so much easier for the provokers of racial and theological

hate to function. Leaders of religious groups are notoriously successful in spreading intellectual poison-gas. Or is it, to take the snappy phrase of a Washington politician, a case of "halitosis of the intellect"?

* * *

It is argued, in support of lynch law, that such summary treatment of Negro criminals is necessary because of the slowness of the courts. Please comment.

This statement is exploited by believers in lynching, but the facts explode the argument. The best answer is the obvious fact that most lynchings take place in those states where the Negroes receive rapid and harsh legal punishment. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People reports as follows:

"In 10 southern states, from June, 1930, to July, 1931, there were 81 executions: 13 whites and 68 Negroes. In 12 southern states, for the same period, 669 life sentences were given: 199 to whites and 470 to Negroes. In South Carolina, from 1920 to 1926, 64.1 percent of Negroes charged with murder or manslaughter were found guilty, while a similar percentage for whites was 31.7 percent."

The statement adds that "this is the only nation in the civilized world which permits the hanging, shooting and burning alive of human beings by mobs as a public spectacle without interference by law enforcement officials."

* * *

What's a Harlem diet?

You pick your teeth and drink a glass of water.

* * *

Please comment on the slogan: "Let the Sales Tax abolish Tax Sales."

This tricky argument shouldn't deceive the small home owners. It has been shown that such a home owner, who has a home worth from \$2,000 to \$4,000, will pay more through a sales tax if he has an income anywhere from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per year. The sales tax will be 100 percent more than the property

tax, though the latter seems harder to pay because it must be raised in a lump sum while the former is paid "painlessly" every day of the year. If small home taxpayers were permitted to pay their tax bill in monthly installments the amount would then be comparatively "painless." Beware of that deceptive slogan. It is intended to switch the burdens of government to the pocketbook of the small home owners and other mass consumers.

* * *

If you had to make a choice between living in Russia or the U. S., which would you choose?

The U. S. A.

* * *

Can you explain why it is that Hitler, who is such an obvious enemy of labor, can get Germany's working class to honor his policies, as they did on May 1?

There is no evidence that labor "honored" Nazism on May Day. As Hitler is in control of all means of communication—billboards, radio, press, meeting places, etc.—it's no wonder he can drum up a vast audience every time he puts on a show. But see what happened in Munich, Hitler's home city. On May 1, 1935, Hitler's henchmen had to cancel the Labor Front demonstration because they couldn't get enough workmen to march in the parade. The Associated Press reported: "It was said many workers refused point blank to spend the holiday marching. . . . The Labor Front management called off the festivities. . . . Few workers appeared at the rallying points from which they were expected to march."

That is good news to every lover of freedom and decency throughout the civilized world. Hitler's speech, which was delivered in Berlin, contained the usual flowery phrases—about unity, honor, "we are members of one people as ordained by God," etc.—but not a word about the things that are important to the workers. They want to hear less oratory and more plain statements about employment, commerce, foreign trade, civil rights, purchasing power, the cost of liv-

ing, wages, and other material things that count. "They want facts, but they are given poetry. They want social security, but are told how "honorable" it is to be a German.

Hitler may tell them they are a "united" people, but they know full well they are "united" because Hitler has machine guns trained on them. Remove the threats of force and see how long Germany will be "united" for Hitlerism. When put to the test, Hitler found that the workmen refused even to march in his honor. It is these workmen who will eventually take action, and when they do that, Hitler will find that Germany has formed real unity against Fascist banditry.

* * *

What is the political philosophy of the Christian Science Monitor?

It has always been a thoroughly capitalistic sheet, but now we must add that it is a supporter of monarchy. Perhaps for the first time in the history of this nation, an American newspaper issued a large, special section devoted to Britain's royalty. The *Monitor's* April 17, 1935, issue contains a section of 16 pages extolling King George. In it one finds perhaps 100,000 words of disgusting praise for the figurehead of British imperialism. The king, "by the grace of God," who personifies British exploitation and collective robbery in India, the Gold Coast, South West Africa, Nigeria, Gambia, Kenya, Western Samoa, Southern Rhodesia, British Guiana and other parts of the capitalistic empire, is painted as a great and noble friend of humanity. Incidentally, about half of this section is taken up with expensive advertising, paid for by British corporations, banks, department stores, hotels, manufacturers, etc., which is in keeping with Christian Science's eternal toadying to the rich and the powerful.

* * *

I was surprised to read that the N. Y. Socialists, in their May Day parade, carried the American flag and permitted their bands to play the national anthem. You'll have to admit that the more revolution-

ary Communists would never stoop to such inconsistencies.

There is no reason why the Socialists should not carry both the red flag, which symbolizes the international brotherhood of man, and the American flag, which symbolizes the best traditions of America, embracing the revolutionary fathers of the nation, the libertarianism of Abraham Lincoln and the present manifestation of true Americanism which fights Fascism, repression, racial intolerance, and supports the civilized ideas of free thought, press, speech and the right to meet and discuss social, political, governmental and cultural problems.

Your remark about "the more revolutionary Communists" brought a smile to this scribbler. It happens that I have read about the Communist parade in New York City, on May 1, 1935, and, while it permitted no American flags or the singing of the Star-Spangled Banner, it did make room in its line of march for 2,000 Negro followers of Father Divine. They were dressed as "angels," which means they marched through the streets garbed in white cheesecloth, with Father Divine at the head of their section, sitting in a Rolls Royce limousine, driven by a liveried chauffeur. And that isn't all. What I'll now tell about deserves a better pen than mine. Gilbert and Sullivan could do fuller justice to the delightful show these angels and cupids, led by "God" himself, put on in a Communist parade, of all places. Here are some of the banners these dark-skinned dupes carried:

"Father Divine is God."

"Father Divine is the lily of the valley."

"Father Divine is the light of the world and the bright and shining star."

"There is no space where Father Divine is not."

"God has truly come to earth, Father Divine."

"Over 20,000,000 people can't be wrong. Thank you, father."

What a comedy this would make! Fancy Karl Marx and Lenin on the reviewing stand, watching the

"revolutionary" paraders pass by, and then picture, if you can, their bewilderment on seeing Father Divine and his outfit carrying the above absurd banners! I wonder what they'd say to Comrades Browder and Foster?

* * *

What is the tithe war in England?

England still endures tithes, a form of church exploitation that compels farmers to pay one-tenth of their income to the clergy. Farmers in Norfolk, Suffolk and Kent counties, finding themselves unable to pay the clerical parasites, have been revolting against this legalized form of extortion. The law, which is still enforced, permits the church to order sheriffs and their deputies to attach crops, cattle and other chattels to satisfy the claims of the preachers, who insist on their 10 percent. The Associated Press, on April 14, 1935, reported a case of a poor widow, in the Romney Marsh district, who, while sick in bed, saw the police confiscate all but two of her cows. A neighboring farmer's haystack and three heifers were seized for sale at public auction, the payments to be turned over to the rich church treasury. Attempts to reach the cleric were frustrated by the police, who at last permitted two of the 60 farmer committeemen to talk with the churchman, but with no results, because he insisted on his legal right to the tithe. Hundreds of farmers make futile attempts to resist the police, one of their favorite devices being to throw themselves on the ground in front of the loaded trucks that are leaving farms where chattels have been taken by force, but the police merely cut their way around them and make their way to the town market. Tithes have an ancient history, going back to Babylonian, Persian, Arabian, Egyptian, Grecian and Roman times. Until about two centuries ago, the English farmers were compelled to surrender the entire profit of the first year's operation and then pay 10 percent thereafter. The theory of the English tithe is that God gives the farmer his crop or the animals that live off his soil,

and it is only natural that the farmer should show his gratitude by giving a tenth of this increase to God's own representatives—the preachers—for otherwise God might grow angry and curse the land, thereby bringing famine and drought. Each year the farmers rebel against this clerical hold-up, but the law is still there and the clergymen refuse to give in. The pious parasites must have their graft, which they will take by law, if they have the power to write and enforce such a statute, or, lacking the support of the state, they will beg their way, though they prefer the former, because it's easier, surer, and more dignified.”

* * *

What are the facts regarding Japan's threatening invasion of our domestic markets, particularly in textiles?

The figures prove there isn't the least cause for alarm, even in textiles. Japan is buying far more goods from us than it is selling us. Such a good customer certainly shouldn't be driven away, and as for buying from that country, we should increase our purchases instead of decreasing them. In 1934, Japan bought goods worth 49,704,000 yen more than it sold us, an unfavorable trade balance that stands in contrast to Japan's favorable trade balance of 172,746,000 yen in 1929.

Our textile interests are making strong protests to President Roosevelt because Japan, in February, 1935, shipped into our country a total of 4,000,000 yards of cotton textiles, but this volume is slight—only seven-tenths of one percent of our own production, for the same month.

In other fields the volume of Japanese trade in the U. S. is even smaller, though to hear the howls let out by our high tariff propagandists one would imagine the country was being flooded with Japanese commodities. Our electric bulb manufacturers have been particularly vociferous because of Japanese competition in this field, but here again the figures tell a different story. In 1933, we bought

only \$791,000 worth of bulbs from Japan. The total for 1934 was but \$833,000. It isn't the quantity that bothered our manufacturers, but rather the low price, which caused much comment from the consumers. As a result of this healthy competition, American bulbs are now being offered as low as 15 cents each, for a popular brand, and even this price is too high.

During 1934, we bought from Japan only \$2,657,000 worth of chinaware; \$1,204,000 of straw hats; \$280,000 of dolls, and \$1,280,000 of other toys; \$114,000 of lead pencils; \$638,000 of brushes. Such purchases are not excessive; in fact, they could, and should, be increased. We can't expect to sell Japan goods worth 398,928,000 yen, as we did in 1934, without spending something in return. We used to be Japan's best customer for its fine silk, but that industry has almost been killed by the crisis and the development of rayon. Before 1929, we bought great quantities of silk from Japan and in return sold it our cotton, but the silk market is dead now, with its price down about 75 percent.

If we stop buying from Japan, we'll have to expect to lose Japan as a customer, and we can't afford to do that. President Roosevelt has wisely refused to permit the high tariff crowd to panic him into shutting out Japanese goods.

* * *

What is the attitude of the religious press towards the frequently exposed Protocols of the Elders of Zion?

The low-brow press—such as **The Defender**, edited by the Rev. Winrod—keeps circulating these charges of a Jewish world hegemony. Such preacher-editors keep their ignorant followers in a state of hysteria, thereby increasing their own profit and influence. On the other hand, the more intelligent church press accepts the plain fact that these Protocols are forgeries. **The Christian Century** and the **Christian Science Monitor**, for example, condemn the use of these so-called Zion Protocols. In its issue of April 30, 1935, the **Christian Science**

Monitor printed a dispatch from its Berne, Switzerland, correspondent, from which I quote:

"Everybody who has studied the matter is aware that the documents, which have played an extraordinary historic role and are still influencing national and international policy, are faked. The case was conclusively proved when the original—a purely fictitious work which the compilers had copied—was discovered by a correspondent of the **London Times**. The exposure (of the Protocols) was complete. But the public at large doubtless remained in ignorance. . . ."

A Rev. Winrod, when he meets a statement like the above, smiles, for he knows it can have no influence on the great body of his readers, who are steeped in superstition and Fundamentalism, ready to persecute an innocent minority. The article from which I have just quoted contains further interesting and valuable suggestions, as follows:

"It is on these documents that most of the anti-Semitic propaganda has, more or less consciously, been based in recent years. It is so based today, in Germany and other countries. Obviously if it be true that the directors of Jewry are plotting an immense movement, and are carrying out with cunning and with skill a scheme which will smash the existing system of society, and place them in supreme power, than anti-Semitism might seem to be justified.

"But the whole argument breaks down not only on the denials of Jewish leaders, and the obvious division of Jewish opinion on political subjects, but on the discredited origins of the Protocols. . . .

"It seems impossible that anyone who, like this correspondent, has examined the text of the Protocols and the text of a forgotten pamphlet directed in 1864 against the French Emperor Napoleon III, can have any doubt that the

Protocols have been 'inspired' by the pamphlet. The satirical publication was entitled 'Dialogue in Hades Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu'; it was written by a lawyer named Maurice Joly. Naturally it fell into oblivion when Napoleon was overthrown.

"Extracts from each, set side by side, are absolutely convincing. The necessary transformations are, of course, undertaken. Chiefly Machiavelli, with his reasoning, becomes the Elders of Zion. . . ."

So far as I know, Father Coughlin has never made use of these discredited Protocols when he pursues his disgracefully bigoted anti-Semitism as a part of his program of Catholic-Fascism, but I certainly wouldn't be surprised if his type of Fascist leader, considering that he is so closely modeled after Hitler, would, in time, use them as an excuse for a great wave of racial persecution in this country. Forgeries are favorite weapons in wars of racial hatred, or in religious strife. The history of sectarian warfare is crowded with manufactured evidence. For example, during the recent K. K. K. hysteria in this country, when 100 percent Protestants turned their guns on Catholics, they circulated millions of copies of a forgery which was known throughout the land as "The Oath of the Knights of Columbus." At the time, I wrote several articles exposing this oath, as I've done more recently in exposing the fake Protocols. In my discussions of Catholic-Fascism, especially as it presents itself in the form of Coughlinism, I have been scrupulously careful about my sources, quoting only what I felt sure was reliable data. I make mistakes, like everyone else, but when I get the correct information I give complete expression to the truth. But these hate-mongers, like the Rev. Winrod, proceed with their lying even after they know they are disseminating falsehoods. This country, like the rest of the world, is in serious need of accurate, reliable, honest, sincere and

fearless sources of information and organs of opinion.

Is there any evidence to show that the Russian government enforces its laws against acts of racial persecution?

That this law is not a dead letter is shown by a despatch from Moscow, dated March 29, 1935, which reports that five workers in a canning factory in the Ukraine were sentenced to prison for anti-Semitism and for molesting Jewish workers. Three of these prisoners will be sent to Siberia after they finish their prison terms. All five prisoners have been expelled from their labor union. During the trial a formal demand was made to put the factory management on trial for tolerating anti-Semitic activities.

How many beggars are there in Russia?

Before the war, there were 1,000,000. Ten years ago, there were about 150,000. Today there are about 40,000.

Please comment on Hitler's statement that he must rearm Germany because of danger of invasion from Russia.

Hitler's own official newspapers, issued only a few days before he announced his reason for establishing a great army of conscripts, give the lie to this war maniac. These papers plainly say that Germany must rearm because Hitler aims to expand to the East at the expense of the Soviet Union. This, written in 1935, proves Hitler's intentions are aggressive, not defensive. Anyone with the slightest knowledge of what is going on in Europe feels certain that it is against Russian policy to embark on any kind of an aggressive war. Russia has no territorial ambitions. All it seeks is peace and security.

How much territory did Russia lose since the World War?

Her losses were as follows: Latvia, Esthonia, Finland, Lithuania, Poland, Bessarabia and the Kars region. The last named was ceded to

Turkey. Bessarabia was grabbed by Rumania. These provinces contained about 25,000,000 people.

DR. W. J. ROBINSON IS DEAD

Dr. William J. Robinson, distinguished editor, author and urologist, died at his office in New York City on January 6, 1936, in his 66th year. A heart attack was the cause of his death. Dr. Robinson edited a brilliant, informative, useful magazine, "The Critic and Guide," and wrote upwards of 30 books on scientific, philosophical and medical subjects.

Dr. Robinson was a great fighter for civilized standards and social justice. A great hater of shams and frauds, he was given to attacking charlatans with a gusto that usually thrilled and amazed his many readers.

During the World War he fought against America's participation in that senseless conflict, and at one time was arrested under the Espionage Act because of his forthright utterances in favor of peace. In recent years he wrote hundreds of effective attacks on Nazism and Fascism. Hitler was his pet aversion. He loathed all forms of racial and national persecution.

A great believer in birth control, Dr. Robinson was a pioneer in this movement, fighting for his ideal of sexual enlightenment during the years when such educational work was dangerous. He was ever ready to support unpopular causes. In the world of religion, Dr. Robinson was a sincere, firm Atheist. He wrote one book and numerous articles in support of Freethought.

The realms of science and education have lost a brave soldier, a keen, enlightened student, an admirable commentator, and a debater who knew how to put his full strength behind his intellectual blows.

The world will long miss Dr. Robinson.

I'm with you in your educational campaign to develop sentiment in favor of nationalized banking. Is there any way in which we readers can help?

One of my most valued subscribers, Homer M. Green, of Middletown, N. Y.—a dirt farmer who writes sensible, sane letters to the newspapers—helped in the work by writing a short letter which the *New York Times* printed on its editorial page, November 29, 1935. Subscriber Green caught almost every point of our

banking policy in a few short sentences, which I'm glad to reprint below:

"As there is now over a billion dollars of the people's money on deposit in the government's postal savings, why not raise the cash limit from \$2,500 to \$5,000 and at the same time grant that branch of the government full commercial facilities, including the clearing of checks?

"This should be done at once, 'cause them banking boys at their recent annual convention in New Orleans showed a decided animus toward the present administration, which has helped them so greatly of late, by heck."

Other readers could prepare letters on the same subject for use in their local newspapers. In addition, they should write to their Congressman and Senators, with a copy going to the White House. And then, of course, remember what I've been pounding at so long—do as little business as possible with the banks. The service charges are outrageous. You can escape them by paying your bills with cash, postal money orders, or postage stamps. The mails are safe. Don't be afraid to trust the boys who run Uncle Sam's postoffice. They're honest and efficient.

* * *

So far as I can recall, all your reports on Soviet Russia's production are based on the heavy industries. Have you any figures dealing with the light industries?

The figures for 1935 indicate increases right down the line in light industry, except vodka, which declined 9,510,000 quarts over 1934. Meat production increased by 79,000 tons; butter by 11,000 tons. Face powder production, 40,000,000 boxes; tooth-powder, 50 percent gain; laundry soap, 13,000-ton increase. During 1936, a perfume and cosmetic factory will be erected at a cost of 75,000,000 rubles.

* * *

By what process would the leaders of industry be chosen under a Socialist regime?

In a Socialist society, the large-scale industries—including distribution and communication—would be socially owned and democratically managed, or operated. In other words, private ownership would make way for collectivization, and industrial au-

torocracy would be turned into industrial democracy.

There was a time when all political institutions were autocratic—ruled absolutely from the top. The democratic principle destroyed this regime in the most enlightened countries, and proof of the benefits of the change will be found in the better economic, social, political, cultural, physical and mental status of the people. Political democracy, with all its faults, is better than political autocracy, or, as it's called in these days, Fascism. The facts demonstrate that. But, this political democracy, joined to industrial autocracy—in which the instruments of large-scale production are ruled from the top—causes an unjust, unscientific, unbalanced social order. American Capitalism, which is tyranny in industry wedded to democracy in politics, can't produce in an orderly way because it is motivated only with a view to serving the profit-seeking top-rulers.

Socialism would extend democracy from politics to economics. That, in broad outline, is the policy aimed at. Details must always be worked out when the issues arise for solution. The Abolitionists came out against chattel slavery—as a broad generalization—but they left the details of emancipation to be solved when the situation reached the point where remedies were ready to be applied. That's the common-sense attitude to take when dealing in mass movements. We must always beware of cut-and-dried schemes, worked out to the last comma, because such solutions have to meet the tests of realistic conditions.

The Socialist wants industrial democracy, in much the same spirit that the great political libertarians of the 18th Century wanted political democracy. Just what steps will be taken no one knows, though many are always ready to suggest working models. But such blue-prints of the future are only another form of utopianism. It may be that when the industries are socialized, the workers, who best know their trades and industries, may vote for their superintendents and upper officials. It seems fairly logical to assume that that might be one of the methods, though it doesn't necessarily follow that the same method need be followed in every

industry. For example, let us take the postoffice department today. The quarter of a million postal workers could pick a better set of upper officials by democratic methods than could the chairman of a political party who is out to reward those who were able to drum up the most votes for the party in power. I am inclined to believe, from careful observation, that the postal workers—a keen, intelligent, efficient, honest lot—could improve every branch of the service if they were to apply themselves to the problem of doing away with party politics and electing from their own ranks the postmasters, superintendents, etc., who are to be in charge. There might be mistakes, but in the end the method would be a great improvement on present partisanship.

The important thing now is to establish the broad principle of industrial democracy. The details can be worked out later.

* * *

Is there any form of animal life that never rests or sleeps?

The only bit of information I have on this point is a clipping from the *London Times*, which says:

“A shark never sleeps, never lets up his ceaseless swimming through the sea. From the minute he is born he must keep that great tail moving, fins fanning, and his ugly face constantly on the watch for food.”

* * *

How many bushels of wheat from this year's crop should be stored as a safety against the crop of 1936?

Under Capitalism, with the great grain elevators and mills belonging to a small class, it's desirable to store as little as possible, because that would make for higher prices, regardless of the fact that there may not be a sufficiency. The members of the boards of trade hope for shortages, in order to boost their holdings. On the other hand, the consumer wants enough of a surplus to enable him to obtain flour, or bread, at prices he can afford to pay. The farmer produces in the hope that others will produce less so that he will get more. These paradoxes make Capitalism fundamentally unsound.

The farmer welcomes the chinch bugs in his neighbors' crops. The capitalistic government pays some farmers to produce less. The boards

of trade register great increases in quotations when there are reports of droughts, hail storms, pestilence, etc. A good crop report sends prices down. The whole jumble is economic madness.

The job of producing wheat should be a social one, and its end should be the feeding of the people. Under a system of large-scale, socialized farming, granting the full development of a Socialist system of production, over-production of wheat would be a cause for rejoicing, for it would mean that a bad crop next year wouldn't cause distress. The wheat would be produced as generously as possible, because those employed at this work would be creating social values which they would be able to exchange for the products of other industries. The motive would be to produce more wheat, without regard to the profit motives of speculators or capitalistic-minded farmers. There would then be no motive for plowing under grain. The regime would want still more grain as social insurance against the possibilities of bad years to come. If it should happen that more was produced than could possibly be consumed, then it would be a signal for a general stoppage for a certain period, during which the producers would continue to enjoy the social values they had created.

* * *

How would the percentage of wages of the workers be determined under a Socialist government?

When a Socialist regime succeeds in establishing the policy of collective ownership of the large-scale facilities of production, etc., it follows, logically, that the purpose of production will be to satisfy the needs of the people instead of piling up profits for the capitalistic owners. There being no motive to exploit, it follows that the socialistic policy of “wages” would be on the basis of the full social value of what the worker produced. He would have the right to consume the products of other industries, or his own, to the extent that he produced things or services of value to society, minus, of course, such elements as social insurance, pensions for the aged, hospitalization, depreciation, etc.

This point marks one of the serious differences between Socialism and Communism. Where Socialism, as

stated, holds for the principle of giving each worker the full social value of his labor, the Communists, theoretically, hold that the worker should render such services as he is able, in return for which he is to take out of society whatever he may need. In an ideal social state, with limitless facilities for production, I fail to see how Communism could be a mistake, but such a social order belongs to the distant, remote future. The immediate problem is socialization, which the Socialist would operate on the basis of strict production for use, added to the policy of rewarding only those who serve the community, to the extent that their efforts are productive and useful.

In a recent Freeman you called Paine's Age of Reason a mind-liberating book. In this I agree with you and would be very thankful if you would list the names of a dozen books of the same mind-awakening caliber.

Giving only my personal opinion, I'd offer the following mind-liberating books: 1. Thomas Paine's Age of Reason. 2. Joseph McCabe's little blue books on religion. 3. Ingersoll's Lectures. 4. Descartes' Discourse On Method. 5. Gibbon's two famous chapters on Christianity. 6. Nietzsche's The Antichrist. 7. Baron D'Holbach's System of Nature. 8. Lucretius' On the Nature of Things. 9. Voltaire's Candide. 10. Charles Darwin's works on Biology. 11. Prof. Huxley's lectures on Evolution. 12. Bertrand Russell's Has Religion Made Useful Contributions to Civilization?

My last two Freeman issues were passed on to an acquaintance, as I believe this to be an effective way to arouse interest in your publications.

Thanks for the friendly act. I appreciate such efforts. My readers, alas, are an individualistic outfit, preferring to keep *The Freeman* a secret, instead of doing their utmost to increase this publication's influence. Not more than one in a thousand takes the trouble to introduce the paper to friends and acquaintances. I wish more readers would take it on themselves to get at least one friend to subscribe. I need the extra readers. Also, let me suggest that more readers follow the lead of William E. Dippon, of Indianapolis, the writer of the above, and pass on their

issues of *The Freeman* when finished with them.

"In the enlightened civilizations of the future, I feel that the Haldeman-Julius press will be remembered as one of the few clear-minded and truth-seeking groups in a period marked by religious reaction, return to homosexual and syphilitic dictators, and hypocritical and oppressive Capitalism."—Harry Brobst, R. I.

I recall having seen on public walls a two-line jingle, of which I can recall only the first line, as follows: "Some come here to sit and think." Can you supply the second line?

I don't recall ever having seen such a poem. The line submitted has something of the swing of Shakespeare, or maybe it's Kipling. Don't tell me it's from Eddie Guest or Longfellow. Perhaps some of my readers who are familiar with the finer things in poetry can help out this lover of literature, for the thought suggests a visit to the sacred haunts of piety for purposes of meditation and prayer.

Will any cream on the market today prevent wrinkles on the face?

There is no cream that can do away with, prevent or help prevent wrinkles. Wrinkles are caused mainly by internal conditions, which can't be reached by a cream or salve applied externally.

Please explain the meaning of these frequent arrests of Catholic dignitaries in Germany because of the violation of Nazi laws dealing with money.

The Catholic Church, which is an international business and real estate corporation, has what it calls, innocently, "Peter's pence." This sounds as though a few pence are gathered here and there for the upkeep of the Pope. What it really amounts to is an international assessment, by which the Pope gets literally hundreds of millions of dollars each year—all in the name of "Peter's pence." It would not do to call it "Peter's millions."

Germany, however, forbids the exportation of money, because of the shaky condition of its financial and economic structures. Now and then, a bishop, or perhaps some priests or nuns, leaving for Rome, are caught with thousands of marks on their persons. They are arrested and charged with the crime of violating

Hitler's monetary laws—and that, of course, enrages the Pope, because he simply must have his "Peter's pence." The latest report has it that the German Catholic hierarchy has 20,000,000 marks on deposit in German banks, earmarked for the Pope, but unable to get the cash to him. This, naturally, is a serious blow at the spiritual-minded, unworldly, money-hating Vatican. But, God's light has a way of shining through the clouds, and it looks as though the problem will be solved to the complete satisfaction of the saintly, untainted Pope.

Here's the scheme, as it's been worked out: Mussolini will give the Pope Italian bonds to the value of the 20,000,000 marks in the German banks. The Pope will then assign this money to Mussolini, in order to help that amiable gentleman continue his perfectly Christian war on Ethiopia and in other ways oil up the war machine. Germany will recognize the assignment, giving Mussolini a credit which he can use as he sees fit in making purchases in Hitlerland. In that manner everybody is satisfied—the Pope gets his "Peter's pence" in the form of Italian bonds; Mussolini goes into Germany to buy what he wants of iron, steel, coal, etc., Hitler's administration keeps the money at home and gets it transferred from the Catholic accounts in German banks to the official treasury of the government. Great is God! The Lord will provide!

Please explain how the government is helping writers.

The Writers' Division, Professional and Service Project of the Works Progress Administration, in Washington, D. C., is taking about 4,500 writers from the relief rolls and putting them to work on an encyclopedic survey to be called *The American Guide*, which will fill five volumes of 600 pages each. Every section of the U. S. will be described. This writers' project will strive to cover the following: general topography; flora and fauna; historical settings and backgrounds; archeological remains; parks; army and navy posts, armories; monuments and landmarks; literature, art, music and drama; libraries and museums; educational facilities; societies and associations; ethnography — races represented; highways; manufacturing and indus-

tries; products—exports and imports; natural resources, developed and undeveloped, etc.

There will be other writers' projects, including the compilation of an encyclopedia of governmental functions.

You have been pounding at Father Coughlin for many months, but it seems apparent that the priest is just shooting off his mouth without regard for Fascism or the destruction of democracy.

I have poured forth numerous columns of facts, citations, quotations, etc., to prove Coughlin's Fascism. At this time I will rest my answer on the words of the Rev. John Haynes Holmes, famous preacher, who, on December 3, 1935, said:

"The voice of Coughlin is the voice of Fascism and is one of the most dangerous menaces to democracy. I am alarmed at millions listening to it over the radio, who think it has anything consistent with democratic traditions."

Being in the poultry business, I find that cannibalism among my chicks is a problem. Is there a remedy?

Your chicks, especially if they are white, pluck feathers, and when they draw blood their cannibalistic instinct is aroused, compelling them to destroy and eat the victim. A Minneapolis poultryman, Edward A. Schutz, claims to have solved this problem by an experiment with a red light. He claims that such a light makes the chicks see black. When the blood specks appear, they look black and therefore don't arouse the cannibalistic impulse.

Who pays for the expenses of Federal Deposit Insurance?

On December 15, 1935, the banks under the plan of Federal Deposit Insurance (F. D. I. C.) were assessed on all deposits over \$100 at the rate of 75c for each \$1,000 or fraction thereof. This expense will be passed on to the depositors by either the application of service charges or a direct charge against the depositor's balance. As I've stated before, deposit "insurance" is a delusion and a snare. The public will pay for "protecting" its own money, on which the bankers will earn interest. And then, should there be another bank crash and the reserve collected through assessments become exhausted in paying

off losses, the depositors will find themselves compelled to either put up more money or get along without this "protection." The whole thing is crooked. I urge depositors to put their money in the Postal Savings Banks, where no service charges are assessed against accounts. Then, instead of writing checks, resort to postal money orders or cash. Also, be sure to urge your congressman and senators to pass a law extending commercial facilities to postal savings accounts, including the clearing of checks.

* * *

How many Negroes does Britain rule in Africa?

37,000,000. These black men are watching Ethiopia's attempts to save its independence, and should the armies of Haile Selassie succeed in defeating Mussolini's mechanized legions, there's no telling what the people of the Dark Continent would do to British imperialism. England is in a most delicate spot—it can't let Italian imperialism defy the British, and at the same time it fears what would happen should the Ethiopians whip Italy. England's armed forces in Africa are relatively small, compared to the vast territories and populations they rule.

* * *

Some years ago I heard a lecture of yours in Topeka, in which you told a story you got from some Kansas City preacher, dealing with a girl in a bathtub. Would you mind repeating it?

I don't know how it'll sound in print, but I'll try to oblige. I got the little yarn from L. M. Birkhead, who has, to my knowledge, used it several times, and always with good results.

A certain hell-raising, puritanical, blue-nosed Fundamentalist preacher in Kansas City—I believe his name was Rev. Hargitt, or something like it—delivered a sermon at the time the theatrical producer, Earl Carroll, got into trouble for arranging a champagne bath for a beautiful chorus girl as entertainment for the guests at a private function. The preacher went on like this:

"What did this devil Carroll do? He poured gallons of champagne into a tub, and, before hundreds of men, brought out a beautiful, but wanton, woman, who proceeded to take off her clothes, down to the last stitch. Mark you, this section"—proper gesture—

"was exposed. She put her feet into the tub of champagne. She got down on her knees. Then she SAT in the champagne! Then she splashed it around, over her shoulders and mammary glands. Then demon Carroll invited the men guests up to the stage to dip into that champagne while the shameless hussy was still SITTING IN IT! What do you think of that?"

To which a little fellow in the congregation yelled:

"Unsanitary!"

* * *

I've received literature from the Natural Body Brace Co., Salina, Kansas, offering a device that is guaranteed to overcome illnesses such as backache, curvatures, nervousness, indigestion, colitis, neuritis, lung troubles and kidney, liver and bladder troubles. Please comment.

It's the bunk. Beware.

* * *

Don't you think that what this world needs, in addition to a good 5c cigar, is a spell of Charlie Chaplin?

I have found an excellent 5c cigar, but unfortunately it costs me \$7.50 per 100. Another 5c cigar I smoke with a certain amount of solace should properly be sold at the rate of three for a dime. So the great goal set by the late Vice President Marshall, two decades ago, is still to be won. Perhaps the cellophane wrappers have something to do with the issue, for it seems to my lay mind that they give the cigar something akin to high blood pressure.

Soon we shall have Chaplin's new picture, *Modern Times*, and I know in advance it'll be good, for the immortal Charlie hasn't disappointed me yet. What this world needs is belly laughs, and who but Charles Spencer Chaplin can give them to us? In these days of Mussolini, Haile Selassie, Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Streicher, Laval, Father Coughlin, Townsend, Upton Sinclair, F. D. R., Lord 'erbert 'oover, movie bank nights, radio jokes, sanctions, the Voice of Experience, anti-Semitism, unbalanced budgets, busted purchasing power, auto accidents, Japanese imperialism, South American revolutions, British music and the humor of Irvin S. Cobb, there is urgent need for escape, if only for a few hours.

What would be better than an immediate revival of the great works of Charlie Chaplin? Let our thousands of movie theaters agree to set aside

a Chaplin Week, during which we will be able to see those deathless masterpieces again—*Shoulder Arms*, *A Dog's Life*, *The Kid*, and the other life-giving tales of the world's most amusing man. The world would be a better place to live in if such a Chaplin Week were to be given to this sour and humorless planet.

* * *

Can you say whether the Unity School of Christianity, at Kansas City, Mo., is a commercial organization or is sincere and is trying to make this a better world?

I have, during the past decade or more, printed numerous pieces about this Unity outfit. The so-called "school" has worked out a "popularization" of Christian Science. The latter is supposed to be just a little too "high-brow," so the Unity gang made over its religious hokum with a view to appealing to a lower mentality. The results have been most gratifying—from the viewpoint of the "school's" promoters. The whole thing is just one more commercial racket, but having religious connections it is let severely alone by the authorities. A fake that's offered in the name of religion automatically earns the right to follow any methods, however questionable. One of the worst features of this money-grabbing gang is its mass-prayers from some sacred room in the temple of Unity. You pay your money and at a certain time some master or mistress of mumbo-jumbo goes into the silences and argues God out of bumping you off with a cancer or a bunion. There's no limit to the number of moneyed yokels who can be trimmed in this racket alone. And there are many other features just as brazen—and profitable. The place reeks with money—buildings go up like cantonments in war time—and all in the name of religion, plus mazuma.

* * *

How can Frank B. Robinson, the great religious leader in Moscow, keep up his racket year after year?

You've got me stumped. Perhaps old Barnum was right. This Idaho prophet poses as a "psychologist," though I know of no great expert in this field of science who recognizes him as such. He ties up his pseudo-psychology with a bunk-ridden religion that is supposed to put his customers in direct contact with health,

wealth and happiness by the application of Jesus' hidden meanings, discovered only by the great Robinson, of Moscow, Idaho, not Russia.

I learn from Warren Weitzel, Nevada, that Dr. Robinson (pardon the "Dr.") sells his printed "discoveries" at \$20 per set, cash, or \$28 in payments, which is right nice pay for "discoveries" that take up the space needed by a fair-sized pamphlet. After getting this money, according to literature seen by Reader Weitzel, the Moscow Jesus then does some fine panhandling. He's after more cash, and gets it by outright begging. "Perhaps you will be able to give only a few dollars." That's the "message." This, of course, is done in the blessed name of the great creative life spirit which works only through the Idaho "doctor" but seems unwilling to give him all the money he thinks he should have, thus making it necessary for this gigantic master of science and psychology to panhandle his victims.

Dr. Robinson's slogan, I understand, is "1,000,000 students by 1937." If that goal is reached—and here I admit I'm beyond my depth—the cash register will show receipts of something like \$20,000,000. Even if we were to allow 75 percent for expenses, printing, advertising, etc., the Idaho whiz-bang would still have \$5,000,000. That's hitting at a pretty bright goal. And there's the possibility of nice dividends from the campaign of begging, along the lines of "If you can't spare a hundred dollars for this great work, perhaps you can send me a few dollars to help me carry on my noble work for humanity." I'm touched to the depths. Let's pass the hat.

* * *

Cal Coolidge once spoke up for the collection of the war debt with the remark: "They hired the money, didn't they?" Please comment.

Did the Allies really hire the money? I know of no money having passed between the U. S. and the governments who were on our side in the war. Instead of lending them money, we supplied them with munitions, explosives, chemicals, wheat, copper, lead, iron, steel, oil, cotton, meats, and the like. There's no doubt that if the U. S. had agreed to settle these war debts by accepting goods instead of money from Britain, France and the others, the debts would have been paid. But we didn't want the

debts paid that way. To accept such goods would mean the disruption of our economic system, as it operates under Capitalism. We want money, not goods, and that's impossible under present exchange conditions. So, it would have been more accurate for Cal Coolidge to have said: "They hired our goods, didn't they?"

* * *

As I'm troubled with surplus hair, I want to know if I can trust the offer of X-Basin, distributed by Hall and Ruckel, Inc., to permanently remove the surplus, and "discourage, devitalize and lessen the future growth of such hair"? Furthermore, can I trust the claim that "it is safe, harmless, non-irritating and mild"? It is supposed to be endorsed by great scientists.

The whole thing is hooey. Save your money. Don't let this gyp clean you out. Beware of this outrageous bunk.

* * *

What makes an onion bring tears to the eyes?

W. R. Beattie, of the U. S. Bureau of Plant Industry, says young onions don't have the oil that produces tears. It's an old onion that gives off the oil that causes eyes to cry. Added to mature age is the element of growth under hotter temperatures. The highly volatile oil which brings tears will not be found in sufficient quantities in onions that are picked in the spring or early summer. The same authority says a ton of onions contains less than a tenth of a pint of the volatile oil, which gives one a hint regarding its great strength.

* * *

In a speech in California, early in December, 1935, Herbert Hoover said: "If Agnosticism grows our whole civilization will topple." Please comment.

I don't feel certain that Lord 'erbert 'oover has yet qualified as a philosopher, historian, or sociologist. His remark shows appalling, devastating ignorance. We are given to understand that without religious men—a la Billy Sunday, William Jennings Bryan, Mrs. Aimee Semple McPherson, J. Frank Norris, Father Coughlin, and the like—civilization is doomed.

The fact is, history shows that civilization was at its lowest when it was most pious. Page the Dark Ages. As civilization grew and prospered, religion declined, until now, for all practical purposes, we are entering

an age of Agnosticism.

If Lord 'oover knew his history he wouldn't talk such rot. If he looked at the real makers of civilization—in learning, art, music, statesmanship, philosophy, science, invention, commerce, literature, poetry, history, biography, economics, journalism, etc.—he would see that the main work was done by Freethinkers.

Let me dash off a list of names—representing all shades of doubters, anti-clericals, skeptics, Agnostics, Freethinkers, Rationalists, Atheists, etc.—and then let Lord 'oover decide what kind of a civilization we would have had these figures never lived and given the wealth of their intellects and talents to humanity. My quick compilation follows:

Lincoln	Engels
Jefferson	Marx
John Adams	Gibbon
Walt Whitman	Hume
Thomas Paine	Herbert Spencer
Ingersoll	Epicurus
Lester F. Ward	Lucretius
Mark Twain	Confucius
Clarence Darrow	Omar Khayyam
H. L. Mencken	Shelley
Karl Kautsky	Goethe
Dr. Freud	Schiller
Muensterberg	Erasmus
Jastrow	Rabelais
Havelock Ellis	Boccaccio
Van Loon	Renan
Geo. Jean Nathan	Santayana
Sinclair Lewis	John Dewey
Maynard Shipley	Bruce Bliven
Clement Wood	Joseph W. Krutch
Joseph McCabe	Nietzsche
Vance Randolph	Hegel
Ernest Boyd	Clemenceau
Isaac Goldberg	Thomas A. Edison
Joseph Lewis	Luther Burbank
Anatole France	Brahms
Emile Zola	Beethoven
Voltaire	Stephen Girard
Diderot	L. M. Birkhead
D'Holbach	Bertrand Russell
Ernst Haeckel	Jean Jaures
J. M. Robertson	Eugene V. Debs
Charles Darwin	Morris Hillquit
Prof. Huxley	Victor L. Berger
Einstein	Charles A. Eliot
Haldane	President Grant
Chapman Cohen	Thoreau
Dr. Robinson	Jack London
Gorky	H. G. Wells
Bebel	Romaine Rolland
Lassalle	Henri Barbusse
Robert Burns	John Morley

* * *

Now that the Rock of Gibraltar is so much in the news because of the Italo-British crisis in the Mediterranean, it would be useful to know if England's

hold on that fortress has ever been challenged?

The Rock of Gibraltar has been in British hands since 1713. This, of course, includes the 14-mile wide strait which the 1,396-foot rock commands. This crown colony has a normal military population of about 3,000, with about 17,000 civilians living in the town at the foot of the rock. For four years (1779-83) the Spaniards besieged the Rock, but couldn't budge the British garrison that was ordered to hold this natural fortress at all costs.

* * *

Who committed more murders—Hitler or Mussolini?

The average person thinks Hitler did more bloody work, but keen observers like George Seldes and Dr. William E. Bohn hold that while there are no actual statistics it is safe to estimate that Mussolini did 10 times as many murders as Hitler. And that doesn't even take into consideration the deaths he caused on both sides in East Africa.

* * *

I have been told by various people that ex-President Hoover tried to ship gold out of the country contrary to law and that President Roosevelt had it brought back by force. Have also been told that Hoover wished to return to California via the Panama Canal but was forbidden to leave the country by Roosevelt. I wish to know how much truth there is in these rumors.

I've heard the first one many times during the past year or more. The second one—about the Panama Canal—is new to me. As for the truth of these rumors, you may put them both down as ridiculous lies. There isn't a grain of fact in either yarn.

* * *

In his December 1, 1935, broadcast, Father Coughlin did a puzzling flip-flop on the question of Roosevelt. Please comment.

Last year the Coughlin slogan was "Roosevelt or Ruin." During the two weeks prior to the December 1 broadcast, the priest's slogan was "Roosevelt and Ruin." And then, as you say, he came around to Roosevelt again by purring and murmuring that he never was against the New Deal, that he really wanted only to help make it a thing of perfection. This intellectual contortionist had, as he confessed, heard from his followers. He realized that Roosevelt

was much stronger than he had imagined, despite the assaults of the Liberty League, Wall Street bankers, the Hearst press and the other representatives and spokesmen of incipient and real Fascism. That explains the beautiful about-face. But don't let that worry you. If, on the morrow, he feels it'll be safe to pour it on Roosevelt, he'll do so again, for the man is utterly without honesty, decency or consistency, except as he seeks to lead America gradually in the direction of the Catholic Fascism that has made Central Europe one vast inquisitorial torture chamber and concentration camp.

* * *

I have been following the flights of the China Clipper with the keenest interest and admiration. What does it weigh? Are bigger ships along the way?

The China Clipper weighs 50,000 pounds. Its performance has been worthy of the greatest praise. The men who guided this great airplane did their job intelligently, efficiently and, above all, modestly. The whole thing is a splendid achievement for American science and resourcefulness.

Igor I. Sikorsky, world-famous pioneer builder of aircraft, contributed an article to the *National Aeronautic Magazine*, December, 1935, in which he predicted that the clippers of five years hence will weigh about 200 tons. Such ships will be able to make overnight flights to Europe, without a stop.

Mr. Sikorsky reports that he is now at work on two new clippers. One is 40 tons, the other 65 tons. The largest ship he has turned out thus far weighs 19 tons.

Regarding the question of stratosphere flying, Mr. Sikorsky disapproves, for the following reason:

"I do not visualize stratospheric flying across the ocean. It is feasible and possible, but there are no great advantages; and certainly the comforts of the passengers would be less. For these reasons, I believe the conventional ships flying from 15,000 to 20,000 feet high, with some provision for releasing oxygen in the cabins, offer the most practical solution to long-distance over-ocean travel."

* * *

Did Voltaire write: "I differ with everything you say, but will fight to the death for your right to say it"?

I always thought he did utter that

famous line, but Dr. William J. Robinson recently challenged anyone to prove it, and no proof was forthcoming, despite the fact he offered a reward. The remark was traced to an author who now admits the sentence wasn't taken from Voltaire's works but was worded to reflect the general philosophy of toleration held by that famous libertarian. I'm rather inclined to agree with the person who offered this explanation, though I must add it would be highly unethical to keep on reprinting the quotation as a direct citation from Voltaire's writings. If the thing is to be used, one should add words to the effect that it is "in the spirit of Voltaire," or something to that effect. Of course, I'm ready to agree that Voltaire would have been the last person in the world to "fight to the death" for anything, let alone free press. He loved liberty, free thought, free speech, free inquiry and the other important gifts of modern civilization, but he certainly wouldn't have died for them. He, like the sane, sensible, shrewd philosopher he was, would utter his broadsides and before the enemy could annihilate him he'd be off for Switzerland or some other temporary haven of safety. He thought it was important to fight for freedom, but not to die for it, and that's right sensible philosophy. Any fool can die for his notions. How much better it is to back up temporarily when the fight gets too hot, in order to wait for the moment when it'll be safe to lambaste one's enemies again! That sounds unspectacular and unheroic, but it's good dope, especially if you want to live long—and Voltaire not only fought for many decades but actually managed to live until he was somewhere around 83 years old before he had to die a perfectly unromantic, untheatrical death in a safe, warm bed. Yes, Voltaire wouldn't have died for the other's right to talk freely, but he found some other way to blast the suppressionists with an epigram, story, novel or play.

* * *

What have you against the American Legion?

My objections to the Legion are based on the reactionary leadership of this body, the readiness to resort to violent attacks on the civil rights

of spokesmen for unpopular or minority groups, the frequent hints of Fascism, the flaunting of the bogey of "Red Communism" in order to keep down those elements who would increase democracy in politics and extend it to industry, and numerous other tory, unprogressive, undemocratic, unconstitutional acts. The Legion can cry for the bonus in the fullest spirit of patriotism and then denounce as traitors strikers who would use their industrial power to get more bread for their families.

The veterans of the G. A. R. are in an entirely different class because they really did a great work in saving the Union and crushing the slaveholding class. No person would dream of complaining over their activities, past or present. They earned their pensions. They did a tremendous job in the finest spirit of modesty, and when it was over they didn't pour into civil ranks with a view to browbeating holders of unpopular opinions.

On the other hand, the Legion patriots participated in an unnecessary and stupid war, in which victory was as damaging as defeat, with shouts at one moment that the war was to end war and make the world safe for democracy, and in the next breath cheering for rampant militarism and urging the denial of constitutional rights to persons who have ideas that don't happen to jibe with those of Wall Streeters, big daily editorial writers, time-serving politicians and greedy munitions interests.

* * *

Why does the Old Guard in the Socialist party oppose the Communist party?

Louis Waldman, one of the leaders of the Old Guard and chairman of the State Committee of the Socialist party of New York, puts the issue in the following words:

"The Socialist party has traditionally and consistently adhered to the principles of democracy and freedom. The Communist party believes in dictatorship and suppression of civil rights. Between the two there is an unbridgeable gulf."

* * *

Why do you think Hitler will be a "harder nut to crack" than Mussolini? Isn't there the beginning of an underground movement in Germany while Italian radicalism lies prostrate?

Hitlerism is more enduring than Mussolini's Fascism, because the

former is based on organized gangsterism. By that I mean that if Hitler were to die, German Fascism could go on as long as his gang could keep itself organized and effective. If Goebbels and Goering were to rub each other out, there's always the army ready to establish a military dictatorship. Besides, Germany has greater wealth, resources, industrial equipment and population to work with. Hitler has created numerous economic difficulties in Germany, but the situation there isn't as bad as what has resulted from Mussolini's years of tyranny in Italy. Mussolini is clean busted, and the country he has ruined is too weak to resist, for the present, but should there be a great military defeat—which isn't at all impossible—the whole Fascist state will fall about Mussolini's head. With Mussolini out of the way, Italian Fascism would most likely be through, while this, as I explained, wouldn't necessarily have to happen in Germany should Hitler be shunted aside. It's true that Germany is building up a strong underground movement against Hitlerism, but it's a mistake to conclude that opposition in Italy is totally dead. It's waiting for the right time to get into action. The people have been propagandized into accepting Mussolini's bluffs and insanities, but this condition won't last much longer. The belt has been pulled up too often. The limit has been reached. When the people, in final desperation, realize that they have ruined their country in order to satisfy the mad ambitions of a bulldozing lunatic, they can be counted on to bring that great and beautiful land back into the family of civilized nations. As I've said before, Ethiopia may well prove the graveyard of Italian Fascism. But Hitlerism's graveyard may need something more substantial—perhaps a world war.

* * *

When the medieval Catholic Church opposed usury, did this mean all interest?

In his book, *God and Mammon*, J. A. Hobson answers your question, as follows:

“Usury, as condemned by the medieval Church, did not signify, as now, an excessive rate of interest on a loan. All interest, regarded as a fixed payment stipulated in advance for the loan of money, was usury.....IT IS HARDLY NECES-

SARY TO ADD THAT THE CONDEMNATION OF MONEY-LENDING (EVEN WITH THE QUALIFICATIONS I HAVE SPECIFIED) DID NOT APPLY TO LARGE FINANCIAL OPERATIONS CONDUCTED BY THE RICH AND GREAT. Kings and feudal nobles borrowed for their war needs and their extravagances from the international money market long organized in Italy, Germany, and later in Holland. The Church itself, in the person of the Pope, regularly employed these finance-houses for lending or for borrowing, and even used threats of excommunication as a means of enforcing interest payments. PROTESTS WERE MADE FROM TIME TO TIME BY MORALISTS AGAINST SUCH DISCRIMINATION, BUT IN VAIN.”

* * *

Writing a letter to you often helps me to clear up ideas in my mind, for I so often find that I was wrong even before your criticism comes. I erroneously tried to defend Consumers' Research. Can you suggest a real, sincere consumers' organization?

The general cooperative movement is making splendid headway in this country, as I've shown in a number of brief articles, giving figures to support the assertion. Of course, we still have a long way to travel before we even approach the cooperatives of foreign countries, especially Sweden, Norway, Denmark, England, Soviet Russia, etc. But we are on our way.

As I've explained before, Consumers' Research started out with a good purpose, but it soon found itself betrayed by its organizers. Limiting the information strictly to members was just one more proof of the organization's determination to cash in rather than to enlighten consumers on how to buy and what to look for in goods. I suspected the organization from the moment I learned that its information was strictly confidential, for I knew its excuse that it wanted to avoid libel suits was not the real reason. As I pointed out at the time, it's just as libelous to limit one's expression to an organization's members as it is to broadcast the libel to the general public. This excuse couldn't hold water, because it was intended merely to hide the real reason—the desire to cash in on the consumers' needs rather than serve to educate the consumers. In addition, the organization became a dictatorship, and

that resulted in dissension, union smashing, strikes and lock-outs. The mess is an unfortunate one, but this doesn't mean a real cooperative movement of consumers couldn't be made a huge success.

It might be worth our while to watch the progress of Cooperative Distributors, Inc., 30 Irving Place, New York City. The organization issues a monthly publication, which is edited by James Rorty, well-known contributor to the liberal press. There may be something worth while there.

* * *

Is it true that publishers have been jailed for issuing the works of Thomas Paine?

You will find an interesting and revealing passage on this point in *The Dynamics of Religion*, by J. M. Robertson, as follows:

"In 1812, after Paine's death, his avowed publisher Eaton was sentenced to the pillory and 18 months' imprisonment. All this while there was no thought of prosecuting the publishers of the works of Gibbon, Hume and Voltaire, which, as Eaton's counsel argued, might be held to do more harm to religion than the attacks of Paine. The principle of the vice society was that freethinking literature likely to reach the poor must be prosecuted, but no other, their action being in fact largely an expression of the political anger of the upper class against the democratic principle."

* * *

What is your opinion of and/or?

It's a crime against decent English. Senator Glass performed a genuine public service when he denounced those legal muddle-heads who were too dumb to know whether the piece they were writing meant "and" or "or." His snorts were welcomed wherever decent English is admired and respected. I never pose as a grammarian, but there are some things I simply won't tolerate—try as I will always to avoid a too formalistic conception of English—and at the head of my list you will find eternal scorn for "and/or."

Justice Chester A. Fowler, of the Wisconsin Supreme Court, paid his disrespect to this "and/or" nonsense when an insurance case came before the court, on December 12, 1935, as follows:

"It is manifest that we are con-

fronted with the task of first construing 'and/or,' that befuddling nameless thing, that janus-faced verbal monstrosity, neither word nor phrase, the child of a brain of some one too lazy or too dull to know what he did mean, now commonly used by lawyers in drafting legal documents, through carelessness or ignorance or as a cunning device to conceal rather than express a meaning with a view to furthering the interest of their clients. We have observed the 'thing' in statutes, in the opinions of the courts and in briefs of counsel, some learned and some not."

* * *

Please comment on the enclosed clipping dealing with Denmark's pension system.

The press report tells of a statement made by Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen, American minister to Denmark, which follows:

"Their old age pension system has removed the haunting fear of poverty from the hearts of thousands."

Mrs. Owen, who is the daughter of the late William Jennings Bryan, admires the Danish government, and her praise isn't the least bit exaggerated. Perhaps it's because she is so high in the councils of the Democratic party that she refrains from mentioning the important fact that Denmark's government is run by Social Democrats (Socialists).

When the Socialists obtain power they introduce workable, sane pension systems for the aged, as shown by Denmark, Sweden and Norway. In this country, we prefer to consider Socialists conceived by the devil and soaked in iniquity, which leaves necessary reforms like old age pension systems to be tinkered with insincerely in Washington or promoted with overtones of racketeering by the demagogues of the type of Dr. Townsend.

* * *

I see by press reports that Germany has openly declared its intention of invading Soviet Russia and is trying to form an alliance with France in order to have a free hand to conduct its war on the East. What do the Russians say about it?

In its issue of November 29, 1935, the government newspaper, *Izvestia*, published at Moscow, hurled this challenge at Hitler:

"You (German fascism) want free

hands, but firstly the hands which are strangling the great cultured German people cannot be free, and secondly the task is beyond your power, and thirdly if you try to push your pigs' snouts into our Soviet garden you will receive such a blow that you will not want to intrude further."

That's gettin' 'em told.

* * *

England is reported to have huge and growing quantities of idle money on hand. How will this problem be handled?

The British financial interests will have to put this money out at interest, if another economic and financial crisis is to be avoided. This puts the powers that be in something of a pickle. Two countries are bidding for this money—Germany and Soviet Russia. The temptations are numerous—and humorous. Germany has defaulted on most of its loans, and yet has the gall to ask for more. No cautious banker would consider such a loan as anything but a dangerous speculation. But Germany is capitalistic, which makes it dear to the hearts of Britain's money-bags. Also, Hitler frankly announces that he intends to make war on the Russian republic (see his November, 1935 interview with the United Press), and this also makes him "worthy" of London's tenderest solicitude. But there stands that tragic fact—Germany is a defaulter. What to do? Alas, the problems facing great bankers are soul-shaking.

On the other hand, Russia has a clean record. Every dollar picked up in capitalistic countries, at excessive rates of interest, and every shipment of goods, bought at excessive prices, have been paid on the dot, as agreed—and to the penny. A borrower who acts like that ought to be able to pay off another loan, especially when the indices show progress in every phase of Russian finance, industry and agriculture. But, Russia is non-capitalistic—it's proletarian. And that puts shivers down the spines of the London bankers. What to do? Lend them money—and make money? That sounds good. Refuse to lend them what they want—and lose money? That's terrible.

It's at this point that the British get into their most perfect form. Some solemnly declare that Russia—despite its good record since the rev-

olution—should not be given the money it wants because it has repudiated the loans made by pre-revolutionary regimes. The Russians, of course, say they'll never pay the debts of the Czar and Kerensky. And they mean it. So financial experts and newspaper editorialists go into moral spasms, forgetting that England repudiated its debts to Uncle Sam. And those debts, mark you, weren't made by a defunct regime. The government that took the money is the same outfit that refused to pay up when Washington sent out its request for a little cash.

That's why I say the problems are numerous—and humorous. But the British, with their genius for compromise, will most likely find a way to let Germany have more money with which to get ready to fight Russia (on the valid assumption that it'll never be repaid) and then turn around and let Russia have plenty of money, because its credit is good, and in order to enable it to get fully ready to meet Germany's expected attack. I know this sounds screwy, but please remember I'm speaking from the record. This is not a flight into imaginative fiction.

There are even additional puzzling possibilities. Let's not forget that a great deal of the repudiated money London turned over to Germany was relent to Russia by Germany, at a big hike in the rate of interest. Then Russia used that credit to buy German machinery and other goods. When the time came to pay, Russia met its obligations, but Germany, instead of turning it back to England, where it came from, poured it into its own armament industry, in order to get ready to make war on Russia. Isn't that a subject for the satirical genius of Gilbert and Sullivan, or the author of *Alice in Wonderland*? Fancy England going through all that once more!

* * *

What's your opinion about "mercy death" or the right to shorten the life of an incurable patient?

I certainly believe that the individual has a right to decide for himself whether or not he prefers to continue living, but I don't seem able to stomach the notion of calling in a doctor to do the slaughtering. A doctor's job should be to try to save life, not to end it, even when requested to do

so by the patient and his relatives. "Mercy deaths" make exciting newspaper stories, but I can't trail along with those who would have our doctors authorized to kill off the incurables.

* * *

Please tell me where I can get a dependable, accurate investment or trading advisory service.

These market forecasts, when run on the level, only deal in hunches, even though the "experts" sprinkle their literature with dozens of impressive charts. A study of the reports of these dopesters during 1928 and 1929 would show that their advice about the future activities of the stock and bond markets was worth just about zero. One prominent market "expert" anticipated a slight decline—a pretty easy guess, after years of the Coolidge boom—but when the Big Bust came his decline looked like prosperity when compared to what really happened. Such services cost at least \$50 per year, sometimes much more, so my advice is to forget about such outfits. Many of them are nothing more than market-riggers, though it's true that some are very careful to keep out of the market themselves, whether from honesty or disbelief in their own advice I can't say. My suggestion is to put your money into the postal savings banks and forget about this stock and bond business. You'll end up without your shirt. Buy yourself a decent home, a car, and whatever essentials and luxuries you feel you should have in order to enjoy life, and then take what's left and put it in Uncle Sam's bank where you'll be able to see it again when you want it. If you have a good business, put it there where you can watch it and get the most good out of it.

* * *

In Harper's for October, 1935, Edward S. Martin says: "From cover to cover the Bible is full of stories of communications with the invisible world . . . and with what we are used to call miracles. Matter-of-fact observers in our day incline to reject these stories, but that may be because their own knowledge is defective." Please comment.

I fail to see anything defective about the mentality or knowledge of a person who rejects the story about a man who told the sun to stand still while he finished a job that still

awaited being done. The best intelligences of the modern world—from Voltaire to Ingersoll—approached Bible stories in a most critical spirit, and it would be childish to dismiss them as being defective. The most casual survey indicates that it is the persons who accept these Bible stories as absolutely true who qualify as being defective. In fact, it can be put down almost as a law of human nature that the more defective the mind the easier it is to accept the Bible's communications with "the invisible world" or miracles. It's usually true that the most devout are the most intellectually backward.

* * *

1. How many people would be qualified to receive \$2,400 per year under the Townsend Plan, if passed? 2. How much money would this mean annually? 3. What portion of the national income would this be?

1. 8,000,000. 2. \$19,200,000,000. 3. About one-third.

* * *

Is there any way of solving the problem of population pressure without resorting to war?

Over-population, in pre scientific days, constituted a reason for making war, but in this age war, as a cure for population pressure, is unnecessary and stupid when we have available the humanitarian and intelligent remedy of Birth Control. Mussolini talks about over-population as an excuse for the destruction of Ethiopian independence, and at the same time he follows the policies of the Catholic Church in condemning and making illegal the dissemination of information on Birth Control.

* * *

You write admiringly of the new Supreme Court building. How many workmen's lives were lost while it was being built?

It happens that not one workman lost his life while working on this magnificent building. Whether it was good luck or intelligent management, I can't say.

* * *

What is your opinion of Max Stirner's work, "The Ego and His Own"?

A copy of this book has been in my library for a quarter of a century, but I've never been able to read it. The work is recognized as one of the classics of philosophical anarchism, but frankness compels me to say that dozens of attempts to read the jumble

always left me bewildered after getting through the first few pages. To me, the book is plain goofy. And I always wonder how sincere are those intellectuals who claim the work is a supreme masterpiece. To me it's hard, involved, uninteresting, tedious reading—and such a book isn't worth bothering with, even though it may be true that the author made some contributions to thought, which I doubt.

* * *
I understand that the U. S. government prints booklets giving information on many subjects. To what address should one write to get this literature?

Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

* * *
A writer in Harper's, for October, 1935, speaks of Lord Lothian, who was brought up a Catholic, "but eventually quit it and later . . . hooked up with the Eddyites and Christian Science." Is that a sneer or not?

It's probably an unconscious sneer. You will find frequently that writers will refer to one who is won over to Catholicism as a "convert," but let the same person become something less "sacred" and he is described as having "hooked up" with so-and-so's church. It would be considered irreverent and blasphemous to say that a man "hooked up" with the Catholic Church. It all goes to show the workings of the orthodox, bigoted mind. It's my religion that's pure and holy; yours is tainted, so don't "hook up" with it. That's the way they sneer at each other. But as for me, I'd say the whole mess should be kicked out, because religion is nothing more than a disease of the mind. There's no hope for real intellectual progress so long as we permit our thinking to be poisoned by the superstitions of religion.

* * *
A woman running for mayor in Brockton, Mass., says: "We must elect leaders who are upright and religious." Please comment.

It's a very common error for shabby thinkers to confuse uprightness with religion. You couldn't throw a brick in Saint Patrick's cathedral, in New York City, without hitting a Tammany politician. Take all the political grafters in Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, etc., and you'll find most of them are religious, but no one would

think of calling them upright. There is nothing in the science of Ethics to show that religion has anything to do with scientific morality. Our prisons are full of religionists, mainly Catholics. Hauptmann, who murdered the Lindbergh child, is sure about Almighty God's concern over his welfare. Most prostitutes are deeply shocked at any suggestion of their customers that they don't believe in God. Gangsters always prefer swell church funerals, usually in a Catholic cathedral. Codes of honor—honesty, truthfulness, loyalty to ideals, justice, tolerance, humanitarianism—have nothing to do with religion.

* * *
Your statement that Dr. Townsend and his partner, Clements, own The Townsend Weekly for their own profit is challenged in the November 11, 1935, issue of that paper. Please comment.

Dr. Townsend's paper says such "destructive criticism" is "unsupported." In other words, *The Townsend Weekly* is not owned privately by these two worthies and is not run for the satisfaction of their acquisitive impulses. If skeptics will turn to page 18 of the issue under discussion they will find the paper's sworn Statement of Ownership, as required by postal laws. The declaration, signed by Robert E. Clements, shows the paper's owners to be as follows:

The Prosperity Publishing Co., Ltd.
F. E. Townsend, President
R. E. Clements, Sec.-Treas.

Townsend and Clements own the Prosperity Publishing company, so I fail to see any evidence of "destructive criticism," as charged. These two racketeers are clever at doing a great deal of twisting in order to conceal the fact that they are cashing in at a tremendous speed in these days when the Townsendites are willing to part with hard-earned cash in order to advance the fortunes of a pair of financial manipulators who are out for a cleaning—and, from reports, are getting it fast.

The latest reports have it that Townsend and Clements, as officials of the corporation instead of as private partners (as though that makes any real difference), are pocketing profits at the rate of \$2,500 per week. And this, let me remind my het-up Townsend critics, doesn't include all the other plums—lectures, royalties, fees, dues, donations, literature sales,

advertising, etc. Dr. Townsend has cooked up a "plan" that is so much hog-wash, but, through clever manipulation and the shrewd direction of his side-kicker, Clements, the fools everywhere are emptying their purses into the laps of these grafters and racketeers.

* * *

Please describe some of the activities of the priests in Mexico which are objected to by the heads of the government.

I have already given a great deal of space to the Catholic Church's rotten history in Mexico, and have issued in the *Appeal to Reason* important surveys by Joseph McCabe and Joseph Lewis, but the matter is important and should be discussed whenever additional material becomes available, which happens to be the case at this moment.

Colonel Adalberto Tejeda, who, in 1932, was governor of the Vera Cruz province, speaks from first-hand knowledge when he explains why the Catholic Church, for three centuries, has been a thorn in the sides of Mexico's poor people and a force for reaction whenever any attempts were made to advance Mexico culturally, educationally, economically and politically.

Colonel Tejeda, for example, reports that the Catholic priests in his province fought the government's health authorities when they attempted to apply scientific methods to an attack on an epidemic of small pox. It was the contention of the priests that better results could be obtained by going to the cathedrals and churches for prayer—with incidental contributions to the coffers of the Church.

The same source reports that during periods of drought the government's agricultural experts found it difficult to get the farmers to tend their crops scientifically because the priests contended that going to church for the purpose of praying for rain would be more effective.

With the people of Mexico in serious economic distress, the priests worked on them for donations so that it became possible to send 40,000,000 pesos annually out of the country to the treasury of the Vatican. Colonel Tejeda continues with the information that peon labor, enslaved by the clerical forces of Mexico, was compelled to erect church edifices to the value

of 5,000,000,000 pesos, all of which came out of the sweat and toil of the masses, but which the priests claim to be their own property. Being a great property-holding corporation, the Catholic Church, in Mexico, was more concerned over protecting the privileges of the rich than in supporting the struggles of the poor.

Colonel Tejeda explained that the present government, tackling the problem of education from its practical side, is empowering its Ministry of Education to spend \$25,000,000 yearly in supplying modern, secularized schools to the poor people in the outlying districts—a policy that enrages the priests who, for so many generations, succeeded in keeping the peons in mental and physical slavery.

* * *

I read that Toscanini despises Tschai-kowsky's music. Tschai-kowsky epitomizes the Russian "soul" and it seems that Toscanini is a nationalist.

There has been a great deal of comment on Toscanini's attitude towards the great Russian composer, but I'm sure there's nothing to it. If I recall correctly, Toscanini included one of Tschai-kowsky's compositions during his 1934-35 season. If I'm right, and I seem to be fairly certain about it, this disposes of the great Italian's so-called nationalism.

Toscanini, who is without a doubt the world's greatest director and interpreter of music, certainly has shown, during many years, that he appreciates the fine music of every nationality. Consider what he does with Wagner, Brahms and Beethoven.

During the first racial eruptions of Hitlerism, when great Jewish directors were hounded out of Germany, Toscanini's name headed a statement of protest, which he followed by refusing to accept an invitation to direct a series of Wagnerian operas in the land of Hitleristic persecutions. When directing in Italy, some years ago, he refused to play the Fascist anthem at the opening of his concerts, thus bringing down on his head the wrath of Mussolini and his blackshirted bullies. Such incidents prove genuine, civilized internationalism, not nationalism.

As for Tschai-kowsky's music, it is, of course, uneven, but by and large it is great. His concerto for the violin is a fine achievement. His *Romeo and Juliet* overture is perfect. His

Pathetique symphony strikes me as being drivel, except for a few inspired themes. He was a brilliant, subtle, gifted, colorful orchestrationist. I've always noticed that musicians adore Tschaiakowsky, because he gives them such gorgeous opportunities to bring out their fullest musicianship. When he is "profound," Tschaiakowsky is inclined to whine, but when he's exciting he's glorious.

* * *

"I get the most kick out of such brief and terse word photos as that of Guy Kibbee, William Allen White, articles like the battery produced egg, and your philippics against Mussolini and Hitler. Your paper, outside of your comments on Social Credit—of which you know a helluva lot that ain't so—is great and I'm NOT stopping my subscription. As a Scot, I know I'm getting more than my money's worth."—Duncan MacKenzie, Battle Creek, Mich.

* * *

Who was it that described Shakespeare as "myriad-minded"?

Coleridge.

* * *

I was interested in several of your comments on Mark Twain as a Freethinker. I would be grateful if you were to elaborate on this theme.

W. D. Howells, the distinguished critic and novelist, and long a friend of the great humorist, wrote an article for *Harper's Magazine* shortly after Mark Twain's death, from which I take:

"He greatly admired Robert Ingersoll, whom he called an angelic orator, and regarded as an evangel of a new gospel, the gospel of Free-thought. He took the warmest interest in the newspaper controversy raging at the time as to the existence of a hell; when the noes carried the day I suppose that no enemy of perdition was more pleased. . . . After they [Mark Twain and his wife] had both ceased to be formal Christians she was still grieved by his denial of immortality, so grieved that he resolved upon one of those heroic lies which for love's sake he held even above the truth, and he went to her, saying that he had been thinking the whole matter over and now he was convinced that the soul did live after death. It was too late. Her keen vision pierced through his ruse, as it did when he brought the doctor who had diagnosed her case as organic disease of the heart, and after making him go over the facts of it

again with her made him declare it merely functional.

"To make an end of these records as to Clemens' beliefs, so far as I knew them, I should say that he never went back to anything like faith in the Christian theology, or in the notion of life after death, or in a conscious divinity. It is best to be honest in this matter; he would have hated anything else, and I do not believe that the truth in it can hurt anyone. . . ."

There's no doubt about Mark Twain's Agnosticism and Free-thought. He belongs with the world's Rationalists, those brave men and women who reject the authority of dogmatists and demand the rule of reason. His great masterpiece, the short and brilliant book, *The Mysterious Stranger*, published after his death, gives final, undoubted evidence of Mark Twain's Freethought.

* * *

Will you comment on Major Bowes' Amateur Hour?

Major Bowes has succeeded in putting over one of the neatest pieces of mean exploitation since the beginning of radio advertising. He poses as a friend of amateur talent, but it's known as an obvious fact that not a single professional has been turned out from the thousands of amateurs he has used so crassly to advance his own financial interests.

Major Bowes receives hundreds of thousands of dollars each year, but only an occasional ten-spot reaches the performers. The whole scheme is nothing more than a racket to get free talent for Bowes and his sponsors. When he organizes a company of amateurs to go on the road for appearances in movie theaters and vaudeville houses, he pays the talented performers something like \$40 per week and pockets thousands for himself every Saturday.

Amateurs flock to him, but Major Bowes uses them as easy marks, without the slightest interest in their future artistic welfare. Thousands of talented persons pour their time, money and energy into his racket. It's a sad commentary that our artistic amateurs have to let themselves be used as means of enriching a shrewd charlatan and his rich sponsors, with not one chance in a thousand of seeing the door to opportunity opened to them. It's nothing more than heartless, mercenary, merciless

panhandling by a notorious skin-flint.

* * *
How high can a bird fly?

An astronomer, in India, while photographing the sun, accidentally caught a picture of geese flying at an estimated height of 29,000 feet, which is the highest known thus far.

* * *
What's your opinion of Rutherford and his movement?

Judge Rutherford and his Watch Tower movement have done an immense amount of propagandistic work. The core of it all is the line: "Millions now living will never die." It seems to this old skeptic that the millions now living, including Rutherford himself, will die. Ketch on?

* * *
Recently I discovered that my young son, raised in a home that holds only Rationalists, had become afflicted with fears of Hell. Inquiry showed that he had been influenced by fanatical teachers in our public school. Please comment.

Our public schools are supposed to be secular, but it's an unfortunate fact that the parsons use their influence to make the tax-supported institutions mediums for the dissemination of superstition and dogmas. The only remedy is for Rationalists to protest. The church element is now in a minority, and its real influence grows dimmer each year, but by a peculiar paradox it's able to assert itself in our public schools, to the detriment of the children's minds. There can be no real education so long as the schools spread ideas that can't be accepted by intelligent, educated people. In desperation, the preachers, seeing their empty churches, reach out to terrorize and dominate teachers, students, editors, lecturers, etc.

Meanwhile, let's take a look at a country in which the public schools are really secularized and devoted to rationalistic, scientific education. I refer, of course, to Soviet Russia. Recently the *Moscow Daily News* printed an article on religion and Russian school children, from which I quote the following revealing, provocative sentences:

"They have healthy minds as well as healthy bodies, and these are the results of their remarkable liberation from the old taboos. Thanks to the scientific rational system of education adopted by the Soviet Government, it is practically impos-

sible for a child to acquire a sense of sin, a fear of Hell, or any of the other bogeys which can play such havoc with the psychological condition of the young. Religion is not dead in the Soviet Union—it is free, indeed, to all who desire it—but so far as the rising generation is concerned it is not merely dead, but forgotten. The young mind is unclouded by any sort of theological fantasy."

* * *
What are the requirements for admission into the Regular Army?

To enlist in the U. S. Army, a man must be (1) unmarried, (2) between 18 and 35 years of age, (3) at least five feet, four in height, (4) not less than 128 pounds, (5) have general good health, mentality and character. The minimum pay, during a three-year enlistment, is \$21 per month, with no charge for food, clothes, and housing. There are numerous opportunities to learn trades and become mechanics, electricians, chauffeurs, tailors, cooks, etc., with increases in pay, the maximum being \$157.50 per month for specialists and non-commissioned officers. The pension, after 30 years' service, amounts to three-quarters pay.

* * *
What do automobile interests consider the motor car's future to be?

John W. Scoville, chief statistician of the Chrysler Corporation, in an address to the Econometric Society, estimated there will be 35,000,000 motor cars in use in this country in 1950, which is 9,000,000 more than we have in 1936. He also estimated the industry's production of 5,104,000 cars, in 1950, to take care of the domestic and foreign markets. He claimed that the industry has succeeded in making about 5,000,000 extra jobs, which, of course, include the work done in steel mills, paint factories, glass plants, tire companies, etc.

* * *
If I succeed in throwing heads 50 times in succession, what are the chances that the 51st throw will be tails?

The 51st throw will still be a 50-50 chance for heads or tails, regardless of what was done in the previous 50 throws.

* * *
What was the 1935 value of automobile production?

Alfred Reeves, vice president and general manager of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, in his re-

port, "Preliminary Facts and Figures About the Automobile Industry During 1935," holds that U. S. motor cars and trucks produced during 1935 had a wholesale value of \$2,186,400,000. The production was 3,400,000 passenger cars and 750,000 trucks. Adding tires, parts and accessories, Mr. Reeves put the total wholesale value at an estimated \$2,999,500,000.

During the same year, 1935, our 26,000,000 motor cars consumed 16,150,000,000 gallons of gasoline, which cost the public \$3,260,000,000, including taxes. Lubricating oils cost about \$504,000,000 for 485,000,000 gallons.

During 1935, the car-owning public paid \$1,288,000,000 in special motor vehicle taxes and fees, which is 13 percent of the entire tax bill of the country. In the same year we had 3,550,000 commercial trucks in use, a new high. There were 22,450,000 passenger cars in use in 1935, an increase of almost 1,000,000. We now have about 71 percent of the world's motor cars.

The same authority says American farmers, in 1935, owned 5,035,000 cars, of which 900,385 were trucks. The report also holds that there were, in 1935, 48,000 small communities which depended entirely on motor cars for transportation. Sales of our cars in foreign countries took 13.6 percent of the output. In 1935, the railroads of the U. S. carried 3,422,000 carloads of automotive freight.

Has anything of a practical nature been done to remove the gold in sea water?

This problem has received a great deal of attention, but thus far it costs about \$50 to recover \$1 of gold from the ocean.

Has chemistry made any headway in providing a substitute for wool?

During the World War, Germany made clothes from artificial wool, but with poor results. The least moisture hurt the threads, while a rain was positively devastating. Today's German chemists are still working on the problem, but while some progress has been made, the cloth isn't as good as real wool and actually costs more.

It is reported that Italian chemists have perfected a wool substitute which is made from cheese. It is processed something along the lines

of rayon, which is made from wood pulp. The cheese is squeezed through tiny holes, after which the "threads" are hardened in acids.

"Wool" made from cheese may serve a country that can't afford to import raw materials because of the absence of foreign exchange, but for the present it's safe to say that the substitute won't be as serviceable as the real thing, and it's cost is, and will likely remain for a long time, prohibitive.

The problem is much like our own efforts to make synthetic rubber, in order to free our rubber-using industries from the control of the great interests in England and Holland, which control the rubber market. Our chemists have certainly succeeded in fabricating a substitute, but the price is much higher than the real rubber that nature makes. However, this doesn't mean the problem is beyond solution. But we have a long way to go before we can stop importing rubber, and the same applies to the wool situation in Italy.

Which is right: per cent or percent?

Both are right, but I prefer percent.

Give a lucid definition of Socialism and Communism; explain how they differ and in what ways they coincide.

Socialism and Communism are frequently used as synonyms, but such vulgar usage is unscientific. Both are branches of the same proletarian philosophy, but they differ fundamentally in methods, tactics, and objectives.

Socialism is a social order in which the large-scale industries, instruments of communication and means of exchange belong to the working class. These economic, industrial and financial facilities will be used for the purpose of satisfying the legitimate needs of the people and not to produce profits for private capitalists. In fact, under a system of socialized industry there will be no capitalists, because ownership of socially-necessary mechanisms will be vested in the people. Socialism provides that these social implements shall be democratically operated, and that the fuller economic life shall be accompanied by complete social-minded freedom of speech, press, assembly and thought. Instead of advocating violence, the

Socialists claim that so long as a country—such as the U. S., England, Canada, France, Holland, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, etc.—provides civil and political rights to the masses the movement of labor should strive to achieve socialization through legal, orderly, non-violent means. Once in control, a Socialist society will put the masses to work to create wealth to satisfy the needs of the people, rewarding the workers on the basis of the full social value of their labor. By full social value the Socialists mean the value of a worker's products minus depreciation, overhead, social insurance, old age pensions, research, education, entertainment, hospitalization, scientific inquiry, and the like.

Communism is a social order in which the working class achieves power through the inauguration of what is known as a "dictatorship of the proletariat." Under such a dictatorship all social, personal, cultural and political rights are granted or denied as may be seen fit by the human instrumentalities of the dictatorship. Such a society deliberately socializes everything from a railroad system down to a peanut-stand. It, like Socialism, permits personal property—clothes, furniture, motor cars, homes, etc.—but it confiscates every conceivable piece of property that might be used to create wealth. Under a real communistic society the workers, instead of receiving the full social value of their labor, create what their abilities will permit and then take out of the public treasury or stores of goods what they feel they need. Communistic groups function under the theory that their system of society can be established only through violence and confiscation, for it is their belief that the capitalistic elements will never surrender their economic power without resisting to the limit.

From the above outlines—and they have been all too brief—it will be seen that while there are a number of similarities between Socialism and Communism, there are, at the same time, serious and fundamental differences. First of all, there is the element of WHAT to socialize. The Communists say it's to be everything, except strictly personal belongings. The Socialists say it's to be only the large-scale industries, etc., leaving

small business and enterprises to private hands, on the theory that such ventures can be made productive by individual enterprise but become wasteful when they are run by society. Thus, under Socialism, the great railroads, mines, mills, telephone companies, telegraph lines, banks of all sizes, insurance companies, large farms, steel mills, refineries, pipelines, natural resources, waterways, etc., would be taken over by society for the good of the people, with the likely method of paying for them with non-interest bearing bonds, issued by each industry, and subject to heavy inheritance taxes.

It's a mistake to infer that the Soviet Union is a communistic country. The leaders of Russian Communism are the first to admit that only meager steps have been taken in the direction of Communism. Thus far, nothing has been done to reward labor on the basis of its needs instead of its social values. But there's no denying the fact that pure, real Communism is the ultimate goal of these leaders. How long will it take to reach such a system? That I can't answer. It may take many, many generations. Then, again, it may take only decades. I can't say definitely, but my impression is that it'll be a long time coming.

Socialists admit that a dictatorship can be absolutely essential in a country which has never known the blessings of democratic institutions, but that such a method in democratic countries can end only disastrously. Fascism is the Capitalist's logical answer to violent Communism, and we can see what happens when demagogues like Hitler and Mussolini throw a scare into the private owners and then institute a reign of terror as a part of their answer to violent Communism, though the real motive on the part of the Fascist leaders may be personal profit and gangster power.

Socialists claim that Fascism does not make any real headway in the really advanced countries I listed above, because the working class, when it's radical, is led by Socialists who reject non-legality, dictatorship and confiscation. If these sane and reasonable Socialists were to be replaced by violent Communists, there's no telling how long these progressive,

democratic countries would permit the civil rights that are now enjoyed so widely. In all fairness, it's necessary to add that during the past few months even the Communists have come around—at least in words, if not in deeds—to a realization that their violent methods are really reactionary and prepare the way for Fascism. Their pleas for a United Front are a part of their campaign to convince the working class of the world that the Communists are willing to recognize the benefits of democratic institutions in capitalistic countries. But it's interesting to note that little has been done in Russia itself to establish this viewpoint, and Socialists, in Russia, are frequently hounded and imprisoned with the same harshness that one meets in a Hitler or a Mussolini. Communists are learning slowly, and there is hope for the future, but there's no denying the simple fact that even though they've done marvelous things in Russia, they have done serious injury to the cause of labor and freedom in western countries. It was the tactics of the Communists which did a great deal to bring on Hitlerism. They played into the hands of their enemies. Their ceaseless threats, espousal of dictatorships, deriding of democratic institutions, etc., gave their enemies a seemingly valid excuse to institute a counter-terror. It isn't unreasonable to assume that the Communists now realize they went too far, but at the same time one must be very cautious of their words, for in their private gatherings they frequently confess that their actions in the direction of democracy and freedom are only maneuvers to give them control and leadership, after which they can be relied upon to give the western world a dose of Russian dictatorship and violence. It's a serious problem, and while it would be a mistake to shut the door in the face of the Communists, it's pretty wise to make haste slowly before taking them at their own word. The Socialists don't want to destroy the good in present civilization. They want to save the great things that have come down through the generations—the ideals of freedom, democracy, security, orderly processes of government and changes through law instead of the bullet.

* * *

Is it correct to abbreviate President

when referring to the Pres. of the U. S.?

I never approve of that abbreviation. President, when applied to the head of our government, should always be spelled out.

* * *

Please comment on the Christmas Eve address of the Pope, in which he attacked the "dark godlessness" of Russia and Mexico.

Pope Pius XI is a keen politician and international intriguer, but as a commentator he permits himself, perhaps willingly, to be uninfluenced by facts. At the time when Mexico and Russia were in the depths of "dark godlessness," they were at peace with the world. They weren't following policies of gory imperialism. Both nations continue asking nothing of the world except peace and good-will. They stand ready to defend themselves—particularly gigantic Soviet Russia—but they wouldn't move a finger to take something by force and violence. At home, both governments are striving heroically to improve the conditions of the working masses. In Russia, tremendous strides are being made in the direction of prosperity and security. The standard of living is rising. Costs are falling. There are no unemployed. Each able-bodied person has the inalienable right to a job, and failing to get it he is entitled to social insurance. Education is being promoted at an almost frantic pace. The country is booming. The 166,000,000 people are in a frenzy of construction, planning, achieving, cooperating.

In Mexico the pace is slower, but progress is measurable and real. Mexico, of course, isn't a Socialist country, but many of its governmental figures are socialistic and it's only a question of time before they hit the stride of Soviet Russia and bring the masses of workers closer to economic and industrial independence. Illiteracy is being fought on a wide front, and cultural victories are being won, despite the age-old blight of Catholic control and its reactionary, anti-progressive policies.

Yes, Russia and Mexico have nothing to be ashamed of, even though they are living in "dark godlessness." Their decision to function without the burdens of the priesthood enables them to get closer to the light of civilization and advancement. The world is in serious need of more such

godlessness. When the people take their minds off the gods in the skies they free themselves to give some necessary service to the problem of ridding the earth of its social, political and economic satans.

What rankles is the plain truth that Russia and Mexico—freed of the mind-stiffing and body-crushing rule of religious obscurantism—are getting along right well and promise to establish regimes that will endure and provide for the legitimate needs of the toilers. And these same countries, when they suffered under the rule of the black-robed priests, were notorious for their darkness, backwardness and tyranny.

The Pope, of course, was careful to say nothing about the "bright godliness" of his Fascist Italy, which is now an annex of the Vatican. Mussolini and his gangsters, on that Christmas Eve, were directing the bombing of helpless blacks in Ethiopia. That was a splendid demonstration of the Christian spirit of love and charity. Italy was, and is, striving to rob a nation of its independence, its land, its opportunities to live. And that war—one of the blackest pages in human history—has received the blessings of the Pope, his Cardinals and his priests. It's Italy that needs a good dose of "dark godlessness."

* * *

In raising turkeys this year I found they were of poor appetite and slow to fatten. Any suggestions?

Science Service reports that Jerome Simkins, who runs a turkey farm near Vancouver, Wash., gives his birds weekly doses of Epsom salt in order to pep up their appetites.

* * *

What is the difference between Materialism and Atheism?

This question, and numerous others connected with Theism, Religion, Rationalism, Theology, etc., are being covered thoroughly in Joseph McCabe's new series of essays, so I don't quite fancy the idea of intruding, but as this particular point can be answered briefly, I'll make an exception. A Materialist holds that there is nothing but matter, in its various forms, in the universe, thus rejecting the school that claims there is such a thing as "spirit." An Atheist rejects the assumptions of the Theists who claim there is validity in their arguments for the idea of God. Thus,

while there is no essential, fundamental difference between the two, there is a technical one because each devotes himself to a different set of claims.

* * *

Is it true that in Soviet Russia a person is judged by his class background before being admitted to full rights as a worker?

Until recently this was the case. The son of a rich farmer would find his position rather difficult because of his former class associations. But this attitude is changing rapidly, and it might be said that it will be gone before long. Late in December, 1935, Stalin heard a young worker at a great public gathering admit, during his speech, that he was the son of a kulak (wealthy peasant). Stalin immediately called from his seat:

"It doesn't matter whose son you are but who and what you are and how you work."

This statement, which was received with a great burst of cheering, indicates clearly that the recent prejudice against the children of socially undesirable parents no longer has official acceptance. We thus mark up one more step for Soviet progress.

* * *

Is it true that if a coin were thrown an infinite number of times, heads and tails would show up equally?

There is a difference of opinion here. Sir James Jeans, the distinguished mathematical astronomer, in his book, *The Mysterious Universe* (page 28), writes:

"If we throw up a million tons of half-pence, we know there will be 500,000 tons of heads and 500,000 tons of tails. The experiment may be repeated indefinitely, and will always give the same results."

That's putting it squarely, but I rather doubt that Jeans has made the experiment he refers to. Jeans' conclusion is rejected by D. Finlayson, D. Sc., as follows:

"It is easy to show, mathematically, that the chances of throwing exactly equal numbers of heads and tails in a given number of throws will become increasingly less as the number of throws is increased. In two tosses there is an even chance of throwing one head and one tail; in four tosses the chance of throwing two heads and two tails has fallen to six out of 16; in six tosses the chance of equal distribution is 20

out of 64, i. e., the odds are 44 to 20 against throwing three heads and three tails. When 1,000,000 tons of half-pence are thrown, the chance of exactly equal numbers of heads and tails is 530,600 to 1 against.

"If the above is doubted I suggest an easy way to convince the doubter is to make a practice of offering odds of 2 to 1 against anyone throwing equal numbers of heads and tails in eight throws. The mathematical odds are 186 to 70 against, so that the doubter will have a reasonable margin in his favor. If he is avaricious, he may suggest a larger number, say 12 or 16."

Not being of a mathematical turn of mind, I'm unable to take sides in this controversy, though it seems to this mere layman that Dr. Finlayson—if his premises are correct—has the better of the argument. There may be some readers who can tackle this problem with more certainty than I'm showing, and if so I'll be glad to hear from them.

* * *

How'd you like the movie version of "The Tale of Two Cities"?

I was highly pleased with the acting, direction and realistic reproduction of late 18th Century life in London and Paris, except, of course, for the fourth-rate handling of the French Revolution.

To judge the revolutionists by this picture one would take them to be a vicious crew of murderers, hoodlums, drunkards and malicious destructionists. As usual, the "terror" is given first emphasis, despite the obvious fact that the terror didn't arrive until about four years after the beginning of the Revolution.

With the fall of the Bastille, the movie shows the big knife cutting off heads, until one is forced to conclude that the purpose of the leaders of the French people wasn't to destroy great social and political wrongs but to go on a murder-spre. Any school-boy ought to know that the guillotine, instrument of the Terror, was unknown until about the fourth year of the Revolution.

It would, perhaps, be too much to expect simple historical truth and honesty from Hollywood when treating so touchy and delicate a thing as mass revolt against social injustice. After all, these are delicate times we are living in—what with Capitalism wobbling, Socialism advancing, and

Russian Communism growing defiantly powerful—so Hollywood must, perforce, do its bit for the good of "law and order" by showing how terrible the French Revolutionists were.

If Hollywood wanted to tell the truth, it would have to swallow many an unpalatable dish. It would have to show that the French Revolution was not engineered by murderous hoodlums but by the flower of France's intellectual life. The French Revolution was one of the grandest, cleanest, most honest, civilized, progressive, constructive, humanitarian moments in history. It was organized by keen-minded, idealistic, justice-loving Rationalists, creators of the Age of Reason. And when the Terror came—after the defeated ruling class showed its crass disloyalty to France—the deaths were, in the main, the result of the activities of those new leaders of the Revolution who had destroyed the early Rationalism and substituted religious superstition as a social "necessity." The originators of the Revolution were defeated by religious obscurantists, but even here the Terror, bad as it was, was by no means as vicious as Hollywood and dishonest historians would give us to understand. I doubt that more than 4,000 men and women were executed, and many of these, of course, earned their punishment.

To see this new, impressive, sumptuous movie, one would imagine that no revolutionary judge could sit on his bench without having before him huge quantities of alcohol. One would have to picture the revolution's women as so many toothless, hysterical hags. One would imagine the revolutionists wanted no new civilization but were merely letting themselves indulge in a blood-bath.

The French Revolution marked the end of France's Feudalism, which in itself justified everything that happened during those great, glorious years of action, thought and emotion. It destroyed the privileges of the Catholic Church. It rooted out age-old superstitions in law, education, society, and government. It opened the door to newer, brighter days, despite ominous reactions that followed and which still may visit civilization. It was a period of great dignity, formality, caution, inquiry, truth-seeking—right up to the months of the Ter-

ror which the aristocrats and religious-minded mass-leaders brought into being. For generations conventional historians—now aided by Hollywood's magic—served to libel and misrepresent the French Revolution, but its lessons endure and its spirit is deathless.

But, as I've already mentioned, the picture's bad history doesn't shadow the fine work done by such capable artists as Ronald Colman, Walter Catlett, Edna May Oliver, and a score of others. Their work was flawless and thoroughly in the spirit of Dickens' creative masterpiece. Reginald Owen's portrayal of the pompous, stupid, loud-mouthed, incompetent London lawyer was really fine and gave me many a quiet chuckle.

As usual, I had a hard time enjoying this film because of the rudeness of our typical Kansas audiences. I happened to be in Parsons, Kansas, when I saw the announcement of a local theater. I soon found myself surrounded by noisy, bad-mannered children and equally unpleasant grown-ups. At least a third of the audience held paper bags filled with pop-corn (sold in the lobby by the management, which simply had to capture another dollar of profit though their action might destroy the pleasure of those who paid their money to see the film in quiet and order), and the rattling of paper, the crunching of pop-corn, the sucking of morsels from between teeth, the hopping around of hateful kids—all worked to make it difficult to follow the film.

A person sitting near me was also annoyed. A small boy in front of both of us persisted in slamming his seat, jumping up and down, buying sack after sack of popcorn and in a dozen other ways making a complete nuisance of himself. Finally, this stranger leaned forward and whispered something to the little demon. I suppose he asked him to keep quiet. To which the young imp made answer with louder noises. This led the gentleman to say: "If you don't keep quiet I'll call the manager to put you out." And then came this answer: "You can't put me out, because I'm the manager's son." So that was that. If my readers are still to see *A Tale of Two Cities* I hope they'll have better luck.

The picture is worth seeing but, as

I've already warned you, don't swallow its history without reserve.

* * *

How long can Mussolini finance his Ethiopian war?

As this is being written, late in December, I'd say that, granting no change in the international situation, Mussolini will have enough money to keep going until the end of February, 1936. Thus far he has made a miserable failure of his invasion of Ethiopia. From the very beginning I predicted (even without the legal protection of a prophet's license) that he would have a tough time defeating the Ethiopians, and that it would take perhaps 10 years to finally subjugate them, granting the permanence of his regime, the certainty of plenty of money and the non-interference of other powers. I wrote these things when others were making ominous noises about Mussolini's mechanized army, to which I replied, on many occasions, that the Duce's tanks would have hard going in roadless, mountainous Ethiopia, and that the airplanes would have few targets worth bombing. At the same time I suggested that Haile Selassie could conceivably win the war by refusing to expose himself early and resorting to guerrilla warfare. Things worked out that way, which leads me to reconsider my decision to operate without a prophet's license. Mussolini has learned, at last, that the further he penetrates Ethiopia the more untenable his position becomes—the exact words I used almost a year ago. Mussolini can make something of a noise now, but he knows that the rainy season will be back in May, 1936, and that will pull down his whole campaign and cause an expensive wait. But will the Italian people be willing to wait? They will find out late in February, or early in March, that their great Caesar has busted the country and that he is without funds to buy needed supplies. What will they do to the great Mussolini? Maybe they'll send him over to those dumb Americans who have been saying that "what this country needs is a Mussolini."

* * *

As I am a new Freeman reader, I request you to summarize the arguments you have presented against the Townsend Plan.

Though my anti-Townsend editorial

material is available in my books of questions and answers, I'm willing to set aside my usual policy of refusing to repeat questions already handled. My objections to Dr. Townsend's pipe-dream follow:

1. Dr. Townsend and his colleague, Clements, are two racketeers, out to make a lot of money at the cruelest jest ever thrown at the poor, helpless aged men and women of this country.

2. Dr. Townsend is making a fortune through the private exploitation of his weekly paper, which he keeps as a private corporation instead of permitting it to be the property of the organized Townsendites.

3. Dr. Townsend really knows his scheme is unworkable, which explains his refusal to meet opponents in public debate, after he has been challenged on numerous occasions.

4. The scheme to raise between \$20,000,000,000 and \$24,000,000,000 yearly through a "transactions tax" amounts to a tax on the poor men and women who are under 60 years of age. Such a tax will make 5c worth of bread cost 10c; a \$2 shirt cost \$4; a \$500 motor car cost \$1,000.

5. The Townsend Plan won't increase purchasing power; instead it will cause inflation, and thereby decrease purchasing power.

6. The Plan won't put more men to work. It will merely swap a few jobs without improving the industrial and economic situation.

7. It would take a vast army of spies and snoopers to make sure that each pensioner would spend his money during the month it was received, and even such a vast snooping organization couldn't compel the sought-after spending.

8. The Plan is serving to injure sensible, reasonable, workable social insurance movements. By asking the impossible, the Townsendites make it impossible for the old to receive the possible.

9. The Plan offers no change in the social system, thereby serving to support Capitalism, the real enemy of social insurance and security.

10. The transactions tax would have to come out of the public's income, which would mean that almost half the nation's income would have to go to a small percentage of beneficiaries.

11. You can't tax the common people into prosperity.

12. Passage of a Townsend bill would so disorganize society that it would take many years before sanity could gain the opportunity to further social reforms of real value to the masses.

13. The promoters of the Townsend Plan are profiting at the expense of the aged poor, in order to keep them from getting real social insurance.

14. Dr. Townsend and his fellow-racketeer, Clements, are schemers for money and power, without the slightest knowledge of social, economic, financial or governmental problems.

15. The Townsend Plan is a racket that aims to attract the caliber of mentality that falls for the Long Share-the-Wealth "plans," the Father Coughlin money-tinkering nonsense, the Upton Sinclair EPIC stunt to save the taxpayers the expense of feeding and clothing the unemployed, and all the other hurry-up schemes to cure Capitalism overnight without touching the real issues of Capitalism—private ownership of the large-scale instruments of production, distribution and exchange.

16. Wall Street isn't alarmed over the growth of Townsendites, because it knows that the pipe-dream is right up Wall Street's alley. Any movement that serves to muddy the water and thereby confuse the masses who might otherwise be drawn to scientific social transformations, serves the big money interests. A planned economy can be killed by a screwy outfit, and that's what Wall Street wants. Therefore, it's glad to see Dr. Townsend clean up the cash while he goes about the "good" job of discrediting real old-age pensions.

17. The Townsend Plan is economic fanaticism, day-dreaming, wool-gathering. It has the same effect as a good shot of dope. The promoters are enemies of social progress.

* * *

Your articles on Stakhanoffism interested me very much, but as a worker in a Ford assembly plant, it seems I'm familiar with the scheme, except that over here we simply call it the "speed-up."

There's a real difference between the Russian idea of increased production and the American speed-up, though superficially they seem to be the same. Over here, you speed up

to increase the corporation's dividends, while over there they speed up so that the workers will have a bigger supply of consumers' goods to draw on. That's altogether different.

* * *

I am sending you a report, including numerous pictures, showing how Mussolini built roads, fountains, public buildings, etc. At the same time you and others say Fascist Italy is bankrupt. How come?

The Italian budget hasn't been balanced since 1925. By manipulating figures, Mussolini is always able to report a "balance," but these statements are false. During the past 13 years, Italy's national debt increased 55,000,000 lire. These debts are ignored, which makes rotten accounting but good Fascist propaganda. As for the roads and monuments you saw pictured, they were paid for by American fools, who will never see a penny of their money if they wait until their securities mature. Mussolini, through clever propaganda and the help of corrupt American bankers and licksplittle newspapers, was able to sell \$600,000,000 worth of Italian bonds to American "investors." This money paid for the nice things you saw, which writes down Americans as dupes. If they had any sense they would have dumped those securities on the market months ago to take whatever they could get and fo get about the loss. If they hold on they will finally have to charge them off as total losses.

* * *

It is claimed, in extenuation of Mussolini, that he saved Italy from Bolshevism. Please comment.

This notion is without foundation. Communism was insignificant when Mussolini and his gangsters stole power. In the Italian election of 1921, a year before Mussolini became dictator, only 18 Communists were elected, as against 195 Socialists. The strikes of 1921 were well over long before Mussolini began his orgy of murder and tyranny.

* * *

Much is made of the alleged fact that Hitler's regime is justified if for no other reason than his attack on the Versailles Treaty. Please comment.

I have shown many times that the German Republic fought and gradually defeated the iniquitous Versailles Treaty long before its decent people

dreamed it was possible for that homosexual gangster to steal power and turn his hoodlums on everything that suggested real civilization. The well-known correspondent, John Gunther, summarizes the argument this way:

"German policy had gone far toward redressing the dictates of Versailles before Hitler came to power. Foreign military control was abolished early in the republic. The Rhineland was evacuated under Stresemann. Reparations dwindled under Bruening and Papen. And the Allies accepted Germany's theoretical right to military equality under Papen-Schleicher."

* * *

How much silver and gold are there in the world?

The world supply of silver is about 15,000,000,000 ounces; of gold, about 600,000,000 ounces. In other words, for each ounce of gold there are about 25 ounces of silver. Gold is worth nearly 50 times the value of silver.

* * *

I am sending you herewith, for comment, a copy of The American Bulletin, which makes the assertion that Huey Long's assassination was the result of a Jewish plot.

This publication, which is issued in New York City, is undoubtedly a propaganda medium of the Nazi poison-squad. Serious attempts are being made to give the U. S. the same brand of malicious and shameless anti-Semitism that made Germany the modern source of persecution and racial fanaticism.

As everyone knows, Huey Long was shot by a Roman Catholic, Dr. Weiss, who, a few hours before he committed his dastardly deed, attended mass. Now it is claimed that because his name is somewhat Jewish and that it can be shown that he was only seven-eighths gentile, it must follow that the plot was hatched by Jews. It takes such "logic" and "facts" to put on the heads of the helpless Jews another burden of prejudice and calumny.

We are thus given to understand that if a seven-eighths gentile does something good, the credit belongs to "Aryanism," but should that same individual do something bad the blame naturally falls on the one-eighth 'non-Aryan.'

This incident is just one more proof

of my oft-repeated assertion that the Jews in this country are in for a period of merciless persecution, if the American tools of Hitler can make their filthy propaganda stick.

Decent Americans must do their utmost NOW to counter such campaigns of falsehood and malice.

* * *

Have birds good hearing and sight?

Both senses are highly developed. During the World War, the French kept parrots in their forts and the Eiffel Tower because they were able to give warning of approaching airplanes before they were seen by observers.

As for the sense of sight, it's interesting to note that birds can change their eyes from telescopes to microscopes in a split second. Dr. E. H. Eaton reports that an eagle high in the air observed three miles away a small dead fish floating on a stream. It dove for its food in a straight line.

The sense of smell is not so acute.

* * *

What is the deepest distance birds can dive in water?

Gordon C. Aymar, in his book, *Bird Flight*, says that fishermen have caught birds in their nets at a depth of 90 feet.

* * *

How fast does a humming bird stroke its wings?

Experts report that no count has yet been made, but that estimates which allow for the hum indicate about 200 strokes per second. Compare this speed with the pelican, which makes less than two strokes per second.

* * *

Which migratory bird makes the longest yearly trip?

Ornithologists report that the Arctic tern leaves the Arctic, travels to the Antarctic, and returns to the Arctic yearly. The golden plover, a shore bird, takes the record for ocean flying, making a non-stop trip from Labrador to the Argentine pampas. Another non-stop water flight is made by the Pacific form, which flies from Alaska to Hawaii.

* * *

Has the Reconstruction Finance Corporation taken over any corporations which failed to pay back what they borrowed from the government?

Stuart Chase, in his *Government in Business*, shows that the federal gov-

ernment now owns outright, because of default, the following: scores of banks, three insurance companies, one railroad, one real estate mortgage loan company, and 4,000,000 bales of cotton.

* * *

Which bird flies fastest?

The record may belong to the dotterel, which leaves North Africa in the evening and takes breakfast in Sweden.

* * *

It is urged that the low caliber of Southern statesmanship—represented by the Bilbo-Long-Hefflin-Vardaman type of demagogue—is to be blamed on the fact that the South lost its aristocracy when it was destroyed in the Civil War. Please comment.

A little fact may help expose this nonsense. During the Civil War the Confederacy lost 4,626 officers, who were killed, wounded, or succumbed to disease. Surely the so-called aristocracy that moved on such a lofty plane couldn't possibly be exterminated by such a comparatively small loss. We humans everywhere like to look for goats. In the case of Southern demagoguery, our intelligent Southerners like to rationalize this misfortune by blaming the Civil War, but that excuse simply won't hold up.

* * *

The Catholic priesthood is the most contemptible reptile that ever wriggled out of hell. How, then, can you patronize that hypocrite and American traitor, Charles Coughlin, by calling him "Father"?

I call Coughlin "Father" in the same way that I call another man "Pope" or "Cardinal." It's his official title. Father (of what?) Coughlin is not being patronized when he's called "Father" but is being identified.

* * *

How tall is Stalin?

The only report I recall ever having seen said he is five feet, five inches tall, but perhaps this should be verified before being accepted. I'll be thankful for reliable information on this matter of Stalin's height. From his pictures I always took him to be at least five inches taller.

* * *

Is it a fact that Mussolini freed the slaves in the territory he occupied in Ethiopia?

The Fascist propagandists have made much of Il Duce's "civilizing" mission in East Africa, not the least feature of it being the concern the

Blackshirt bully has shown for the poor, suffering slaves in or near Adowa. The facts, however, make a joke of this slave-freeing ballyhoo.

According to *Le Canard Enchaîné*, published in Paris, General de Bono's order to abolish slavery in the occupied territory caused a great problem when his men were sent after some slaves, for none could be found at once. After diligent searches, soldiers succeeded in coming on some "slaves" who were living in complete freedom in the forests. They were brought to the central square of Adowa, to be reviewed and "civilized" by Mussolini's general. The following is reported to have happened, according to the French publication named above:

"Slaves," he (General de Bono) said to them in a voice vibrant with emotion, "you are henceforth free."

"Long live freedom!" the freedmen shouted.

"They were immediately clapped into jail for subversive utterances."

And that's how some of Ethiopia's slaves became free and independent, thanks to Mussolini.

* * *

How tall is Mussolini?

Westbrook Pegler, American newspaperman, interviewed Mussolini and reported:

"He is not as tall as I had expected, being about five feet one and thick in the barrel, but not fat."

* * *

How much food do the CCC camps consume?

The Army Quartermaster Corps reports that the 500,000 men in the CCC camps consume 1,737½ carloads of food monthly, or 58 carloads daily, covering 39 food items. Beef comes first, with a monthly consumption of 9,375,000 pounds, which is enough to fill 426 2/3 carloads. Pepper is the least used article, and yet it is served up at the rate of 150,000 cans per month. Men in the CCC camps have the same rations as the Army.

The CCC food bill costs \$6,000,000 monthly, which means about 45c per man per day. To get the picture of just one CCC breakfast, try to imagine the following:

Oatmeal, 1½ carloads; eggs, 500,000; bacon, one carload; flour cooked into biscuits, one carload; coffee, several tank cars; butter, one carload; syrup, 1,800 cans; sugar, one

carload; jam and preserves, 10,000 cans. In all, this typical breakfast will mean about 20 carloads of food.

That the CCC rations are ample is demonstrated by the fact that the men gained from seven to 11 pounds during their first 60 days in camp, according to the report of the surgeon general.

* * *

You've had very little to say about Father Coughlin these past few months, after a long spell in which each issue contained many columns about this terrestrial representative of the Holy Ghost. Why?

Father Coughlin isn't much of the menace he was early in 1935. The gentleman's guns seems pretty well spiked. It may be that the masses aren't so dumb as the charlatans imagine. At any rate, they—at least a good many of them—came to realize that a victory for Coughlinism would be a defeat for liberalism, democracy, progress, education, freedom, civil rights and the other precious gifts of modern civilization. Father Coughlin's Fascism and anti-Semitism became obvious—so much so that the people who still have decent feelings decided to turn elsewhere. Unfortunately, many of them turned in the wrong direction—to Townsendism. But I predict that the Townsend racket will blow up even faster than Coughlinism.

The American people certainly don't want Fascism, and when they realized that Coughlinism means a combination of Mussolini and Hitler for American institutions, they came to their senses. I'm glad I did my little share in exposing this monumental fraud. He still talks and works himself into a lather, but no one trembles any more, and the Statue of Liberty seems to be safe, for the time being, anyway.

Of course, Coughlin is shrewd and clever, so there's always the possibility that he may think up a new line of shoddy goods to palm off on the American people. If he does, lovers of freedom and democracy will be on the watch for the first sign of his returning influence. Eternal vigilance, you know. In a democracy we learn to use the civilized weapon of debate, and it's powerful, if used intelligently. So long as we can enjoy full and free discussion, the Coughlins will eventually be undermined and defeated.

That's one of the great things about living in a democracy—you can think aloud!

* * *

Is it a fact that the governor of Kansas balanced the budget?

Alf M. Landon balanced the budget, but the newspaper ballyhoo should add that the budget is always balanced in Kansas. To read the political hokum one would imagine Landon became governor of a busted State, put its financial house in order, and ended by keeping expenditures well within the bounds of receipts. Go back over the administrations that preceded the present one and you'll find that the State's budget has never been out of balance in many decades. So what?

I've lived in Kansas for 20 years and know of only one bond issue in all that time—a small debt of about \$20,000,000 shortly after the World War to pay a bonus to the Kansas men who served the colors. And that issue has been liquidated each year, as demanded by law, so that it's only a matter of time before the State will be back to its old position of enjoying a completely debtless treasury. It's been that way because Kansas farmers hate debt the way the devil hates coca-cola.

The question next arises as to how the State handled the problem of relief during the past six years of depression. The answer here is that the Constitution doesn't permit direct appropriations for relief. Such help must come from the counties. During Alf Landon's administration he has used his influence to keep the Legislature from changing the Constitution on this point, because he wanted the relief load to be carried by the federal government and the counties. This situation has resulted in an unfair load on the local communities, during a period when the State enjoyed a credit rating every whit as good as that of the federal government.

Recently I heard a State official deliver an address on the new Social Security Law which went into effect on January 1, 1936. Under this enactment, the Federal government agrees to pay old age pensions and other benefits to the needy, provided of course that the State pays an equal amount. Landon is doing nothing to

enable the State to participate in this social reform. Instead, he sends out men to tell the counties to prepare to cooperate with the federal authorities in order to supply relief where it is necessary. Naturally, the counties, which are all broke or near that condition, won't be able to carry much of the expense, so it's safe to say that the Social Security movement will have slight results in a State where the Governor is willing to let tens of thousands of Kansans suffer privation rather than use the credit of the State treasury to bring quick amelioration for the aged, disabled, or unemployed.

Governor Landon is being groomed for the presidency, which explains the political hokum that is being ladled out so generously, but, despite this unfortunate characteristic of American political life, the man is exceptional in many ways, with admirable qualities. First of all, Landon is scrupulously honest. He has never been known to use political office for the enrichment of his own finances. It happens, of course, that he is a wealthy man (as rich men go in Kansas), but I feel sure he'd be just as honest were he quite poor.

Governor Landon is an intelligent, well-mannered, well-intentioned, competent public man. During his administration he has shown consistent regard for the precious principles of civil liberty. Never has he done a single thing, by word or deed, to indicate unfriendliness towards free speech, assembly, press and thought. In these days of near-Fascism, such a position deserves to be noticed. I say this after careful consideration, for I recall vividly the recent excitement over Hearst's visit to Topeka to look over the nation's "next President." Hearst, I know, gave Landon his cordial O. K., but I'm positive if Landon were elected President he would soon disappoint Hearst because of his unwillingness to join in heresy-hunts, red-baiting, hysterical attacks on helpless aliens, persecution of academic leaders, and the other disgraceful pursuits that seem to please sadistic Hearst. Landon never was a Hearst type of man, and never can be. He isn't made that way. The man has too much honest, simple dignity in his make-up to stoop to such unintelligent spectacles. If Hearst

thinks Landon will make a good near-Fascist President, he is in for the disappointment of his hectic life, for Landon believes in old-fashioned Americanism, and that means democracy, liberal toleration, and full protection of all civil rights.

* * *

Does the *Normandie* bring in enough revenue to pay expenses?

The French liner *Normandie*, according to an official report, made 18 Atlantic crossings, up to December 25, 1935, and took in receipts amounting to 50,000,000 francs. Operating costs were 36,000,000 francs; general costs, 14,000,000 francs. This leaves the item of service charges on construction costs still uncovered, but they shouldn't be figured because the French government has assumed them.

What will happen when the British *Queen Mary* is finished is somewhat of a problem. The English are going to charge \$145 for a first class trip, and \$93, third class, summer rates. The owners of the *Normandie* have announced that they intend to meet these rates.

* * *

In the matter of greater mechanized agriculture in Russia, what is the role of the tractor?

In 1933, tractors were used on 85,000,000 acres in the Soviet Union. In 1935, the tractor acreage was 240,000,000. In 1934, combines reaped 5,000,000 acres; in 1935, 15,000,000 acres. It's estimated that the combines will be used on 45,000,000 acres in 1936.

* * *

As Lenin listed numerous specifications for Russian industrialization, I want to know if you have any information showing whether or not these quotas have been reached.

G. K. Ordjonikidze, Commissar for Heavy Industry, late in December, 1935, reported the actual figures that Lenin put down for production levels in 10 to 15 years, and also gave the figures of 1935 production for purposes of comparison. The results:

Coal, 62,000,000 tons annually under Lenin's schedule; in 1935, 103,000,000 tons.

Peat, 16,400,000 tons under Lenin's schedule; in 1935, 18,500,000 tons

Oil, 11,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons under Lenin's schedule; in 1935, 25,000,000 tons.

Iron ore, 19,000,000 tons under

Lenin's schedule; in 1935, 27,000,000 tons.

Pig Iron, 8,200,000 tons under Lenin's schedule; in 1935, 12,500,000 tons.

Steel, 6,500,000 tons under Lenin's schedule; in 1935, 12,400,000 tons.

Aluminum, 9,800 tons under Lenin's schedule; in 1935, 25,000 tons.

The Commissar for Heavy Industry also made other comparisons of daily and monthly production between 1925 and 1935, which are equally impressive:

Electric power, 3,400,000 kilowatts per day; in 1935, 58,000,000.

Coke, 6,000 tons per day; in 1935, 49,000 tons.

During December, 1925, the Soviet Union produced 12 locomotives; in December, 1935, 134.

Freight-cars, in December, 1925, 28; in December, 1935, 10,000.

Tractors, in December, 1925, 49; in December, 1935, 9,500.

Auto trucks, in December, 1925, seven; in December, 1935, 7,000.

Light motor cars, in December, 1925, none; in December, 1935, 1,700.

Putting the subject in terms of money, the Commissar's report shows that in 1925 the Soviet Union's heavy industries produced wealth to the value of 2,300,000,000 rubles; in 1935, the production was worth 24,300,000,000 rubles, with the money figured on the same basis of valuation. In terms of man-power, the report shows 690,000 workers engaged in heavy industry, in 1925; in 1935, the workers numbered 5,750,000.

The next question deals with the value of each worker's productivity. The report shows that in 1925 an average worker produced in a month wealth to the value of 270 rubles; in 1935, 870 rubles. In 1925, the average monthly wage was 46 rubles; in 1935, 280 rubles.

When this valuable report was issued, A. I. Mikoyan, Internal Trade Commissar, was asked what effect this increased production would have on employment, the questioner having in mind the fact that in capitalistic countries increased productivity works to the disadvantage of the employes. The Commissar replied:

"Some fear this will cause what America calls technological unemployment. This is nonsense here. We simply build more factories because there is no limit in the So-

cialist U. S. S. R. to the possibilities of industrial development."

The questioner should have known that there's all the difference in the world between private, capitalistic ownership and collective ownership. The former owner produces for profit; the latter, for use. In the former (Capitalism), the more labor produces the greater the danger of technological unemployment; in the latter (Socialism), the greater wealth labor produces the richer the rewards for the toilers.

Russia is demonstrating its strength, virility, intelligence and constructiveness. The future is indeed bright. A great future is headed in the right direction. Will the goal be achieved? Barring defeat in war, success seems assured.

* * *

What are the chances of drawing a perfect bridge hand? Also, a straight flush at poker?

Some bears on figures at Columbia University say the chances of a perfect bridge hand are four in 635,013,559,000. A straight flush at poker may be drawn at the rate of one in 64,973 tries.

* * *

I've been living in this country many years, but wonder if I couldn't do better by myself if I were to go to Russia. Please comment.

Whether or not you should return to Russia depends on circumstances. If you have a fair job or profession and make even a moderate living in this country, I'd certainly advise against leaving. If you were to throw over a job or business here in order to start all over again in Russia you would find yourself in for a long period of readjustment, and in the end might not be well off from a financial and economic viewpoint. A skilled worker in this country, who is steadily employed, is far better off than any kind of a worker in the Soviet Union, though we are always glad to call attention to Russia's gigantic constructive achievements during the past few years. The Russian standard of living is higher than it was 10 years ago, and much higher than it was in 1913, but this doesn't mean that American standards of steadily employed skilled workers in the U. S. have been reached or closely approached.

Let Russians work out their own

problems. I'm sure that in the end they will win great rewards and make tremendous progress in wealth, culture, education, health, social security, etc. But these jobs are for Russians, not Americans, and by Americans I mean also those Russians who have been living here many years and have established deep roots in this country.

We who are struggling to live in America shouldn't try to escape our problems and responsibilities by going to Russia. We should devote our best energies to improving American life—and it can be done, for we have the equipment, the intelligence and the motive. There isn't anything that Russia can do in industry and economics that we couldn't match two times over, if we were to organize for scientific attack on the evils of Capitalism. We could, with proper measures, turn America into a paradise for those who work, but before doing that it would be necessary first to socialize the large-scale industries, banks, communication and transportation systems. Once we lay the foundations for cooperative action we shall be on the way to social security and independence for those millions who do the work of the land.

We have great opportunities for social and cultural service in this country, and my suggestion to wavering or discouraged friends is to stick right here and face the music. Russia for the Russians—let that be the slogan—and America for the Americans! We are fortunate to live in such a vast, rich country, crowded with natural resources, blessed with ample room for expansion, and facilities for the production of goods to satisfy every reasonable need. Our misfortune isn't the country; it's the system that's at fault, and that system can be corrected through legal, orderly, non-violent means.

* * *

Your figures on the size of California's tourist trade lead me to ask for data dealing with Florida.

The Florida State Road Department estimates that 1,395,650 tourists visit Florida yearly, in 515,000 motor cars, and spend \$90,458,000. The average visit lasts 29.4 days. They consume 36,786,000 gallons of gasoline, paying the State \$2,575,000 in taxes. The majority of these tour-

ists, 56.6 percent, come from Georgia and Alabama. New York and Pennsylvania contribute 13.5 percent. Then follow Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, 10.7 percent; West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, 9.1 percent; New England, 3.0 percent; Oklahoma, Texas, 4.0 percent; foreign countries, 0.5 percent.

* * *
I am more than interested in your numerous comparisons of conditions in Russia in 1913 and today. What are the facts with regard to the number of doctors and nurses?

In 1913, Russia had 12,154 doctors and 36,476 nurses. In December, 1935, there were 53,000 doctors and nearly 150,000 assistant doctors and nurses. My authority is the December 14, 1935, issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*.

* * *
How much business do the railroads get from the Chicago packing industry?

Incoming and outgoing cars of freight, needed to service the meat business, number about 1,000 per day. A year's cars—almost 365,000—would extend from New York almost to San Francisco.

* * *
Among other things, Hearst blames the New Deal for Lindbergh's self-imposed exile. Please comment.

I don't see how Hearst can make that charge stick, when the kidnaping itself took place during the Hoover administration.

It seems as though Hearst is trying to muddy the issue, because it was the behavior of the Hearst newsmen and photographers which had a great deal to do with Lindbergh's decision to get out of the country. It comes direct from Lindbergh that one morning, not long before the family left the country, little Jon was being taken to school in the family motor car. While on the way, a Hearst car appeared and crowded the Lindbergh car to the curb, where the child was compelled to pose for its pictures, which later appeared in the Hearst press and other newspapers that cared to pay the price. This amounted to a temporary kidnaping and a disgraceful violation of the rights of the Lindberghs.

A decent newspaper would have asked permission to take the pictures, and denied such approval would have let the matter drop. But Hearst's

gangsters, taking their cue from the big boss himself, are not bound by such niceties. There's nothing too low for a Hearst newsmen to do. And when they have helped drive out the Lindberghs, the big boss has the gigantic gall to blame the incident on the New Deal, aliens, Communists and his other pet hates.

* * *
Do the State and local governments owe more money than the Federal government?

On November 30, 1935, the total public debt of the Federal government was \$29,500,000,000, since which time the debt has increased about \$1,000,000,000. Gross State and local government debts, on November 30, amounted to \$20,500,000,000. The total, Federal, State and local, is about \$50,000,000,000. This sounds tremendous, but when one considers that this is hardly more than a single year's income of the nation the obligation doesn't look so terrible, though our near-Fascist, Hearstian elements would give the public the impression that the nation was headed towards bankruptcy.

According to the National Industrial Conference Board, about 34 percent of all money received by the Federal government, during 1934 and 1935, went to debt charges. During the 10 years ending 1933, Great Britain paid out about 43 percent of its revenue to cover debt charges. As the Wall Street press never speaks of England being insolvent, then it ought to be clear that the U. S., with lower debt charges, by about 9 percent, is even stronger financially.

It's well to remember that the elements who are squawking about "mounting debts" are the very people who want the federal government to do nothing about relief and social reform, except to give a dollar here and there to local bodies for charity.

* * *
In his speech before Congress, on January 3, 1936, President Roosevelt said there were nations in Europe and Asia which were based on tyranny and aggression. Which nations did he mean? Also, he urged peace on the world, but gave no constructive plan. Please comment.

It isn't at all difficult to name the nations Roosevelt had in mind as sources of tyranny, aggression, and anti-democratic movements. They are, of course, Japan, Germany and Italy.

These three countries are the danger-spots of the world.

You're quite right when you mention that Roosevelt's plea for world peace was based mainly on generalities. I'm sure this country is sincerely interested in maintaining world peace. The same goes for Great Britain and the Soviet Union. If these three great governments were to organize an *entente cordiale* they could keep the entire world at peace. Such a policy is necessary, and the sooner it is worked out the stronger will be the foundations of what Roosevelt calls good neighborliness.

Japan, Germany and Italy could never get very far if they realized that the U. S., England and Russia not only want peace but are ready to stand together to achieve that goal. The mere fact that these great, mighty nations were standing together would be insurance against war.

* * *

Does the Diesel engine work more economically than steam?

S. T. Bledsoe, president, Sante Fe railroad, reports that his company has done considerable experimental work with Diesels and adds: "The major advantages of Diesel power as compared with steam lie in much lower fuel cost, ability to make long, continuous runs, and to maintain high speed."

* * *

I saw recently a press report of a slot machine which vends ice cream. Is that a hoax?

I understand there is, in London, England, a company which has placed a number of slot machines which offer ice cream. Cartons of ice cream are kept in the machine for as much as four days by solidified carbon dioxide, which acts as a refrigerant. Each machine, of which there are 5,000 at this writing, holds 100 cartons.

* * *

I've heard a great deal about the Madison Square Garden debate between Norman Thomas and Earl Browder. What did you think of the dispute?

I wasn't at the Garden to hear the debate, but I've read the stenographic report. The controversy was worded "Which Road for American Workers—Socialist or Communist?" Both disputants did excellent jobs, though it seemed to me that Norman Thomas' arguments in support of the Socialist party were more effective and con-

vincing than Browder's case for the Communist party. The debate—one of the most important in recent years—should be read carefully by all students of economics, politics, government, international affairs, Socialism, Communism, Fascism and Capitalism. It contains a mine of information, and is, in addition, entertaining, exciting reading. That audience of 20,000 persons must have been keyed to a high emotional pitch when these two brilliant disputants got wound up.

I have long felt that the Communist plea for a United Front was insincere and intended only to cause confusion in the ranks of the Socialists. But I'm willing to admit that after reading Browder's appeal there may be something earnest and real in the whole proposition, though it would be unwise to rush into a United Front without making sure that the whole thing isn't a clever ruse after all.

Fascism and war are two real menaces in the United States, and a real, honest, sincere United Front could do good work in warding off these evils—if only the Socialists could be convinced that the Communists really want to work with the Socialists instead of wanting to destroy them. There's lots of ground to be covered before a United Front can become a reality, but the proposal is by no means an impossibility. Thomas lists numerous arguments against the Communists to show why a United Front to fight Fascism and war cannot be achieved just yet, but he does assert that a long step has been taken in the direction of such mutual aid for a common objective.

The debate is therefore of immediate concern to every citizen and intelligent follower of current events and mass movements. It constitutes a document of first importance that may mark a new era in American radicalism.

* * *

Was the late Morris Hillquit's brand of Socialism different from that of the regular international Socialists?

Morris Hillquit (1869-1933) was in accord with the platforms and declarations of the international Socialist parties. The best way to answer your question is to give you a quotation from Hillquit's works, as follows:

"I am a Socialist because I cannot

be anything else. I cannot accept the ugly world of Capitalism with its brutal struggles and needless suffering, its archaic and irrational economic structure, its cruel social contrast, its moral callousness and spiritual degradation."

* * *

It is Hoover's contention that the greatest cause of the bank holiday of March, 1933, was the decision of England to go off the gold standard. Please comment.

Lord Herbert Hoover and his defenders continue to harp on this silly point. I'm sure they have been told the facts a thousand times, but that doesn't halt them. The English decided to go off gold in September, 1931. Thousands of banks had already folded up by then, and they continued closing daily until March, 1933, when a general bank holiday was called in order to stop the nationwide runs. If England's decision to abandon gold caused our banks to close then it should follow that England's own banks also should have closed. IT HAPPENS, OF COURSE, THAT NOT A SINGLE BANK IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, WALES, IRELAND, NEW ZEALAND, AUSTRALIA OR CANADA WAS COMPELLED TO CLOSE ITS DOORS. There's nothing new about this argument. It was noticed the first time Lord Herbert Hoover tried to defend his banking policy by blaming England's desertion of gold. But it had no effect, because Hoover and his outfit had, and have, no answer to make to it.

* * *

What's the spiciest literary work you've read?

I'd put Mark Twain's 1601, or *Social Life in the Time of the Tudors*, at the top of the list. It is, without a doubt, the greatest piece of pornography ever written. It makes Rabelais, Boccaccio, Lucian, Aristophanes, Petronius, Sterne, Swift, and the author of *The Specialist* look like so many puritanical sissies.

* * *

Noticing increased use of classical music over the radio, I wonder if the companies have obtained proof of public appreciation of better compositions. Please comment.

CBS, in November, 1935, conducted a nationwide popularity contest in order to pick the most popular composers, dead or contemporary, and

the results—compiled from the votes of 12,112 listeners—indicate a substantial victory for the great, creative masters. In all, 219 composers received votes. The first 10 among the dead, and the number of votes they received, follow:

Beethoven, 1,878; Brahms, 904; Wagner, 788; Tchaikovsky, 648; Bach, 556; Mozart, 258; Franck, 166; Bruckner, 160; Schubert, 136; Debussy, 130.

Living composers received the following votes in the same poll:

Sibelius, 1,888; Ravel, 910; Strauss, 616; Stravinsky, 418; Rachmaninoff, 254; Roy Harris, 162; Respighi, 108; Gershwin, 96; Sowerby, 94; Hanson, 92.

I can find little fault with the listener-reaction to the dead composers, though if given my own choice I would have Bach follow Wagner instead of Tchaikovsky. And Debussy would have come off a little better. If I had voted I certainly would have given first place to Beethoven, followed by Brahms and Wagner. Public taste, which is supposed to be trashy, showed itself just about perfect in this popularity contest, though I prefer to leave to psychologists the reasons that motivated this great mass of voters.

Among the living, I'd rather have seen Richard Strauss given first place, with Sibelius second. The Finlander is one of my favorites, of course, but I don't think he measures up to the giant stature of the composer of *The Life of a Hero*, *Salome*, *Death and Transfiguration*, and *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. Ravel's facile, superficial art I'd put down near Gershwin's.

What pleased me above everything was the place given gigantic, majestic, immortal Beethoven—the titan who spoke with the tones of thunder, lightning, tidal waves, volcanoes and cyclones, then softened to the lilting calls of birds, rippling waters, songs and dances of strong, happy peasants, the deep, brooding thoughts of the philosopher and the pure beauty of the poet's loveliest sonnets.

* * *

A newspaper report says: "A man can think better if he rests his feet on a desk." What do you say?

I have two desks in my office and I doubt if I've ever tilted back with my feet on either of them. When I'm

actually at work, I keep my feet under the desk. But don't get the idea from this that I don't like to take my ease when going through the motions of thinking. There's a nice, hefty couch in my office, with two pillows, on which I flop when I want to read and think. So the moral of this is: Keep your feet off the desk, because a couch is better.

* * *

Is Russia raising cotton?

During 1935, up to November 25, the Soviet Union, in Central Asia, reported the delivery of 1,500,000 tons of cotton, a record for the country. Pre-war Russia's cotton production never went beyond 500,000 tons. This cotton, most likely, will be kept for domestic consumption, in line with the policy announced by President Mikhael Kalinin to "make the Soviet people the most beautiful and best dressed in the world." That little or none will be exported is proved by the fact that Russia is buying increasing quantities of cotton in the American market, taking about 26,000 tons of our short staple cotton during the first nine months of 1935, at a cost of about \$10,000,000, as against 1934 expenditures of \$6,000,000. Russia's 1935 cotton production registers a 30 percent increase over the previous year. Most of the Soviet Union's cotton crop is raised by collectivized farmers, 90 percent of the cotton growers in Central Asia being members of State or collective farms.

* * *

What sort of sex lives did Marx and Engels live?

Karl Marx was what we'd call a one-woman man. Even a blue-nosed puritanical Fundamentalist couldn't find anything in his sex life to squawk about. Friedrich Engels—tall, handsome and something of a heartbreaker—kept an Irish mistress, an arrangement which Marx never discussed, so far as I know, but on which he must have frowned. The great revolutionary theoretician was bound to a rigid, bourgeois code of morals.

* * *

What's good for a cold, besides whisky?

You idiot, you don't deserve to have a cold. (I swiped this out of a joke book.)

* * *

It is urged that Roosevelt is pro-Jewish. in that he tolerates two Jews on the

bench of the Supreme Court. Please comment.

Since the President had nothing to do with naming Brandeis or Cardoza, I fail to see how this argument has any weight.

* * *

Did not Darwin influence Marxist philosophy?

Darwin's epoch-making book, *The Origin of Species*, appeared in 1859. *The Communist Manifesto*, by Marx and Engels, appeared in 1848, which shows that its philosophy developed independently. When Darwinism appeared, however, it exercised great influence on Socialist thought.

* * *

Please comment on the following: "After all, an Atheist is not so sure there is no God. What if he finds out after death that there IS a God, and Heaven and Hell? By his unbelief he will have lost everything. But the person who believes in God plays safe. If he finds out there is no God, his faith will have done him no harm. On the other hand, if there is a God, his faith will have done him an everlasting favor. Therefore, be a Theist. It's safer."

I'm more than happy to have this chance to analyze what might be called the "Safety-First Argument for the God-idea." It is, of course, an old and decrepit argument, but it continues to be one of the favorites of the apologists for religion. It presents simple evidence for the utter bankruptcy of theistic thought. The gentlemen of the cloth, with their large followings, their social prestige and their immense church properties, betray intellectual childishness when they expect intelligent people to be impressed with such a piece of tripe.

Let's take the first sentence: "After all, an Atheist is not so sure there is no God." Just what sense does that make? It would have been more accurate to express the following thought: "After all, an Atheist is sure there is no logic in the arguments presented in support of the God-idea." That means something. It presents the Atheist as he really is—a critic who examines the various arguments advanced by the Theist, analyzes them carefully, and then rejects them because they are full of holes.

We now devote ourselves to the "Safety-First" notion. This argument—if we may call it such—carries the inference that truth-seeking is not

important. It is a betrayal of all that is precious in thought, culture and free inquiry. The religious propagandist frankly puts his case on the level of a crap game—come seven (heaven), come snake-eyes (hell), come eleven (God), come double-sixes (all is lost). You throw your dice and take your chances. And that, of all things, is intended to convince students of logic and philosophy of the efficacy of belief, or faith, in God and Immortality. An intelligent child in a kindergarten wouldn't stoop to such shoddy thinking.

The appeal to the "Safety-First" impulse is nothing less than a demonstration of intellectual cowardice. We are asked to put aside our knowledge, powers of analysis and scientific deduction to embrace a faith in God and a heavenly hereafter, because if there's nothing to the notion you're no worse off than the Atheist, who, after cashing in his chips, went forth to complete annihilation, as he expected all along, because his reason told him that when a being dies he's dead. He is asked to change before it's too late—play safe, get on the band wagon. Such an attitude means studied and deliberate surrender of the powers of thought. The intelligent Atheist, after being insulted with such a piece of mental balderdash, can only reply with sardonic laughter. The proposal sounds like an echo from an institution for the mentally feeble.

This "Safety-First" argument could be used to justify any absurd superstition dealing with the so-called hereafter—the intellectual meandering of a Bantu medicine man is put on a par with the dignified incantations of the Archbishop of Canterbury. To show the plain idiocy of the point our religionist makes, let's imagine a new religion being proposed along the following lines of "reasoning":

"When I shuffle off this mortal coil I have implicit faith in a great Mumbo-Jumbo who will show His love for me by supplying me with an endless stream of pigs' knuckles—boiled or pickled. Therefore, as you can't prove there isn't a Mumbo-Jumbo up beyond the stratosphere who supplies his loved ones with pigs' knuckles, I can safely make you the following proposition: If you believe in my Mumbo-Jumbo you will be rewarded with the much-sought pigs' knuckles,

and thereby get what's coming to you. If you don't believe, you kick off and don't stand a chance at the Mumbo-Jumbo commissary. Why take such a risk? You haven't anything to lose! Join up now for the glory of the God of Mumbo-Jumbo and his blessed pigs' knuckles. The believer has the inside track if he hit on the right God, and if he didn't, well, it's just too bad, but he's no worse off than you, you poor Atheist."

When the notion is put in the terms of burlesque, one sees how insane the whole silly business really is.

Another point to bear in mind is this: The "Safety-First" argument is based on the assumption that matters of religion are really harmless, and if you accept them without debate or doubt you hurt no one and, at the same time, put yourself in line for a nice, fat reward from God—perhaps an eternal life of bliss, with plenty of women and song (if you're a Mohammedan), or an eternity of harp-playing (if you're a Christian).

But religion isn't as simple a matter as that. We must remember that religion is more than a few silly, childish superstitions. It's a big business—a racket—with billions of dollars of investment, and, in this country alone, an army of 200,000 priests, preachers and rabbis out to get you to believe their idiocies in order to keep their racket going as a profitable concern. If the audience being appealed to shows signs of intelligence, these ecclesiastical Al Capones lift their arguments to the theistic philosophers, but if the audience is made up of the mine-run of morons, then it's effective to tell them to play safe and accept God, because they stand to lose if they guess wrong, while if they guess right they've got the merry ha-ha on the disappointed Atheist. If religion were merely a matter of saying yes-yes to the preacher and letting it go at that, there wouldn't be anything to get het up about. But the facts of history and the evidence of our daily lives show us that the matter is serious because a great, vested interest is built on it—an interest that must make a fat living, help the exploiters by keeping the masses in the chains of ignorance, serve every reactionary cause, oppose social and intellectual progress, and in a thousand ways

keep the masses at the levels of servility and inferiority.

* * *

In a recent issue you criticize Roosevelt for attempting to patch up the capitalistic system. Would it be possible to patch up the old system reasonably well by a drastic application of income and inheritance taxes? Granting that complete Socialism or extensive government ownership of industry would be better than patching the old system, do you believe that any appreciable percentage of the American people desire Socialism or are ready for Socialism? Do you not think that a very large majority of the American people would like to see established an economic system that would work, and continue to work, with as little change from the old system as possible?

It would be an excellent *reform* to hike income and inheritance taxes, but such increases would merely mean that the rich would be made to bear a greater portion of the expense of government. It wouldn't in any way alter the capitalistic principle of private ownership of large-scale industries. Capitalism, as a system of producing and distributing wealth, is secure so long as capitalists dominate the economic scene, regardless of the fact that they happen to make heftier contributions to the national or state treasuries. Socialism, instead of patching up Capitalism, would do away with it, by introducing a social system in which the workers, farmers and professionals would own cooperatively the great instruments of wealth production, would operate them with a view to supplying the needs of the community, and would consider use of wealth more important than the mere making of profits by capitalists. Socialism, therefore, is a revolutionary philosophy, in the sense that it would do away with private monopoly and institute a completely new social order. Such a revolution need not come necessarily through violence—legal action, through the intelligent exercise of political and industrial powers, could bring about the change in a reasonable time.

As for the question of whether or not the great masses of American people desire, or are ready, for Socialism, I must, in all candor, answer the first half in the negative. No, they don't desire Socialism. If they did, they certainly wouldn't be switching from one to the other of

the old parties—from Democrat Tweedledee to Republican Tweedledum, and then back again. But that doesn't mean they will always remain in economic ignorance. Properly approached and educated, they could desire scientific Socialism, because that social philosophy is the only one which is certain to destroy the evils of Capitalism and inaugurate an economy in which those who labor will be guaranteed work and the full social value of their labor, regardless of race, sex or nationality. The fact that the great majority of voters support capitalistic ideas is no argument against Socialism—rather is it an argument against the stupidity of the foolish voters. As to whether or not the masses desire Socialism, the answer, of course, is that the conscious desire isn't there, but there is present an unconscious, inchoate desire for economic and social security, which Socialism alone is able to supply, and which they must appreciate and aim to turn into living reality if they are to escape from the injustices of making a living—or what passes for a living—under Capitalism.

I rather fancy the masses would like to see the least possible change in the social order, if they thought they could get jobs, wages, purchasing power and social security under the present system. It's a human trait to dread change. The old always looks so inviting, if it can be maintained. But when the old is really in decay and can't produce and distribute the things the masses want—that is to say, in quantities fitting a civilized people—they must, of necessity, give thought to a social philosophy which aims at revolutionary transformations in order to achieve scientifically what the masses seek only blindly, with feeble, groping steps in wrong directions.

You can alter the old system for century after century, and in the end it'll still be Capitalism, if you tolerate private ownership of the machinery of production, distribution and exchange. There's nothing to prevent us from building a Chinese Wall about our economic life and settling down to centuries of bondage, exploitation, poverty, unemployment and chronic insufficiency in an environment where plenty could be had once the people decided to tackle the

problem seriously and earnestly.

We must make our own choice in the matter, but this doesn't mean the whole world will rest content with a patched up Capitalism. About 170,000,000 in Russia are rapidly building a system that is headed in the direction of Socialism. Another decade or two may see the entire country—and what a vast land it is!—socialized, with the workers owning and operating democratically a vast industrial system, a gigantic agricultural machine, and all the other avenues of mass activity, including great forward steps in the arts, culture, science and education. If we tolerate our own Chinese Wall, we may see ourselves put out of the picture as a great nation. We can, if we permit it, become second rate, third rate, and then positively backward when compared to a new, vigorous, active energetic civilization which is marching towards economic plenty and security. Do we want to be put into such a hole? I hope not. I'm optimistic enough to believe that we will, in our time, get wise to ourselves and set about building a civilization that will produce everything every person has reasonable need of, without having to pay homage to capitalists.

* * *

Did the AAA do the peanut growers any real good?

Before AAA, the growers—there are 90,000 of them in the South—received 1½c per pound, which meant disaster. In December, 1935, after AAA tinkered with the lowly goobers, the price to the grower was 3½c per pound, which is a slight improvement, but a long way from the 6.2 cents parity price which it's claimed growers must have if they are to make a decent living. Late in 1934, peanuts retailed at 10c per pound; in December, 1935, they were bringing 30 cents per pound, a hike of 20c. As the farmers received an increase of less than 2c, it's obvious that the AAA is giving profitable boosts to interests unrelated to the growers.

I'm very fond of peanuts—they're beans, not nuts—but have trouble getting them freshly roasted. Peanuts grow stale rapidly after roasting—perhaps in a day—so the chances are we consumers can't get the fresh article when we're in the mood for

some delicious monkey food. There's nothing flatter than a stale peanut, as any good goober fan will tell you. The only way to make sure is to taste a sample before buying. If they're right fresh you're in for good eating. I care only for peanuts in the shell. The kinds you buy in cellophane, already hulled, or in penny machines, are crimes against humanity. They're loaded up with too much salt, to keep them from spoiling. Besides, hulling them weeks before they're to be eaten plays hell with the taste.

Peanut production for 1935 was estimated at 1,280,000,000 pounds. An acre of land will produce a crop of about 750 pounds, which is considerably higher than the yields of previous years, the production per acre in the years 1923-32 being 707 pounds. The 1935 crop, which included hay after the peanuts were threshed, required about 1,800,000 acres.

The peanut originated in Brazil, from which country it was taken to Africa. The peanut vine was moved to our South by slave-traders. It made slow headway until the Civil War, when its popularity grew because the Northern soldiers developed a taste for peanuts and demanded them when they returned home after the war. Today, the American crop is only 10 percent of the whole, 70 percent coming from Asia and 20 percent from Africa.

Peanuts are used for many purposes besides the sacred one of being scooted down our gullets. A great deal of the peanut crop remains on the farm, where it's used as fodder for live-stock. Its oil goes into oleomargarine, shortening, salad oil, candles, and soap. Peanut oil was once used as a lubricant on Southern locomotives. The Chinese still use peanut oil in lamps.

Peanuts are most popular at ball games. Some authorities claim this is because of the time of the day—afternoon—when men want something to stave off the pangs of hunger before settling down to the evening meal. One peanut impersario figured that pop should be sold at the same time because peanuts arouse thirst, but he found, to his dismay, that the customers didn't like to tilt back their heads to drink the stuff, because doing that took their eyes off the game. So, the genius hit on

the idea of putting straws into the bottle, with profitable results.

As for peanut butter, I don't fancy it, because I can't work up enough saliva to handle the smear after the second or third bite. The article tastes good, I admit, but it sticks to the roof of my mouth. So I have no traffic with it any more, preferring to remain loyal to the friendly, humble, unassuming, democratic peanut. At that, the national consumption of peanut butter is more than 125,000,000 pounds per year, mostly produced by small, local industry, because of the ease with which peanut butter may be made. You merely grind the nut, add a little salt—and there's your peanut butter.

The most famous peanut-vender in the world has his stand near the White House. This dealer—a Greek—was slated to go when the police decided he was a traffic menace, but Mrs. Roosevelt used her influence with the President, who saved the man's business. His stand is patronized by national and world celebrities, including, in the past, Cal Coolidge, Lord 'erbert 'oover and others.

The peanut is without class or swank—it belongs to the humbler things of life—but it belongs, and will remain because people will ever appreciate this tasty, stimulating, energy-creating, nourishing bean. No bard has written poetry to its beauty, but that's the fault of the bards, not the peanut. Poets palaver about orchids and neglect the modest, ever-present, friendly, worldly, inexpensive, wholesome goober. "Fresh roasted peanuts"—that's the sign that always brings me up with a start. And if they're really fresh and well-roasted—not too dry, of course—I gobble them up with quick, nervous gestures. Hail, thou poor, lowly peanut!

The trouble with the peanut's status is its bad name. "Give a dog a bad name," can be changed to "Give a peanut a bad name." The peanut has become a synonym for smallness—"peanut politicians," "peanut brained," "couldn't run a peanut stand," etc. The peanut doesn't need its face lifted, but it needs a better reputation. Its name should be changed. But to what? "Goober" is worse. A great industry will erect a monument to the genius who can

succeed in giving the peanut a name that will ring with sex appeal and style. But there's no savior in sight. The peanut plods its slow, weary way, unsung and without honor. But wherever there is joy—carnivals, circuses, parades, ball games and celebrations—there you'll find the peanut. It is the lowly orphan of joy, which adds happiness to the world without adding to its own glory.

* * *

"Your American Freeman is unique—and quite fascinatingly interesting. It is a surprise to me that in these days of horrible journalism, written by knaves for fools, here is a sane journal, crowded with genuine information, scholarly yet easy to read, accurate in its big stores of knowledge—and neither out of date nor out of touch with the wisdom of past ages. You are doing something both great and novel—not for the first time in your history. I wish your ventures, all of them, a real success. You may depend on my heartiest good-will."—George Bedborough, London, England. (The writer of the above is the well-known British lecturer and writer.)

* * *

How efficient is an automobile engine?

Only 8 percent. The engine's cooling system alone uses up 40 percent of the power. Engineers claim that gasoline will be more efficient when it's turned into a gas instead of a vapor. But this is a problem that hasn't even begun to be solved.

* * *

Being a teacher, I was surprised by your description of President Brandenburg as a "pompous ass," because I have read numerous articles on educational subjects, in learned school magazines, from the pen of this educator. Please comment.

The President of Pittsburg Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kansas, being only one step from illiteracy, could never write an article for a "learned school magazine" even if his life depended on it. But, as articles do appear, bearing his name, the matter deserves a note of explanation. It happens that Brandenburg, who wants to pose as a "learned educator," employs a ghost writer to pen his articles. This busted writer gets from \$15 to \$25 per article, and uses the money to keep himself alive, the royalties from his books being rather meager because of the depression. It is amusing to note that Brandenburg has a few lines in *Who's Who* (mere-

ly because of his official position, of course), while his ghost writer takes up perhaps three times as much space (because of his personal achievements in literature, of course). Things are so constituted that the "pompous ass" has the great reputation in the community, while his ghost writer, who turns out learned papers at about 50 cents per page of manuscript, is hardly known in his own neighborhood.

* * *

In the November, 1935, Freeman says that our banking system is headed for another crash. But if the statement is true that the government backs all money of depositors up to \$50,000 in a National or Federal Reserve Bank, why should the banks be headed for another crash?

The deposit insurance is for amounts up to \$5,000, not \$50,000. The U. S. Treasury doesn't guarantee one penny of deposits. If you will read the law carefully you will find that all the federal government did was to set up machinery (without financial responsibility on the government's part) to have the banks protect the deposits of one another. The banks which belong to this so-called insurance scheme are assessed so much each year, out of which losses, if any, will be paid.

Thus, if a bank in a small Missouri town fails for \$300,000, the fund will be drawn on for that amount, if none of the deposits are in excess of \$5,000. If the bankers' fund, under governmental administration, has enough money to pay losses, well and good. But if there should be a panic and a tremendous run on the banks, as in March, 1933, the fund would soon be exhausted, and then it would be up to the banks to decide whether they wanted to put more money into the fund or quit. If they decided to pour more money into the organization, it's quite conceivable that the solvent banks would fall with the insolvent ones. If they decided to withdraw, the busted banks would fail and the public would have to stand the loss.

In such a situation, with the public confused as to its degree of protection, it stands to reason that the run would be worse than ever, once the facts became known regarding the insufficient support available for depositors' insurance. Uncle Sam

wouldn't dare give all deposits under \$5,000 a blanket insurance, because that, during another bank crisis, could result not only in the destruction of the banking system but in the bankruptcy of the government itself.

For the present, the banks are feeding themselves enormous profits through service charges, which, in fact, make it almost unnecessary for a certain number of banks to ever bother with legitimate loans. By charging a fee on each deposit slip, deposited check, or check against the account, the bank is in a position to gather in immense funds from depositors, especially the smaller accounts. When these facts really register it's safe to assume the public will want to do as little business as possible with the banks, preferring to put its money in the safe and sound postal saving banks, paying local bills with cash and using postal money orders for the settlement of out-of-town accounts.

One reader scolded me for suggesting that he remit by postal money order instead of check. His point was that he found it necessary to stand in line at his local postoffice the last time he was there to do business. Of course, if he had said a word to the postmaster, or assistant postmaster, he would have seen this condition quickly remedied, for I've found the employes of the postoffice department always more than anxious to give the public quick, competent and courteous service. If a clerk who writes money orders is overworked, he should be supported, through friendly complaints to the higher-ups, so that another clerk may be installed to help him handle the volume of business. This sort of business is highly profitable to the department and every effort is made to encourage it. At the same time, I want to mention the fact that I have, on numerous occasions, stood in line at a bank window, from five to 10 minutes at a time, and here I'm sure a complaint would have fallen on deaf ears.

One reader calls my attention to the fact that if he were to pay 6c for a postal money order he would be worse off than at his local bank, where he pays only 3c for the privilege of writing a check against his account. My reader fails to take into

consideration several important facts. First, he had to pay 3c on his deposit slip in order to get his deposit accepted by the bank. If he deposited checks, the bank charged him on each item, which added to the expense. Then there was a monthly maintenance charge of 40c or 50c. Finally, my critical reader should remember that the person to whom he is sending his check is also required to pay a service fee on each deposit slip and must, in addition, pay a collection fee on the check itself. Thus, when we figure all the ramifications of the banking service charges we find that the postal money order is, by far, the best, the cheapest, and the most efficient method of doing business by mail. In addition to saving all the service charges I've listed, the person who uses a postal money order also enables the concern to which he is remitting to get its money in full, thereby making it unnecessary for the sender to add an exchange fee to his remittance. Yes, the facts strongly support my contention that it's wiser to do business by cash or postal money orders, whenever possible.

* * *

What is the present size of the Russian army?

In my last report on this point, for 1935, I showed that the Soviet Union had 940,000 men under arms. Now, in 1936, according to a statement made by Marshall Mikhail Tukhachevsky, Assistant Commissar for Defense, before the central executive committee of the Soviet Union, on January 15, 1936, the army numbers 1,300,000 men. This immense force—the largest standing army in the world—is considered absolutely essential because of the aggressive designs of Germany and Japan.

In former years the Red Army was built on a territorial basis, which means that the bulk of it—74 percent—was trained in home sections, leaving only 26 percent for training at strategic points in the West and East. This condition has been reversed, so that now only 23 percent are in their home territories, the balance—77 percent—being close to points that might be attacked by Hitler and the Mikado.

To prove how the Russians are training officers, the same authority reported that the country now sup-

ports 13 military academies, containing 16,000 students. This is in addition to six civilian academies where military engineers receive their training.

The pay for soldiers of ordinary rank will be increased 57 percent for the present year.

When German Fascism and Japanese militarism decide to initiate their mutually-agreed plan, they will find themselves barred by a solid wall of steel. The Russian army's purpose is purely defensive, and even the most unfriendly elements agree that it is able, and willing, to give a good account of itself when any attempt is made to take by force a single square inch of Soviet territory.

During 1935, the Japanese built 745 miles of railroad in Manchuria, all leading towards important points in East Siberia. Every action taken by prospective military enemies of the Union is being watched, but no move will be made until the Germans and Japanese actually attempt overt acts. Russia isn't looking for trouble, but it's ready for anything that might arise.

* * *

You write about Mussolini's great problems of supply in his Ethiopian campaign. Have you any facts on this point?

Counting Italian and native troops and laborers, there are about 400,000 men on duty in the war on Ethiopia. This means that Mussolini must ship in daily about 2,800 tons of food, and, when there is military activity, at least 4,000 tons of ammunition, daily. Food and ammunition alone demand daily services from 7,000 trucks. In addition, there is the element of bringing the supplies from Italy and equally distant places—perhaps an average of 2,000 miles. A vast fleet of ships must be kept constantly at work keeping the forces supplied. When we realize that Italian sources admit that the campaign will really get under way only next winter, we begin to understand what an awful chunk Mussolini has bitten off. He has practically nothing to show for all his efforts, expense and vast manpower employed in East Africa. The thing begins to look like another Napoleonic excursion into unfriendly, snow-covered Russia, in which almost 500,000 were engaged, but of whom less than 1,000 later appeared for

parade in Paris. The great Mussolini refused to listen to his own military advisers, as Napoleon likewise refused to do more than a century ago when he was shown what it would mean to attempt to march into vast, frozen Russia. No wonder Mussolini is frightened over the mutterings of the civilians at home and the mutinies of his conscripts who don't want to be shipped down to East Africa. In one breath we are told that Italy is 'solidly behind its dictator, but in the next we learn, from official sources, that the people of all Italy were called together at numerous meeting-places and made to listen to a written speech of Mussolini, in which he promised the people that he would meet opposition with the sternest measures.

What is Russia's total 1936 budget?

Commissar of Finance Grinko, on January 14, 1936, announced it would be 78,500,000,000 rubles, which in our money is about \$15,700,000,000.

As a great number of meteors fall on the earth every day, at what rate is the world increasing in size?

Dr. C. C. Wylie, of the University of Iowa, claims that 300,000 meteors, large enough to give off light equal to a first magnitude star, fall daily. Smaller meteors, that throw less light but are visible to the eye, rain down at the rate of 24,000,000 per day. There are still smaller ones, observable only with the telescope, which pour down at the rate of many millions daily. From this, one would imagine that the earth was being expanded constantly at a rapid rate, but the same authority estimates, figuring the meteors that dropped on the surface of the earth during the entire lifetime of the globe, that they added a layer to the earth of only one inch in depth.

One frequently hears the expression that the Supreme Court is made up of "nine old men." What are the facts?

Statisticians connected with the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company have studied the records and report that the average age of the 76 men, who have sat on the bench in the 146 years of the existence of the Supreme Court, is 71.4 years, at the time of death. Before the Civil War, the average age at the time of appoint-

ment was 48.9 years, but since then the age has increased to 55.8 years.

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

The last report, for 1930, shows 131,687, as against 82,120 in 1920, an increase of 60 percent. This means that the list of policemen grew four times faster than the growth in population.

What is Russia's 1936 military budget?

Premier Molotoff, in a speech on January 12, 1936, before the central executive committee of the Soviet Union, meeting in the Kremlin Palace, urged that the nation's military expenditures for 1936 be increased over those of 1935. During 1935, Russia spent 8,000,000,000 rubles, though the original budget had called for 6,500,000,000 rubles, in itself the largest military expenditure in the world. For 1936, it was suggested, and accepted on January 14, with shouts of approval, that the military budget be increased to the gigantic amount of 14,800,000,000 rubles.

(Based on the new rate of exchange, this is about \$3,108,000,000.) This, it is felt, is necessary because of the planned aggression of Japan and Germany. If left to its own devices, Russia would disarm, turning the vast financial resources and man-power into constructive industries. But the cold facts don't permit such a policy. As a matter of self-preservation—and nothing but that—Russia is forced to become the world's greatest spender on its military establishments.

Russia has no designs on any nation's territory, but will defend to the last man its own land, regardless of cost.

How do you account for the sudden decline of French Fascism?

During the second half of 1935, French Fascism seemed ready to assume menacing proportions, with the not remote possibility of the quick, violent destruction of Parliament, democracy, free institutions, and civil rights. But at this writing—in mid-January—the clouds seem to have been carried away. French Fascism is perhaps permanently disabled. Why?

There are several answers. First, of course, is the innate realism of the French people. Frenchmen, instead of

being emotionally unstable and volatile, are keen logicians and great admirers of cold facts. French realistic thinking was struck by the lesson of Fascism in action in Central Europe. Mussolini, Hitler and the lesser dictators in Austria and Poland, gave the world a lesson in the value of democracy. The French saw that Fascism in action means preparations for war, aggression, persecution, tyranny, blackmail, and economic ruin. If that's what Fascism would mean in France, then they would have none of it.

Also, there was the element of great alertness among the Leftists. They were eternally vigilant. They made clear any attempt at a Fascist coup would mean civil war. The Left elements worked together to ward off Fascism—and it now seems as though they have saved France, perhaps for a long time. French radicals, libertarians, democrats and republicans have Mussolini and Hitler to thank for this. The two madmen of Europe served well as instructors, though their intention, of course, was to do whatever they could to spread the poison of Fascism to France, and then to the rest of the world.

Wasn't vaccination abandoned in England during the World War because after a trial the authorities became convinced of its harmfulness to their soldiers?

There isn't a word of truth in the statement that England didn't practice vaccination during the World War. Every civilized country in the world recognizes the scientific value of vaccination.

How many Americans are incurably insane?

700,000.

Is there any truth in the claim of certain historians that racial reasons are provocative of war more than economic reasons?

The least knowledge of history ought to dispel such a baseless notion. Wars are fought mainly for economic reasons—land, trade, booty, privileges, concessions, and the like. As for racial antagonism being the main cause of war, look at the map today. The yellow men of Japan are subjugating the yellow men of China. The overwhelming majority of the soldiers who are doing Mussolini's

fighting in East Africa are black natives. Great Britain and the United States fought two wars. Our own North and South fought for four years—white men against white. Germany fought France. England fought France, as an ally of Prussia, but later joined France as an ally against Germany. Russia and Turkey had a war. The Thirty Years' War was between white men. If the wars between nations of the same race were removed from the pages of history, about 95 percent of the records of armed conflict would be erased. No, man isn't divided on racial lines as much as certain superficial historians would have us believe. But when we come to the economic motives we account for perhaps 99 percent of history's wars.

Why do you write of the Civil War? It was a War between the States.

I still insist on calling it the Civil War. The Southern States, associated in the Confederacy, didn't declare war on a group of northern States. It was a war against the Federal government because of the decision to secede from the Union. That makes it Civil War with me.

Can you explain why Mussolini insisted on keeping his minister to Ethiopia at Addis Ababa as long as possible?

Mussolini had the pretty notion that it would take his mechanized armies only four months to reach Addis Ababa. He therefore instructed his minister to remain at his post until the soldiers arrived, in order to be on hand to negotiate a quick peace. This all goes to show what a shrewd and realistic thinker Mussolini is!

Instead of marching right on to victory, his troops have been treated like so many monkeys, and by miserably-supplied, black Ethiopians! The armies of Haile Salassie permitted Mussolini to enter the country, knowing that the terrain at certain places would make Italian victories impossible.

History now proves that Haile Selassie was right and Mussolini was wrong. The war has been going on for four months and Mussolini has practically nothing to show for all his wasted millions—less than one-half of one percent of Ethiopian soil has been invaded, and there are strong possibilities that even this slight hold

may be broken. At any rate, Mussolini can't win a decisive victory and he is faced by the return of the rainy season, which will compel complete cessation of operations because of immobility.

The Ethiopians, however, will be able to continue with a certain volume of guerilla maneuvers. And Mussolini will have to continue shipping vast, and expensive, stores of supplies to 400,000 men in a corner of the Dark Continent that isn't worth a day's fighting.

This reminds me of the standing motto on the front page of Rome's largest newspaper, which reads: "Mussolini is always right!" Always right? The record shows that he always has been wrong—so wrong that his regime is endangered, his finances are exhausted, economic bankruptcy faces the nation, the tourist trade is dead, raw materials can't be imported for Italian industries because of the lack of foreign exchange, world opinion is anti-Fascist, the Ethiopian nut is too hard to crack, sanctions are wearing down Italian resources, mechanized legions are of slight value in mountainous Ethiopia, Fascist bombers spend thousands of dollars worth of bombs to destroy property worth perhaps a few hundred dollars, Italian soldiers have resisted Mussolini's orders to proceed to East Africa, 80 large Italian hotels went into bankruptcy in a single week because of the stupid destruction of the tourist trade, the cost of living is rising, gasoline costs about \$1.25 per gallon, meat is beyond the purse of the average citizen. Yes, Mussolini is always right!

As I've said before, all we need do, in order to turn the United States into a paradise, is to obey the injunction of our near-Fascists and join in the chorus: "What this country needs is a Mussolini!"

* * *

How many questions may a reader ask and still be answered in *The Freeman*?

There's no limit to the number of questions a reader may ask. It's quite common for me to receive letters containing a dozen, or even more, questions. I'm limited only by the space at my command—about 27 columns of type each month. I figure I receive upwards of 500 questions monthly, from which I select about

125. The criterion here is whether the subject is of general interest. I estimate it would take about 12 pages to permit me to answer all questions received at my desk. Many readers are patient and understanding when their particular questions are left unanswered, while others get huffy and order their subscriptions stopped. When a reader expects a personal answer he sends me a dollar to cover the time it takes me to answer the item. If I'm unable to answer the question I send the correspondent a refund in the form of trade coupons, which are good for anything published by this institution.

* * *

I have read your attack in the *March Freeman* upon Dr. Townsend and Mr. Clements, and I wish to say that I think it very unjust and ill-considered.

My criticisms aimed at these two worthies were fair and reasonable. I said, in so many words, that the federal government should investigate this racket, in order to let the public know what is being done with the hundreds of thousands of dollars now being collected from millions of duped aged men and women who can ill afford to be imposed on.

As the Townsend movement is active in federal elections in two or more states, it comes under the jurisdiction of the Federal Corrupt Practices Law, under which such an organization must file regularly with the Clerk of the House a statement covering all receipts and expenditures. Thus far, Dr. Townsend and his side-kicker Clements have failed to make such reports. Of course, if the federal authorities were to demand compliance, they would obey or stand prosecution. The information would be invaluable, and, I'm sure, would demonstrate completely the truth of my charge that the Townsend movement is nothing more than a get-rich-quick scheme put over by two conscienceless racketeers.

My severe criticisms of the Townsend movement have offended many of my readers, but I dare not let such a reaction deter me from continuing my complaints, when I'm positive they are based on valid objections. Many readers have ordered their subscriptions canceled because of my anti-Townsend articles, and while I hate to lose even a single reader I can only say that such actions never cause me

to waver for a single instant. If I think I'm right, I go ahead with my discussion, regardless of consequences.

One indignant reader grants that the official organ of the Townsend movement is the private property of Townsend and Clements, and that the new publication is coining money for its promoters, but he insists that "if the ownership, by two men, of a newspaper like the *Townsend Weekly* can make them so enormously wealthy in five or six months, what must be the wealth of the one man who owns the Haldeman-Julius Publications?"

The answer is indeed very simple. Townsend and his fellow-racketeer are posing as high-minded, uncommercial, public-minded leaders of a non-profit organization. They are pretending that everything they do is for the good of humanity, when the facts show clearly that they are out to clean up the cash as fast as the suckers part with it.

As for my own publishing plant, it is frankly and honestly a private business. I never suggested it was anything else. I am in the business of buying paper at the lowest prices the market will afford, smearing some ink on it and then selling it to those who care to pay for what I have to offer. The enterprise is a venture in the world of business, and even if I were to make a hundred million yearly my argument would still be valid. It happens, however, that my wealth has been greatly exaggerated. I make a fairly decent living, and own this large plant (clear of debt, of course), but the money doesn't roll in and I have to do some pretty tall scheming each Saturday in order to meet the pay roll and the bills for paper, freight, power, fuel, taxes, interest, ink, repairs, etc.

I've never posed as a savior of humanity. My position is clear and simple. It happens that I'm just a small-town printer who thinks ideas are important. That's all. I enjoy publishing the kind of literature I happen to think is important. I could publish trash, like any other commercial publisher, but this wouldn't give me any satisfaction. So, purely as a personal matter, I prefer to issue what gives me genuine satisfaction, even though I may make less than if I were to publish the usual trash of

the producers of printed hog-wash. At that, honesty makes me confess that it might happen that I couldn't even pay expenses if I followed the lead of the publishers of the pulps or the confession magazines, a la Macfadden, so it's perhaps additional proof of enlightened selfishness when I go out of my way to issue such literary matter as I consider to be of real value and permanent significance. I'd rather publish one book by a Joseph McCabe than a thousand tomes by a Harold Bell Wright, though the latter might produce a greater volume of profits. But on this point I should hasten to assure my readers that it's more than likely that I'd make a flop of Harold Bell Wright, while in the work of issuing the scores of books written for me by Joseph McCabe, I am still to lose a dollar on him, though many publishers consider me eccentric in standing by a writer who insists on retaining his "unpopular" views on questions of science, philosophy and religion.

* * *

What is your opinion of the reproduction of the Parthenon at Nashville, Tenn.?

I saw this magnificent, beautiful, stately, exquisite masterpiece in Nashville some years ago, while on a lecture tour. I'll never forget the thrilling experience. My host was driving me for a view of the city, telling me nothing about the replica towards which he was headed. If I ever knew Nashville had such a structure, the thing entirely escaped my mind, so you can imagine the shock I enjoyed when the motor car stopped and I was asked to look at this architectural jewel. I stood there for hours, enjoying the sight from every possible angle. If I'm ever near Nashville I'll visit the Parthenon again, for there are many features I want to study more carefully.

* * *

Is Marion Davies the lawful Mrs. Hearst in whose name milk funds are raised in New York City, or is there another real Mrs. Hearst?

There is a real Mrs. Hearst, who plays with the milk fund charity in the East, while the famous movie star, Marion Davies, shows her charms before the camera and between days keeps Mr. Hearst amused. I wouldn't let such a matter be brought up in print, except for the fact that

I hate a hypocrite. Recently, Mr. Hearst took the leadership in the fight for "moral movies," "decency," and similar clap-trap. He posed as a protector of morality and delivered many blows at his enemies because of their "immorality." And all along he was living openly with Miss Davies. That was a private matter so long as he kept his mouth shut about other people, but when he used his 27 newspapers to smite others less "pure" than a saint, he laid himself open to the charge of hypocrisy and thereby made it fair for anyone to refer to his own bed-room sports. I certainly am no puritan. If Mr. Hearst wants to take on a harem, that's his business. But when he does these things at the very time he is conducting a morality crusade I get sick at the stomach.

* * *

What do you think of the growing tendency toward straw-polls?

An ordinary polling of a group of citizens is all right, but it seems to me that national polls, along the lines of those operated by the *Literary Digest*, at critical times in history, can be used as a means of misleading the people and making them follow the lead of demagogues and the privileged elements in the world of high finance, industry, politics, etc. Thus far, so it seems to me, these straw-votes have been fair, but there's always the possibility that in a time of crisis such polls can be used by clever propagandists out to put over their particular schemes. Under such circumstances, a fraudulent straw-vote, along national lines, might be the means of turning an election.

* * *

Why haven't you continued your interesting discussions of Upton Sinclair's Epic?

I had my say, and when I figured I had just about covered the subject (to my own satisfaction, of course) I turned to other topics. Meanwhile, I notice that Sinclair's movement is just about as dead as Huey Long. These economic cure-alls sweep the country like a prairie fire, and the finish is usually quicker than the beginning. Sinclair's Epic has been formally kicked out by the official Democratic party of California, Sinclair has resigned, and it looks as though the storm has passed. Father Coughlin bumped himself off (politi-

cally) just about the same time. Right now the thing-of-the-hour is Townsendism, but that also will blow up between days. Meanwhile, Dr. Townsend and his fellow-racketeer, Clements, are cleaning up the kale, which is more than one would even hint about Upton Sinclair. The great Upton was sincere and uncommercial about his movement.

* * *

It is claimed by Hitlerites and anti-Semitic propagandists in our own country that Jews are naturally dishonest and therefore given to crime. What are the facts?

I have treated this subject several times in the past, showing the utter emptiness of this so-called argument, but as I have some new data I prefer to deal with the matter again.

Dr. H. S. Linfield, director of a statistical bureau, reported on January 26, 1936, that surveys, for the year ending June 30, 1935, showed the proportion of Jewish criminals was much lower than their proportion to the population.

During the period studied by Dr. Linfield (the year closing June 30, 1935) 57,901 individuals were convicted and sent to prisons in New York State. Of these, 2,965 were Jews, or 5.1 percent. Fifteen percent of New York State's population are Jews.

In New York City, 89,075 persons were sent to prisons belonging to the city, of whom 17,302 were Jews. Thirty percent of the population of New York City is Jewish.

In New York State there were 2,045 persons convicted of grave offenses, of whom 197 were Jews, or 9.6 percent.

* * *

Just off the press! The complete text of the debate on Socialism or Communism, between Norman Thomas and Earl Browder. This debate attracted 20,000 persons to Madison Square Garden and caused an immense volume of comment and discussion. You can get a FREE copy of this Thomas-Browder Debate by sending \$1 for a year's subscription to *The Freeman*, plus 20c for carriage, handling and packing. This offer applies to new subscriptions or renewals.

* * *

Please comment on "fee-splitting" in the medical profession.

This ancient, reprehensible practice consists of sending a patient from Dr. A to Dr. B for special treatment. Dr. B, who is a specialist, charges

the patient what he thinks he can get—which is often too high—and when he gets his fee he splits it with Dr. A, who supplied the patient. The practice is quite common in commercial enterprises, but in so ethical and dignified a profession as medicine the trick of fee-splitting should be frowned on and made disgraceful. There is a strong feeling in the profession itself against the practice, but the evil persists.

* * *

How does it come that the right-hand side of a column of print always comes out even, including proper hyphenation, when splitting of words is necessary?

It really is very simple. The linotype operator, when he finishes a line, glances to see if it fits the full width of the column. If the line is just right he sends it on to be cast, but if, let us say, the type runs short by a quarter or a half inch, he remedies the matter by dropping in extra spaces between words. This, of course, can't be done on an ordinary typewriter, which accounts for the uneven right side.

* * *

What is your opinion of the seven volumes on "The Bankruptcy of Christian Supernaturalism," by Bishop W. M. Brown.

Bishop Brown, who was kicked out of his office as Bishop of Arkansas in the Episcopal Church, is an Atheist and a Communist. The books mentioned are of real value to students of religious phenomena. As for the accuracy of his data, documents, references, etc., I understand their scholarship is sound and constructive, the author having drawn on the expert services of Joseph McCabe in checking his authorities. Readers who are interested in the works of Bishop Brown can reach him at Galion, Ohio.

* * *

I'm interested in radio and expect to go to a radio school. I would like to know where I could get the best practical training for the least consideration?

The best schools are those run by the public, State or City. As you live in Pennsylvania, I suggest that you make inquiries in Philadelphia or Pittsburgh, where you will have no difficulty in finding a public-supported institution that will give you the instruction you seek at practically no cost. The commercially-run institu-

tions are expensive and inefficient.

The man who asked the above question is a coal-miner, 24 years of age, and has had one year of high-school. As his interest is in the practical side of radio, his preliminary education is quite sufficient to see him through. Of course, if he intended to go into questions of physics, mathematics, etc., he would have to submit to intensive preliminary work before taking the course he seeks at one of the higher institutions.

If this reader is unable to go to one of the cities mentioned, he can, I believe, accept at full value the promises made by the International Correspondence School, at Scranton, Pa., one of the best-run and honest private concerns in the country. The prices are a little too high, but otherwise the services are acceptable and helpful. The I. C. S. is really a well-run correspondence school that sincerely tries to be of help to its great body of students. Of course, if it's possible to attend a school run by the State, the results are sure to be better, but in the absence of that possibility I'd be willing to stand by the I. C. S.

* * *

How many banks are there left which do not make service charges?

I don't know, and have no way of finding out. A few years ago practically the entire banking system of the U. S. made no charge for clearing checks, accepting deposits, etc. Now, it seems likely, only a small minority of our banks is still to establish the numerous service charges. It's safe to assume that in another few years the entire system will be operated under what is known as "metered banking." I'm refraining from delivering a lecture on what to do about it, having written so often about the matter in the recent past that further harping on the topic may tire my readers.

* * *

Is it a fact that the U. S., during the World War, sold ammunition to Germany, directly or indirectly, with which ammunition the Americans, in turn, were killed in battle?

Practically all of the Allies made it possible for the Central Powers to get munitions and supplies during the World War, though practically none of the deals were made without the aid of intermediaries. Vickers, Inc.,

of England, great munitions corporation, supplied Germany with numerous weapons, which in turn killed British soldiers in France and Belgium, but most of these deals were made through neutral countries like Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, etc. The foreign trade of the U. S. jumped tremendously during the World War, and no small part of it was the result of abnormally large orders from small neutrals. In that manner Germany and its allies were able to get important chemicals, metals, oil, food and other supplies, mainly in the form of raw materials. Therefore, it's reasonable to say that American boys were killed by Germans who were supplied or fed by American business concerns.

* * *

Have you a line on what may be the policies of England's new King?

Edward VIII has already shown himself to be quietly anti-French and pro-German. He will undoubtedly be careful about expressing himself publicly, but behind the scenes he will most likely play the game of international politics a little in the direction of Hitlerism. The idea that British royalty has no real influence in politics is a myth that ought to be scotched. King George V usually kept in the background, but his influence could always be detected. It was he who got Ramsay MacDonald to become a traitor to Socialism and throw his immense influence towards the national government that was practically suggested by the king. Also, there's little doubt that it was King George V who pulled for the Hoare-Laval "peace" plan that would have given most of Ethiopia to Mussolini. The British royal house may not like Mussolini, but the Italian House of Savoy feels its future may be unsafe if Italy is defeated in East Africa, so the British King put in an oar for his fellow king.

Edward VIII is inclined in the direction of Fascism, so it's possible that the near future may see some interesting developments. While there may not be an out-and-out alliance with Hitler—the British public wouldn't stand for such a betrayal—there's little question that he will give aid and comfort to the beasts who are tyrannizing the German people. Edward VIII pretends, according to reports from the inside, that he is

against Hitler and for the German people, but this is the merest camouflage. The German people are not vocal—the expression of unofficial opinion is a crime—so when Edward VIII helps Hitler under the cloak of showing friendship for the German people he is fooling no one. British international policies will bear the closest watching now that this young, alert, vigorous king is on the throne. It's my own notion that his greatest efforts will be expended in the direction of militarism, imperialism and Fascism.

* * *

I have received literature from the National Protective Insurance Company, of Kansas City, Mo. Please answer if it is safe to take out one of their health policies?

I've heard from several sources that this company is reliable and lives up to its contracts.

* * *

Is it true that Russia's railroad system is worse today than it was before the World War?

You've been reading Isaac Don Levine, that professional anti-Soviet poison-peddler for Hearst's rotten newspapers. The best answer to your question is to quote briefly from the *Wall Street Journal*, January 13, 1936, as follows:

(The railroads of the Soviet Union are showing) "an activity and efficiency which are beginning to attract attention not only inside but also outside the country."

The same correspondent—mark you, for the official voice of *Wall Street*—adds that since 1929 freight movements dropped in England 22 percent; in France, 39 percent; in the U. S., 43 percent. In the Soviet Union, they increased 100 percent. It's always best to counter the Levine generalizations with facts. They have a way of puncturing wind-bags.

* * *

Who is your favorite orchestra conductor?

I put at the top Arturo Toscanini, a genius who is ever sublime. I'm reminded of the words of Puccini, himself a great admirer of Toscanini:

"He [Toscanini] conducts the work not just as the written score directs but as the composer imagined it."

The great Toscanini is a world-artist who scorns mere lines of nationalism. He not only does brilliant

and noble things with Italian music, but reaches out and embraces the music of all countries that have been fortunate enough to make creative contributions to this beautiful and significant art. The music of France, Germany, Austria, Bohemia, Russia, Finland and other countries is brought to new life when worked on by the magic of Toscanini's gigantic musicianship.

* * *

Hitler has been keeping pretty quiet during these months of Mussolini's adventuring in Ethiopia. What are the facts with regard to 1936 Germany and how long is it possible for the Nazi regime to last?

Conditions—economic, financial, industrial—have become grave under Hitler's dictatorship, so that it seems likely that the not remote future will see an uprising. There are various possibilities.

First of all, the Army is feverishly pressing its opportunity to rearm the country and thereby get ready for a new war, perhaps far more deadly than the World War. The Army is Hitler's pet, but it is an interesting fact that the army is NOT bossed by Hitler. Hitler may think he is the commander of the Army, but the real bosses are the great landowners, aristocrats and industrialists. The Army, naturally, will let Hitler "rule" as long as he produces money to pay for armaments, etc. If the country is to go bankrupt—and that condition is developing rapidly, with inflation as a near possibility—the Army can take over the country, establish a military dictatorship and give Hitler the boot. The Army never liked this upstart, and the only reason it has tolerated him the last three years is his readiness to give the Army everything it expected.

Some experts agree that the Army at present isn't strong enough to capture the country—that such a development might take another year, perhaps two or three. This leads certain students of the German situation to conclude that if Hitler is to be overthrown by the working people, Socialists, Communists and other dissidents, quick action will be necessary, perhaps during the next few months, if there's to be any hope for success. The longer the masses wait, the more difficult will become the change from dictatorship to democ-

racy or some other form of government closer to the wishes of the people.

That Hitler and his gangsters are aware of their delicate situation is shown by the manner in which persecution has been intensified during the past few months, especially against the Jews, and also why terror is being used in greater volume against Communists, Socialists and other active agents of the anti-Hitleristic underground, illegal movement. The courts are crowded with cases against anti-Hitlerites, and harsh sentences are being handed out daily to scores of political prisoners. Now and then word reaches the world that another Communist head has rolled in the sand. The prisons are jammed with men and women who have been sentenced to long terms because of their conspiratorial activity against Hitler's regime of terror and tyranny.

It's this serious economic situation which explains a great deal of the new intensification of the persecution of the Jews. Germany's Jews now number less than 500,000—less than 1 percent of the population, and they are being made the scapegoats for Hitler's political, economic and social failures. When Hitler took power he made numerous promises to the working people and small businessmen. He promised the end of interest, the breaking up of department stores, the outlawing of chain stores, the distribution of the great estates among the landless peasants, etc. Not a single one of these so-called radical promises was kept. The great blood purge of June 30, 1934, was his first answer to the more radical wing of the Nazi party that insisted on Hitler doing something to keep his promises. Instead of carrying out the terms of his program, he ordered hundreds of these radical brown-shirt leaders to be shot down in cold blood.

Since then, he has continued taking orders from the great industrialists who put up millions of marks to put him into power on the secret promise that he would destroy the Socialist and Communist parties and all organizations of workingmen. August Thyssen, the great Ruhr steel baron, alone put up 20,000,000 reichmarks (about \$5,000,000) during 1931-1933, and others followed Thyssen's lead

with cash contributions. Hitler kept his bargain with these industrialists, breaking up the labor unions, and outlawing the opposition political parties that represented the working class of Germany. That investment was really profitable for the industrialists, as is shown by the corporation figures for 1935. Dividends took tremendous hikes. Profits increased for the great capitalists.

But this, naturally, was putting no bread in the stomachs of the deluded workers who had supported Hitler's program because he made definite promises of social change. In order to cover up this betrayal, Hitler decided to put all emphasis on the persecution of the Jews. By blaming all of Germany's evils on the poor, helpless Jews—a minority, as I stated above—it was possible to take the minds of the masses off their real social difficulties—for a time, at least. The Jews are being robbed, persecuted, discriminated against, denied the right to make honest livings, and the like, because such a "cold pogrom" enables Hitler to hide the real situation in Germany. But this can't last indefinitely. There comes a time when the common people realize they have been duped. That situation is just about ripe in Germany.

Prices are going up, despite the fact that Hitler appointed a price dictator to prevent such hikes in the cost of living. Real wages have gone down. Certain foods—particularly fats—are so scarce that they can hardly be had for love or money. When asked about Germany's butter shortage, Propagandist Goebbels thundered: "We're too busy making history to bother about making butter." That may please certain political henchmen as a clever answer, but I'm sure the average German housewife would prefer to see a little less history and a little more butter.

These facts all indicate that Hitler's position is growing more insecure each month. During December, 1934, unemployment increased by more than 500,000 men. This is because of the complete failure of Hitler's policy of autarchy. This theory, as I explained before, is an attempt to make Germany independent of outside materials.

Under autarchy, Germany was to get along without outside oil, copper,

wool, cotton, etc. A pretty theory, but it couldn't be made to work because the substitutes were more expensive than the originals and of lower quality. This, of course, was said at the time, and even I joined my modest, quiet voice in the chorus of discussion, proving to the hilt that autarchy was possible for agricultural states, for rural communities, but would spell ruin for a modern industrial state which must rely on foreign credits, foreign markets, and foreign sources of raw materials.

Hitler accepted Dr. Schacht as economic dictator, and no one can deny the man's efficiency, but even Dr. Schacht can't make the German economic machine jibe with the insanities of Hitlerism. The results are uniformly bad, with collapse around the corner.

To show the failure of autarchy, one need merely look at a few industries. Let us suppose that Hitler's economic dictator decided to do away with the use of wool and cotton. Germany has a vast textile industry. If rayon and other substitutes are to be brought in, a great industry is compelled to lay off its hundreds of thousands of employes and shut down for good. This means ruin straight down the line—for manufacture, wholesaling, retailing, etc., with the consumer paying the expenses of this economic folly by parting with more money for useless substitutes than he would pay for useful genuine articles.

While Germany's real industries have been going from bad to worse, Schacht was able to continue a semblance of industrial activity by priming the pump of the armament industry. The war machine has been working feverishly, night and day, turning out cannon, rifles, machine guns, bombers, shells, uniforms, cantonments, barracks, tanks, vast networks of military roads, and the like, but such enterprises use up cash and never bring in the necessary money to pay their way. The situation has aggravated Germany's financial condition, for Schacht, in order to raise the necessary money, has gutted the banks and the insurance companies, compelling them to accept loans, for which they received certificates of dubious value. The banks and other financial institutions, including the insurance companies, have their vaults

crowded with Hitler's short-term loans: Hitler has used the money to build up the army, real industry has suffered mortal wounds, inflation is in sight—and the masses are in agony. How long can such an insane arrangement last? How long will Hitler be able to hide his failures by blaming everything on the poor Jews?

Of course, there was a financial side to Hitler's anti-Jewish policies, in addition to using the persecutions to hide his political mistakes. In all, the Jews of Germany had about 12,000,000,000 marks of wealth in their various businesses—about \$3,000,000,000. It was Hitler's plan to get that money, for the purpose of building up the Army and satisfying the greed of his gangsters who simply had to have their graft. He had drawn to his side the worst elements of gangsters, blackguards, blackmailers, extortioners, criminals, dope fiends, perverts, pimps and common thieves that had been attracted to any central power in the history of any modern state, and it was necessary for Hitler to satisfy their lust for wealth, luxury and political power. This passion could best be satisfied by stealing the wealth belonging to the Jews. They have been just about stripped, so from now on Hitler's blackguards can expect little from that source, though they can be made to serve the Nazis as convenient targets in order to divert the public's attention from the real issues created by insane Hitlerism.

The Jews have been ruined, but Germany itself is close to ruin, so what was gained by this brutal assault on a helpless minority? They, the Jews, have been stripped down to sheer necessities, without hope, humiliated, shamed, tortured and degraded. Germany hasn't marched on over their bodies. Germany, like the Jews, is headed for ruin, for Hitlerism means national ruin, no matter what country it is set up in and under what name.

When the economic situation worsens—which is likely very soon—Schacht may be driven from office by Hitler. When that happens it will be a signal to the world that the conservative elements have been unable to save German business and that German finance and industry have at last fallen completely into the hands

of the Hitlerites. Such a happening would be followed by an orgy of graft, open robbery, blackmail and booty. The gangsters would soon throw Germany into such an orgy of inflation that it would take a trillion marks to buy a newspaper. Such chaos might bring the Army into action, in order to kick out the Nazis and establish a more orderly government, with perhaps a few concessions to the liberal, parliamentary elements, with special care to see to it that the real radicals—Socialists and Communists—were hounded out of existence. But it's a moot question just how far the Army will be able to go.

The radical workers, now working secretly, have the Nazi officials scared, as is shown by their mass persecutions, and they might assert themselves in civil war, riots, rushing food stores, strikes, sabotage, and individual and mass violence. Such things may be facing Germany in the near future. And if the uprising comes—and it's by no means a remote eventuality—there's every reason to believe that the revolutionists, out to build a new civilization, will take time out to pay their respects to those beasts who enslaved and tortured Germany under the iron heel of Hitlerism. Serious accounts will be paid off, of that there's no doubt.

Hitler and his criminal followers will never give up an iota of their power without a struggle. They are tyrants and can be unseated only by force. The enemies of Hitlerism know this, and they are preparing for the seemingly inevitable upsurge. Will it come in time? Will it be a success? Can Hitler's regime be smashed? On the answers to these questions rests the future of European civilization.

If the reactionaries win, then will follow another world war. The Hitlerites, allied to Japan, will attack Russia; France, most likely, will rush to the defense of Russia. And then the fat will be in the fire. A German revolution could prevent such a terrible possibility. The best hopes for peace rest on the ability of German labor to act in time to tear Hitler and his gangsters from their seats of power.

* * *

Being interested in our youth, I'd like to know how many young people we

have between 16 and 24 years of age. Also, how are they occupied?

School Life, in its December, 1935, issue, reports there are 20,100,000 persons, male and female, in the U.S. of the ages of 16 to 24, inclusive. They are grouped as follows:

Full-time schools and colleges	4,000,000
Taking part-time school work	500,000
Young married women, not employed and not in school	2,800,000
Employed in full-time or part-time non-relief jobs	7,800,000
Out of school and unemployed, but not seeking employment	300,000
Out of school, unemployed and seeking employment	4,700,000

The last figure is really ominous—4,700,000 young people unable to get work, even though they are looking for it. It's disgraceful to contemplate a civilization that lets its best blood and energy go to waste. Here in itself is an overwhelmingly compelling argument for a social order that will open opportunities for a nation's youth. But, since we prefer, in our dense ignorance, to tolerate a system which will employ such young men and women only when they can produce a profit for the owning class, we shut the door in their face.

If society were to socialize the large-scale industries, it would be an easy matter to put these 4,700,000 young people to productive and useful work. Russia, which has only begun its great constructive task of building a Socialist society, doesn't know what unemployment means. Each individual has a job, if he or she is capable of rendering services, and if unable to do so there are the benefits of social insurance to be drawn on.

Our 4,700,000 unemployed young persons indicate an increase of 150 percent over the number of such disengaged individuals in 1930. Recently a survey was made of high school graduates, and it was found that 46 percent continue as students, 24 percent find jobs and the balance, 28 percent, are thrown into the army of the unemployed.

A system that refuses to take care of its young people is inviting trouble. Our militarists would like to "solve" such a problem by rigging up a nice, big war, but that provokes further economic distress with the added danger of complete collapse of civilized

institutions and the violence of revolution.

The sane, orderly, decent thing to do is to throw open the great industries which make or distribute wealth, and put them on a production-for-use basis. Under such a society every willing and able youth could be put to work in the near future.

Why don't we do such a simple, logical, intelligent thing? It seems as though the only plans that can attract popular attention are the screwy, impossible, unscientific ones, along the lines of a Townsend brain-storm, or a Father Coughlin's tinkering with the money question. Such flub-dub wins a certain measure of popular support, but the realistic, workable solution—Socialism—is treated like leprosy by the beneficiaries and the victims of the capitalistic system, or rather our plutocratic lack of system.

* * *

An official statement from Rome says that Ethiopian announcements are "typical of Addis Ababa," meaning they are inaccurate. Please comment.

If anything, the Ethiopian statements have been more accurate than the Italian reports. Addis Ababa has difficulties in getting its information, but it usually strives for accuracy, and many of its announcements are later substantiated. On the other hand, Italian releases are wildly exaggerated. The best instance was that of mid-December, 1935, when it was claimed that 30,000 Ethiopians were surrounded and were "in danger of annihilation." Subsequent releases simply ignored the fate of these 30,000 Ethiopians! It was, obviously, a piece of manufactured war propaganda to keep up home enthusiasm, which, despite all the tricks of organized lying, is wilting fast.

* * *

What is Mussolini's theory of war?

Mussolini looks on war as some sort of a glorious rejuvenator. Let me offer a few of Mussolini's sentences, taken from his numerous speeches:

"I regard the Italian nation in a permanent state of war . . . the next five or 10 years will be decisive in the fate of our country. These years will be decisive because the international struggle has already commenced. It will grow fiercer as time goes on, and it is inadmissible that we, without energy, should appear on the world stage

too late." (Speech before the chamber of Deputies, December 11, 1925.)

"For me to live is to fight, to risk, to dare." (Same speech.)

"Fascism does not think that permanent peace is possible or desirable. . . . Only war raises all exhibitions of human energy to their maximum tension. It puts the stamp of dignity on nations which are able to wage it openly. No other test can take its place." (1932.)

"The fundamental duty of Fascist Italy is the preparation of all armed forces on land, sea, and in the air. We must be able to mobilize 5,000,000. . . . Then, between 1935 and 1940, will come the tragic moment in Europe's history, and we can let our voices be heard." (May 26, 1927.)

In hundreds of other expressions, Mussolini has glorified war, threatened destruction, promised the spread of his brand of civilization, and explained that the Italian nation of today would regain all that ancient Rome had lost—naturally, at the expense of England and other countries who may not be quite ready to surrender to Il Duce's dreams of grandeur.

It's amusing to note that when Mussolini's glorious aims are put to the test—as in Ethiopia—it's black natives who do the real fighting, leaving his own soldiers in the rear, in comparative safety. If war is such a glorious thing, why does he persist in using African natives as his spearhead? It seems to my thick mind that this would be just the right job for the warriors and heroes of Fascism. But, no, it's the blacks who do most of Mussolini's fighting. Then, after a battle, their bodies are cleared away so that the movie cameras may have a clear view of the white soldiers marching to take charge of what the blacks took for them. The blacks do all the fighting, but it's the whites who make the news-reels. Yes, war is "glorious"—when others do the fighting.

Has Mussolini always insisted on Italy's need for expansion?

In his speech before the Chamber of Deputies, May 26, 1927, Mussolini asked for more population, but insisted that Italy was plenty big enough to take care of the added people. Here are his words:

"Gentlemen, in order that Italy

may become influential she must in the second half of the 20th Century count 60,000,000 inhabitants. You will say: 'How will those 60,000,000 live on this territory?' But this same objection was probably made in 1815 when Italy had only 16,000,000 inhabitants. At that time, perhaps, some people believed that it would be impossible for the 40,000,000 of today to find the means of livelihood, at a much higher standard, on our present territory."

True, the Italy of a century ago, with its 16,000,000 people, would have ridiculed the idea of 40,000,000 or more people in 1935. But they're there. And in 1927, Mussolini himself promised a 50 percent increase during the present century, within Italy's present limits. Of course, there's no denying that Italy could support a still larger population. There are great stretches of good land held out of use by the landowning capitalists, as I've shown in previous articles which gave the actual figures. How easy it would be to put such land to productive use, if Mussolini were really sincere.

* * *

Isn't it a fact that the size of the heart has a great deal to do with the rate of its beat?

So far as I know, the smaller the heart the faster its beat. The following list gives the heart beats per minute of:

Elephant, 25; adult man, 75; child, 90; infant, 140; rabbit, 150; mouse, 175.

* * *

How much wood does the average person consume in a lifetime?

It's estimated that the average American, in a lifetime, consumes about 300 trees of medium size. This, of course, covers all wood required for residences, household furniture, fuel transportation, paper, rayon, and the like.

* * *

Clarence S. Campbell, 410 Hellerman St., Philadelphia, Pa., author of numerous Little Blue Books, is bringing some of his friends together in a Freethinkers' Club. Freeman readers in Philadelphia and vicinity who might be interested in such a group are advised to get in touch with Mr. Campbell, by letter.

* * *

Our little boy—five years old—seems to have developed a phobia towards death. I am utterly baffled as to the

best way of handling him. Please advise.

From your letter I take it that this phobia regarding death was created by some of his playmates. Knowing his parents to be very rationalistic about such questions, it seems to me that the only thing you can do is to try to keep the child's mind occupied with other subjects—lively, interesting, cheerful topics and experiences. I'm sure the mood will pass over quickly. The natural, normal, healthy attitude among children is to give little or no thought to subjects like death, sin, hell, heaven, etc. I'd advise you not to lecture the young man on these matters. Just keep him occupied with games and other interests intended to take his mind from the excessively morbid. If the child is physically well I'm sure he'll snap out of it.

* * *

How many of our World War veterans are dying daily?

79.

* * *

A LETTER FROM DR. W. J. ROBINSON

Dr. William J. Robinson, who died early in January, 1936, was a great letter-writer. Every issue of The American Freeman would provoke a flood of communications, and all of them of real value to me in my editorial work. I mightn't agree with him, but his letters would always provoke ideas and lively discussion. The letter that follows came literally from Dr. Robinson's deathbed. At the bottom of the communication, in his own hand, was written: "Laid up. Dictating from sickbed."

Dr. Robinson headed his letter: "License to the Nazis?" It follows:

Dear Haldeman-Julius:

I am just through reading the December issue of The American Freeman. You are always so sane and sensible that I was astonished to read your answer to the question: "Do you favor free speech for all, including Fascists?"

I do not know whether you have read all my debates and writings on the subject. If you have and you still maintain that freedom of speech should be given to the Fascists and Nazis, then I do not suppose that this letter will convert you to my point of view. But, as you know, I always burn with a Messianic zeal, and if I see a WORTHWHILE person making a mistake, I cannot help trying to correct him.

There is all the difference in the

world between expressing one point of view and another. But the Fascists and Nazis do not present any arguments. They simply say that liberty is a "stinking, decaying corpse" (not mine, but Mussolini's expression) and one of the planks in their program is the complete and permanent suppression of free speech and free press.

It is one of the fatal mistakes of the weak-minded or muddle-headed—among whom I do NOT count you—that as long as those fellows do not resort to force, violence, intimidation, etc., they should be permitted to propagandize their so-called ideas without interference. How many times must I repeat that WORDS ARE ALSO DEEDS, that words must precede deeds? Deeds are not done spontaneously—they are the results of words. Do you suppose that brutal Hitlerism would have gained such enormous power, would have become so omnipotent since January 30, 1933, if for 12 years previously it had not been permitted to spread its ideas in every corner, in every factory, in every school? This is the fatal mistake that the heads of the German Republic made. It is their liberalism that ruined the country and that is now the curse of millions of people. If Hitler had been shot during 1923 when he made the Putsch to overthrow the Republic, as he legally deserved to be, there would have been no Nazism now.

Bear in mind my slogan: WORDS ARE ALSO DEEDS, WORDS MUST PRECEDE DEEDS.

You say: "The opponents of free speech haven't made much headway in this country despite the fact that they have never been interfered with." How do you know? Evidently you have not come in contact with various classes and various sections of our nation. Everywhere Fascism and Nazism, with their destructive poison, anti-Semitism, are penetrating and percolating through the various strata of society. There are no open pogroms, but people who have their eyes and ears open notice it everywhere. And people who are looking for jobs, whether it is manual labor, a stenographer's job, a teacher's job, or a professional position, feel the poison very keenly.

You have no idea how perniciously active, how viciously cunning the Nazis are in spreading their poison. You travel through 50 different countries in the different continents, and everywhere the

poison of Nazism has gained a foothold. Even in such a place as Port au Prince, in Haiti, I found some of the most horrible cartoons in their French papers, advocating ruthless anti-Semitism.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. William J. Robinson

* * *

CHANCE AND COIN-TOSSING

My short discussion of the question of chance in the tossing of coins brought interesting letters, which I'm sure my readers will enjoy. The first is from C. F. Newman, Duluth, Minn.:

"Both Sir James Jeans and Dr. Finlayson are wrong in their theories on coin-tossing and the ratio of heads and tails. The chances are not 50-50 as Jeans says, or 186-70 as Finlayson suggests. There is absolutely no element of chance in it at all! When a coin is tossed in the air, whether it will come down heads or tails depends upon these conditions: 1. the position of the coin in the hand. 2. the position of the hand. 3. the angle at which it is thrown. 4. the force with which it is thrown. 5. the resistance it meets in the atmosphere. If these five conditions are unchanging, a coin could be tossed 50,000,000,000 times and would always come down the same way. If any of these conditions vary, and it is determined to what extent they vary, the results can be expressed in an algebraic formula. 'The dice of God are always loaded,' says Emerson. This simply means that there is no such thing as chance—the Universe is the slave of law. Sir James Jeans is a greater authority on astronomy than I am, but I believe you will agree with me that I am a greater authority on coin-tossing than Sir James.

It seems to me that Reader Newman's argument is far-fetched. Granting that the choice of head or tail would depend on the numerous physical conditions enumerated above, the simple fact remains that it would be impossible for the tosser to know these conditions at the moment he threw the coin, so it follows logically that so far as the coin-tosser is concerned the matter is purely one of chance. H. F. Mullikin, New York City, enters the discussion with this letter:

It is, of course, possible to toss five pennies and obtain five heads. Likewise, it is possible to toss (mathematically and philosophically speaking) 500,000 pennies and have them all show tails or all show

heads. This possibility is very remote but cannot be excluded. Likewise, there are a vast number of other combinations which might occur, the chances being more or less remote. However, the chances of obtaining 250,000 heads and 250,000 tails, or 249,999 heads and 250,001 tails, or some combination very close to these, are very good. Without going into involved mathematical proof, we may say that the chances of obtaining a very nearly equal number of heads and tails are quite great although, as Dr. Finlayson has pointed out, the chances of obtaining an exactly equal number of heads and tails become more remote as the number of pennies is increased.

You will note that Sir James Jeans used "tons of pennies" in his discussion. I do not know how many pennies are in a ton but the number must be considerable. To obtain a number of tons of pennies' heads equal to an equal number of tons of pennies' tails is quite different from obtaining a number of pennies' heads exactly equal to a number of pennies' tails. The difference is equal to the number of pennies in a ton. Sir James Jeans' statement is correct for all practical purposes, although not mathematically correct. The chances of having the number of pennies' heads different from the number of pennies' tails by more than a ton of pennies is rather remote—so remote that it may be neglected.

On this same subject I might state that from a mathematical point of view there is a chance (exceedingly remote) that one might dump a bottle of ink in the Atlantic Ocean, return in two years and scoop up all of the contents of that bottle of ink with a pail at that particular spot. The chances are much greater, however, that the ink will have distributed itself throughout the ocean.

Next comes a letter from that ever-loyal reader, C. A. Lang, Mo., as follows:

Jeans says that 1,000,000 tons of half-pence, if thrown up, will yield 500,000 tons each of heads and tails. Finlayson says that the chance of an even number is 530,600 to one against. I should be interested to know by what processes, short of actual experiment, Finlayson arrives at so exact and positive a probability. But—they are probably both right! How come? Well, although Finlayson's estimate is preponderantly against an exact

number of coins falling each way, he does not say that the number is likely to be very far from half, and furthermore I think he would admit that if the throw were repeated, the variation in favor of tails, let us say, in the first instance would likely be balanced by an equal variation in favor of heads on the second throw, or at any rate that the deviation one way or another from an exactly equal split would on an increasing number of throws tend, if averaged, to more and more closely approach zero. And that, I think, is what Jeans meant, although he put it rather rigidly. But I think he would so qualify his original statement if asked about it.

* * *

Reader M. Olewin, Niagara Falls, N. Y., writes spiritedly against my hesitancy in endorsing "mercy slayings." His letter:

Your comment in the March issue of *The Freeman* on "mercy death" for persons suffering from incurable diseases surprises and puzzles me.

Admitt'g that the individual has a right to decide for himself whether or not he "prefers to continue living," you say, however, that you "don't seem able to stomach the notion of calling in a doctor to do the slaughtering" (a helluva way of putting it, unless you add "of pain," in which case the doctor and you become "murderers of misery," "assassins of sorrow," etc.), plainly implying that the sufferer who wants to die should end his life himself. But how about the person who wants to die but can't, on account of his physical disabilities, attend to the details involved in putting oneself out of existence? And how about the person who can't, because of his mental condition, decide for himself whether or not to continue "living," though there is nothing but agony—whole hours, days, weeks, months, or years of it—in store for him? Do you think it more merciful, humane, civilized, virtuous, decent, or what have you, to let nature take its merciless course in a case like that, to let the poor creature "die by inches," or even, perhaps, to let the doctors use him for a guinea pig, than to deliberately send him to the heaven of non-existence? Too, how about the monstrosities and other pitiful humans that are frequently born?

I don't think that life is so pre-

vious (even at its best, I think it's pretty much of a joke) that even when it is hell everything possible should be done to preserve it. I think that to preserve such a life, especially against the wishes of its owner, is criminal. I can understand the opposition to "mercy death" in a religionist, who must, of course, consider the desires of his cruel God, but not in an Atheist. No sir.

I may be a tory-minded reactionary, but I can't get it out of my craw that when I meet a doctor coming out of a house I don't want to have to say: "Howdy, doc, been savin' a life or bumpin' someone off?"

* * *

"Permit me to congratulate you for publishing in *The Appeal to Reason* that blistering review by Joseph McCabe of De Mille's spectacular movie, *The Crusades*. Also I think it entirely fitting that I add my own praise to that no doubt voiced by some others, in behalf of your Little Blue Books. I am inclined to think that they are taken too much as a matter of course by a lot of us who want something more vital than the miserable pap obtainable elsewhere at even several times the price. It is only recently that I have again had some time to shift a few of them from the "not read" to the "read" end of my shelf. I thought the one about bees by Vance Randolph especially fine and informative."—C. A. Lang, Mo.

* * *

Did Bill Nye ever characterize Wagnerian music?

He wrote: "Wagnerian music is better than it sounds," which certainly is pretty fair wit but lousy appreciation.

* * *

What portion of our population is feeble-minded?

4,000,000.

* * *

My frenzied, ringing, shattering attack on "and/or" brought what I certainly had a right to expect—an equally positive defense of the use of this eccentric construction. Reader H. F. Mullikin, New York City, works hard in pulling for his side, but I'm still as fanatically opposed to "and/or" as before, though I'm sure the readers will want to know his arguments. Here's his letter:

In the *March Freeman* there is an item which you, undoubtedly due to the press of work, have not, in my opinion, sufficiently considered.

It concerns the usage of the expression "and/or." A little reflection will show that the

mark “/” represents not, as you assume, confusion in the mind of the user of the expression but the word “or.” Obviously it would be somewhat confusing to use the expression “and or or” instead of “and/or,” in the same way that that expression “that that” that some people use may at times become confusing. Last you do not agree that the “/” is intended to replace “or,” and that the expression “and/or” or its equivalent “and or or” is sometimes necessary to precisely express a meaning, may I give an example?

Suppose I might wish to delegate to a representative of mine the task of delivering \$1,000 to The American Freeman and I were writing the instructions as a matter of record. I might say, assuming that you had a treasurer and that I knew that you had a treasurer, “you are to deliver this money to Haldeman-Julius and his treasurer or if they are not both there deliver it to Haldeman-Julius alone or deliver it to the treasurer.” It is possible to write this more concisely “deliver this money to Haldeman-Julius and his treasurer or to Haldeman-Julius or to his treasurer.” Instead of writing “Haldeman-Julius” twice and “treasurer” twice it is possible to use a still more concise form “deliver this money to Haldeman-Julius and or or his treasurer” the first “or” meaning that a choice is to be made between the words “and” and the second “or.” The words “and or or” are usually written for clarity “and/or.”

To argue against a shortened form because it is not decent English (what does decent mean as used here?) is similar to arguing against the use of abbreviations, the use of shorthand and the like.

I want to assure Reader Mullikin that if he decides to test out his argument by sending \$1,000 to The American Freeman, I'll guarantee him there'll be no confusion regarding the meaning of “and/or”; it'll be a case of plain, little ME, for right now I could make constructive use of a thousand bucks.

* * *

Things keep moving at a lively pace in this shop. The first number of The Freethinker has been mailed to its subscribers, and a right nice little job it is. And, here's the fifth volume of Questions and Answers, by E. Haldeman-Julius. This fifth series is jammed with important facts and opinions on subjects of current interest. The handsome volume is carefully indexed. A copy of No. 5 Questions and Answers

may be had FREE by sending \$1 for a year of The American Freeman, new subscription or renewal. Add 20c to cover carriage, packing and handling. Also, please add 10c to personal check. The No. 5 Questions and Answers cleans up all the editorial material available, which means that the sixth volume won't be ready for perhaps six months. Those who would like to have all five volumes of Questions and Answers can have them FREE OF CHARGE by renewing their Freeman subscriptions for five years, at \$1 per year, plus 50c carriage. This means that for only \$5.50, you get the five books FREE and The Freeman for five additional years, regardless of when your subscription expires.

* * *

It is charged that tourists in Russia are permitted to see only what the authorities want seen. Please comment.

I have talked with dozens of men and women who returned from a tour of the Soviet Union and always found they had been permitted the fullest liberty of motion. The only “exceptions” were professional liars and intellectual pimps like Clarence P. Oakes, the anti-Soviet lecturer who is making a business and a racket of slandering the Russian regime.

George Soule, editor of *The New Republic*, returned recently from a trip to Russia, and wrote a number of articles in which he set out to prove that Socialism is really working in Russia. Mr. Soule, who is a capable writer, honest editor and experienced observer, characterized as “downright nonsense” the notion that tourists are permitted to see only what the officials want shown. Writes Mr. Soule: “The Soviet State, with its 170,000,000 citizens, is not in the business of putting on a show for 25,000 tourists.” The article continues:

“Nonetheless, tourists do require surveillance for their own comfort and protection, not only because the language is so strange that even street signs are unintelligible, but also all money arrangements must be made in advance. A visitor is as helpless with his dollars as an Iroquois set down on Broadway with a pocket full of wampum. The language and currency difficulties make necessary a chaperonage that the critical visitor interprets as conscious isolation.”

I recall vividly the to-do Clarence P. Oakes made in his Pittsburg, Kansas, skunky lecture over the

"tremendous risks" he took because he dared actually go on journeys by himself, the inference being that he was expected to stay close to tourist headquarters and see only those things he was expected to have brought to his attention. When I bawled him out for this obvious lie, after the lecture, I happened to see a college professor, Dr. Mendenhall, nearby, who also had been to Russia. I quickly asked him: "Tell me, professor, were your movements restricted when you visited Russia recently?" To which the honest teacher replied: "I was given every right and opportunity to go wherever I pleased, both in or out of Moscow."

* * *

I would like to know what you think of Toyohiko Kagawa as a leader and as a thinker.

I'd never even heard of the gentleman until he decided to come to this country a few months ago for a series of lectures in our larger communities. Since then I've followed his work with care and consider him utterly unimportant as a thinker, superficial as a teacher, and completely lacking in an understanding of the profundities of philosophy, science and learning in general. He's been petted and noisily fussed over by the preachers because he is the most famous Christian convert in Japan, and it is thought, naively, of course, that he will be able to recapture many of America's "lost souls" for the work of the Lord. I'm positive that about 200 years of open criticism of Christianity, and the educational work of Skeptics, Rationalists, Agnostics, Atheists, Modernists, Free-thinkers, Secularists, etc., will not be undone by this convert from yahoo to mumbo-jumbo. Kagawa poses as something of a cooperater in economics, but it's interesting to note that he never misses a chance to warn the public against the world's two great cooperative philosophies—Socialism and Communism. Revealed religion is doomed, and no Japanese revivalist will be able to build where millions of American, Canadian, English and European preachers failed. Religion is dying rapidly, but its institutions are big business corporations in need of the services of a Kagawa, who is able to help keep the racket paying dividends while Theism and

theology are riddled and in collapse.

* * *

What's your opinion of Bertrand Russell's essay, "A Free Man's Worship"?

It's one of the finest things I've ever read. This short masterpiece is an intellectual adventure that every intelligent person should want to experience by reading and studying it. I was so pleased with it when I first came on it some 10 years ago that I decided to give it a place in my library of Little Blue Books, where it has held an honored place ever since. It hasn't been a very popular number, but that doesn't hinder me from keeping the essay in print. Such a great, beautiful, profound study should always be available for minds capable of assimilating liberating ideas.

* * *

What is your opinion of that radical publication, The Fellowship Forum, published at Washington, D.C.?

It was—and I suppose still is—an organ of the K.K.K., and that's enough to brand it among intelligent, civilized people. This publication is a weapon of incipient Fascism, racial persecution, intolerance, Fundamentalism, violence against helpless minorities, and general reaction in social and political philosophy. It fights the Roman Catholic Church, but not because the Church is wrong in its history, ideas, ethics, ideology, methods, etc., but merely because it isn't Protestant. I'll grant you that the Protestant Church isn't as dangerous as the Catholic, but let's remember that the Catholic Church is older and therefore has had more experience in the black arts of repression. Instead of being merely anti-Catholic, I prefer to be generally anti-clerical—which means I have no use whatever for priests, preachers or rabbis. They are all anti-social and parasitic. The Catholic Church is a dangerous institution, but the proper way to oppose it, to my way of thinking, is to attack all clericalism, so that when the priests are stripped of power we can be sure they won't be supplanted by preachers or rabbis. Furthermore, the K.K.K. brand of anti-Catholicism means persecution of individual Catholics, which, to my way of thinking, is grossly immoral. The intelligent thing to do is to attack the Church as an institution but to refrain from persecuting its vic-

tims. They, rather, should be approached with a view to educating them away from the influence of the priest, instead of making them suffer for their beliefs, as the K.K.K. would do. K.K.K. anti-Catholicism is plain biogtry.

* * *

I note what you say about Mark Twain's "1601, or Social Life in the Time of the Tudors." Do you happen to have copies available for distribution?

I have never issued this booklet, and never intend to. It has always been my policy to avoid any form of pornography. I don't mind publishing scientific literature dealing with sex, but I don't care to publish out-and-out pornography. This doesn't mean I don't care for an occasional half-hour of good pornographic literature. I have, perhaps, read more than my share of Rabelaisian humor, during the past 35 years, but I simply don't care to make that kind of literature a part of my publishing program. I leave that field to others, preferring to deal with subjects of sexual interest as social documents or scientific dissertations. Recently I accepted for publication a volume of 60,000 words entitled, *The Autobiography of a Pimp*, but this is by no means a pornographic book. It is a social document, written in dignified speech. It's a million miles from pornography. As for the Twain item, you may be able to get a copy in some store that caters to a public that seeks the rare and erotic in literature, but I'm afraid the price will be high.

* * *

I take this opportunity to thank my 200 odd (and five not so odd) readers who went to elaborate pains to explain the meaning of the sentence about the gals at Juarez who danced on one leg and then on the other, etc. It seems I was dealing with a couple of bad women. Such things must not be permitted again in these chaste, sober columns.

* * *

Do you think raising frogs is a profitable money-making idea?

I doubt that this business can be made to pay, except in very exceptional cases. The market is usually taken care of by boys who live in the country and can pick up a few extra dollars now and then catching frogs. There is, as yet, no great demand for this delicious item of food. Incident-

ally, the business has attracted a number of racketeers, who are promoting a fake scheme based on the screwy idea that the public is to buy a certain number of frogs from the advertiser, who, in turn, will raise them, see that they marry and reproduce, and then will raise the young and sell them on the basis of 50-50, or something equally fantastic. Don't fall for such an obvious flim-flam.

* * *

You speak of putting one's savings in the Postal Savings Bank, where they are safe with the U. S. government behind them, but what about the danger to such deposits resulting from an unbalanced budget and a great public debt? Would my money be safe under such conditions?

While it's true that the budget hasn't been balanced and that the government owes more than \$30,000,000,000, I can't see what that could possibly have to do with your savings with the Post Office. That money is kept separate, and can be used for only one purpose—to repay you when you want to turn your certificates into cash—on a moment's notice. It wouldn't make any difference if the budget were to remain unbalanced for another century and the deficit piled up another \$100,000,000,000—the money in the Postal Savings Bank would still be good at 100 cents on the dollar. You can't lose here any more than you could possibly lose if you presented a postal money order for payment. That money has nothing to do with the government's general finances. It's there when you want it. Never let a postal savings account cause you the least worry. It's good.

* * *

Who was the philosopher quoted by President Roosevelt at the end of his recent message to Congress?

Josiah Royce. He was, until his death, professor of philosophy at Harvard.

* * *

Tell me something of the male "so-prani" of the Vatican Choir in Rome; and of the so-called "castrati."

I have printed a little about these Catholic castrations, but the subject can be followed more thoroughly in the various works of Joseph McCabe. He's an expert on the Catholic Church—so much so that he has never been "called" by a single Roman publication, despite the fact that he has

written millions of words about the Church. McCabe knows what he's talking about, and when he explains about the "soprani," etc., you can depend on what he says.

* * *

Now that Russia is making some progress in the direction of a moderate use of booze, what is the official attitude in that country toward tobacco?

So far as I can find out, the Russian government has taken no stand against the use of tobacco, though the public schools carry the usual anti-nicotine propaganda.

* * *

Recently I praised the employes of the Post Office Department for their intelligent handling of their job. A postal worker, whose name had better be omitted, checks me up in the following letter:

I was interested in your remarks about democracy in industry and especially in the Post Office. As a postal worker I exactly agree with you as to the desirability of democracy in the Postal Service as elsewhere, but I think you are a bit too sanguine in your estimate of the intelligence of "the boys." As one of them I know how their brains work. I have mentioned this democracy idea to a lot of them. None waxes enthusiastic; the idea of an extended Civil Service which would remove our supervisors from political control strikes a more responsive note with most of them. But they do not see that it is quite possible for the Civil Service to fall into the politicians' hands (and under this head certain things are now happening that bode no good for the future) and that nothing short of the assumption of more responsibility by ourselves either by direct democratic methods or by a democratically controlled Civil Service can assure continued integrity here. Further, a large proportion of them are great rooters for the inanities of the American Legion. And just the other day I overheard several of them deploring the probable success of Bernard Macfadden's presidential aspirations because "he is a very immoral man having done much to foist nudism on the country." This last I consider about the dumbest thing I have ever heard outside of a conversation in Babbitt for at least four reasons: first, Barney has no chance; second, his nudism publicity was cheap, sexy superficiality for his own enrichment which, third, resulted in damage rather

than aid to the nudist movement; and fourth, the extension of the practice and understanding of nudism could result only in improvement of what we are pleased to call morals, not to speak of the improvement in health. But, of all this these birds were as ignorant as pigs, though I must add that perhaps something less than half of them would rate quite as low as these.

My remarks about the workers in the Post Office had to do with their quiet efficiency, which I know to be a living reality, after many years of watching them handle the mail of this establishment. I have sent out and received millions of catalogues, circulars, letters, parcel post packages, air mail, special deliveries, registered pieces, and C. O. D. shipments, and have always been impressed with the honesty, loyalty and intelligence of the department's hundreds of thousands of employes. I was, of course, limiting my praise to their jobs—not to their knowledge of current events, philosophy, science, history, or politics. In such matters I've found them to be just about as smart—and as dumb—as the average person in other walks of life.

* * *

What did the World War cost us in dollars?

Including the soldiers' bonus, the cost, up to January, 1936, was \$45,200,000,000. It is estimated that the World War will continue to cost us money at the rate of \$1,000,000,000 a year, because of pensions, interest on Liberty Bonds, hospitalization, etc. When President Harding formally declared the end of the war on July 2, 1921 (actual hostilities ended on November 11, 1918) the cost of the World War to the U.S. was figured at \$25,729,000,000. Since then the expense has almost doubled, and the end isn't in sight, for it's claimed that pensions will still be paid almost a century hence. In 1930, the cost of the World War was placed at \$37,873,908,499. These figures, gigantic as they are, don't include a penny of what the World War cost in lost lives, shattered bodies, dislocated business and, finally, the depression since 1929, most of its severity being credited to the economic consequences of the World War.

* * *

"I enclose \$1 for a year's subscription, which is to go to a friend of mine. I never discard any of the issues received, giving them instead to friends who read them with enthusiasm. The

Freeman is splendid."—Mrs. F. J. Brod-
erick, Seattle, Wash.

* * *
What is Erastianism?

Erastianism is the belief that there should be close and organic association between Church and State. When the U. S. Constitution came out for complete dissociation of Church and State a great blow at Erastianism was struck. The battle is far from being won, for most countries have established Churches, particularly in Europe. Erastianism in Italy was destroyed when the Pope was deprived of temporal power, but the victory was short-lived, for Mussolini undid the work of the Italian patriots and established the Catholic Church as an arm of the Fascist State. Russia and France are strictly secular.

* * *
I wish you would continue your discussions regarding the economic situation in Sweden.

As I've already shown, Sweden's Socialist administration has resulted in economic progress for the masses, without the loss of a single democratic right, without the blustering of a dictator, the poison of race persecution, the destruction of free press, speech, assembly, and the like. The record speaks well for the sane, constructive, orderly policies of the Socialist party of Sweden.

Employment in 1936 is greater than in 1929. Less than 1 percent of the employables are without jobs. The budget has been balanced right through the depression. There is practically no national debt. There are only 43,000 persons unemployed—out of a population of more than 6,000,000. Sweden's money is as strong as the best in the world. Sweden's foreign trade is flourishing. Sweden's imports from the U.S. increased 78 percent in 1934, consisting mainly of American motor cars, which are very popular with the Swedes. Figured per capita, the people of Stockholm own more automobiles than those of any other European city. The same goes for telephones, which, by the way, are made by cooperatives at low cost, instead of by private corporations.

Sweden operates many socially necessary industries, and always without losses. The utility system, which is owned by the people, makes a net gain of about \$5,000,000 yearly. The

telegraph and telephone systems belong to the nation, and produce a net profit of \$8,000,000 yearly. The state-owned railroads produce \$6,000,000 in profits yearly, after paying all expenses, depreciation, obsolescence, high wages, pensions, social insurance, etc. The national treasury makes \$3,000,000 annually from the forestry department. Liquor, tobacco and radio are national monopolies, and may be followed soon by coffee and gasoline.

The Swedish cooperatives are vast, efficient, economically-sound business institutions that operate exclusively for the benefit of the consumers, doing one-fifth of the nation's business in consumer's goods.

Sweden's housing program compares with the best in history. One-fifth of Stockholm's population—100,000 persons—live in apartments or small dwellings built by cooperatives. For a down payment of only \$80, a person may get a well-built, thoroughly modern home in a good neighborhood (there are no slums) on land leased to the buyer for 60 years.

Yes, the Swedes have something to teach us.

* * *
Can you explain the silence of American Jews in the face of growing anti-Semitism?

History is repeating itself. In Germany, before Hitler took power and instituted a reign of terror against 1 percent of Germany's population, the prominent Jews—belonging mainly to the middle class—kept a discreet silence. They entertained the baseless tactic of meeting anti-Semitic fire with dignified silence. The record shows how they were made to pay for their near-sightedness.

In this country, there are upwards of 20 organizations that are devoted to bitter, vicious, unrelenting, unscrupulous and untruthful propaganda against American Jewry. And the Jews have practically nothing to say in reply, though occasional individual voices—like that of Dr. Isaac Goldberg—warn their own kind against impending disaster and appeal to the decent elements among non-Jews for fairness and tolerance.

A Fundamentalist preacher—Gerald P. Winrod—starts an anti-Semitic sheet that reeks with all the lies and filth of Julius Streicher's *Stormer*,

and in a short time he builds up a circulation of 90,000. There's no telling how fast this medium for disseminating hatred against an innocent minority will grow in influence. But the American Jews hardly notice such an incident—and the poison-propaganda continues.

Publications of all kinds—periodicals, pamphlets, leaflets, broadsides, books, circulars, etc.—are being turned out by the millions in order to give anti-Semitism the strength to repeat in the U.S. what Hitler, Goebbels, Streicher and other infamous sadists have perpetrated in Germany. Practically nothing is being done by the intelligent Jews of this country to counter this unspeakable, obscene, far-flung campaign of miseducation and libel.

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion—exposed as crude hoaxes—circulate widely in this country. And the average person—uninformed or misinformed—swallows these terrible lies. The Jews, after repudiating the purported documents, turn to other matters, as though the ravings of Jew-baiters were unworthy of serious attention.

In the political arena, anti-Semitism is growing apace, as I warned in previous articles. The next national election will see an orgy of anti-Jewish sensationalism, if present signs mean anything. The Jew is slated to be the scapegoat. He will be made to bear the blame for everything that goes wrong in government, finance, business, economics, and the like. Of course, this hate-drive won't be conducted in the regular daily press. The methods will be adapted to conditions, using whispering campaigns, circulars, pamphlets and other publications, bearing every sort of imprint. These printed and spoken lies will provoke an orgy of hysteria and venom without equal in the history of American quackery—but, judging by their present behavior, American Jews may be expected to say little or nothing in their own defense. The method may reek with dignity, but dignity is a poor weapon with which to fight bigotry.

What should they do? The answer, to my way of thinking, is simple. They should decide now—before the storm breaks in all its terrific fury—to fight back, meeting the lies of

their enemies with the truth, exposing the ideology of the anti-Semites, setting right the facts of the record, and striving in a thousand ways to meet the propaganda of their detractors. Such a campaign isn't guaranteed to achieve success, but at least it's the manly line to follow. Then, should the Jews be defeated and made to endure the humiliations and persecutions of their brothers and sisters in Germany, they will at least be able to reply that they fought the good fight in their own defense. There's no disgrace in manly defeat.

The Jews have able men to fight for them—Dr. Isaac Goldberg's name comes first to mind. There are several others equally able. But they are not being given the necessary means or opportunities to apply their publicistic talents to the important and necessary educational work that waits to be done. I say, in all seriousness, that meeting the fire of anti-Semitism with silent disdain is the essence of fatuousness. Will the Jews of America wake up in time?

* * *

Can you quote from some conservative source in support of the dire things you write about Germany and Italy?

Certainly. The Kiplinger Washington Agency, Washington, D. C., runs an expensive information service for its banker, industrialist, financier subscribers, who pay a high yearly fee for the regular Letter. Under date of January 25, 1936, the Letter practically repeats what I've been writing in these columns about Hitler and Mussolini. Kiplinger says:

Europe and war, the actual prospects: Following observations are based on dispatches from our well-informed foreign correspondents, plus checkings by authorities who know the "inards" of foreign affairs. Comments are "unofficial," but are more frank than the "official."

Italy in Ethiopia: Campaign about all washed up—dud to date. Rainy season, about to start, will stop operations and ruin morale. If it weren't for censorship, this would already be clear to all.

Italy at home: The internal economic situation is precarious. Civil population is approaching the point of suffering, is grumbling. Italian gold for cash purchases can't last long; credit is almost nil. German aid can not be expected, for Germany also is hard pressed.

Italy is approaching internal crisis. May be put off six months, perhaps more. Monarchist movement is growing: Points to Prince Umberto. Umberto might mean Mussolini's downfall. England and France might welcome monarchy, as means of downing Mussolini without civil war.

Germany's internal economic situation is becoming critical. There isn't ample food or clothing for masses; there's war-time suffering. (Full food quotas in hotels-restaurants serve to fool foreign visitors.) Low wage scales and spread-work employment mark the consumer industries. Full employment prevails only in armament and allied industries.

Military bargaining by spring: Hitler plans on most complete military machine in Europe by this spring or summer—men and munitions. Hopes to use these to bargain with other nations.

Schacht is hard pressed as Germany's economic dictator.

* * *

Has anyone estimated how many times the people of Germany salute?

It's been done. The Hitler salute, which consists of stiffly lifting the right arm, is given about 50 times each day by the average German. As Germany's population is 66,000,000, this means that during the year the salute is given 1,204,500,000,000 times. No one has yet figured out what that mass energy could do if applied to constructive tasks. Nor has anyone estimated the number of links of sausages required to produce the energy to make those trillion and several hundred billions of salutes.

* * *

I read in many places that if Mussolini were to fall, Italy would be faced with a Communist revolution. Is this true?

When Mussolini came into power, it was claimed that he had saved Italy—yes, all Europe—from Communism. The facts, of course, gave Mussolini and his propagandists the lie. There was absolutely no danger of Communism when Mussolini stole power, any more than there was danger of Communism in Germany when Hitler got his strangle-hold on Germany.

And now, when Mussolini is toppling, the supporters of Fascism subtly spread the false propaganda that the end of the rule of the Black Shirts would bring in a reign of terror under the Red Flag. This is intended

to frighten the timid and lead the bankers and capitalistic governments to give aid and comfort to the Fascist gangsters, in order to avoid a "greater evil."

If our own J. P. Morgan Company hadn't advanced hundreds of millions of dollars—belonging to American investors, not the Morgan partners—Mussolini wouldn't have been able to hold on all these years and prepare for a senseless, wasteful, ruinous war in East Africa. If the capitalistic powers hadn't given diplomatic and material support to Mussolini, Italian Fascism would have collapsed long ago.

The plain fact is this: the reactionary powers of the world really want Mussolini to remain in power, because down deep they hope to see the absolutism of Fascism spread until it engulfs democratic countries like England, France, Holland, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Canada and the United States. Capitalism is willing to tolerate democracy, so long as it has to, but once given an "out" it doesn't hesitate about Fascism. That, in a measure, explains the amazing progress of many of our own Fascist organizations, including Hearst's red-baiting and the cavortings of the Liberty League.

But, to return to Mussolini, what would happen if he were to fall tomorrow? There are many possibilities, of course. Let me review a few:

A parliamentary regime might be recalled to power.

A dictatorship of the royal family and the regular army might assume power, with the possibility of a merely slight improvement in the condition of the people and their civil and political rights.

The Italian people might assert themselves, taking over the government and ousting the king and his family. Under such a regime, the large estates—12,000 individuals own 17,000,000 acres of land—would be broken up and distributed among the small peasant holders of land or those who have had no access to the land. Such a regime, of course, would grant full political, civil and social rights, establish a republic, oust the king, force the Vatican to withdraw from Italian politics and public institutions (particularly the schools),

and nationalize the large-scale industries and utilities. That would be far from Communism, though it would be progressive in every sense of the word. It would be increasing the number of Italian property-holders, instead of reducing them.

Communism, therefore, is the remotest possibility in Italy today, as was the case when Mussolini stole power.

* * *
Julius Streicher and Dr. Goebbels claim it's necessary to drive the Jews out of moving pictures because they strive only to bring out obscenity and immorality. Please comment.

Streicher, the notorious Jew-baiter, is probably the most consistent publisher of pornography in the world, and yet he and his kind have the gall to talk about "Jewish indecency" in the movies. The real motive is economic—to force the Jew out of the industry and thereby make room for some good "Aryan," who may be able to "buy" the Jew's property at 10 cents on the dollar, if he cares to pay that much.

With Jews eliminated from Germany's film business, and with Dr. Goebbels in complete control, by virtue of his office as minister of propaganda, what do we find? The films produced in Naziland are dull, mediocre—so much so that even the chief censor, Goebbels, is complaining about the quality of garbage turned out by the studios.

But, wait! There's one picture that Goebbels says is O.K. It's called *Der Ammenkoenig*, and he wishes his German movie robots would do more of the same kind. I haven't seen the film, so I can't criticize it, but I've read an outline of its story, written from Berlin by Claire Trask, in the *New York Times*, and it surely is plenty hot. If Jews had produced such a story there would have been more ammunition for the anti-Semites. Here's the story of what Dr. Goebbels calls a masterpiece:

The picture is a cock-and-bull story about a village, a century or so ago, that refuses to pay the high marriage tax and goes about producing prolifically and without legal sanction by annually choosing the most virile of the younger men as progenitor for the year. That he, incidentally, helps the attractive young archduchess, who is married to a dilapidated dotard, to over-

come her barrenness, is merely another highly satisfactory proof of the young man's fitness. In the end the marriage tax is annulled, but not without numerous regrets.

* * *

Aren't the Jews heavily represented in American industry?

Fortune magazine, for February, 1936, contains a valuable article which thoroughly debunks this notion. It shows, what I demonstrated in these columns about a year ago, that the Jews in banking are negligible. The facts will be found in my books of questions and answers. In the investment field, the Jews again are negligible, as is shown by the fact that the Jewish firm, Kuhn, Loeb, made, as of March 31, 1935, only 2.88 per cent of all outstanding loans, as against 19.87 for the non-Jewish Morgan Company; 11.71 for the non-Jewish National City Company; 8.45 for the non-Jewish Chase, Harriman, Forbes concern; 6.68 for the non-Jewish Guaranty Trust; 6.18 for the non-Jewish Bancamerica-Blair; 4.23 for the non-Jewish Lee Higginson. *Fortune* adds the interesting fact that the so-called Jewish houses have many non-Jews in executive positions.

Leaving finance and entering heavy industry, what do we find? Here *Fortune* has done some original research, which I'm glad to pass on to my readers. The facts show that where the Jews are insignificant in banking and investment financing, they are practically non-existent in heavy industry, which, of course, is the most characteristic form of American business life, and the most important. As *Fortune* (a non-Jewish, rich man's magazine, which sells at \$1 per copy) says, the Jews are totally unrepresented in the following important heavy industries: motor cars, steel, rubber, coal, transportation and communication. Quoting *Fortune*: "A vast continent of heavy industry and finance may be staked out in which Jewish participation is incidental or non-existent." *Fortune* adds:

To this may be annexed other important areas into which Jews have rarely penetrated, such as light and power and telephone and engineering in general and heavy machinery and lumber and dairy products. In brief, Jews are so far from controlling the most characteristic of present-day American activities, that

they are hardly represented in them at all.

Fortune finds Jews in the light industries, particularly clothing, adding, however, that Jewish activity in light industries is more in the line of distribution than production, and the farther west one travels in the U.S. the smaller the presence of Jewish interests. Next to clothing, says *Fortune*, comes tobacco, and here we find that Jewish activity is limited almost entirely to distribution.

* * *

What is the extent of Jewish influence in magazines, newspapers, advertising, books, theaters, movies, law, medicine, agriculture?

Magazines: So far as I can learn (and I've studied the situation carefully) Jews are interested only in the following magazines of general circulation: *The Nation*, *The American Mercury*, *The New Masses*, *Esquire* and *The New Yorker*. To give one an idea of how trifling this is in proportion to the general field of non-Jewish periodicals, the total circulation of these Jewish-controlled magazines equals less than 10 percent of the circulation of *The Saturday Evening Post*, which is non-Jewish.

Newspapers: Out of about 2,500 daily newspapers in the U.S., the following are owned by Jews: *The New York Times* and *The Chattanooga Times* (Ochs); *The New York Post*, *The Philadelphia Record* and *The Camden (N.J.) Courier and Post* (J. David Stern); *The Newark Star-Eagle*, *The Toledo Blade* and *Times*, and *The Duluth News Tribune* (Paul Block); and several dailies in Iowa, Wisconsin, Missouri and Nebraska, owned by Emanuel P. Adler. The combined circulation of all these Jewish-owned newspapers is less than one-fourth the circulation of the Hearst chain of 27 dailies.

Advertising: *Fortune* magazine says that advertising agencies are mainly non-Jewish, only from one to three percent being Jewish.

Book publishing: Jewish-owned book publishing houses are very rare. I can think of only the following, after a careful survey of the latest publisher's directory: Lewis Cope-land, Viking, Simon and Schuster, Eugenics Publishing Company, Knopf, Covici-Friede, the Modern Library, Inc., and Random House. The yearly output of all these houses

combined is less than the list of titles issued by the first of the following really large non-Jewish book publishers: Macmillan, Doubleday-Doran, Harper's, Scribner's, Appleton-Century, Houghton-Mifflin. It's safe to estimate that not more than five percent of the books published in the U.S. come from Jewish companies.

Radio: Jews are at the head of the Columbia network. David Sarnoff is the executive in charge of the National Broadcasting Company, which is owned by the Radio Corporation of America, a non-Jewish institution.

Theaters: Jews are in control of less than 50 percent of the theaters of New York. We should bear in mind the fact that New York's Jewish population is about 30 percent of the whole.

Movies: I have already given figures in connection with the position of Jews in Hollywood. The facts show that Jews are only a minority there, though a fairly substantial one. The data will be found in my books of questions and answers.

Law: There are many Jewish lawyers in New York and a few other large cities that have fairly large numbers of Jewish residents, but here we find that Jewish lawyers in proportion to the whole are less in number than the actual Jewish population's proportion to the general population. If we were to judge this matter by the actual volume of business enjoyed by Jewish lawyers we would find that they are quite weak, because it's a known fact that even in cities like New York, with its large Jewish population, the great bulk of the law practice is in the hands of the large, non-Jewish law firms. The great corporations, banks and insurance companies usually give their law business to non-Jewish firms, leaving for the Jewish lawyers the less lucrative practice, such as is found in bankrupt courts, divorce cases, real-estate law, collections and other piddling branches. The non-Jewish attorneys, even in New York, with their control of real law practice—the branches already listed (banking, insurance and corporation) plus trust companies, investment, railroading, patents, admiralty, holding companies, and the like—have nothing to fear from Jewish "competition."

Medicine: On this point *Fortune*

magazine writes that there are "numerous good Jewish doctors and a few very great Jewish doctors. But Jews do not occupy a position of power corresponding to their abilities or their numbers in the profession."

Agriculture: Out of a farm population of 30,500,000, only 80,000 are Jews.

The facts, whenever studied, show how baseless are the charges of the anti-Semites. The country is being flooded with anti-Jewish propaganda of the vilest kind, and at times it seems hopeless to even attempt to answer the wild charges of the Jew-baiters, but the conditions are such that each point must be considered seriously and answered soberly. Of course, I haven't the delusion that a factual answer will silence the anti-Semites. They cook up their "facts" dishonestly, because they merely wish to have some sort of an argument to support their appeals to hatred and passion. They base their cases on emotionalism, not reason. But that doesn't mean that persons able to make reasonable answers should keep silent. It is a social duty for lovers of truth and justice to speak up firmly and candidly in these days of wild appeals to terrorism, persecution and mass mania.

* * *

In his much-publicized Liberty League speech, Al Smith charged Roosevelt with throwing over the Democratic platform and stealing the Socialist platform. Please comment.

It's true that Roosevelt's policies weren't based on the platform adopted by his party in 1932, because the set of conditions that faced him when he took office on March 4, 1933—particularly the complete collapse of the banking structure—weren't covered in the planks of that evasive, mealy-mouth document. Had he permitted himself to be bound by that empty platform he would have been able to do exactly nothing in meeting some of the pressing issues of the depression.

It's nothing less than pure charlatantry for Al Smith to claim that Roosevelt should have limited his activities to the terms of a platform that was drawn up by men who were not even remotely in touch with the economic realities of the times. At that, Roosevelt served Capitalism as it never was served before—vigor-

ously, brilliantly, intelligently, and effectively. As Roosevelt himself said, when he addressed Congress, the Capitalists cried: "Save us, save us, lest we perish!" They were down on their bottoms, ready for the count, and they turned to the only man capable of doing them a service.

The big figure behind the American Liberty League is Mr. Raskob, of General Motors. Surely, Mr. Raskob ought to be the last man in the world to complain against the policies of Mr. Roosevelt, when one considers that the statement for 1935, published shortly before Al Smith made his demagogic speech, showed net profits for General Motors of over \$167,000,000, after all taxes, depreciation, obsolescence, interest, bonuses, and enormous salaries to a number of inside executives. This was record-breaking, for the depression, and thanks should properly go to F.D.R., for it is the man in the White House who enabled General Motors and the other great private corporations to come back into the black during the past year.

But, in saving Wall Street and Capitalism, Roosevelt found it necessary to spend some money—a great deal of money, to be sure—but he saved the system. And where's the gratitude? Not a peep of thanks. There's a public debt that must be liquidated during the next generation, and the plutocrats don't care to carry the load. They wanted their system of exploitation saved, but they wanted it done free of charge! That's thanks for you, Mr. F.D.R. The big boys feel that now—after you've saved their hide—they can get along without you, so they are organizing to liquidate the few steps you've taken in the direction of social insurance and other reasonable, necessary reforms.

But, and here we come to the core of Al Smith's speech—Roosevelt found the Socialists in swimming and stole their pants! That's good fun and supplies his hearers with a hearty laugh, but the facts—and, alas, facts have to be considered—show that Roosevelt's policies weren't taken from the Socialist platform, as Smith so fervently and untruthfully charged.

The 1932 platform of the Socialist party was a clear, candid, concise

document. It covered the problems of the day intelligently and constructively—and if it had been carried out we would find today fewer unemployed, less suffering among the workers and farmers—and undoubtedly less than \$167,000,000 profits for a single corporation.

Had Roosevelt really stolen the Socialist platform and put it into practice, we would find today that the large-scale industries—the means of wealth-production, distribution and exchange—would be in the hands of the people, operated democratically for use instead of for the gain of private corporations. Have our basic industries been socialized under Roosevelt? Let Mr. Smith answer.

The Socialist platform of 1932 prophetically provided a remedy for the banking crisis which appeared in the spring of the following year. It called for the nationalization of the banking system, placing all the means of credits and resources in the hands of the people, through a banking system owned and operated by Uncle Sam. When the banks closed their doors, did Roosevelt—the “Socialist”—socialize the banks? Did he do anything to take them from private to public control? No. He turned them back to the private bankers, and, furthermore, permitted them to inaugurate a system of service charges that constitutes the greatest legalized steal in the history of finance. Where was Roosevelt’s “Socialism” in the banking issue? Let Mr. Smith answer.

Instead of nationalizing the banks, Roosevelt turned hundreds of millions of dollars over to the private banks in order to pump new life into them. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation poured these hundreds of millions into the treasuries of the private banks—in order to save Capitalism, not to institute Socialism. And later, as though he hadn’t done enough for private Capitalism, Roosevelt had the federal government buy hundreds of millions of dollars worth of preferred stock in these private banks, in order to make them stronger and thereby make Capitalism more able to endure the storm. That’s a queer kind of Socialism, Mr. Al Smith. It looks like Capitalism to me.

The point, of course, is simple.

Capitalism feels that it is out of danger. It can dump overboard all the reforms put into existence during the time of storm and stress. Capitalism—which lacks gratitude for the brilliant services of its smiling savior—is ready to kick overboard all these “socialistic” measures and go back to the free, pure, unadulterated policies of old-time Capitalism. The Raskobs and the DuPonts now feel they don’t need any of Roosevelt’s crutches. And, like all other humans, they hate the man who saved them. They think they can forget their recent days of deep sickness by kicking their doctor in the face. And Al Smith’s job is to do the Liberty League’s dirty work of smearing F.D.R.—the man who will go down in history as the President able and willing to give a new lease on life to a system that should have been kicked into the sewer, where it belonged.

* * *

Please comment on Al Smith’s peroration regarding our choice between “Washington and Moscow.”

It was high-class, unmitigated bunk, but the American Liberty League and the reactionaries everywhere ate it up. To say that Moscow is influencing Roosevelt’s policies is to utter the purest clap-trap.

Al Smith, who is the most prominent lay voice of the Catholic hierarchy, warns Americans against letting the Red Flag fly over the Stars and Stripes, but he is careful to avoid talking about the Black Flag of Roman clericalism. The influence of Rome on the U.S. is plain to all honest students of American affairs, but this is all right with Catholicism’s most effective lay tool.

The Catholic Church, in the U.S. as in Central Europe, is tied up irrevocably with the Fascist and reactionary forces in politics, government, economics, finance, and the like. This is, of course, in complete harmony with the Church’s age-old policies, for repression, persecution, exploitation and terror have been written into the record of Catholicism since the first day the Roman Church exercised influence in public affairs, and that means at least 1,500 years ago.

In Italy, the Pope’s henchmen bless the battle flags of Mussolini as his conscripts are shipped by the hundreds and thousands to fight a cruel,

worthless, senseless war in the deserts of East Africa.

In Austria, the cardinal and the Fascist Catholic officials conspire to crush Socialism, and bring about their objective by turning artillery on the apartment houses of Vienna's working class, slaughtering almost 2,000 men and women whose only crime was their love of liberty, democracy and social progress.

In Poland, the Catholic Church gives the dictatorship its support, and this means brutal persecution of the Jews, economic exploitation of the masses, and preparation for war on the Soviet Union.

In Spain, the Catholic Church is using every power at its command—including firing squads, starvation, imprisonment and repression—to put its priests back into the seats of power they occupied for hundreds of years under the monarchy.

In Mexico, every conspiratorial trick, learned in hundreds of years of political intrigue, is being applied to the end that the Mexican revolution shall be liquidated and the Church be returned to its place as an arm of the secular government to restore peonage, ignorance, superstition and tyranny as they existed in the days of Catholic and governmental collaboration.

And here, in the U.S., which is supposed to have a secular government, we find the Catholic Church lined up with the Fascists in an attempt to inaugurate real Fascism.

We see Father Coughlin making demagogic appeals to the masses in order to conceal the real motive of the hierarchy—the destruction of democratic and liberal institutions.

We see the great layman, Al Smith, throwing his brown derby among the high-hats of American plutocracy, in order to crush even the moderate relief policies of the administration.

We see the corrupt influence of the Roman Church wherever it can assert itself politically—in New York City, Boston, Kansas City and other centers of Catholic political gangsterism.

We see floods of literature released by Catholic institutions to advance the propaganda of Fascism, to destroy the civil and political liberties guaranteed by our Constitution.

We see the Catholic Church accept-

ing the approval of the Hearst press because of its "war on Communism," which, in the U.S., is merely a mask for a war on labor, freedom, real education, unbridled press and speech and the other blessings of civilized, democratic, liberal governments.

The facts tell a terrible story. The evidence is clear.

The Catholic Church knows that it's at the crisis of its history—either the world goes forward to greater democracy in industry as well as government, or it turns back to the reaction of absolutism in social life, culture, education, government, industry, finance, etc. The former means freedom and light, with secular institutions. The latter means Fascism, clerical domination, dictatorship of the great capitalists, allied with sectarianism.

The Catholic Church knows that it can thrive only under conditions of ignorance, exploitation, authoritarianism, undemocratic political institutions, graft, mass degradation, mis-education, and enslavement of the minds and bodies of the people. It has seen its powers dwindle and Democracy and freedom spread slowly from country to country. It therefore decided to fight this menace to its black regime of clericalism.

Democracy and freedom must be stifled by the combined powers of clericalism and Fascism. Reaction will mean new leases on life for the forces of the Vatican.

Having tasted of the sweet morsels of power in Italy—where the work of the libertarians was undone and the Church was brought back to its old position of power—it is active in every country where there is any possibility of destroying liberal ideas in government and society. It is strong again in Central Europe.

It would use Central Europe to make war on Russia and thereby remove that menace to clericalism—a government based honestly and effectively on anti-clericalism.

It would promote Fascism in France, in order to undermine the Republic and bring back the tyranny that prevailed before the French Revolution.

It wields great influence in Eastern Canada, where ignorant elements of the population help keep it in a

position to maintain Eastern Canada's intellectual medievalism.

But the biggest plum of all is the United States—the richest, of course. And what a goal that is for the clerical Fascists! Capture the U.S.—and the Black flag of papal clericalism will fly aloft for centuries, sure of limitless economic backing, and from that center of power reach out to rule most of the civilized world.

The Roman Church knows no compromise. It sees its goal, and it's marching there. Whatever stands in the way must be destroyed—free institutions, tolerance, and the other prized possessions of civilized communities.

The Catholic Church promises Capitalism to keep the masses wedded to the present system. In return, it asks Capitalism to do away with democracy and give it the powers it seeks. The bargain seems to be a fair one to the plutocrats, and we can see signs everywhere of the alliance.

There are a few obstacles, however. There, for example, stands the Constitution. But that can be nullified once the country is over-run by Fascist hordes and the Roman Church is recognized as the spiritual arm of the new regime of violence, suppression and terror.

The goal is inviting, but all is not as simple as it seems. The people appear to be asleep, but they aren't dead. Let the real danger once be comprehended and it's likely that countless millions of men and women will spring to defend the sacred, blood-bought rights of free Americanism.

The blood of the revolutionary founders seems to have run thin, but under the surface is a powerful force, which may rise in its might and say that the Bill of Rights must not be destroyed, the right to speak, think, write and print must not be crushed, the spirit of free inquiry must be protected, and the forces of clericalism must be separated from the American government.

Our incipient Fascists may find America isn't going to be a big, juicy oyster waiting to be swallowed at a single gulp. There are tremendous, if hidden, powers latent in the American people—determination to keep America and its institutions from falling into the hands of clerical and

Fascist reactionaries, and the will to promote further progress in this vast, great country—progress in the direction of industrial democracy, production for use instead of dividends, the freedom to think and speak on the most controversial subjects, the development of social institutions based on cooperation instead of mass exploitation, and the opening of all doors to economic freedom, industrial expansion for the public good, prosperity based on social justice for the producers of wealth, peace, the end of capitalism, the attainment of intellectual and academic freedom, and the inauguration of all those social policies which make for good-will, plenty, and government by the consent of the people.

* * *

The anti-Semites make a great to-do over the alleged increase of Jews in America. Please comment.

The facts explode the attempt to arouse fears over Jewish domination of our population. We have about 125,000,000 people in this country, of whom only 4,500,000 are Jews. That amounts to one Jew to about 28 persons. Doesn't that show the utter absurdity of the claim that Jews are numerically important in this country?

* * *

How many stores does the Woolworth Company operate in Germany?

It owns 81 stores in 55 cities.

* * *

How large is Hitler's army to be?

Lieutenant-Colonel Tasnier, who writes on military problems for the Belgian financial journal, *Le Capital*, estimated, on February 21, 1936, that Germany's new army will number 7,000,000 by the end of 1936. This expert says 3,000,000 of these men will be in active service and 4,000,000 in reserve.

* * *

Is it not a fact that the fundamental law of the Soviet Union calls for the destruction of religion?

The Constitution of the Soviet Union, as I've explained many times, doesn't call for the persecut- or destruction of religion. The government is frankly atheistic, of course, but it protects worshipers in their right to practice any religion.

On January 23, 1918, less than three months after the Soviet Union was organized, a decree was issued

dealing with religion, which was later incorporated in the Constitution, as follows:

"1. The church is hereby separated from the state.

"2. It is unlawful to pass any local law or issue any decree whatsoever within the territory of the Republics, which will restrict or limit the liberty of conscience or grant any advantages or privileges whatsoever to any citizen on the basis of his religious profession.

"3. Every citizen may profess any religion he desires or profess no religion; all laws disfranchising any citizen by reason of his profession or non-profession of faith are hereby repealed.

[Note: No reference is to be made in any official document to the profession or non-profession of religion by any citizen.]

"4. No proceedings of any state or other official public body shall be accompanied by any religious rite or ceremonies whatsoever.

"5. The right to perform religious rites is hereby guaranteed in so far as no breach of the peace is committed and the performance does not infringe upon any of the rights of any citizen of the Soviet Republic."

In addition to the provisions in the above, the fundamental law of the country provides for the following, with regard to religion:

1. Religious oaths are not recognized.

2. Religious ideas must not be taught in educational institutions.

3. Private instruction in religion is tolerated.

4. Religious societies are permitted to function, but they must subject themselves to the same laws which govern other private societies.

5. Religious organizations are not permitted to collect dues, donations or assessments by compulsion. All contributions must be voluntary.

6. Religious bodies are forbidden to own private property. Church plants and other property must be held in the name of the people. The government, however, guarantees to permit the use of religious property at no expense to the worshippers.

* * *

How long does it take to fly from England to South Africa?

On February 9, 1936, Tommy Rose, an officer of the British Air Corps, flew from Lympe, England, to Cape Town, South Africa, in three days, 17 hours and 38 minutes. This re-

cord solo flight bettered the record made by Amy Johnson Mollison, in 1932, by more than 13 hours.

* * *

How many idle ships are there in the British merchant marine?

On January 1, 1933, there were 760 ships laid up (1,971,000 tons); on January 1, 1934, 482 (1,239,000 tons); on January 1, 1935, 323 (878,000 tons); on January 1, 1936, 186 (426,000 tons). Some of this steady decline was due to scrapping of old ships, but most of it resulted from recovery in international commerce.

* * *

What is the present size of Russia's gold industry?

The figures are growing constantly. I have made numerous reports on the gold situation, during the past two years, and invariably had to revise my figures to a larger scale. In 1935, the Soviet Union produced 5,500,000 ounces of gold, which is a growth of 1,500 percent over that of seven years before. Russia is now in second place, the greatest gold producer in the world being the Transvaal, South Africa, which produced 10,776,700 ounces of gold in 1935, as against 10,486,400 in 1934. The Transvaal's peak was in 1932, with 11,553,600 ounces.

The Russians say their Second Five-Year Plan calls for 10,000,000 ounces of gold in 1940, and, judging by the progress being made, one is safe in assuming that the goal will be reached. Gold is now known to be available in several thousand localities throughout the vast possessions of the Soviet Union, mainly in Siberia.

Russia's gold industry employs 500,000 men. Milling capacities run from 750 to 1,000 tons per day. The industry now has 100 dredgers and 85 large plants. Some of these plants employ from 10,000 to 15,000 workers. There are 200 hydraulic installations. This means only one thing: Russia is out to become the world's greatest source of new gold. It has crept up to second place, ahead of the U.S. and Canada. Will it catch up to and pass South Africa?

* * *

In the April Freeman you quote an interesting paragraph from George Bedborough, whom you describe as a well-known lecturer and writer. As I know nothing about the man, please tell me

about one or two of his literary efforts.

His latest book, published by the Pioneer Press, London, for the Secular Society, is entitled *Arms and the Clergy* (1914-1918)—a perfectly devastating collection of short quotations from the war sermons of our paragons of piety, English and American. These "elegant extracts" fill most of his book, and tell an instructive story.

Naturally, I was more interested in the chapter devoted to American Men of God, which he compiled from *Preachers Present Arms*. The men represented are "big guns" in the clerical racket. How they can live down this record I don't know. Let's take a few examples, almost at random:

Lyman Abott:—"In this hour every Christian Church should be a recruiting office for the Kingdom of God. The Christian Church and the Christian ministry should hear the voice of the Master saying, 'I have come not to send peace but a sword.' And they should lead Christ's followers forth, His Cross on their hearts, His sword in their hands."

Edward Increase Bosworth, Congregational Minister and Dean of Oberlin College:—"To take life in hate is a dreadful deed. The Christian soldier in friendship wounds the enemy. In friendship he kills the enemy. He never hates."

Rev. Horace Bridges, Unitarian and Ethicist:—"The Duty of Hatred is an imperative of conscience prescribing resentment as unconditional as the very law of love itself."

Albert C. Dieffenbach, Editor of the "Christian Register" (Unitarian):—"As Christians we say Christ approves of the war. But would He fight and kill? There is not an opportunity to deal death to the enemy that He would shirk from or delay in seizing. He would take bayonet and grenade and bomb and rifle and do the work of deadliness. . . . This is the inexorable truth about Jesus Christ and this war, and we rejoice to say it."

George W. Downs, at Asbury Methodist Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh:—"I would have gone over the top with other Americans. I would have driven my bayonet into the throat or the eye or the stomach of the Huns without the slightest

hesitation, and my conscience would not have bothered me in the least."

Charles A. Eaton, of Madison Avenue Baptist Church, New York:—"We fight because we are Christians, and we will win because we are Christians."

James A. Francis, Baptist Minister, California:—"I look upon the enlistment of an American soldier as I do on the departure of a missionary for Burma."

Newell Dwight Hillis, Minister of Brooklyn Congregational Church:—"An aluminum medal is given to every German soldier with the following inscription:—

'I, the Kaiser of Germany, declare herewith on the authority committed to me by Almighty God, that the bearer of this token is permitted to commit any crime he may desire and I, the Kaiser of Germany, will take upon myself the responsibility for such crime, and to answer to God for the same.'

(Presumably the Kaiser's "permit" was in English, as the Rev. Hillis produced the actual metal disk and read its inscription to the audience.)

Edwin Holt Hughes, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church:—"God pity us if we are not going to have God's Son in this war. God's Son must be with our young men or there is not much hope for them. We are agents of God, and we are charged with the duty of keeping the songs of our homes in the war in the comradeship of the Son of God."

Herbert S. Johnson, Pastor of Warren Avenue Baptist Church, Boston:—(Pointing to the location of his vital organs) "Three inches are not enough, seven inches are too many, and twelve inches are more than too many, for while you are pulling out the bayonet you are losing the opportunity to drive it into another man five inches."

W. Douglas Mackenzie, President of Hartford Theological Seminary:—"Nowhere has the Sermon on the Mount, the embodiment of the Spirit of Christ, exercised more visible and amazing power than in the matter of war. This war, when carried by the Allies and America to the right issue, will be another proof of

the Divine Power of the Sermon on the Mount."

Randolph H. McKim, at his Church in Washington:—"It is God who has summoned us to this war. It is His war we are fighting. It is Christ the King of Righteousness, who calls us to grapple in deadly strife with this unholly and blasphemous power (Germany)."

A. E. Marriott, Y.M.C.A. Physical Director at Camp Sevier:—"Never miss an opportunity to destroy the eyes of the enemy. In all head-holds use the finger on the eyes. They are the most delicate points in the body, and easy to reach. The eye can easily be removed with the finger."

John Francis Morgan, Presbyterian Church, Jersey City, N.J.:—"When we support this war we follow the Great Peacemaker. We deny Him if we refuse."

Daniel Alfred Poling:—"We could not win this war without the Young Men's Christian Association, for even though our armies reached Berlin, our souls would lose their way."

Bishop William Alfred Quayle:—"We are not at war with the Junkers, not Prussianism, not the Kaiser. The German people is what we are at war with. The new atrocity story this week was spraying prisoners with burning oil. This is Germany's most recent jest. It makes them laugh so . . . and to climax its horrid crimes, Germany has inflicted compulsory polygamy on the virgins of its own land." (The North-Western Christian Advocate.)

Rev. Robert E. Speer:—"The net result of the war will probably be found to have been good. Amongst other blessings the pressure of life has forced men to pray. There is more praying in America among all classes of people than ever before. The war has taught us that we are saved by Christ's life poured out on the Cross."

Henry B. Wright, Camp Director of Religious Work and Professor in Yale Divinity School:—"I discerned through clouds of gas and smoke One on foot, arrayed in a garb of olive drab which was stained with blood and mire, and in His hands a bayonet sword attached to a rifle. He asked no man to go where He

would not go. He stood in the center of the line. . . . 'Lo I am with you always' . . . I would not enter the war work till I was sure of this vision."

(In a book written in conjunction with George Stewart, called "The Practice of Friendship.")

William L. Stidger, Pastor of Methodist Episcopal Church, San Jose, California:—"No boy goes through the hell of fire and suffering and wounds that he does not come out newborn. The old man is gone from him, and a new man is born in him."

Harold Bell Wright, Famous Christian Author, formerly a clergyman:—"A thirty-centimeter gun may voice the edict of God as truly as the notes of a cooling dove. The sword of America is the sword of Jesus."

But, you ask, were there no denunciations of war? Alas, the record shows that not more than six American preachers (out of 200,000) said a word against the World War. They were led by John Haynes Holmes and two rabbis. Not a single Catholic priest uttered a word against the war.

A reading of the vast library of war sermons shows that even the pro-war preachers of the U.S. and England denounced war, "but," as Mr. Bedborough shrewdly checks the question, "it was always some other war, or else we were not really making war at all, we were at the worst punishing the Central Powers for making war. Later on it was a 'war to end war.' What our preachers justified was the recruiting, and subsequently conscripting, of our best manhood to kill as many of our 'enemies' as we could. 'War is Hell,' of course, said the Rev. Hardy Harwood, 'but' . . . Dean Hensley Henson called it 'the infinite anguish.' . . . 'but,' . . . as Canon Johnson said in St. Paul's, 'there was war in heaven' once upon a time." One darling D.D., the Rev. J. W. Hoorsley, after much meditation and prayer, after endless searching of God's Word, questioned whether it would be really Christian to permit battles to take place on the Sabbath Day. There should, he argued, be some arrangement whereby soldiers could be in-

spired to kill only six days a week, leaving the Holy Sabbath for the things of the spirit.

Mr. Bedborough, in his introduction, says that "the Pulpits were unanimous that in one way or other, the war was under the most distinguished supernatural direction, and were generally emphatic that England was fighting under Divine direction." Or, as the President of the Scripture Reading and Prayer Union saw the issue: "God had a lesson to teach, and He has permitted this war to take place." Literally hundreds of sermons were delivered on the theme: "The Kaiser is fighting against God." Of course, worldly historians know that even though God was on the side of the British, that even though he was the "Big Brother" of the forces against the powers of the Devil, it was necessary, however, for the Allies to do a little of the job themselves, spending billions of dollars, and killing and maiming tens of millions of men. God merely stood on the sidelines and yelled for His side.

But, I promised my readers some samples of British wisdom and light, as sent forth from the pulpits, so here goes:

Rev. Archibald Alexander, M.A., B.D., at Trinity Church, Ayr, May 19, 1918:—"Agnosticism breeds despair. Christ crucified is man at his noblest: 'Gentle Jesus Meek and Mild' to the little children, but to the young man, the Captain of Salvation, the Son of God who goes forth to war.

"Christ crucified is the moral equivalent of war. No wonder Jesus is not forgotten."

Rev. J. H. Bateson:—"On the 'Agamemnon,' a remarkable spiritual influence has been making itself felt. The gunners' room in the battleship has become literally the House of God and the Gate of Heaven." (Methodist Times, August, 13, 1914.)

Bishop Browne (In a Sermon preached at Sandringham Church, before Their Majesties the King and Queen, December 30, 1915):—"It is not only folly, to limit the output of power, it is sin."

Rev. E. W. Brereton, Vicar of St. Margaret's, Hollinwood:—"We are

fighting for dear life against enemies who are not Christians, not human beings, but reptiles. We claim the right to fight these fiends not with kid gloves. I scorn the humanitarians who object to reprisals." (John Bull, July 10, 1915.)

Rev. S. Parkes Cadman (of New York), at Whitefield's Tabernacle, London, August 30, 1914:—"... You must have the strong temper which characterized Oliver Cromwell. He said, 'We were simple fellows of the country and the enemy were men of blood and fashion, but the Lord delivered them into our hands. By His grace we killed 5 000 of them. If He continues to show mercy we shall kill more tomorrow.' "... I am not one who dons the robe of a pacifist to advocate other people's participation in war while he is in the coal cellar. I am the chaplain of a thousand men, and it was an open question last June as to whether we should go to Mexico. . . ."

Catholic Literature Association:—"Protestantism is one of the 'inferior Articles' made in Germany." (Church Times (Advt.), January 15, 1915.)

The "Catholic Review," January, 1915:—"England is defending Catholic interests all along the line."

Rev. A. E. Cook, at Vancouver, B.C., Congregational Church:—"Christ Himself calls to the nations that love His name to prove that love by crushing the German armies down to defeat and visiting the judgment of God on their sins. As the war committee of a New York Church has vividly put it: 'To love is to hate. Those who do not hate, do not love.'" (Christian World Pulpit, February 26, 1919.)

Dr. A. C. Dixon, at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, November 1, 1914:—"Whatever nonsense the Kaiser may talk, he does not deny Christ."

Rev. J. C. V. Durell, D.D., Rector of Rotherhithe:—"German military despotism, the product of crude Materialism and the negation of Christianity" (Church Times, September 25, 1914.)

Rev. E. J. G. Force, M. A., In Westminster Abbey, August 18, 1918:—"Better an endless warfare, better the desertion of your friends, better the lonely death upon the

Cross than an ignominious peace without honour, a victory without a conflict."

The English Church Union President, at Church House, November 25, 1914:—"For us this war is a Holy war, and must be fought to the very end. We have to see to it that we guard the Catholic Faith." (Church Times, November 27, 1914.)

Rev. R. Moffat Gantrey, at Whitefields Tabernacle, August 4, 1918:—"The shallow-pated Atheist proceeds to browbeat the man of faith. . . . 'Where is the Lord thy God?'"

"Some of you are worrying yourselves unduly about the Kaiser. . . . The timber of his coffin was felled long ago, and the Carpenter is even now 'stretching out His rule, He marketh it with a pencil. . . .'"

Rev. J. O. Johnson, M.A., In St. Paul's Cathedral, October 4, 1914:—"At this moment God calls England to send every man it can into the battlefield."

Rev. Joseph Johnson, President of the Metropolitan Free Church Federation, January 2, 1918:—"Let us not forget that all the resources of the Holy Spirit are at our command. Surely the whole world sees to-day that Nietzsche's Superman has failed. It is up to us now to show to the world Christ as the Super Conqueror."

Rev. J. R. Legge, at Gallowtree Congregational Church, Leicester:—"It is some palliation of our pain that God who was pleased to save Europe by means of our Fathers a hundred years ago at Waterloo, has been pleased, up to this hour, to do so again by ourselves. . . ." (Christian World Pulpit, August 15, 1917.)

Rev. John E. Linnell:—"God has given us one of the ablest soldiers on earth to direct our army operations. God has delivered our army when its destruction seemed inevitable. He has preserved our Fleet comparatively unhurt. He has brought our Colonies to our aid. And are these not an earnest of other blessings yet to come?" (The Record, November 6, 1914.)

Rev. Alfred Shave, B.A., at Zion Congregational Church, Frome, September 8, 1918:—"Cannot we see that God must not suffer the vast designs of a backward people to be accomplished? There are plain rea-

sons why God should require the downfall of German tyranny. But are we to go on to conclude that prayer is unnecessary?"

"The Standard" Editorial, August 21, 1914:—"At the Royal Service at Westminster Abbey, on August 21, the prayer, 'Prosper the Forces of our King and Country,' was amended to include the Forces of our Allies."

Rev. A. J. Waldron, M.A., Vicar of Brixton, London:—"May the guns ring in a new age, a bigger God, and a larger Heaven." (John Bull, November 7, 1914.)

How clear it is, from even a casual reading of the above few extracts, what a crass world this would be if there were no Men of God to bring us messages of love, hope, faith, peace and charity. While these voices of the Holy Spirit were leading humanity to the throne of Heaven, that terrible materialistic Atheist, Bertrand Russell, was going to jail for six months because he was a conscientious objector against war. But then, it's evident that Russell and other Materialists didn't have the benefit of God's grace and the priest's power to give suffering humanity the only code of ethics capable of leading man to the higher and nobler life.

* * *

Can you give me Lenin's reply to Mr. Bullitt when the latter told him that the world would like to know "when this Red Terror will end"?

Lady Astor, when she met Stalin a few years ago, asked him: "How long are you going to continue killing people?" To which Stalin answered, quietly: "As long as it is necessary." I don't know what Lenin's reply to Bullitt was on this point, but I don't see how it could have been much different from Stalin's. The rulers of Soviet Russia aren't murderers, but they are ready to administer stern measures to any individual or group that attempts to do anything to injure or destroy the regime. The revolution itself caused a surprisingly small loss of lives—well under 5,000 deaths, according to certain good authorities—but later, when the enemies of the Bolsheviks attempted to destroy the beginnings of a Socialist state, the attack was vigorous and the forces of reaction

were crushed. Even here the number of deaths has been greatly exaggerated.

Another question reads: Is there an "admitted" list of Bolshevik executions? So far as I know, there has been no official list of executions of priests, teachers, intellectuals, peasants, etc. The records are all there and eventually may be given to the world, but for the present they are known only to the authorities, though it has been the custom—pretty well followed—of releasing announcements of legal executions.

It has been the policy of the Soviet Union to let its enemies know that it is always ready to break the teeth of those who would bite into it. The government is strong, and, when it deals with state enemies, merciless. The same attitude holds in international affairs. It would prefer the most friendly relations with foreign powers, particularly its immediate enemies—Japan, Germany and Poland—but it's willing, and ready, to use force to the limit if any overt act is attempted. The Russians aren't given to threatening, blustering or bluffing. But they mean business. I'd advise individuals and governments to keep away from the Russian buzz-saw.

* * *

What are Henry Ford's sales?

In 1935, the Ford Motor Company sold motor cars as follows: in the U.S., 1,065,002; in Canada, 31,620; balance of world, 215,305; total, 1,311,927, compared with 865,101 units in 1934.

* * *

What are the total motor car sales in the U.S. and Canada?

According to the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, U.S. production, during 1935, was: passenger cars, 3,286,000; trucks, 724,000. Canada: passenger cars, 140,000; trucks, 33,000.

* * *

I am interested to procure or assemble a list of the major acts of violence which have occurred in recent years in the U.S. upon the part of constituted authorities in the interests of the status quo. Could you give me any direction in this?

There is no compilation available, but the facts can be obtained, though by no means easily. It would take many weeks, perhaps months, to gath-

er the data. The best first source ought to be the files of the *New York Times*, which, of course, is thoroughly indexed in a large yearly book issued by the publishers. Then one should go to the files of the American Civil Liberties Union, which specializes in assembling facts dealing with violence.

The field, of course, is immense, but it can—and should—be done. A most interesting book could be written on this significant subject. Such an investigation would have to cover America's astounding and shameful record of violence against strikers, which is known to all students of current social affairs to be the worst in the world. There's hardly a strike report that fails to include listings of deaths and injuries. To say that such violence against strikers is inevitable is to shut one's eyes to the interesting and revealing fact that during the past 75 years there hasn't been a single death in all the strikes that have taken place in England, a fact to which I have referred before.

A report of class violence in America would have to cover a tremendous field, but some competent student of affairs should do the job.

* * *

"I find your publication, *The American Freeman*, very stimulating and the source of valuable information, frequently, which it would be difficult to obtain elsewhere."—Skillman E. Myers, minister, *The First Congregational Society, Unitarian, Burlington, Vermont.*

* * *

"Just a line to let you know that I am hard at work on my new book, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, which will be No. 4 in *The Reviewer*. It is very complete—in fact, the fullest (I don't mean longest) expose of the lie—how it originated, how it was spread, and how it is being perpetuated."—Isaac Goldberg, Brookline, Mass.

* * *

Please comment on the report that Germany is now able to produce tires made of artificial rubber.

The German dye trust, in February, 1936, issued a statement that it had achieved "butadien," a word coined to describe the artificial rubber it had discovered. Butadien is made, principally, of calcium and various substances taken from coal. It's also claimed that variations in the proportions of these substances will produce various types of rub-

ber, from soft to hard. The coined word, "buna," describes the finished articles made from butadien. In a speech, Hitler claimed that tires made from this artificial rubber were from 10 to 30 percent more efficient than those made of natural rubber, an estimate that could be accepted only after the most careful tests. However, nothing was said about the cost of this home-made rubber. Artificial rubber has been produced in the U. S. during the past four years, but it was admitted that the article could not be accepted generally in our industries so long as it cost more than the natural product. Germany, however, has practically no foreign exchange, and is therefore unable to purchase sufficient supplies of rubber in the world's markets. In the face of this exchange difficulty, Germany is willing to pay more to domestic industry (with reich marks), even though the practice is wasteful of labor energy, material and time.

After the assertion was broadcast by Hitler that Germany had solved the problem of synthetic rubber, a prominent chemist and engineer connected with the B. F. Goodrich Company, Akron, Ohio, expressed his skepticism. This spokesman for the American rubber industry, J. W. Schade, director of research, said:

"Germany has been compelled by government edict to use synthetic rubber derived from petroleum for some time, but I don't believe it is better than natural rubber. During the World War, Germany used methyl rubber, which was not at all satisfactory."

Chemically-manufactured rubber, as I said above, is nothing new in the U.S. The du Pont Company, with its main offices in Wilmington, Del., has, during the past four years, manufactured great quantities of synthetic rubber at its special plant for this purpose at Deepwater Point, N.J. But, as I've already mentioned, the matter of cost enters here, to the advantage of the natural product. Artificial rubber costs the du Pont Company \$1 per pound, which is about 400 percent higher than the cost of natural rubber. Chemists admit that the German manufacturers may have succeeded in cutting this \$1-per-pound cost slightly, but deny that the lower cost approaches even

remotely the price of ordinary rubber in the regular markets.

Du Pont synthetic rubber could be used in tires, but for the present it's limited to minor functions, such as lining oil or gasoline hose. Natural rubber, which is subject to oxidation, breaks down when submitted to the chemical reactions of oil or gasoline hose, so the \$1-per-pound artificial rubber, which isn't subject to oxidation, is beginning to be used.

* * *

I have run into all kinds of information about the so-called prostate gland specialist, Dr. John R. Brinkley, a former resident of your state. As this seems to be an important issue, I would like you to discuss it in *The Freeman*.

"Dr." Brinkley's goat gland operation is scientific quackery of the worst kind and I feel it to be a moral duty to warn my readers against this charlatan. The man has absolutely no standing in the world of science. His methods are unethical and his theories are valueless. He charges \$750 for an operation which is supposed to attach the sexual glands of a goat to men who are slipping into sexual incompetence. His glib propaganda has brought him thousands of victims, but there isn't a scrap of evidence to support his claim that his operation restores lost manhood. Believe absolutely nothing he says or prints in support of his surgical racket. It's disgraceful when one observes the ease with which this brazen quack goes about the business of cleaning out the bank-rolls of his dupes. It speaks well for Kansas when one sees how that state put the clamps on Brinkley and made him stop his contemptible practice, but this quack merely moved down to Texas, where the authorities permit him to go his cherry way, frisking the sick and near-sick for all they are worth.

* * *

How many tourists visit Washington, D.C.?

In 1933, 1,756,000 tourists visited Washington; in 1934, 2,076,000; in 1935, 2,534,000.

* * *

How many federal employes are there in the District of Columbia? What is the population of the district?

About 115,000, compared to 65,000 in June, 1933. The all-time high was 117,000 during the World War.

In January, 1936, the population was about 500,000, as against 487,000 in 1930. In November, 1933, the federal payroll, in Washington, was \$9,614,500 for the month; for the month of June, 1935, \$15,754,000.

* * *

How many people have registered for jobs with the U.S. Employment Service?

The federal government's employment exchanges have 9,000,000 registrations from men and women seeking work.

* * *

Is it true that there is a serious shortage of skilled labor in certain lines?

The motor car and machinery trades report shortage of skilled labor, but this is explained by the fact that many of the skilled workers who were thrown out of their jobs early in the depression have now become unemployable. Another element, according to the American Federation of Labor, is the fact that the employers in these trades have black-listed many thousands of skilled workers because of union activity. The Department of Labor reports that while it's true there is a shortage of such labor in certain localities, there is no shortage on a nation-wide scale.

* * *

How many acres are being farmed in this country by Jews, compared with the beginning of the century?

The Jewish Agricultural Society, New York City, reports that more than 1,500,000 acres are owned by Jewish farmers, with a Jewish farm population of 100,000. In 1900, the acreage was 12,000, with 216 farm families.

* * *

How many persons are there on the payrolls of the federal government?

There were 798,700 employes of the government in December, 1935; on March 4, 1933, 564,500, an increase of 234,200. It is held by informed politicians that each federal job holder is good for 40 votes. On his basis, the present administration ought to be able to count on 11,800,000 on the basis of its vote-pulling employes. In addition, of course, is the volume of votes the Democrats can expect independent of job patronage.

* * *

How many people are there now at work under WPA?

The Works Progress Administration reports that on January 25, 1936,

the employes numbered 3,725,812, as follows: WPA Projects, 2,926,630; CCC, 486,812; others, 312,370 (the last figure includes 131,118 under the Department of Agriculture and 32,179 under Resettlement projects). The WPA was given an initial fund of \$1,291,828,000, which is expected to be depleted in April, 1936. When this money is exhausted, the President, according to his statement, will transfer to WPA funds from the \$4,800,000,000 appropriated for relief by the previous Congress.

* * *

How much silver is the federal government holding, compared with gold?

The U.S. Treasury, on February 11, 1936, reported holdings of silver estimated at 1,642,000,000 ounces, with a money value of \$2,118,600,000. The Treasury's gold holdings have a monetary value of \$10,154,460,000. This makes the government's silver worth about one-fifth of its store of gold—21.8 percent, to be exact, as against 12 percent when the department began its silver buying on a large scale, in 1934. If the federal authorities intend to keep silver holdings at one-third of gold, it will be necessary to buy almost 1,000,000,000 more ounces of silver.

* * *

Dr. A. Strachstein, of New York City, is one of the best-known authorities on urology, and I'm glad to count him among my readers, albeit he sends me a letter of complaint on one point. His letter:

"I have passed your recent issue along among my friends for the purpose of enlisting them as readers of your valuable and instructive paper. They were all impressed with the intellectual and high contents of its columns, but they pointed out to me the incongruity of some of the low quack ads that recently crept into your paper.

"I am sorry that I must agree with them. How do you allow such a fake to creep into your paper as this 'men's developers'? You, as an intelligent man, know that it is an out and out fake, yet you lend the columns of your paper to defraud your readers.

"The effect of this ad on your paper is the same as if one would thrust a piece of mud on a beautiful painting."

Dr. Strachstein, who is a brilliant specialist in venereal diseases, refers

to a small ad which offered sanitary rubber goods and which also contained the following sentence buried in the text: "We also have men's developers." I hadn't noticed this line before and was glad to have my attention called to it by Dr. Strachstein. It sounds bunk, though I really don't know what the advertiser is talking about. Is it some device to enlarge a man's organ? If it is, it's a fake, and won't be permitted in this paper again.

That's the only point I know that upports Dr. Strachstein's complaint. Hope that he, a practicing urologist who knows how destructive venereal diseases are, doesn't intend to include ads offering rubber goods as fakes. Here, of course, I don't see eye to eye with the doctor. I know there are puritanical objections to such advertisements, but that doesn't mean a thing to an editor who rejects puritanical notions about sex. I'm sure that if many of Dr. Strachstein's patients had used sanitary rubber goods (condoms to you) at the proper time they wouldn't be suffering from the clap or syphilis and taxing the doctor's scientific ability to arrest or eradicate the evils.

Dr. Strachstein, by the way, has written a valuable book for me, entitled *The Price We Pay*, which is a scientist's discussion of the various phases of the venereal disease problem. The book is now on the press and when issued will be of great help to laymen who want authentic information on this too-hushed subject. I'm sure my readers will follow Dr. Strachstein's arguments with the closest attention and be benefited by his vast experience in a field that has had altogether too little publicity, though of late I've noticed a healthy change of attitude. Where only a few short years ago, venereal diseases were considered beneath notice, the intelligent world of today knows that that attitude means ignorance, suffering and early death. The minds of the people are being opened to the discoveries of science, thanks to the efforts of such authorities as Dr. Strachstein, who are ready to put aside their duties as practitioners long enough to write popularized treatises for laymen.

I have just enrolled in a "100 Percent

Self-Correcting Course in the English Language," put out by the Sherwin Cody School of English, at a cost of \$30. Do you think I'm wasting my time and money?

You undoubtedly will get some good out of this "course," but it seems to me that you won't get \$30 worth of good out of it. There isn't a thing in that "course" that you couldn't get from about 20 of my Little Blue Books, and you know how much less than \$30 they'll cost you. By the way, Rex. R. Eastman, who compiled several valuable books for me (*The Liberty Book of Quotations*, *Famous Dates in History*), is now at work on a Self-Teaching Manual of English, which I plan to issue at a dollar per copy, and I'll bet you a good dinner you'll get more out of that 60,000-word book than a dozen "courses." Watch for the announcement of that helpful, low-priced book.

* * *

George Bedborough, who lectures with Joseph McCabe at the Leicester Secular Society, in England, writes me a pleasant letter, in which he suggests that I become interested in one of his favorite poets. I confess, contritely of course, that *The Freeman* has been woefully lacking in its appreciation of poetry, and the result has been several pained comments from readers who like poetry. Of course, I'm really fond of good poetry, as my record as editor of the Little Blue Books shows. I've done more than my share in the work of bringing fine poetry to the attention of the American public, but I'm willing to add that I certainly should have done much more. Being so busy with problems of politics, economics, international affairs, Freethought, science, history and philosophy, I may be forgiven if I slight some of the great arts.

Mr. Bedborough writes:

The enclosed poem by T. E. Brown is probably unknown to your readers. It is one of the best bits of sardonic eloquence ever penned.

Brown was born in the Isle of Man in 1830. Became a schoolmaster, and died in 1897. Every anthology I've come across printed his very worst poem, silly and not even pretty-pretty: ("A garden is a pleasant thing, God-wot.") But it calls the Atheist a fool, and that is good enough to immortalize anybody's poem.

Brown was first recognized by W. E. Henley, whose "Head was bloody but unbowed" was recently in your columns. Henley wrote a glorious eulogy of this most human of poets and humanest of men.

T. E. B. loved the habits, manners and dialect of his Manx peasants and wrote a delightful series of verses called "Fo'c'stle Yarns" about these humble fisher folk.

His poem "Katherine Kinrade," glorifying an "immoral" woman who had been condemned by Bishop Wilson—of the island—is a magnificent impeachment of the puritan moralists.

The poem enclosed ("Sunset at Chagford") was so heretical that Brown's publishers refused to include it in the printed volume of Brown's works—until after the poet was dead.

Strange as it seems, the "Answer" (God's answer to Man's indictment) was published without the poem to which it was an answer. I append a few lines of this "Reply" which is full of fine poetry, but is no answer at all. It is mainly remarkable (apart from its exquisite phrasing) for Brown's recognition that God does not make anything simply because He cannot. Man is Lord, not I!

The two Brown poems follow, thanks to Mr. Bedborough's interest:

from DARTMOOR

SUNSET AT CHAGFORD : Homo
Loquitur

By T. E. BROWN

Is it ironical, a fool enigma,
This sunset show?
The purple stigma,
Black mountain cut upon a saffron
glow—

Is it a mammoth joke,
A riddle put for me to guess,
Which, having duly honoured, I may
smoke

And go to bed,
And snore,
Having a soothing consciousness
Of something red?

Or is it more?
Ah, is it, is it more?

A dole perhaps?
The scraps
Tossed from the table of the revelling
gods?

What odds!
I taste them—Lazarus

Was nourished thus!

But, all the same, it surely is a cheat—
Is this the stuff they eat?

A cheat, a cheat!

Then let the garbage be—

Some pig-wash! Let it vanish down the
sink

Of night! 'T is not for me,

I will not drink

Their draff,

While throned on high, they quaff

The fragrant sconce.

Say, "'tis an anodyne"—

It never shall be mine!

I want no opiates—

I want to be co-equal with their fates—

I will not be put off with temporal pre-
tence:

I want to be awake, and know, not stand
And stare at waving of a conjurer's
hand.

But is it speech

Wherewith they strive to reach

Our poor inadequate souls?

The round earth rolls:

I cannot hear it hum—

The stars are dumb—

The voices of the world are, in my ear,

A sensuous murmur. Nothing speaks

But man, my fellow—him I hear

And understand. But beasts and birds

And winds and waves are destitute of
words.

What is the alphabet the Gods have set?

What babbling, what delusion!

And in these sunset tints what gay con-
fusion.

Man prints his meaning. Has a letter

Determinate. I know that it is better

Than all this cumbersome hieroglyph.

The "For"—the "If"—

Are growth of man's analysis.

The gods in bliss scabble a baby jargon

on the skies

For us to analyse! Cumbersome? Nay,
idiotic—

A party-coloured symbolism,

The fragments of a shivered prism.

MAN gives the swift demotic!

The leech

Looks from its muddy lair

And sees a silly something in the air—

Call you this SPEECH?

O God! If it be speech,

Speak plainer

If Thou wouldst teach

That I shall be a gainer!

The hour of picture alphabets is gone;

We are not now so weak;

We are too old to con the horn-book
of our youth.

Time lags—

O rip this obsolete blazon into rags

And speak! O, speak.

from "RESPONDET"

"I am old and blind
I have no speech
Wherewith to reach
Your quick selecting ears.
And yet I mark your tears.
You've hit
The mark—a servant; for the other
word—
Why, you are Lord, if anyone is Lord.
For I can do no more, wherefore
I am not vexed.
But I
Who have not sat
Obeying Mine own laws,
Since first into the void I swam,
Persist, because
I am but what I am.

* * *
Wouldn't it be a great achievement if it
were possible to issue all of Joseph
McCabe's works in one large volume?

As a printer, I'd certainly say it
would be an achievement—the great-
est in the history of the graphic arts.
It would have to be some volume, for
it's a fact that McCabe has written
more than 200 large volumes. One of
McCabe's works contains 1,250,000
words. I'm afraid you won't be able
to see your wish granted. At a rough
guess, I'd say that McCabe's com-
plete wordage would make a set of
books twice the size of the latest *En-
cyclopaedia Britannica*.

* * *
Let me suggest that you issue a His-
tory of Freethought.

That's a good idea, and I'll be hap-
py to act on it. The late J. M. Rob-
ertson wrote a hefty History of
Freethought, and it contained sound
scholarship, but, alas, Robertson's
literary style is hard to follow. The
man knew a great deal, but unfortu-
nately didn't know how to tell
about it. Joseph McCabe has even
greater scholarship—being familiar
with about 40 sciences—and if he
were to write a history on the sub-
ject you suggest he would present his
material in an orderly way, keep the
manuscript reasonably short, and
garnish the dish with a racy, peppy
style that would hold the attention
of the average literate reader. Thanks
for the idea. I'll see what can be
done about it.

* * *
Let the Atheists put into the finest
building on earth all the rulers of the
nations, all the scientists in the world
and put at their disposal all the scien-

tific achievements of man, and not any
one of them nor any group could make
a common fishing worm. Would not
this convince any sane person that there
is a God?

This is what is known in logic as
a *non sequitur*, or as it's sometimes
called, *fallacia consequentis*. Our
friend has drawn an inference that
doesn't follow from the premises he
has established. To argue that there
must be a God because no man can
create life is to take a swift trip in
logic that gets one nowhere in a
hurry. First of all, there is consider-
able evidence to prove that our sci-
entists have been able to produce
artificially simple forms of life,
though they haven't been able to man-
ufacture so complicated a biological
structure as a "common fishing
worm." Such an organism is highly
complex, but the fact that scientists
have been able to make progress in
exceedingly simple spheres could logi-
cally imply that in time they may
even be able to produce a worm. If
this steady progress were to be
achieved, would it therefore mean
that there is no God? My corre-
spondent's proposition turns back on
him, for it's plain that he is not in
touch with the latest developments
in the world of science.

But, let us grant that science will
never turn out any complex organism
by artificial means. This, after all,
is the point of my amateur logician's
argument. Does this, by any stretch
of the imagination, prove the exist-
ence of a supernatural body that goes
around creating biological organ-
isms? We have here a perfect *non
sequitur*—man doesn't do a certain
thing, therefore there must be a God
to do that certain thing.

There are several assumptions
here. First, there is the basic notion
that life was "created," when every
scrap of evidence gathered by scien-
tists, during the past few centuries,
indicates that there is no validity to
the creationist theory—that life de-
veloped by evolutionary processes.
But, argues our theistic logician, if
you go back far enough you will find
it necessary to bring in a Creator
whose job it is to get the organism
started. The answer here is equally
effective, for it remains to be shown
that anything, however simple, was
ever "started," or "made," or "creat-

ed" by some personal or impersonal God.

So far as we can tell—from observation, analysis, tests, research—the materials of the universe have always been in existence. That assumption is based on experience, and in order to refute it our logician would be compelled to prove that the materials of the universe didn't exist at one time, but were created at some particular moment in cosmic history by some supernatural power who became tired of enduring a matterless, empty void. There has never been an iota of evidence produced in all history to warrant such an assumption.

If matter is indestructible and uncreatable, we should, in all sanity, assume that the common fishing worm (which my correspondent makes so much over) developed after millions of years—or billions of years—of evolutionary impulses. The circumstances of environment were favorable to the development of a worm. But, our Theist claims that some supernatural being set out one fine morning to create fishing worms so that my correspondent might have an easier time when he goes down to the nearby stream for a mess of catfish.

At that, it wasn't so very long ago that apologists for the God-idea held in all seriousness that the common worm was made by God so that man would be able to catch the elusive fish. If God did that, he certainly did man a turn, but one would like to get the opinion of the common fishing worm on this question. He might, could he voice his protests, claim that God was a menace to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—from the viewpoint of the worm. But even Theists rarely bring up such shoddy arguments any more, though one still meets them among the less-educated believers.

Our logician picks out the fishing worm, because he knows it will be many, many years before science will be able to advance to the stage where such life can be made artificially. But should that be achieved, he could go a few miles up the biological scale and insist that man create a crocodile or, perforce, grant the existence of a God. And having done that, he could still hide behind another

argument and blandly call on scientists to manufacture a cosmic system, with a few Milky Ways thrown in for good measure.

* * *
Are the theater chains held by large movie companies increasing since the depression?

At their peak, five large companies owned 3,600 movie theaters. In 1936, these holdings were reduced to 2,220. The five companies follow, with their peak figure first and their present number of the theaters second: Paramount, 1,600, 1,210; 20th Century-Fox, 1,000, 300; Warner, 600, 450; Loew's, 200, 170; Radio-Keith-Orpheum, 200, 90.

* * *
How many natives Indians are there in both American continents?

The total population of the Western Hemisphere, in 1936, is 247,246,000. Of this population, 15,620,000, or 6.31 percent, are native Indians, and 30,933,000, or 12 percent, are Mestizos. In North America (from Greenland to U.S.) there are 487,000 Indians (including Mestizos), or 0.36 percent of the total population of 132,874,000. In Mexico, Antilles and Central America there are 6,642,000 Indians and 11,868,000 Mestizos, the former being 20.94 percent and the latter being 37 percent of the total population of 31,706,000. In South America, there are 8,491,000 Indians and 19,065,000 Mestizos, the former being 10.27 percent and the latter being 23 percent of a total population of 82,666,000.

* * *
How many members of the present Congress are bald-headed? How many have beards? How many have mustaches?

Bald-headed Congressmen number 52. Only one Congressman has a beard. Thirty-one have mustaches. Authority: House of Representatives barber shop.

* * *
Which place in the world have artists painted most?

The Grand Canal, in Venice, which, according to art authorities at the Louvre, has been used in more than 100,000 paintings.

* * *
I smoke a pack of cigarettes each day. How much am I paying the Federal government in "hidden taxes" yearly? \$21.90.

* * *
How old is radio?
24 years.

Index

- AAA, what was its effect upon peanut growers, 73.
Benefited middle-men more than it did peanut growers, 73.
- American Bulletin**, blames Jews for assassination of Huey Long, 61.
Is an organ of the Fascist poison squad, 61.
- American capitalism**, is a combination of social democracy and industrial autocracy, 37.
- American flag**, symbolizes best traditions of America, 33.
- American Freeman**, suggested method of increasing its circulation, 39.
Number of questions its readers may ask is unlimited, 79.
Its questions selected on basis of general interest, 79.
Has neglected poetry, 113.
- American Houses, Inc.**, offers low-cost housing, 24.
Claims huge savings in production, 25.
- "Americanism,"** used as a mask by exploiters and reactionaries, 4.
- American Jews**, should bring suit against disseminators of anti-Semitic libels, 6.
Are foolish to ignore anti-Semitic propaganda, 96.
Should fight anti-Semitism vigorously, 97.
Find their greatest field in business of distribution, 100.
Number of, 104.
Farm holdings of, 112.
- American Legion**, is led by reactionaries and red-baiters, 45.
Seeks to suppress radical minorities, 45.
- American people**, have become aware of Coughlin's Fascism, 63.
Would like to preserve as much of the old order as possible, 72.
Can be educated to appreciate the value of Socialism, 72.
Are they ready for Socialism, 72.
Number incurably insane, 78.
Number who are feeble-minded, 91.
Will spring to arms to defend freedom, 104.
- Americans**, should they seek employment in Soviet Union, 66.
Should let the Soviet Union work out its own problems, 66.
Should devote their best energies to improving American life, 66.
- American youth**, employment statistics of, 87.
Millions are unable to find employment, 87.
- Ameringer, Oscar**, charged with supporting Ku Klux Klan, 18.
Has not refuted Oneal, charges, 19.
"And/or," is a crime against good English, 47.
A defense of its use, 91, 92.
- Anti-Semites**, pay no attention to truth, 101.
- Anti-Semitism**, is being vigorously promoted in the U.S., 97.
Will feature the political campaign of 1936, 97.
- Appeal to Reason**, exposed Catholic intrigue in Mexico, 51.
- Arabs**, is God giving them a harsh deal, 13.
- Arms and the Clergy**, quotations from, 106, 107, 108, 109.
- Atheism**, definition of, 31.
Contrasted with Materialism, 57.
- Autarchy**, definition of, 85.
Has proved to be a failure in Germany, 85.
- Automobiles**, estimated number of in 1950, 53.
Value of production of in 1935, 54.
Amounts paid in taxes and accessories for, 54.
- Automobile engine**, what is its rate of efficiency, 74.
- Aymar, Gordon C.**, wrote *Bird Flight*, 62.
- Baby**, announcement card for, 17.
- Baldwin, Stanley**, calls Rhine England's first line of defense, 30.
- Banks**, how they evade responsibility for depositor's money, 27.
Their depositors share risks but not profits, 27.
Refuse to accept responsibility for default of correspondents, 27.
Are losing many customers, 28.
Charge customers for protecting their own money, 40.
Are making enormous profits through service charges, 75.
Majority of now make service charges, 82.
Were saved for Capitalism by Roosevelt's measures, 102.
- Beard, Dr. Charles A.**, exposes Pelley's Franklin "quotations," 23.
Brands Pelley's Franklin "quotations" a "bare-faced forgery," 23.

- Bedborough, George**, likes *The American Freeman*, 74.
Wrote *Arms and the Clergy*, 105, 106.
Calls attention to a favorite poet, 113.
- Beethoven**, given first place in radio poll, 69.
- Bellamy, Edward**, his *Looking Backward* has had tremendous influence, 17.
- Bible**, its sales have been hit by depression, 28.
Is approached in a critical spirit by the more intelligent, 49.
- Birds**, how high can they fly, 53.
How keen is their sight and hearing, 62.
How deep can they dive in water, 62.
Which fly the farthest, 62.
Which fly fastest, 62.
- Birkhead, L. M.**, his story of Earl Carroll and the bathing beauty, 41.
- Blanquism**, definition of, 28.
- Bledsoe, S. T.**, statement on Diesel engine, 68.
- Bowes, Major**, has put over a neat piece of exploitation, 52.
Uses aspirations of amateurs to enrich himself, 52.
- Brandenburg, William A.**, does he write for "learned" publications, 74.
Hires a ghost writer to pen his "learned" articles, 74.
- Bridge**, chances of drawing a perfect hand in, 66.
- Brinkley, Dr. John R.**, his goat-gland operation is quackery, 111.
- Brisbane, Arthur**, his claim for Los Angeles is erroneous, 25.
- British imperialism**, uses Zionists to promote schemes of English capitalism, 16.
- Brobst, Harry**, lauds Haldeman-Julius press, 39.
- Broderick, Mrs. F. J.** passes her Freeman on to friends, 95, 96.
- Brown, Bishop W. M.**, is now an Atheist and Communist, 82.
- Brown, T. E.**, was one of the humanest of poets, 113, 114.
A description of his works, 114.
Excerpt from his *Respondet*, 115.
- Bryan, William Jennings**, an estimate of, 5.
Tried to stop Morgan war-loans to British, 5.
Was the victim of jingoistic press attacks, 5.
Stood consistently for peace while Secretary of State, 5.
His diplomatic policy was sane and correct, 6.
- Bullitt, William**, asked Lenin how long "Red Terror" would continue, 109.
- Butadien**, developed by Germany as a rubber substitute, 110, 111.
Cannot compete with natural rubber on a cost basis, 111.
- Califano, Michael**, his paintings destroyed by Nazi hoodlums, 10.
- Campbell, Clarence S.**, forms Freethinkers' Club, 88.
- Canada**, is it ready for Socialism, 7.
Is even more monopolistic than the U.S., 7.
Its wealth controlled by a small group, 7.
Is exploited by a banking monopoly, 7.
Suffers under a Catholic-imposed censorship of literature, 12.
Its censors make pornography a pretext, 12.
Its Postmaster General refuses to divulge list of forbidden books, 13.
Examples of its literary censorship, 13.
Has no Prime Minister, 28.
- Canadian censors**, their conduct is brazen, 13.
- Canadian Nationalist**, restrained by Canadian court from circulating "ritual murder" libel, 6.
- Capitalism**, depends on foreign trade to dispose of its surpluses, 21.
Has failed to keep the economic machine running, 22.
Examples of its inconsistencies and paradoxes, 38.
Patching it up will never cure its ills, 72.
Will endure as long as private ownership of means of production is tolerated, 72.
- Ungrateful to Roosevelt** for his services, 101.
- Capitalists**, believe war will restore their lost foreign trade, 21.
Wanted their system saved free of charge, 101.
- Catholic Action**, what is behind its campaign, 24.
- CCC camps**, amount of food they consume, 63.
- Chadbourne, Prof. J. H.**, wrote *Lynching and the Law*, 28.
- Chaplin, Charles S.**, can give the world belly laughs, 41.
His past hits should be revived, 41, 42.
- Chase, Stuart**, wrote *Government in Business*, 62.
- Chiang Kai-Shek, General**, heads military dictatorship in China, 10.
Is one of the bloodiest murderers in history, 11.
Gets huge revenue from opium traffic, 11.
Encourages opium traffic, 11.
- Chiang Kai-Shek, Madame**, wrote *New Life in Old China*, 10.
Her article on China drips with sweetness and light, 10.
Says nothing about opium in her article, 11.
- Chicks**, how cannibalism amongst them can be prevented, 40.
- Child**, why it develops fear of death, 88, 89.
- Children**, usually pay little heed to mor-

- bid subjects, 89.
- China Clipper**, some facts about it, 44.
- Chinese farmer**, income of, 25.
- Christian Science**, always toadys to the rich and powerful, 32.
- Christian Science Monitor**, lauds British royalty, 32.
- Published expose of Protocols, 34. 35.
- Cigarette smoker**, yearly tax paid by, 116.
- Civilization**, has been largely built by Freethinkers, 43.
- Civil War**, not responsible for low caliber of Southern statesmanship, 62. Should it be called by that name, 78.
- Clerics**, use childish arguments in defense of Theism, 70.
- Are anti-social and parasitic, 93.
- How they supported war and militarism, 106, 107, 108, 109.
- Only a tiny minority denounced World War, 107.
- Were sure God was on the side of the Allies, 108.
- Coin-tossing**, comments on by various readers, 90.
- Cold**, what is good for one besides whisky, 70.
- Coleridge**, S. T., described Shakespeare as "myriad-minded," 52.
- Columbia University**, is a center for Italian Fascist propaganda, 14.
- Communism**, was never a menace in Germany, 19.
- Its theory of rewards, 39.
- Contrasted with Socialism, 54.
- Is predicated upon "dictatorship of the proletariat," 55.
- Communist journalists**, squirm when they discuss Franco-Russian pact, 4.
- Communists**, their reaction to Franco-Russian Pact, 3.
- Make jesuitical statements regarding Franco-Russian pact, 4.
- Fight opium traffic in China, 11.
- Are they "more revolutionary" than Socialists, 33.
- Their parade was featured by "God" himself, 33.
- Believe Capitalism must be overthrown by violence, 55.
- Are they perceiving the error of their ways, 56.
- Their promises of reform must be taken with caution, 56.
- Is their plea for a United Front sincere, 68.
- Composers**, lists of most popular, selected by a radio vote, 69.
- Consumer's Research**, its aim is profits, not service, 46.
- Seeks to limit its information to subscribers, 46.
- Coolidge**, Calvin, remark on war debts, 42.
- Cooperative Commonwealth Federation**, is it a real Socialist party, 7.
- Its influence promotes coalition of Liberals and Conservatives in Canada, 7.
- An outline of its development, 7, 8.
- A statement of its aims, 7.
- Puts scare into old parties in Canada, 7.
- Seeks to inaugurate production for use, 8.
- Is now the second party in British Columbia, 8.
- Cooperative Distributors**, an organization worth watching, 47.
- Cooperative movement**, is making splendid headway in the U.S., 46.
- Cooperatives**, an outline of their activities in Sweden, 12.
- Coughlin**, Father Charles E., his National Union could become the sword-arm of Fascism, 24.
- Is he just "shooting off his mouth," 40.
- Is an intellectual contortionist, 44.
- Does an about-face on the question of Roosevelt, 44.
- Why he is called "Father," 62.
- May stage a come-back, 63.
- His influence is waning, 63.
- Criminals**, are usually religious, 50.
- "Cure-alls," will not solve economic problems, 22.
- Danzig**, result of its elections discredits "menace of Communism," 19.
- Darrow**, Clarence, is he religious, 30.
- Proclaims himself a Materialist, 30.
- Doesn't like the word "Atheism," 31.
- Darwin**, Charles, his Origin of Species appeared after publication of Communist Manifesto, 70.
- Darwinism**, exercised great influence on Socialist thought, 70.
- Davies**, Marion, is not the lawful Mrs. Hearst, 80.
- De Bono**, General, how he "freed" the slaves of Adowa, 63.
- Debs**, Eugene V., issued statement opposing violence, 6.
- Denmark**, a comparison of its Socialist and Communist vote, 15.
- Deposit insurance**, is a snare and a delusion, 40, 41.
- How it works under present arrangement, 75.
- Would not be adequate to stem another banking panic, 75.
- Der Ammenkoenig**, is a pornographic German film, 99.
- Diesel engine**, it is more efficient than steam power, 68.
- District of Columbia**, population of, 112.
- Divine**, Father, his dupes marched in Communist parade, 33.
- Du Pont Company**, manufactures synthetic rubber, 111.
- Use of its synthetic rubber is limited, 111.
- Economic questions**, are too complex for many to grasp, 22.
- Eddy**, Nelson, has more sex-appeal than Lawrence Tibbett, 28.

- Eden, Anthony**, contrasts Stalin to Hitler by inference, 20.
- Engels, Friedrich**, kept a mistress, 70.
- England**, origin of its tithe war, 33.
Its farmers still forced to pay tribute to the clergy, 33.
Has had no deaths from strikes in 75 years, 110.
- Erastianism**, definition of, 96.
- Ethiopia**, will continue guerrilla warfare, even in rainy season, 79.
Is accurate and truthful in its war dispatches, 87.
- Executions**, statistics of, 31.
- Fascism**, can it happen here, 10.
Will have hard time getting started in U.S., 10.
Is Capitalism's answer to communistic violence, 55.
Makes little progress in countries with a democratic tradition, 55.
Why it has declined in France, 77, 78.
- Fascists**, will not find that America is their oyster, 104.
- Feather, William**, an able business commentator, 17.
- Federal Deposit Insurance**, who pays for it, 40.
- "Fee-splitting,"** how it works, 81, 82.
Is an unethical practice, 82.
- Finlayson, D.**, questions Jeans's conclusion with regard to tossing of coins, 57, 58.
- Fishing worm**, is not proof of God's existence, 115, 116.
Did God create it to aid men in catching fish, 116.
- Five-cent cigar**, is still an unattained ideal, 41.
- Florida**, statistics of its tourist trade, 66, 67.
- Ford, Henry**, his 1935 sales, 110.
- Foreword**, definition of, 25.
- Forgeries**, are favorite weapons of religious bigots, 35.
- Fortune magazine**, makes survey of Jews in American industry, 99.
- Fowler, Justice Chester A.**, criticizes user of "and/or," 47.
- France**, learned a lesson of Hitler and Mussolini, 78.
Its Leftist elements united to avert Fascism, 78.
- Franco-Russian pact**, bolsters French imperialism, 5.
- Franklin, Benjamin**, would not be guilty of anti-Semitism, 23.
- Freethinkers** a list of, 43.
- French people**, are realists, 78.
- French Revolution**, was one of the grandest moments in history, 58.
A summary of its results, 58.
- Frogs**, is there profit in raising, 94.
- General Electric Corporation**, forced to cut prices by competition of Swedish cooperatives, 12.
- General Motors Corporation**, made enormous profits in 1935, 101.
- German Army**, may assume control if Hitler falls, 86.
Merely tolerates Hitler, 84.
- German Jews**, might have prevented Hitler's rise to power, 7.
- Germans**, number of times they give Nazi salute, 98.
- Germany**, will be freed from Hitler's tyranny by Socialists, 19.
Its working class refused to parade in Hitler's honor, 32.
Why it arrests Catholics for violating monetary laws, 39, 40.
Used British funds to make loans to the Soviet Union, 48.
Destroyed restriction of Versailles treaty long before Hitler's advent, 61.
Got war supplies from Allies during World War, 83.
Its internal condition has become grave under Hitler, 84.
Will it rise against Hitlerism, 84.
Its capitalists have profited from subsidizing Hitler, 85.
Its economic situation is becoming desperate, 85.
Its war industries are feverishly active, 85.
Has gained nothing by ruining Jews, 86.
Its radical workers organize secretly against Hitler, 83.
Its Jews were silent in face of anti-Semitism, 96.
Uses charge of "immorality" to rob Jews of their moving picture property, 99.
Its films are garbage, 99.
Size of its new army, 104.
Makes tires from synthetic rubber, 110, 111.
- Gibraltar**, has Great Britain's hold on it ever been challenged, 43, 44.
- "Godlessness,"** is a factor in the progress of Mexico and the Soviet Union, 56.
- Gold**, cannot be profitably extracted from sea water, 54.
World supply of, 61.
- Goldberg, Dr. Isaac**, is an able fighter for his race, 97.
Prepares book exposing Protocols, 110.
- Government literature**, where to obtain, 50.
- Grand Canal**, has served as subject for most paintings, 116.
- Great Britain**, fears German air raids, 30.
Number of Negroes it rules in Africa, 41.
Is embarrassed by Italo-Ethiopian war, 41.
Suffers from a huge quantity of idle money, 48.
Germany and Soviet Union bidding for its surplus funds, 48.
Its bankers are in a predicament, 48.
Will probably lend money to both Germany and the Soviet Union, 48.

- Had no bank failures as a result of going off gold, 69.
 Number of idle ships in its merchant marine, 105.
- Green, Homer M.**, supports Freeman banking policy in letter to *New York Times*, 36, 37.
- Gunther, John**, tells how German Republic broke down restrictions of Versailles, 61.
- Haldeman-Julius, E.**, explains his technique of authorship, 26.
 Prefers the U.S., 32.
 Branded "Oath of Knights of Columbus" as a fake, 35.
 Does not put feet on desk, 69, 70.
 Some of his readers offended by criticisms of Townsend movement, 79.
 His wealth has been greatly exaggerated, 80.
 Never posed as a savior of humanity, 80.
 States his position as a publisher, 80.
- Haldeman-Julius Publications**, is strictly a private business venture, 80.
 Does not publish pornography, 94.
 Will publish *The Autobiography of a Pimp*, 94.
 Offers valuable works on subject of better English, 113.
- Harlem**, what was the cause of its race riots, 19.
 Its business life dominated by whites, 19.
- Harlem diet**, what it is, 31.
- Hearst newsmen**, will stoop to anything, 67.
- Hearst press**, has conducted a steady campaign of hatred against Japanese, 8.
- Hearst, William R.**, blames New Deal for flight of Lindbergh, 67.
 His henchmen forced Jon Lindbergh to pose for pictures, 67.
 Has no right to accuse others of "immorality," 81.
- Heart**, speed of its beat determined by size, 88.
- Heine, Heinrich**, Nazis refuse to credit him with authorship of Lorelei, 25.
- Hillquit, Morris**, statement of his beliefs as a Socialist, 68, 69.
- Hitler, Adolf**, does he have right "to rescue" Germans in foreign lands, 9.
 His principle of "rescuing" would lead to endless wars, 9.
 Seeks an alliance with Japan against the Soviet Union, 9.
 Will strike the Soviet Union without warning, 10.
 His *My Battle* has had vast reactionary influence, 18.
 Claims his Nazis saved Germany from Communism, 19.
 European statesmen believe him to be crazy, 20.
- His policies are bound to lead to war, 20.
 Evidence indicates that he has Jewish blood, 22.
 His headsmen ice their axes, 27.
 Gives workers poetry instead of social security, 32.
 Has "unified" German people with machine guns, 32.
 Plans to expand at expense of Soviet Union, 36.
 Why he will be a "harder nut to crack" than Mussolini, 45, 46.
 His regime is based on organized gangsterism, 46.
 Will it take a world war to overthrow him, 46.
 Does not boss the German army, 84.
 Has intensified persecution of Jews and radicals, 84.
 Has failed to keep his radical promises, 84.
 What was behind his blood-purge of 1934, 84.
 Was subsidized by German plutocrats, 84, 85.
 Made the Jews scape-goats for Germany's misfortunes, 85.
 His position grows more insecure each month, 85.
 Used anti-Semitism as a pretext to rob Jews, 86.
 Is surrounded by worst collection of blackguards in history, 86.
 Can be overthrown only by violence, 86.
 Will start another world war unless he is overthrown, 86.
- Hobson, J. A.**, wrote *God and Mammon*, 46.
- Hollywood**, could not be expected to tell truth about French Revolution, 58.
- Holmes, Rev. John Haynes**, calls Coughlin "the voice of Fascism," 40.
 Was one of few clerics to denounce war, 107.
- Hoover, Herbert**, statement on Agnosticism, 43.
 Shows appalling ignorance in his remarks on religion, 43.
 Did he try to ship gold out of the U.S., 44.
 Claims Great Britain's desertion of gold caused panic of 1933, 69.
- Horsley, Rev. J. W.**, would limit slaughter to week-days, 107, 108.
- House organs**, as estimate of their value as business-getters, 17.
- Howells, W. D.**, statement on Mark Twain's Agnosticism, 52.
- Humming-bird**, how fast does it stroke its wings, 62.
- Ice cream**, now vended by slot machines, 68.
- Indians**, number of in Western Hemisphere, 116.
- Inflation**, property better than money in case of, 25.
- International Correspondence School**, is

- an honest and efficient institution, 82.
- Introduction**, definition of, 25.
- Italian labor**, receives starvation wages, 16.
- Italy**, propagandists picture it as a paradise, 14.
- Number of automobiles compared with U.S., 14.
- Has suffered steady loss of foreign trade, 14.
- Wages have fallen and cost of living has risen, 15.
- Apparent reduction in unemployment due to army recruiting, 15.
- Does its labor receive 25c per hour, 16.
- Its chemists make a wool substitute from cheese, 54.
- What will be its reaction if Ethiopian campaign fails, 59.
- Its budget has been unbalanced since 1925, 61.
- Faces terrific problem in supplying troops in Ethiopia, 76.
- Is untruthful in its dispatches from the front, 87.
- Its capitalists withhold land from people, 88.
- Was not menaced by Communism when Mussolini stole power, 93.
- Its future course if Mussolini were to fall, 98, 99.
- Japan**, its common people are against a war with the U.S., 9.
- Would find difficulty in taking Siberia, 9.
- Has an unfavorable balance of trade with the U.S., 34.
- Builds railroads leading to strategic points in Siberia, 76.
- Japanese**, are exempted from Hitler's persecution of non-Aryans, 9.
- Japanese electric bulbs**, forced reduction in price of American product, 34.
- Jeans**, Sir James, comment on laws of chance in tossing of coins, 57.
- Jews**, is their history explained by divine providence, 16.
- Are numerically insignificant in U.S. government, 18.
- Enjoyed the friendship of Alexander, Caesar and Napoleon, 25.
- Charge that they plan to rule world gold market is ridiculous, 28.
- Are less criminal in proportion, than the general population, 81.
- Are they responsible for immorality in movies, 99.
- Are they heavily represented in American industry, 99.
- Are only a small factor in American banking and finance, 99.
- Are not represented in American heavy industry, 99.
- Extent of their interest in American publishing field, 100.
- Extent of their interest in American advertising, radio, theaters and movies, 100.
- Do not get most lucrative law practice in New York City, 100.
- Their position in American medicine, 101.
- Their position in American agriculture, 101.
- "Jewish influence"**, is a device of Hitleristic propaganda, 18.
- Jingle**, what is missing line of, 39.
- Kagawa, T.**, an estimate of, 93.
- Is the most famous Japanese Christian convert, 93.
- Was brought to the U.S. to "save souls," 93.
- Is a foe of Socialism and Communism, 93.
- Kansas**, its budget is always balanced, 64.
- How it handles relief problem, 64.
- Is not in a position to benefit from federal Social Security Law, 64.
- Deserves credit for ousting Dr. Brinkley, 111.
- Kansas movie audiences**, are addicted to popcorn munching, 59.
- King Carol**, seeks to eradicate anti-Semitism, 8.
- King Edward VIII**, what will his policies be, 83.
- Is pro-German and anti-French, 83.
- Is sympathetic towards Hitler, 83.
- Has leanings towards Fascism, 83.
- Kiplinger Agency**, comments on situation in Italy and Germany, 97, 98.
- Terms Italy's Ethiopian campaign "a dud," 97.
- Predicts internal crisis in Germany and Italy, 98.
- La Follette**, Governor Philip, has misconception of Socialism, 26.
- Landon**, Governor Alf M., facts about his "budget-balancing," 64.
- Put relief burden on counties and federal government, 64.
- Is scrupulously honest, 64.
- Respects the principles of civil liberty, 64.
- Is not the Hearst type of man, 64.
- Lang, C. A.**, likes Joseph McCabe's essay on The Crusades, 91.
- Praises Little Blue Books, 91.
- Comment on laws of chance, 90, 91.
- Larkin, William P.**, organizes Knights of Columbus for Catholic Action, 24.
- "Law of combined development"**, explanation of, 26.
- Laws of chance**, an illustration of, 53.
- How they apply to tossing of coins, 57, 58.
- Leese, A. S.**, wrote vile articles on "ritual murder," 6.
- Legalized violence**, extent of in the U. S., 110.
- Offers an immense and fertile field of research, 110.
- Lenin**, was an opponent of Blanquism, 28.

- Had no children, 31.
 Conversation with William Bullitt regarding "Red Terror," 109.
- Levine, Isaac Don**, is a professional anti-Soviet poison-peddler, 83.
- Llars**, continue to spread lies even after they are discredited, 31.
- Lincoln, Abraham**, quotation from opposing dictators, 28.
- Linfield, Dr. H. S.**, gives statistics showing low proportion of Jewish criminals, 81.
- Long, Huey**, was slain by a Catholic, 61.
- Lusitania**, was a legal target for submarines, 5.
- Lynchers**, are seldom convicted, 28.
- Lynchings**, majority occur in states where Negroes receive harshest legal punishment, 31.
- MacKenzie, Duncan**, likes *The American Freeman*, 52.
- Market forecasts**, an example of their unreliability, 49.
 Are of little value, 49.
- Marraro, Howard**, writes propaganda for Mussolini, 13, 14.
 Claims Italians "accept" limitations of liberty, 14.
 Makes false claim of rise in Italian standard of living, 15.
- Martin, Edward S.**, supports religious obscurantism, 49.
- Marx, Karl**, his *Das Kapital* wields tremendous influence, 17.
 Was a one-woman man, 70.
- Materialism**, contrasted with Atheism, 57.
- McCabe, Joseph**, exposes fatuousness of Roman Catholic case against birth control, 13.
 Is an able popularizer of science, 29.
 Aided Bishop Brown in preparation of his works, 82.
 Tells facts about Catholic castrations, 94.
 Could all his works be published in one volume, 115.
 Has been amazingly prolific in his writing, 115.
- Mellon, Andrew**, why the government sued him for income tax evasion, 20.
- Mendenhall, Dr.**, said his movements in Soviet Union were not restricted, 93.
- "**Mercy death**," comment on, 48, 49.
 An argument in favor of it, 91.
- Meteors**, have they caused an increase in size of the earth, 77.
- Mexico**, has been exploited by Catholic Church for centuries, 51.
 Its government enrages priests by educating masses, 51.
 Is making progress in improving the condition of its people, 56.
- Militarists**, would resort to war to remedy unemployment, 87.
- Mind-liberating books**, a list of, 39.
- Morgan, J. P. Company**, aided Mussolini with loans, 98.
- Motor car sales**, in U.S. and Canada for 1935, 110.
- Movie companies**, number of theaters owned by, 116.
- Movie industry**, is it a liberal or reactionary force, 3, 4.
 Supports religious obscurantism, 4.
 Is always on the side of the reactionaries, 4.
 Has aspects of fascistic propaganda machine, 4.
- Mullikin, H. F.**, comment on laws of chance, 90.
 Defends use of "and/or," 91, 92.
- Mussolini**, his propagandist boasts of Italy's increased consumption of tobacco, 14.
 His corrupt bargain with the Pope is a force for reaction, 14.
 Why does he deny all civil liberties, 14.
 Claims Italians do not seek "comfortable life," 14.
 Asks his victims to tighten their belts, 15.
 Has committed more murders than Hitler, 44.
 Italian Fascism will fall with him, 46.
 Opposition to him is not dead in Italy, 46.
 His over-population argument is inconsistent, 49.
 How long can he finance war in Ethiopia, 59.
 His Ethiopian campaign will be halted by the rainy season, 59.
 His public improvements paid for by American investors, 61.
 Did not save Italy from Bolshevism, 61.
 Did he free slaves of Ethiopia, 62, 63.
 How tall is he, 63.
 Has little to show for his Ethiopian campaign, 76.
 Refused to listen to his military advisers, 77.
 Why he insisted on his minister remaining in Addis Ababa, 78.
 His troops treated like monkeys by Ethiopians, 78.
 Is he "always right," 79.
 What he has done to Italy, 79.
 Is always wrong, 79.
 His theory of war, 87, 88.
 Does not believe permanent peace is possible or desirable, 88.
 Enjoys rattling the saber, 88.
 Uses blacks to fight his battles, 88.
 Quotation from showing Italy could support larger population, 88.
 Would his downfall result in a Communist revolution, 98.
- Myers, Skillman E.**, finds *The American Freeman* a valuable source of information, 110.
- Nashville Parthenon**, is a magnificent masterpiece, 80.

- National Protective Insurance Company**, seems to be a reliable concern, 83.
- Natural Body Brace Co.**, its product is the bunk, 41.
- New Deal**, was not responsible for flight of Lindbergh, 67.
- Newman, C. F.**, comment on laws of chance, 90.
His argument appears far-fetched, 90.
- Normandie**, costs of operation and income of, 65.
- Norman Thomas-Earl Browder debate**, an important and timely discussion, 68.
Can be obtained from Haldeman-Julius Publications, 81.
- Norway**, its premier is an interesting character, 21.
- Nye, Bill**, his characterization of Wagnerian opera, 91.
- Oakes, Clarence P.**, makes a racket of slandering the Soviet Union, 92.
Bragged of his daring in Soviet Union, 92, 93.
- Oklahoma**, had best Socialist organization in the U.S., 19.
- "Old Guard"**, why it opposes Communist party, 45.
- Olewin, M.**, believes in "mercy death," 91.
- Oneal, James**, why he attacks Oscar Ameringer, 18.
- Onions**, why they brings tears to the eye, 43.
- Opium**, is an easy problem to handle, 11.
- Over-population**, can be solved by birth control, 49.
- Owen, Mrs. Ruth Bryan**, lauds Denmark's old age pension, 47.
Fails to mention that Denmark's government is run by Socialists, 47.
- Pacific Coast**, does it still harbor anti-Japanese feelings, 8.
- Paine, Thomas**, his publisher was jailed, 47.
- Palestine**, its entire wealth less than that of Peoria, Ills., 29.
- Peanut butter**, is easily made, 74.
- Peanuts**, are good only when freshly roasted, 73.
Statistics of production, 73.
Origin and history of, 73.
Are used for many purposes, 73.
Have a special attraction for baseball fans, 73.
Should be given a more attractive name, 74.
- Pegler, Westbrook**, reports on Mussolini's size, 63.
- Pelley, William Dudley**, circulates anti-Semitic quotations, supposedly by Benjamin Franklin, 23.
Cannot produce book showing Franklin "quotations," 23.
Is an American edition of Julius Streicher, 23.
- "Percent"** may be spelled two ways, 54.
- "Peter's pence"**, what it is, 39.
- Phillips, Joseph B.**, quotation from, 15.
- Poker**, chances of drawing a perfect hand in, 66.
- Policemen**, number in U. S., 77.
- "Political bedfellows"**, definition of, 28.
- Pollard, John Garland**, quotations from his A Connatory, 28.
- Pope Pius XI**, insists on his graft, 40.
Makes fatuous comment on Mexico and the Soviet Union, 56.
His slur prompted by progress made by Mexico and the Soviet Union, 57.
Did not mention "godliness" of Fascist Italy, 57.
Blesses Mussolini's campaign of aggression against Ethiopia, 57.
- Postal money orders**, are cheap and safe, 27.
Why they are cheaper than bank checks, 75, 76.
- Postal worker**, comments on his fellow employes, 95.
- Postal workers**, should be allowed to choose their own officers, 38.
Their intelligence compared with those in other walks of life, 95.
- Preface**, definition of, 25.
- "President"**, should not be abbreviated when applied to head of U.S. government, 56.
- Printed column**, why right-hand side is always even, 82.
- Protocols of Elders of Zion**, their disseminators fined by Swiss court, 4.
Are a rank fake, 29.
Their source discovered by a correspondent of the London Times, 35.
Based on a pamphlet directed against Napoleon III, 35.
Are being widely circulated in the U.S., 97.
- Public schools**, suffer from propaganda of religious fanatics, 53.
- Public taste**, shows itself perfect in radio poll, 69.
- Puzzle**: How the King chose his premier, 3.
- Queen Mary**, will compete with the Normandie, 65.
- Questions and Answers**, offered at a bargain price, 92.
- Racial antagonism**, is not a major cause of war, 78.
- Radio**, best place to get training in, 82.
How old is it, 116.
- Railroads**, amount of business they get from Chicago packing industry, 67.
- Reactionaries**, hope for world-wide triumph of Fascism, 98.
- Reconstruction Finance Corporation**, has it taken over businesses or properties, 62.
- Reeves, Alfred**, gives figures on 1935 production of automobiles, 53, 54.
- Reign of Terror**, who was responsible for it, 58.
- Religion**, is not synonymous with rectitude, 50.

- Constitutes an enormous vested interest, 71.
- Religionists, sneer at each other's superstitions, 50.
- Religious press, more intelligent section of it condemns Protocols, 34.
- Richest men, how they evade income tax, 20.
- Robinson, Frank B., is a master bunk-shooter, 42.
- Begs money from his dupes, 42.
- Robinson, Dr. William J., castigated those who deny germ theory of disease, 30.
- Obituary, 36.
- Offered reward for verification of quotation from Voltaire, 45.
- A deathbed letter from, 89.
- Believed Fascists and Nazis should not be permitted free speech, 89.
- Maintained that deeds must be preceded by words, 89.
- Believed Fascism and anti-Semitism had made great progress in the U. S., 89.
- Found evidence of Nazi poison in many countries, 89, 90.
- Roman Catholic Church, claims that birth control is a worse evil than war, 13.
- Helped Gen. Hugh S. Johnson prepare draft plans during World War, 21.
- An example of its high finance, 40.
- Its position on interest-taking in the Middle Ages, 46.
- Used threat of excommunication to force payment of interest, 46.
- Its dupes should not be persecuted, 93, 94.
- Castrated boys for its choirs, 94.
- Is committed to Fascist forces, 102, 103.
- Aids in crushing democracy in Austria, 103.
- Supports Polish dictatorship, 103.
- Seeks to restore its priests to power in Spain and Mexico, 103.
- A summary of its pernicious activities in the U.S., 103.
- Is at greatest crisis of its history, 103.
- An outline of its sinister aims, 103, 104.
- Its greatest hope is to capture the U.S., 104.
- Would make a corrupt bargain with Capitalism, 104.
- None of its priests in the U.S. denounced the World War, 107.
- Roosevelt, Mrs. F. D., saved peanut vendor's business, 74.
- Roosevelt, President F. D., are 50 percent of his advisers Jewish, 18.
- Refuses to shut out Japanese goods, 34.
- What nations did he refer to in speech of January 3, 1936, 67.
- His plea for peace based on generalities, 68.
- Did not name Jews to Supreme Court, 70.
- Could not meet problems of depression by adhering to Democratic platform, 101.
- Served Capitalism as it was never served before, 101.
- Did not steal Socialists' pants, 101.
- Proof that he did not adopt Socialist platform, 102.
- Failed to socialize banks after crisis, 102.
- Rose, Tommy, established record for flight from England to South Africa, 105.
- Rosenberg, Alfred, outlines a grandiose scheme of German conquest, 20.
- Royce, Josiah, quoted by President Roosevelt, 94.
- Rubber goods, is it ethical to advertise them, 113.
- Rumania, oppressed the Jews for many years, 8.
- Rumanian Jews, give King Carol credit for their improved status, 8.
- Runyon, Damon, an expert in unreality, 15.
- Russell, Bertrand, was jailed as a conscientious objector against war, 109.
- His *A Free Man's Worship* is an intellectual adventure, 93.
- Russian Revolution, caused surprisingly small loss of life, 109.
- Rutherford, Judge, claims "millions will never die," 53.
- "Safety-first" argument, is based on intellectual cowardice, 71.
- An illustration of its absurdity, 71.
- Can be used to justify any absurd superstition, 71.
- Sales tax, will it abolish tax sales, 31.
- Will work to disadvantage of persons of small income, 31, 32.
- San Francisco, handles larger volume of shipping than Los Angeles, 26.
- Scandinavian countries, have governments headed by Socialists, 21.
- Schacht, Dr. H., is Hitler's economic dictator, 85.
- Has gutted Germany's financial institutions, 85, 86.
- What will happen if Hitler kicks him out, 86.
- Schade, J. W., comments on Germany's synthetic rubber, 111.
- Science, can it create life, 115.
- Scoville, John W., estimates increase in number of automobiles, 53.
- Self-Education, a list of books which will be of value in, 17, 18.
- How to achieve it, 29.
- Key to it is found in good reading, 29.
- Semantics, definition of, 15.
- Sharks, never sleep or rest, 38.
- Sherwin Cody School, its English course is high-priced, 113.

- Sikorsky, Igor I., predicts amazing growth of air clippers, 44.
 Comments on stratospheric flying, 44.
- Silver, world supply of, 61.
- Sinclair, Upton, his EPIC is dead, 81.
 Was honest and uncommercial in his movement, 81.
- Skilled labor, is there a shortage of it, 112.
- Smith, Al, makes baseless charge that Roosevelt is a Socialist, 101.
 Was appointed to do the Liberty League's dirty work, 102.
 Shows Catholic bias in his attack on Roosevelt, 102.
 Is most prominent lay voice of the Catholic Church, 102.
- Socialism, its status in Scandinavian countries, 21.
 Would not take over small enterprises, 26.
 How would leaders of industry be chosen under, 37.
 Details of its administration remain to be worked out, 37.
 Would produce wheat for use, 38.
 How would wages of workers be determined under, 38.
 Would pay workers full social value of what they produce, 38.
 Contrasted with Communism, 38, 39.
 Insists that civil rights be safeguarded, 54.
 Lack of support for it implies stupidity of voters, 72.
 Is shunned by those whom it would benefit most, 87.
- Socialism and Communism, are not synonymous, 54.
 Differ on question of what should be socialized, 55.
- Socialist party, repudiates violence, 3.
 Its attitude toward the Townsend Plan, 29.
- Socialists, carried American flag in N. Y. parade, 32, 33.
 Are working for industrial democracy, 37.
 Introduce sane old age pensions systems, 47.
 Believe in achieving their goal through legal means, 55.
- Socialization, is the only remedy for the ills of Capitalism, 21, 22.
 Its accomplishment will require world's best brains, 22.
 Would make opportunities for unemployed youth, 37.
- Soule, George, tells why tourists need surveillance in the Soviet Union, 92.
- Soviet Union, forms alliances with imperialists, 3.
 United with France in a military alliance, 4.
 Its foreign policy based on self-preservation, 5.
 Has abandoned ideal of world-revolution, 5.
 Would attack Japan from the air in event of war, 9.
 Is menaced by Hitler's militarism, 9.
 Would soon be strong enough to defeat Germany, 10.
 Has only two Jews in positions of importance, 18.
 Its transition to Socialism upset a Marxian theory, 26.
 How it enforces laws against anti-Semitism, 36.
 Number of beggars in, 36.
 Wants only peace and security, 36.
 Amount of territory it lost, 36.
 Statistics of production in light industry, 37.
 Warns Hitler's government against invading Russia, 47, 48.
 Has always repaid its obligations promptly, 48.
 Refuses to pay debts of Czar and Kerensky, 48.
 Does not permit minds of its children to be warped by religious superstition, 53.
 Has not yet achieved Communism, 55.
 Still persecutes Socialists, 56.
 The results of its "godlessness," 56.
 No longer judges persons by their class background, 57.
 Is making increasing use of tractors, 65.
 Statistics of production in heavy industry, 65.
 Wealth productivity of its workers has increased greatly, 65.
 Why its increased production is not a cause of unemployment, 65, 66.
 Is headed in the right direction, 66.
 Number of doctors and nurses in, 67.
 Increased its production of cotton in 1935, 70.
 Aims to make its people "most beautiful and best dressed in world," 70.
 Buys large quantity of cotton from U.S., 70.
 Is making progress in direction of complete Socialism, 73.
 Present size of its standing army, 76.
 Prepares to resist aggression by Japan and Germany, 76.
 Increases army pay, 76.
 Its military preparations are purely defensive, 76.
 Budget for 1936, 77.
 Military budget for 1936, 77.
 Would disarm if it felt secure, 77.
 Its rail transportation is increasing, 83.
 Does not restrict activities of tourists, 92.
 Its official attitude towards tobacco, 95.
 Its attitude towards religion, 104.
 Provisions of its Constitution relating to religion, 105.
 Statistics of its gold industry, 105.
 Is now second largest producer of gold, 105.
 Description of its gold industry, 105.

- Defends itself vigorously against internal enemies, 109, 110.
Usually releases announcements of executions, 110.
- Spanish Armada**, its size compared to Bremen, 26.
- Speed-up**, its effect in cigarette industry, 3.
- Stakhanoffism**, how it differs from the "speed-up," 60, 61.
- Stalin, Joseph**, asked French Communists to stop agitating against French militarism, 3.
Explains his conception of dictatorship of the proletariat, 26, 27.
How tall is he, 62.
His reply to Lady Astor's question, 109.
- Stirner, Max**, wrote *The Ego and His Own*, 49.
- Strachstein, Dr. A.**, complains of advertisement in *The American Freeman*, 112.
Wrote *The Price We Pay*, 113.
- Straw-polls**, can become the tool of propagandists, 81.
- Streicher, Julius**, publishes reams of pornography, 99.
- Sunset at Chagford**, poem by T. E. Brown, 114.
- Sweden**, its economic condition is continually improving, 11.
Has benefited from socialistic policies, 11.
Has a Socialist premier, 11.
Its level of industrial activity now highest since 1920, 11.
Only one percent of its workers unemployed, 11.
Has amazingly low national debt, 12.
Much of its trade handled through cooperatives, 12.
Leads the world in rural electrification, 12.
A summary of its achievements, 96.
Its progress a tribute to socialistic administration, 96.
Has high ratio of phones and automobiles, 96.
Many of its industries are socialized, 96.
Has an advanced housing program, 96.
- Switzerland**, is one of the world's most advanced democracies, 20.
- Synthetic rubber**, cannot compete with natural product, 54.
- "Tale of Two Cities,"** an estimate of its movie version, 58.
Depicts revolutionists as blood-thirsty, drunken hoodlums, 58.
Is featured by fine acting, 59.
- Tasnier, Lieutenant Colonel**, estimates size of Hitler's army, 104.
- Tax reform**, would alleviate, but not cure, the ills of Capitalism, 72.
- Tejeda, Colonel A.**, tells of Catholic Church's reactionary influence in Mexican life, 51.
- The American Guide**, will be compiled by writers on relief rolls, 40.
- The Ego and His Own**, an involved and tedious work, 50.
- The Fellowship Forum**, its anti-Catholicism is based on Protestant bigotry, 93.
Is a weapon of incipient Fascism, 93.
- Theism**, a presentation of the "safety-first" argument for, 70.
An illogical argument in favor of, 115.
- The Price We Pay**, is a valuable treatise on venereal diseases, 113.
- The Stormer**, is the most disreputable sheet in history, 24.
- The Townsend Weekly**, is making a fortune for its promoters, 50.
- Toscanini**, does he "despise" Tschai-kowsky's music, 51.
Is not a nationalist, 51.
Led protests against Hitleristic persecutions, 51.
An estimate of, 83, 84.
- Townsend, Dr. F. E.**, a proof that he and his partner own the *The Townsend Weekly*, 50.
Is a money-mad racketeer, 60.
Refuses to meet his opponents in debate, 60.
- Townsend movement**, is subject to Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 79.
- Townsend Plan**, condemned by Socialist party, 29, 30.
Statistics of, 49.
A summary of arguments against it, 59, 60.
Is economically unsound, 60.
Injures prospects of securing a reasonable old age pension, 60.
- Tschai-kowsky**, an estimate of his music, 51, 52.
- Turkeys**, how to improve their appetites, 57.
- Twain, Mark**, rejected Theism and immortality, 52.
His *Mysterious Stranger* is a masterpiece of Freethought, 52.
His 1601 is a splay bit of pornography, 69.
- United Front**, will do much to avert the perils of war and Fascism, 68.
- United States**, could learn much from Sweden, 12.
Its annual consumption of tobacco compared with Italy, 14.
Should increase its purchases from Japan, 34.
Standard of living of its workers still higher than that of Soviet Union, 66.
Can become a third-rate power if it builds Chinese Wall around itself, 73.
Did it sell munitions to Germany during the World War, 82, 83.
Has a shameful record of violence against strikers, 110.
- U.S. Army**, conditions of enlistment in, 53.

- U.S. Congress, tonsorial statistics of, 116.
- U.S. Employment Service, number registered under, 112.
- U.S. farmers, number of cars owned by them, 54.
- U.S. government, how it is helping writers, 40.
- Its debt compared to that of state and local governments, 67.
- Expends less for charges on debt than does Great Britain, 67.
- Number of its employes in District of Columbia, 111.
- Extent of its silver and gold holdings, 112.
- Number of persons on its payrolls, 112.
- U.S. Postal Savings Banks, give the depositor 100 percent protection, 27.
- Are safe, regardless of country's finances, 94.
- U.S. Postoffice department, always strives to give courteous, efficient service, 75.
- U.S. Supreme Court, average age of Justices, 77.
- U.S. Supreme Court building, no lives were lost in its construction, 49.
- U.S. textile interests, seek higher tariff on Japanese textiles, 34.
- U.S. Treasury, does not guarantee bank deposits, 75.
- U.S. World War veterans, daily mortality rate of, 89.
- Unity School of Christianity, is a commercial racket, 42.
- Universe, evidence indicates that it is eternal, 116.
- Vaccination, its value recognized by every civilized country, 78.
- Van Loon, Hendrik W., wrote *Ships and How They Sailed the Seven Seas*, 26.
- Veterans of the G.A.R., are entitled to their pensions, 45.
- Voltaire, did not write words attributed to him, 44, 45.
- His policy was sane and sensible, 45.
- Would not "fight to the death" for anything, 45.
- Waldman, Louis, voices opposition of "Old Guard" Socialists to Communists, 45.
- Wall Street, would use the Catholic Church to inaugurate Fascism, 24.
- Is not alarmed by Townsend Plan, 60.
- War, is on the way, 10.
- Its chief cause lies in clashes of economic interests, 78.
- Is glorious—when others do the fighting, 88.
- War debts, were based on commodities, not money, 42.
- Washington, D.C., how many tourists visit it, 111.
- Wheat, how much should be stored as a safeguard against crop failure, 38.
- Winrod, Rev. Gerald B., relies on discredited Protocols for his campaign of anti-Semitism, 31.
- Makes lying claim that Lenin was a Jew, 31.
- His sheet reeks with filth and lies, 96, 97.
- Wood, amount consumed by average person in lifetime, 88.
- Woodsworth, J. S., fights Canadian censorship, 13.
- Wool substitutes, are not as yet practicable, 54.
- Woolworth Company, number of stores in Germany, 104.
- Workers of the world, are impoverished by Capitalism, 22.
- World peace, could be maintained by an understanding among the U.S., Great Britain and the Soviet Union, 68.
- World trade, a summary of its development in the past century, 21.
- Suffered a staggering loss as a result of the depression, 21.
- World War, statistics of its cost to the U.S., 95.
- WPA, number of persons employed under, 112.
- Wrinkles, can they be prevented by use of face cream, 39.
- Wylie, Dr. C. C., gives statistics of fall of meteors, 77.
- X-Basin, comment on, 43.
- Zionists, seek to establish national home in a barren country, 16.
- Have no intention of trying to rule world, 29.