

Eighth Series

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

E. Haldeman-Julius

EIGHTH 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

Governor Eugene Talmadge, Georgia's great demagogue, recently vetoed a 1936 legislative measure designed to let Georgia participate in the national social security program. Later, he appeared before the Ministerial Association of Mercer University, and gave the following explanation of his opposition to old age pensions:

"It won't work because it kills the ambition of every young man and woman to set aside something to care for them in their old age. . . . It weakens the souls of men and women when the initiative to do is taken away from them."

This action and expression of policy led another Georgian, C. F. H. Morgan, a *Freeman* reader who lives at Hapeville, to put down his feeling of protest in a poem that rings with sarcasm, irony and denunciation. The piece:

THE OLD ORDER SPEAKS

What care I for the woes of age?

Why should I burst in tears,
Or ease the burdens of the old
In their declining years?

Why should a State or Nation care
For those too old to toil—
Too old for factory or mine—
Too old to till the soil?

What use are they, these aged ones
Who drag themselves around?
Industrial jobs they cannot fill,
Nor can they plow the ground.

Then why should they be pensioned off
When they can work no more?
Just let them live among their kin,
Or beg from door to door!

What matters it if they have worked
In sleet and snow and rain,
From month to month and year to year,
In poverty and pain.

Their days of usefulness are gone;
Though clothes and food they lack,
It is not right to give to them
The things they can't pay back.

Although they've tilled our lands and
made
Us very rich indeed,

We do them wrong to pension them
Or help them in their need.

No longer can these feeble ones
Their names in commerce carve,
So let their children care for them,
Or else—just let them starve!

* * *

Why is it the press and other mediums of publicity say nothing about the great number of service charges the banks are slapping on depositors?

The answer is very simple. The press is capitalistic and therefore in sympathy with the policies of the bankers. Besides, very few newspaper publishers are hit by these service charges, because they are rich business establishments with such large cash balances that the banks can't touch them. In order to keep the publishers satisfied the bankers go easy in order to keep the columns of the press free from complaints made by depositors of small means, who have to pay for everything—from making a deposit to writing a check. However, once in a while one meets a word of comment, even in the press. The *Chicago Daily News*, in its issue of April 29, 1936, has a humorous skit joshing the bankers. The report tells of a meeting of the Chicago Financial Advertisers Association, where members put on a sketch entitled "The March of Banking." The scene shows a bank lobby flanked with ticket boxes bearing the sign, "Admission to Lobby, 10 cents—children 5 cents." Large placards set forth:

SERVICE CHARGES

Deposit slips, 1 cent.

Checks cashed, 15 cents, two for 25 cents.

Conference with cashier, 7 cents per minute.

Vice-president's handshake, 5 cents.

Vice-president's smile, 4 cents.

Fountain pens filled, 3 cents.

Statements of condition, 10 cents each; by subscription, 30 cents a year. Postage extra.

With a bargain as an inducement:

SPECIAL TODAY

Chat with our chief

Loaning officer, 50 cent value.

Today only 39 cents.

You save 11 cents!

I'm afraid these humorists have started something. There are several suggestions in the above skit which the bankers have overlooked, but which they are now likely to include in their schedule, especially the one which charges the depositor 7c for a minute's conference with the cashier. Funny they never thought of that one. But give 'em time.

* * *

Will Blum inaugurate Socialism?

Should Leon Blum become France's premier in June—and at this writing that seems almost inevitable—he will take charge of the government as the leader of a minority party, for the Socialist party of France didn't get a majority in the recent election. Even with the Communists, the Left still lacks that much needed majority. The Radical Socialists are a part of the Popular Front, but they aren't Socialists, despite their name. In France a Radical Socialist compares with a Rooseveltian New Dealer, with strong principles in support of liberalism and democracy.

The Socialists, under Blum, want the socialization of the large-scale industries. The Communists, who now have a strong bloc in the Chamber of Deputies—but only about half the strength of the Socialists—want a dictatorship of the proletariat. Blum's position, therefore, is difficult. He has met the issue squarely by stating that he has no mandate from the French people to establish Socialism.

The millions of French voters—workers, middle class members, peasants, etc.—want Blum in France's most powerful political office, not to establish Socialism but to defend Democracy and crush Fascism. These two jobs Blum says he will perform—but within the limits of the Capitalist system. Not until the French people give him an overwhelming majority will he move in the direction of Socialism.

Meanwhile, he will oppose devaluation of the franc, because to permit the reactionaries to ruin France's monetary system would impoverish millions of thrifty, but poor, people. He will institute a vast program of public works, in order to help the unemployed and bring business back

to better days. He will, most likely, completely outlaw the private armies of the Fascist forces. So much for Blum's domestic policies.

In the international arena, Blum will stand for a great League of Nations, as a force for peace. He is opposed to the policies of imperialistic Mussolini, and will strive to use the machinery of the League to curb that international menace. It's even likely that he will offer to strengthen the sanctions against Italy, for he knows very well that even the weak sanctions put across by Eden have had amazing results. Official figures show that in March, 1936, Italy's foreign trade amounted to only about \$6,000,000 as against \$131,000,000 in March, 1935—clear proof that the economic weapon of sanctions can be used for the purposes of peace, provided, of course, those who impose the sanctions are sincere and mean business.

Hitler, a greater war menace than Mussolini, will find himself faced by a statesman who knows his powers and is unafraid to use them. As Blum said, in a speech in May, he would strive for peace, with Hitler, without Hitler, or against Hitler. Those words say a great deal, and I'm pretty sure Hitler will find it unwise to defy a French government headed by Leon Blum.

↑ * * *

How do Russia and Japan compare with regard to scientific research?

Japan has 45 institutions for scientific research, with a staff of 3,500; Russia has 840 such establishments, with 48,000 employees.

* * *

Are we appropriating more than \$1,000,000,000 on our army and navy to defend our coasts against attack?

We are spending, during the year ending June 30, 1937, more on armaments than during any year in our peace-time history. The facts indicate that these weapons are intended for purposes of aggression instead of defense. For example, we have spent comparatively little on our Atlantic and Pacific coasts, but we have invested heavily—and will pour additional money—in fortifying Hawaii and other points distant from our shores. When Franklin D. Roosevelt was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he said:

"Strictly speaking, if national de-

fense applies solely to the prevention of an army landing on our Atlantic or Pacific coasts; no navy at all is necessary."

The Roosevelt of 1936 should study carefully the words of the younger Roosevelt who was in the Navy department. There is some authority for the opinion that the national defense of the U.S. consists solely of defending our two coasts. Militaristic and navalistic enterprises in places outside the U.S. imply imperialistic designs.

How does American aviation compare with the rest of the world?

The Aircraft Year Book, for 1936, reports that "American airlines are doing more business than those of the rest of the world combined. There is more private flying, more charter service and more practical everyday use of airplanes."

The U.S. still holds its lead in technical development. According to the authority just quoted:

"Prior to 1935, U.S. was nearly three years ahead of other nations in the science of designing and constructing airplanes; this margin has been reduced to about 18 months. This is held due to increased government expenditures during the last two years in Great Britain, France, Italy and Germany where research and experimentation have been subsidized in support of military aviation, without regard to cost."

What is the correct pronunciation of the Japanese emperor's name?

Hee-ro-hee-toe (without accent on any syllable, as is the rule with all Japanese names).

When the Pulitzer prizes were announced over the radio, Clayton Hamilton, the drama critic, and Harry Hansen, the book reviewer, pronounced it "Pew-litzer." Is this correct?

The right pronunciation is "Pullitzer."

How much money did each President spend, down to the year before the World War?

President	Years	Expenditures
Washington ..	1789-1796	\$ 34,069,000
J. Adams	1797-1800	34,263,000
Jefferson	1801-1808	72,424,000
Madison	1809-1816	176,475,000
Monroe	1817-1824	147,239,000
J. Q. Adams ..	1825-1829	66,027,000
Jackson	1829-1836	152,970,000

Van Buren ...	1837-1840	122,325,000
Harrison-Tyler	1841-1845	108,905,000
Polk	1846-1849	175,477,000
Taylor-Fillmore	1850-1853	179,631,000
Pierce	1854-1857	255,164,000
Buchanan	1858-1861	272,934,000
Lincoln	1862-1865	3,352,381,000
Johnson	1865-1869	1,578,557,000
Grant	1870-1877	2,253,386,000
Hayes	1878-1882	1,032,268,000
Garfield-Arthur	1882-1885	1,028,324,000
Cleveland	1886-1889	1,077,629,000
Harrison	1890-1893	1,412,316,000
Cleveland	1894-1897	1,441,673,000
McKinley	1898-1901	2,093,919,000
T. Roosevelt ..	1902-1909	4,655,450,000
Taft	1910-1913	2,799,212,000
Total for 124 years		\$24,523,046,000

Does HOLC work out all right?

The government organized the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the purpose of helping, with loans, home owners in arrears with taxes, mortgage payments and interest. Since the borrowers were already in distress a heavy percentage of bad risks could be looked for, yet the facts indicate surprisingly good results. The bad risks are turning out to be good payers. Up to March 31, 1936, HOLC received payments of \$267,799,000, on loans and interest. By that date the government was to have received \$356,354,996. This means that HOLC received 80 percent of the money due it. The remaining debtors—about 20 percent—are by no means classifiable as entirely bad. HOLC, by March 31, had granted 1,100,000 loans in cities, with less than 1 percent resulting in foreclosures or voluntary deeds.

Please comment on the recent national convention of the Socialist party.

The 1936 national convention of the Socialist Party of the United States, which finished its work in Cleveland, Ohio, on May 26, nominated a strong national ticket and wrote a platform that points the way to peace, social justice and prosperity. Norman Thomas, as Socialist candidate for President, will be effective, for he is a brilliant and resourceful campaigner. But it's the platform that is of first importance, because it outlines the Socialist case against Capitalism and proposes the ultimate and immediate changes needed to establish social security.

The small group of would-be delegates (they were not permitted to take

their seats because others contested and won the right to attend the convention) gave the convention, for a while, an atmosphere of dissension, but the body, by a heavy vote, soon disposed of these disrupters. The Old Guard, as the conservatives like to call themselves, finally split away from the organization on the unestablished score of the Leftists' communistic tendencies. Such a reason couldn't hold water, because the facts showed clearly that the Leftists or Militants (led by Norman Thomas) voted unanimously to table a letter from Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist party, in which the suggestion was made that the Socialists and Communists pool their campaign, with Thomas as candidate for President, and Browder, for Vice President. Had the Rightists been correct in their criticism of the Leftists, it seems the Communist proposal would have been accepted, but instead the convention rejected the so-called united front. In other ways, the convention showed its loyalty to straight Socialism, above all in the well-constructed platform, which, of course, is the official utterance of the party in the present national campaign.

I believe it would be wise to outline its main points and make comments where they seem to be needed. The document starts off with a section which carries the headline: "For a Socialist America." Here we get a clear definition of the long-term objective of the party:

"The Socialist Party of the United States pledges itself anew to the task of building a Socialist society, under which the industries of the country shall be socially owned and democratically managed for the common good; a society under which security, plenty, peace and freedom shall be the heritage of all."

I have, on numerous occasions, pointed out that the Socialist party, unlike the Communist organization, wants to socialize only the large-scale industries. In another paragraph, the platform confirms this, as follows:

"Social Ownership.—We propose the social ownership and democratic control of the mines, the railroads, the power industry and other key industries."

The word "key" covers the idea

quite well, though it might be a little clearer if it had followed "large-scale." However, that's what "key industries" means, so let's not quibble. In this plank the Socialist party is far ahead of the Communists in working out a program closer to the needs of the American people. The Communists, who would socialize everything from a railroad down to a peanut stand, are proposing something which is unwieldy, undesirable, unscientific, and socially wasteful. The problems of Capitalism are created by the capitalistic ownership of the great engines of production, distribution and exchange, and not by the operators of one-man filling stations or barbecue stands. So, why bother with the small fry, when it's really the great key industries that we are aiming at? Here, as I've already stated, the Socialist party comes closer to the correct policy. Should America ever decide to leave its charlatans of the Townsend and Coughlin type and turn to the scientific answer, it's pretty clear that the platform of the Socialist party would be the document that would be studied and followed.

The Socialist party, in the paragraphs just quoted from the 1936 platform, comes out clearly for democracy in industry and freedom—two ideas that are not acceptable to the Communists, who describe democracy as a bourgeois myth and freedom as a license to believe or speak what is wrong. You see, they set themselves up as infallible popes—if your ideas aren't exactly in line with the wishes of the party machine you are to be denied the rights of speech, press, assembly, etc.—civil liberties which the 1936 Socialist platform goes to the trouble to defend. Let me quote the section entitled "Civil Liberties":

"We urge the abolition of all laws that interfere with the right of free speech, free press, free assembly and the peaceful activities of labor in its struggle for organization and power; the enforcement of constitutional guarantees of economic, political, legal and social equality for the Negro and all other anti-lynching and anti-Jim Crow laws."

That, I hold, is an important issue that's met without hedging or quibbling. Attempting no evasions, the

1936 platform fights for full civil rights—not only for the whites but for the oppressed black minority as well.

The platform's position on the farm question is clear and simple. It settles once for all, in words that can't be misunderstood, the fear of those farmers who hold the unfounded notion that the Socialist movement intends to dispossess them and socialize their farms. Here are the words as they appear in the 1936 platform:

"The farmer working his own farm would be secure in its possession."

Note here that the Socialists, unlike the Communists, insist on protecting the individual farmer who is working his own land. Such holdings would never be forcibly collectivized by the Socialists, whereas, on the other hand, the Communists in Russia went to every limit in their program of compulsory socialization of the farms. The 1936 platform holds, however, that great plantations and ranches, or farms operated by corporations, will be socialized and operated by farmers' cooperatives. Other important points on the farm question, as covered in this 1936 platform, follow:

Agriculture. We propose the abolition of tenant and corporation farming and the substitution of the use and occupancy title for family-sized farms and the conversion of plantations and corporation farms into cooperative farms.

We propose that the marketing, processing, and distribution of farm products be taken over by bona fide cooperatives and other agencies to be created for this purpose.

We propose that farm prices be stabilized at cost of production to the working farmer, such stabilization to be made by representatives of organized working farmers and consumers.

1. In the meantime, we propose:

That immediate relief be provided for debt-laden working farmers by advancing credit to working farmers on such carrying charges as do not threaten the farmer with the loss of his farm.

2. That social insurance be provided against crop failures, the cost of such insurance to be covered by income, inheritance and corporation taxes.

Aware of the usurpations of the

Supreme Court, the 1936 platform comes out for a constitutional program that will fit the problems of today, as follows:

Constitution. The adaptation of the Constitution to the needs of the times, among other things, through the farmers' and workers' rights amendment ending the usurped power of the Supreme Court to declare social legislation unconstitutional and granting the power to acquire and operate industries; through an amendment making future amendments less difficult, and the child labor amendment.

Here are a few other immediate demands:

Relief, insurance, jobs. We propose an immediate appropriation by Congress of \$6,000,000,000 to continue Federal relief to the unemployed for the next year; the continuance of WPA projects at union wages; a Federal system of unemployment and old-age pensions for persons 60 years of age or over, with contributions from the Federal Government, such contributions to be raised from taxes on incomes and inheritances as provided in the Frazier-Lundeen bill.

Socialized medicine: We propose adequate medical care of the sick and injured as a social function, right and duty, and not as a private or public charity. This to be financed by taxation, similar to the public educational system or governmental functions, and to be democratically administered.

Taxation. We propose a drastic increase in income and inheritance taxes on the higher income levels and of excess-profit taxes, and wide experimentation in land-values taxation.

Labor legislation. We propose the establishment of the 30-hour week, the abolition of injunctions in labor disputes, the prohibition of company unions, company spying and private guards and gunmen, the prohibition of the use of the police, deputy sheriffs and militia and Federal troops in labor disputes.

The 1936 platform minces no words when it comes to the section on militarism and war. We find the party's position outlined in the following section:

Militarism and War.—We reaffirm the historic position of the Socialist Party of the United States in opposition to war. We propose

the drastic reduction of armament with a view to total disarmament; the elimination of military training from our schools; the abandonment of imperialist adventures of the military or economic nature abroad; the maintenance of friendly relations with Soviet Russia, and the strengthening of neutrality laws, to the end that we may ward off immediate wars while fighting for the attainment of a social order which will eliminate the chief causes of war.

Not a penny, not a man to the military aims of the government, unconditional opposition to any war engaged in by the American Government.

The Socialist party calls upon the workers, farmers and all advocates of social justice to join with it in its struggle to widen the channels through which may be made peaceful, orderly and democratic progress; to resist all trends toward insecurity, fascism and war; to strengthen labor in its battles for better conditions and for increasing power; to refuse to support the parties of capitalism, or any of their candidates, and to unite with it in its historic struggle toward a cooperative world.

In the first half of the 1936 platform we find a terse, but comprehensive, outline of the party's case against the old and new deals of Hooverism and Rooseveltism, with an enlightening discussion of the faults of capitalistic economics. These paragraphs I prefer to use below, in full:

Eight years ago the people of this country voted to continue the capitalist old deal. The purpose of this deal was to preserve the rights of the few who own most of the nation's wealth. Under the old deal, the economic machine was plunged into the worst depression in our history.

Four years ago the voters of the United States threw their support to the New Deal. They elected to office Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic party. The New Deal, like the Old Deal, has utterly failed. Under it, big business was given almost unheard-of powers. Untold wealth was destroyed. Prices rose. Profits advanced. Wages lagged. Twelve million men and women are still jobless, and hunger and destitution exist throughout the land.

Under the New Deal, attacks have been made on our civil liber-

ties, more vicious than at any period since the days immediately following the World War. Gag and loyalty bills have been rushed through our Legislatures. Labor organizers have been seized, kidnapped, maltreated, killed.

The militia has been used to crush attempts of labor to organize. Lynching, race discrimination and the development of Fascist trends have continued unabated. Against these infringements of human rights, the Democratic administration has kept an ominous silence.

Under the New Deal, we are now spending on our army and navy three times as much as before the World War, the purposes of which are the suppression of unrest at home and the protection and expansion of American imperialism abroad.

Under the capitalist Old Deal and the capitalist New Deal, America has drifted increasingly toward insecurity, suppression and war.

Insecurity is but the logical result of the workings of capitalism. For under capitalism, new and old, the many work for the owners of the machines and land. The owners will not employ the workers unless they expect to extract a profit. Labor is forced to divide up its earnings with the owning group.

With their scanty wages, the workers are able to buy only a part of the goods which they create. Goods pile up. Factories close. Workers are discharged. The country finds itself face to face with another depression.

In the past, after a period of hard times, we could depend upon the settlement of the West, the development of new foreign markets and the rapid expansion of our population to revive industry. These forces can no longer be depended upon as formerly to keep the system going, while our gross and unjust inequality of wealth, our monopoly prices and our growing debt structure are sowing the seeds of more tragic depressions in the days ahead.

Our capitalist system is also sowing the seeds of dictatorship. As unemployment increases under capitalism, the masses, to save themselves from starvation, are compelled to make even greater demands on the government for relief and for public jobs. These demands are resisted by the propertied classes, fearful of higher taxes. Restlessness grows.

Demands for greater appropriations increase. The struggle be-

tween the house of have and the house of want becomes ever more intense. Big business seeks to deny the masses their constitutional rights. Fascist trends develop, trends that only a powerful and militant labor movement on the economic and political fields can successfully stay.

Militarism, likewise, under a declining capitalism, becomes an ever greater menace. As unrest increases, the masters of industry seek to use the military forces as the bulwark of reaction at home. They support higher military budgets. They look toward imperialist adventures abroad as a means of diverting attention from the unrest at home, and of gaining new markets, new investment areas, new sources of raw material.

A race begins that can have but one ending—an international war. The Japanese seizure of Manchuria, and Italy's invasion of Ethiopia are but examples of the forces at work under capitalism. These adventures may well be the forerunners of another world conflict.

In Socialism and in Socialism alone will we find the solution of our problem. Under Socialism, the socially necessary industries would be socially owned and democratically administered by workers, consumers and technicians. The farmer working his own farm would be secure in its possession. The workers would no longer be forced to pay tribute to private owners. They would be able to buy back the goods they created.

Industry, finding a market for these goods, would run without periodic breakdowns. Unemployment, and the wastes of unplanned industry, would cease. Our national income would double or treble. Every useful worker would be assured of high living standards, short hours, freedom and liberty and a chance to enjoy a good life. Industrial autocracy and war would pass. An economy of scarcity would give way to an economy of abundance.

When one reads such a sound, intelligent review of our problems and the remedy for them, one wonders why the workers and farmers will rush to the polls next November to divide their votes between Roosevelt and the Republican party, for these have nothing tangible to offer the masses, except meager, temporary relief while the system blunders its way in the direction of a

sham boom that's to be followed by another depression. But here we must recognize the fact that the owning class controls the press, radio, churches, etc., and these mediums are used to keep the people from establishing a just social order. The remedy is by no means easy, but it can't be escaped. The people will have to build their own press and party, pledged to a program of socialization. I don't know what the vote for Norman Thomas will be this election, and I wouldn't even care to guess, but this I know: The workers and farmers will give more votes to their class enemies than to the organization that's dedicated to their economic, social and political emancipation. But this, I hold, should be no cause for pessimism. The answer is to accept the challenge. There's work to be done, and it won't be hurried by magicians. It'll take lots of time, energy, sacrifice and money—but it's a job well worth doing.

* * *

What's the position of the Socialist party with regard to violent uprisings?

This is one of the points on which the party differs from the Communist organization. The latter, of course, believe that the change to Socialism can come only by an armed uprising, while the Socialists hold that it's possible to bring about social changes, in democratic countries, through orderly, legal processes.

At the Cleveland national convention of the Socialist party, in May, 1936, the body outlined its policy with regard to armed insurrection, in a resolution which reads as follows:

The ability of the Socialist party to continue to rule and build Socialism once it has won partial power will depend upon the active support of the masses of the nation. The Socialist party, therefore, firmly believes in the strengthening and maintenance of existing democratic institutions through which the Socialist will of the masses may be cultivated and expressed. The policy of armed insurrection as a minority against a stable state machinery is romantic impossibility, entirely inconsistent with membership in the Socialist party. Advocacy of such a policy is rejected by the Socialist party.

The Socialist party, however, will never surrender cheaply the human liberties and democratic rights for

which generations of American workers have paid so dearly, nor will it permit the will of the masses to be frustrated by Fascist dictatorship. In defense of the workers' rights and in enforcement of the democratically expressed will of the masses, the Socialist party calls upon the workers to stand ready to meet reactionary violence with every weapon at their disposal.

✱ ✱ ✱ ✱

What's your opinion of journalism?

Recently, there came to my desk a clipping from the Sedan, Kansas. *Advertiser-Journal*, a journal which I'd never seen before, or since. The clipping had my name on it—properly spelled, hyphen and all. (I still read all clippings which carry my name, and most likely will always do that.) This piece sounded familiar—it read like me, and, by jove, it was mine, though I couldn't remember when I'd written it. Roughly, I'd say the piece was turned out at least 15 years ago, and how it found itself in the columns of the Sedan paper is beyond me. The short article is entitled "Literature and Journalism," which I believe will answer your question. Here it is:

Literature and journalism are the same. Good literature is the flower of journalism, Journalism becomes great literature when it reports the immediate but achieves more than temporary significance. While all journalists are not litterateurs, it is true that faithful depicitors or interpreters of life, writers who catch and hold its values, achieve more than a passing importance.

After all, what was Plato, aside from his philosophical insight, but a great reporter? He heard discussions and conducted interviews. He reported what he thought was interesting. Aristophanes used the theater to pass on his comments on political and social developments. He was a great editorial writer. If he were living today he would probably be a columnist and a very good one, I believe. I could go down the line and characterize one immortal after another—Moliere, Ibsen, Tolstoy, Balzac, Aesop, Machiavelli, some of the writers of the books of the Bible—and the result would be simply this: Great literature is great journalism. Journalism did not begin with the manufacture of newsprint and the invention of rotary presses. A vast

amount of journalism is found on stone and clay slabs.

In addition to creating as good a journalism as we know how, we try to go further and become salesmen of the truth as we see it. We not only manufacture reading, but we seek always to create readers. Like the munitions manufacturers who sigh for new wars that their machinery may be kept going full tilt, we conspire, worthily, of course, to create new readers that our presses may continue to turn out what we think the public should read.

✱ ✱ ✱ ✱

I wish to take a correspondence course in accounting. Please advise.

There are many correspondence courses in accounting. The La Salle Extension Course, mailed from Chicago, offers reliable service, but the price is too high—\$165. I believe you can get what you want through a correspondence course offered by the University of Minnesota, consisting of 22 lessons at a cost of only \$13.50. I'm sure you will get more than your money's worth if you will enroll with the Minnesota institution. (This reader sent a dollar to have this question answered in a personal letter, but as I consider the subject to be of wider interest I've decided to print both the question and answer here.)

✱ ✱ ✱ ✱

Knowing that the thousands of answers you have given to questions in the fields of economics, philosophy, religion, science, sociology, etc., indicate that you follow definite lines of thought, I would be glad to have you outline methods for creative, scientific thinking, for it's only by such methods that truth can be discovered.

You've asked me to tell about something that bothers me almost every day of my life—methods of thought. I try my best to achieve the truth, but this is by no means an easy objective. However, long experience has taught me several fundamental principles, which I try to adhere to.

The first thing that always appeals to me as an effective instrument or tool is a desire to study the facts and the ability to get those facts. When I hear heated, violent expressions of opinion, I try my best to remember that emotionalism must be put aside and the facts, if any, examined carefully and candidly. I have found, from experience, that many

people are given to violent, dogmatic, emphatic speech about subjects of which they have scant knowledge. When a man isn't sure about his stand he usually raises his voice and yells. And I've found that a few facts, properly presented, can puncture the most positive disputant. Subjects like religion, patriotism, nationalism, racial superiority, etc., rest on pretty shaky ground, so their adherents make up for their factual weaknesses by resorting to strong, loud, declamatory, intolerant utterances. Their prejudices are numerous, while their facts are meager.

Another important feature of the art of thinking is to make sure that you are getting support from real experts in their fields. Recently, for example, I had an amusing discussion with Upton Sinclair, who, as my readers know, has been won over to the God-idea, Christian Science and a half hundred other notions that are dripping with fallacy and bunk. Sinclair, being an emotional instead of a logical thinker, is given to violent speech when he touches on a subject about which he is the least bit uncertain. So, in order to buttress his weak Theism, he made the claim that preachers live longer than other men because of the help they get from their religion and the serene life that comes from a deep, pure, abiding faith. Also, that Christian Science must be true because its converts live longer than other people. Here, of course, Sinclair made his statements, but failed to quote competent authority or offer even the slightest support of facts and data. Naturally, I knew just how to dispose of my old friend's pathetic nonsense—get the facts from authorities who carry weight in their field.

I turned to the one man who knows the answers to the questions Sinclair brought up. I refer, of course, to Dr. Louis I. Dublin, chief statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. The argument about the Christian Scientists, Dr. Dublin dismissed with the brief, but devastating, comment that there is no information available to support Sinclair's conclusions. Therefore, in all logic, Sinclair had drawn an inference from non-existent information.

The other issue—that preachers live longer than the average—was

also treated factually from information drawn from Dr. Dublin. First of all, the preachers—who do live three years longer than the general male population—have a higher standard of living. Second, they have no occupational hazards. A miner who digs coal eight hours each day for years on end can easily shorten his life by at least three years because of accident, industrial hazards, occupational diseases, low vitality because of bad economic conditions, poor food, bad housing, cheap medical service, etc., and, of course, the general results of fatigue. But the facts went even further. They showed, for example, that the honor graduates of our greatest institutions of learning live, on the average, three years longer than the preachers. Here we turned to Dr. Leuba, an authority in his field, and found that the higher the degree of education the greater the degree of disbelief in religion. His numerous statistics plainly permit this conclusion. So Sinclair's argument—expressed in the heat of prejudice—blew up with a bang. A few facts, carefully selected from competent authorities, disposed of his infantilism. Sinclair is a literary man, and I would listen patiently and respectfully to his opinions on the construction of a novel, but I'd have no hesitancy in questioning any of his inferences with regard to God, Immortality, Christian Science, Religion, and the like. His opinions in these far fields would have no value with me, any more than I'd turn to a physicist like Eddington for opinions about Theism. I have confidence in a great psychologist who talks about his subject, a great astronomer, historian, economist, chemist, etc., but when the astronomer begins to orate about God, and the physicist begins to attack Atheism, and the economist tries to make me a believer in the dogma of Immortality, I'd remember that each authority is now out of his field.

This question of methods of thought has been discussed by some very able men, and at this point I think I'd be doing my readers a constructive service if I were to give the methods and advice of a philosopher, an educator and a scientist—quotations which I am able to pass on because of the investigations made by my

friend in Kansas City, L. M. Birkhead.

First, let's listen to the philosopher, John Dewey:

There are five logically distinct steps in the process of creative thinking:

1. A felt difficulty (or the recognition of a perplexing problem).
2. The location and definition of the difficulty or problem.
3. Suggestion of explanation or possible solution of the problem.
4. Development by reasoning of the bearings of the suggested explanation or solution.
5. Further observation and explanation leading to the acceptance or rejection of a judgment and conclusion.

Second, the educator comes forward with his 10 "rules" which are taken from "A Decalogue of Good Thinking":

1. Draw an inference early; then test it by comparison with all available facts.
2. Weigh the facts with the utmost care.
3. Hold close to the problem, excluding everything that is irrelevant and immaterial.
4. Give chief consideration to typical, as distinguished from exceptional, facts and cases.
5. Revise or relinquish the inference, or withhold final judgment upon it, if it is found to be in certain conflict with any single fact.
6. Avoid premature conclusions: that is, conclusions not fully warranted by the facts, or conclusions based upon knowledge of only a part of the facts.
7. Keep the mind entirely free from bias or prejudice.
8. Think constructively, endeavoring to find the right conclusion rather than merely to prove erroneous the conclusions or opinions of others.
9. Accept conclusions willingly as soon as warranted by the facts.
10. Refrain from discrediting or distorting the facts that tend to refute your own views or from magnifying those that support your views.

Next, and finally, we come to the answers of a scientist, Dr. H. M. Parshley:

The scientific method, which in some form I hold to be our only means of access to objective truth, is easy to understand but hard to practice.

The method of science is simple

—merely a sequence of operations that experience has shown will lead to the discovery of objective fact and useful principle.

Here are the steps:

Observation.

Working hypothesis.

Controlled experimentation or further observation.

Theory or natural law.

Thus it is that reliable knowledge is reached.

First comes the collection of facts or data, as numerous and as accurately recorded as is possible. This may be a matter of simple observation, or it may involve the use of elaborately constructed instruments.

But it always means painstaking and extended effort in bringing the senses to bear on things. The data must be ample.

Science provides information that works, that we can depend on to pass the pragmatic test.

More, it provides all the information there is, for philosophy and religion expressly avoid the materialistic, observational way toward knowledge.

Thus scientific knowledge, imperfect as it is, becomes the criterion of truth, the touchstone, the well of knowledge undefiled, that philosophers and religionists are always seeking and never find.

It is what we mean, objectively, by the word "truth," if we mean anything in this imperfect world.

But a collection of facts, however accurate, is not yet science. What do these facts mean? What features have they in common? How are they correlated? Toward what do they point?

Now the scientific method requires imagination. Surveying his classified facts, the scientist waits upon inspiration. An explanation occurs to him which seems to "account" for all the facts at hand. This is the working hypothesis, which may or may not be true.

The next step in the scientific method likewise involves reason and imagination. It is now necessary to devise experiments which will show whether or not the working hypothesis is correct.

If the hypothesis proves to be supported by critically and sufficiently extended investigation carried out under proper conditions, it takes on the dignity of a theory or natural "law."

It is the possibility of corroboration or verification by any qualified person that marks off scientific fact from everything else that may be

called knowledge and that justifies our insistence that scientific fact is the essential ingredient in truth.

Thus science affords the only safe basis for understanding the world and it is the characteristic method by which true knowledge is discovered.

I've heard or read many speeches, sermons, editorials, articles, books, etc., by persons who are given to approaching debatable topics with no attempt at logical development or substantiation. And, strange to relate, it's such individuals who seem to have the greatest influence with their audiences or readers. They win their superficial victories because the average person isn't anxious to be led in the direction of sound, logical reasoning and the attainment of truth through verifiable data. Such methods are too trying on the brain cells. After all, thinking is, comparatively speaking, a recent development in man's evolution. What was originally used as a mere center for the receipt of nerve impressions—like pain, pleasure, hunger, thirst, cold, warmth, and the like—evolved, through millions of years, into an organ capable of creative thinking. But such an experience is difficult when the biological tools are immature or unwilling to go through the hardships necessary for the establishment of logical orders of thought. I have no figures to support me here, but, at a rough stab in the dark, I'd say that during the past 50,000 years not more than one-thousandth of one percent of the human race ever really tried to use its brains for anything other than central telephone exchanges for the reception of sense impressions. But this doesn't imply such a condition must always prevail. Education, knowledge, the winning of truth over falsehood—all these have been growing measurably during the past few thousand years, and it may be a valid assumption to expect the future to show even greater progress. But that doesn't alter the fact that today the easier way to lead the masses is to resort to the shoddiest kind of thinking—thinking that is nothing more than the expression of sweeping generalizations that could be demonstrated only after the most elaborate verification, and, in most instances, such verification is impos-

sible because the opinion lacks a factual basis.

Let me quote a few of the generalizations I've heard in speeches, sermons, etc., and which were given without proof and accepted without argument:

World problems would be much easier to solve if men were more active in church.

The home is the cornerstone of the nation.

Morality is the cornerstone of the church.

The Negro is inferior because his biological equipment is inferior.

What this country needs is a Mussolini.

Sex is obscene.

My race is pure; all others are mongrels.

My country, right or wrong.

The Immaculate Conception, the Resurrection, the Adam and Eve theory of man's beginning, miracles—all simply must be true because the Bible says they're true.

Russia can never develop idealism because its rulers are Atheists and its government is godless.

The soul lives on. . . .

Over-sexed people inevitably become flabby and degenerate.

Religion is necessary to keep the people from orgies of crime.

A demagogue could work up a speech that would include every sentence listed above, and he would close his oration to a burst of applause—and yet, as I said, every statement made above is highly debatable. I could go on like this with literally hundreds of sentences—all of them delivered as being as acceptable as the multiplication table, but none of them subject to proof, demonstration or analysis. Sometimes the statements are given in the form of a question. Thus, frequently, I've heard speakers defend their prejudices against the Negro by shutting off honest discussion with the rhetorical question: "Well, how would you like to have your daughter marry a nigger?" Or, a supporter of religious superstition will think he has clinched his argument and disposed of his critic by inquiring: "How'd you like to live in a town that didn't have any churches?"

* * *

What do you think of Candidate Landon?

I've given space to Mr. Landon before, but now that he's the Republican

candidate for President I feel I should restate some of my previous assertions and add some new ones.

Landon, who is standing as an arch-conservative among the East's industrialists and financiers, is being touted in the Middle West as a liberal. So runs the tune of politics. But I don't think the scheme will fool many intelligent students of affairs. Landon certainly is no rabid reactionary, but he's a million miles from being a half-way radical or pink liberal. His record is one long recital of loyal acts to the great god Capitalism. His four years as Governor of Kansas have failed to produce a single measure of social security. His passion has been to balance the budget (which has to be balanced because the Kansas Constitution demands that only money in hand may be spent), and to whangdoodle \$200,000,000 of federal money to take care of the State's needy, without so much as a penny of State funds being appropriated to help the unemployed. What little money Kansas put up for relief came from cities and counties.

In many ways, Landon is a fine type of man—honest, simple, affable, sincere. He has refrained from indulging in patrioteering or red-baiting, and has been a pretty consistent friend of academic freedom in the State's numerous educational institutions, particularly the university. Landon really believes in free speech and the bill of rights. And having said these few things—which, of course, should be taken for granted after 150 years of the Republic—I can't think of anything else to put on the credit side.

We find, first of all, that Landon is blackened by his supporters, for there never was a candidate in the history of the country who was supported by so many reactionaries, blackguards, semi-Fascists, exploiters, patrioteers and stinking newspapers. Take his first pillar of support—William Randolph Hearst. Need anything more be added?

I've followed the Landon drive from its inception, for some of my neighbors were prime movers in the campaign to put Landon over as the Republican candidate. A few miles from here—at Pittsburg—is the editor of a daily newspaper who delivered scores of speeches for Landon's

candidacy, fought for him at the convention, and in a hundred other ways showed himself to be one of Landon's boosters. He stands forth as one of the section's worst reactionaries, a spokesman for the vilest elements in community, State or national politics. Landon took his support—as he took Hearst's—because, after all, it's the reactionaries who own the mortgage on the Republican party.

Oscar Stauffer, who owns the paper on which our Pittsburg editor works, is the boss of a chain of Kansas newspapers—something of a local Hearst. He gave months of his time running the Landon office in Kansas City before the Cleveland convention finally accepted his political pet, and should Landon make the grade he ought to get nothing less than the ambassadorship to Liberia as his reward. This man—Stauffer—is as progressive as J. P. Morgan and as liberal as Andy Mellon. And he's one of the original Landon men.

Then there's that other Republican editor and Landon discoverer—Charley Scott, editor of the *Iola Register*—who fought so valiantly, but fruitlessly, for Hoover in 1932 and now has turned to the "liberal" side of the street! Mr. Scott is a typical small-town Mussolini, reactionary to the marrow. And he, of course, ought to get nothing less than the Lord High Keeper of the Seal when Landon goes into the White House, if he does.

And, of course, let's not overlook the two Kansas top-notchers—William Allen White and Henry J. Allen, the latter once governor of this State. It was Allen who made the first move towards Fascism, before we'd ever even heard of Mussolini or Hitler, by trying to establish a court over industrial disputes which would, in effect, make labor organizations outlaws once they decided to use their economic weapon in order to right the abuses they must endure. Allen is known to hate every suggestion of liberalism. He is devoted heart and soul to the fleshpots of Capitalism. And his "twin brother," William Allen White, is, as I've said before, a bundle of sentimentality, goo and mush, who always pastures on the conservative side of the fence while he steals occasional looks at the liberal side.

And, while we're listing Landon's local friends, let's not forget that he was made Governor twice by the great Kansas utilities and oil companies. They put him in office at Topeka, and he rewarded them by seeing to it that not a single step was taken to keep them from robbing the citizens of the State. They will, undoubtedly, pay liberally to continue Landon's fight in the direction of the White House, and there they will most likely get the greater rewards to which they feel entitled. How Landon, as President, could support the present program of public power plants, particularly TVA, and keep the friendship of his original friends, is quite beyond my powers of comprehension. The logical thing to assume is that he will pay back his political debts to the public utilities by doing his best to sabotage every governmental enterprise that even smacks of TVA.

And now, finally, we come to the Bible, the Moses, the soul and spirit of Landonism—the *Kansas City Star*. Unfortunately, the *Star* editors were not the first to come out for Landon, but they certainly were among the first half dozen, so they can continue to gloat over their great victory. The *Star* stands forth as one of the most reactionary newspapers in the entire world. Compared with the *Star*, the *New York Times* is a Communist organ. It follows a policy of hatred and abuse for any individual or movement that threatens to lessen the powers of the Capitalists. It will, until election day, harp on a new tune—"liberalism"—but we who have followed this paper for a quarter of a century know it's real sentiments. It wants Landon because this man is safe for Capitalism. It hates Roosevelt because he saved Capitalism by spending some money—an unpardonable crime when the Landons claim they can both save Capitalism and balance the budget.

About Landon we know very little, for he has, in fact, been as undistinguished as Calvin Coolidge in his most remote and anonymous Massachusetts lawyer days. But we know enough about him to recognize an Old Guard Republican who will play to the masses for support of his "liberalism" but will give to the Wall Street elements the things they seek

most—security in the rush for profits, safety from governmental interference, withdrawal from programs of social security as fast as conditions will permit. Yes, Alf is as plain as an old shoe, and he wears the boots of Wall Street. The *Kansas City Star* has seen to that.

* * *

Do you plan to print the full text of the new Constitution of the Soviet Union?

Up to this writing, I'm still to see the complete document, but when it arrives I'll issue it in full, if I feel my readers want to study it in its entirety. I have seen several good digests of the Constitution, which I'm drawing on for my summary below. The more I go over this new Constitution the deeper is my conviction that we are witnessing one of the greatest events in modern history—a happening almost as important as the Russian Revolution itself. As I've already mentioned, this move in the direction of democracy is honest and sincere—a tremendous victory for western ideas of government and social ideals.

From what I've read thus far, it seems that Russia's Constitution will become the No. 1 democratic force of the world, for these Russians certainly aren't going half way towards democracy. They seem to have studied the democratic ideals of the world, picked the best and rejected the questionable.

I can't help feeling that the constant pounding and patient criticisms of the real friends of the new Russia have taken effect. Many of us have written endlessly about Russia's magnificent achievements, but always finding ourselves compelled to regret Russia's unwillingness to adopt the philosophy of the modern world which envisages the fullest civil rights, popular control and personal freedom. Now all this criticism seems headed for oblivion. The new Russia is setting an example in democracy, after years of dictatorship and political tyranny.

Democracy has taken some severe lickings during the past decade, particularly in Germany and Italy, but there are not only sure signs of democracy's come-back but almost equally clear signs of Fascism's decline. The new line-up is democracy versus

dictatorship, with Russia, France, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, Spain, Belgium, England, Mexico, and the United States representing the forces of progress, decency, enlightenment and civilization. It seems as though we've been through the worst of the storm. The future appears brighter.

Below I give readers my summary of the new Russian Constitution, based on incomplete versions:

1. The Constitution opens with a general statement of principles, thus: "The political basis of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is formed by Soviets of Toilers' Deputies which grew up and were consolidated as a result of the overthrow of the rule of the landowners and capitalists and the achievement of the dictatorship of the proletariat; all power in the Soviet Union resides in the toilers of town and country in the form of Soviets of toilers' deputies."

2. The document contains 13 sections with 146 articles.

3. When put into practice, according to this Constitution, Russia will have two legislative bodies, comparable to our House of Representatives and Senate. The lower house, consisting of 600 members (one member to 300,000 population), will be known as the Union of Soviets. The upper house (containing about 300 members) will be known as the Soviet of Nationalities.

4. Both houses will be known by the general title of Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

5. Deputies will be elected by "general, equal, direct and secret ballot." Both bodies will have equal powers and rights. Laws, to be effective, must pass both houses, where they must receive at least a majority vote.

6. The Constitution itself may be changed only by the Supreme Soviet—two-thirds of each house voting for changes or amendments.

7. Members of both houses are to enjoy immunity from arrest.

8. An article in the Constitution provides a general guarantee to all citizens in their right to a job, with wages to be paid according to the amount and quality of work done. In addition, citizens are guaranteed the rights of study and leisure.

9. All persons 18 years of age or

older automatically become citizens, with the right to vote or run for office, regardless of sex, nationality, religion, or social origin.

10. All persons too old to work are guaranteed old age pensions.

11. This new fundamental law of Russia declares that "all citizens of the U.S.S.R. irrespective of nationality and race have equal rights in all branches of economy, and in governmental, cultural, social and political life." Punishment is provided for limitations placed on the rights of citizens on grounds of race or nationality. Also, preaching of racial or national hatreds are listed as crimes.

12. Wealth-producing property—mines, mills, factories, waterways, railroads, cooperative or collective farms, communication systems, etc.—are to be the property of the people, through the state. At the same time, citizens are guaranteed the right to own personal property—such as homes, small farms which are worked by the people who live on them, motor cars, bank savings, etc. Also, persons who are self-employed may own their shops and tools, provided they do not exploit the labor of other persons.

13. Every able-bodied citizen in the Soviet Union must labor, in harmony with the principle that "he who does not work, neither shall he eat." The principle aimed at is: "From every one according to his capacity, to every one according to his work."

14. Under Article 125 we find the following important declaration: "In accordance with the interests of the toilers and for the purpose of strengthening the Socialist regime, the citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed freedom of speech, press, assemblage and demonstration."

15. The church is forever separated from the State; the church is forever denied any authority over the school system. At the same time every citizen is guaranteed the right to practice any religion of his choice or engage in anti-religious propaganda.

16. No citizen may be arrested, except by official action of a court or State prosecutor.

17. No citizen's home may be violated, nor may the privacy of one's communications be interfered with.

18. Judges are to be elected by the people, for three years. A paragraph

says that "judges are independent and are responsible only to the law."

19. Deputies in either house may be recalled by the citizens in their constituency on a non-confidence vote of at least a majority. Deputies may submit questions from the floor of either house, which must be answered in writing or orally by the government within three days.

20. Foreigners who escape from countries to avoid persecution because of activities in support of the interests of the workers, of science, or struggles for national liberty, are to receive the right of asylum.

Naturally, the above survey, based as it is on incomplete data, probably omits many important features of the Constitution, but we have seen enough to realize there's no doubt that the Russians have gone democratic in a big way. A dictatorship has expressed its willingness to abdicate without violence or bloodshed. When this document is finally adopted next November, a nation occupying about one-sixth of the land area of the earth will join the ranks of democratic, liberty-loving, free countries. Humanity is taking a long forward-step.

* * *

I have come across the phrase "Hitler prosperity," which puzzles me. Please comment.

Germany is undergoing an artificial boom because of Hitler's frantic preparations for his threatened war on the Soviet Union. The armament industry is humming, which accounts for "Hitler prosperity." The country is bankrupt, yet busy—getting ready for its blood bath, which Hitler will provide unless the masses rise in their might and throw out their homosexual tyrant.

Dr. George Bernhard, exiled German editor, who, before the advent of Hitlerism, was one of the greatest editorial chiefs in Germany, discussed "Hitler prosperity" in New York City, on June 8, 1936, as follows:

"The great majority of the German factories today are working in preparation for war. Eighty percent of the entire German production is in the field of war material. The so-called prosperity of which the Hitler regime boasts is a war prosperity.

"War is the great game for the Hitler regime. The economy of the German Reich finds itself in a posi-

tion similar to that of a business man who has already invested in his enterprise not only his fortune but even the loan obtained against his prospective profits. If German rearmament ceases, German economy faces ruin, and the number of its unemployed will again be increased by millions."

Before I leave this subject let me quote a brief note I received from one of my readers, Dr. Otto Vierling, 2221 Cherokee Street, St. Louis, Mo., as follows:

"I like your interesting answers to questions, and you are, in my opinion, doing a good work, on the whole. No one can be expected to be infallible, and it is good to observe a man who has confidence in himself, even though he, as a matter of course, occasionally finds himself mistaken. I am wondering if your views regarding the expected collapse of the German government's financial structure are of the same caliber as were your views of the certainty of Ethiopian victory over the Italians! 'Expert' opinions on the then Italo-Ethiopian situation no doubt supported you therein, as does 'expert' opinion on the questions of the early collapse of the German financial structure. While your reasons—racial, social and economic—all cause at least some wishful thinking on the German (Hitler) question, by your venom you probably overshoot your mark."

First of all, I must protest against my reader's use of the word venom. A commentator who always rests his case on facts can't be called venomous when those facts establish a case against an individual or a regime. I'll readily grant I'm prejudiced against Fascism and Hitlerism—because I'm strongly in favor of freedom, the right to think, unrestricted expression, tolerance, racial amity, peace, anti-militarism, free assembly, the right to organize, the necessity of socialized industry, industrial rights, and the like. But here I insist that my prejudices in favor of civilized institutions aren't malicious but a sincere regard for the fine things that make civilization possible.

My case against Hitler's Germany has invariably rested on facts, most of which have come out of Germany. The facts, I insist, indicate that Germany is bankrupt—without gold, disrupted foreign trade, reduced pro-

duction in non-military establishments because of the absence of raw material, social waste of labor power in a blind and insane race to militarize the country, suppression of every decent thing in civilization, complete lack of credit because of the world's hatred for Hitlerism and a firm belief in his ultimate collapse, and numerous other reasons which I have stressed during the time I have discussed conditions in Central Europe.

Dr. Bernhard's quotation above helps make my case stand up, but I have long anticipated him with columns of facts and verifiable data. Here, for example, is a report direct from Germany, which has just come to my desk. It tells that the textile industry is now working only eight hours per week, whereas two years ago the men in this industry worked at least 30 hours per week. Why is this? Because Germany has no money or credit to obtain wool or cotton, except for the making of its soldiers' uniforms. And yet, the hundreds of thousands of men and women who are employed only eight hours per week are listed among the employed, and contribute their share to making Hitler's claims of prosperity stand up, at least temporarily.

As for my articles on the Ethiopian situation, I believe a careful review of my writings will show that I predicated Italian defeat on the assumption that the Ethiopians would have sense enough to refrain from a frontal attack on tanks, poison gas, and the other weapons of mechanized warfare. Had the black warriors let the Italians come into the country and then resorted to guerrilla warfare, it's safe to guess that the Italians would have had a 10-year job subjugating them. I said the invasion would cost Mussolini billions of dollars—more than the venture could ever be worth. Mussolini, early in June, 1936, admitted he had already spent \$1,000,000,000 on his Ethiopian campaign, and the end isn't in sight. The billions will still have to be spent. And as for the final pacification of the country—that is still to be achieved, for meager, but ominous, reports come through the strict censorship with the news that thousands of armed Ethiopians are

still in the mountains and that short, swift attacks on the Italians are taking place almost daily. It seems obvious that there's still years of fighting to be done before Mussolini rules all of Ethiopia. The experts, as Dr. Vierling says, were wrong when they predicted the defeat of Mussolini. I confess I drew on them for many of my conclusions, but I believe I was pretty consistent in never making a direct, positive statement, always hedging with rows of "ifs," "buts," "perhapses," and "maybes." Despite this characteristic caution I'll grant that behind these face-saving words was the hope that the Ethiopians would defeat Mussolini and his gang of blackguards. I make no apologies for having expressed sympathy again and again for the Ethiopian people and for having hoped they would come out of the unjust war with their country intact.

* * *

With railroad passenger fares reduced to 2c per mile, what are the buses charging?

When the Eastern railroads, by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, cut their rates from 3.6c to 2c per mile, beginning June 2, 1936, the major bus companies in the Eastern States slashed their fares from an average slightly above 2c to between 1.5c and 1.75c. Round-trip fares enjoy a 10 percent discount.

* * *

Which country is the greatest wheat producer?

Until recently, the U.S. was first in wheat, barley and oats, but the May 22, 1936, report of the Imperial Economic Committee, London, England, says we have lost first place to the Soviet Union. In 1934, the world carry-over of grain was 31,000,000 tons; in 1936, it's estimated it'll be less than 17,000,000.

* * *

What's your opinion of the suggestion that the colonies of the world be redistributed so that each great power will have access to raw materials?

In theory the idea sounds fair enough, but in practice it means strengthening Fascism, and that's a menace to the world's democratic institutions. The two countries which talk most about needing raw materials are the Fascist dictatorships of Germany and Italy, and they, of course, are threatening the world with

a new war and propagating the philosophy of Fascism wherever dupes will listen. Hitler and Mussolini are threats to civilization, and to give them the raw materials they want can mean only one thing: the war machines will be oiled and geared to early activity. If these two countries had governments as decent and enlightened as those of France, Russia, Sweden, Norway, the U.S. and other democratic or, as in the case of Russia, soon to be a democratic country, one could hardly refuse the plea for access to raw materials, for the proper strengthening of one democratic country helps all others. On the other hand, putting additional power at the command of Fascist dictators gives the democratic world new headaches. For that reason, no steps should be taken to help these two tyrants gobble up new colonies or regain those lost in the recent past.

* * *

It's claimed by Mussolini (and other imperialists) that the acquisition of colonies is necessary for his country's foreign trade. Please comment.

The argument is weak, and the facts show the hollowness of the claim. From 1894 to 1932, Italy's trade (both imports and exports) with its colonies amounted to only 5,561,000,000 lire, or a mere 1 percent of the country's total foreign trade. The amount just mentioned covers a period of almost 40 years. From 1913 to 1932 (a period of only 19 years) Italy spent in its colonies 6,865,000,000 lire. This proves that colonial expansion, in Italy's experience, is not a means of helping foreign trade but of piling up new deficits. In Ethiopia, Mussolini admits having already spent over \$1,000,000,000—the truth, undoubtedly, would show a much larger sum—and the future will demand new hundreds of millions of dollars. How is the foreign trade of Ethiopia (a country that has always lived in the worst poverty) going to butter Mussolini's bread? The whole business is a tragic joke.

* * *

Your articles on the San Francisco bridge give no data regarding its cost in human lives. Please explain.

The questions dealt with financial costs, so I refrained from any digressions. Two bridges are now being built, the first of which, the Golden Gate Bridge, was 75 percent finished

in June, 1936, and without a man being killed. The other job, the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, which is twice as long as the former, has already cost 22 lives, a fact which has aroused considerable criticism. The Bay Bridge will be ready for traffic in November, 1936; the Golden Gate will be ready in May, 1937. The Bay Bridge was made possible by RFC funds, at a cost of \$70,000,000.

* * *

As I am planning to spend a vacation visiting one or more of our national parks, please list all of them, giving the size of each.

We have plenty of national parks, as the list below shows:

Name	Area, Sq. miles
Acadia, Maine	21.81
Bryce Canyon, Utah	55.06
Carlsbad Caverns, N.M.	15.56
Crystal Lake, Ore.	250.52
General Grant, Calif.	3.96
Glacier, Mont.	1,553.88
Grand Canyon, Ariz.	1,009.08
Grand Teton, Wyo.	150.00
Great Smoky Mts., N.C.-Tenn.	615.76
Hawaii, Isl. of Hawaii and Maui	245.00
Hot Springs, Ark.	1.58
Lassen Volcanic, Calif.	163.32
Mesa Verde, Colo.	80.21
Mount McKinley, Alaska	3,030.46
Mount Rainier, Wash.	377.78
Platt, Okla.	1.33
Rocky Mountain, Colo.	405.33
Sequoia, Calif.	604.00
Shenandoah, Va.	275.67
Wind Cave, S. Dak.	18.47
Yellowstone, Wyo.-Mont.-Idaho	3,471.51
Yosemite, Calif.	1,176.16
Zion, Utah	148.26

All national parks are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, which has done well in providing tourists with such facilities as transportation, camp grounds, post-office service, fishing, hospitals and clinics, etc. Each park has an office of the department, to which requests may be mailed for booklets describing the places, supplied without charge. These parks abound with scenic wonders, game preserves, geysers, beautiful waterfalls, immense forests, cliff dwellings, glaciers, caverns, mountains, etc. There are reports that private concessionaires charge too much for food and lodging, so I suggest that you go prepared with a camping outfit or trailer and an ample supply of food. It isn't necessary to tote the food from your

home, as it's easy to put in a stock when you get near the park.

* * *

Is it possible to escape inflation through the use of our gold reserve?

We have over \$10,000,000,000 worth of idle gold in our treasury. We also have a stock of silver. The question is: Can we have inflation so long as we have such a tremendous stock of gold and silver? The answer is, of course, Yes. Why? Because of the possibility that such precious metals will be kept idle too long.

We actually have about twice as much gold as we have paper money in circulation. But our keeping that gold underground tends to lessen its real effect on the value of that paper, especially if we were to decide to issue printing press money or commit other acts of inflation.

Our government could, if it wanted to avoid inflation, always turn to its gold supply as a nest-egg. Think of having over \$10,000,000,000 worth of gold on hand, ready to resume its monetary function. There'd be no inflation there! But that, for the present, seems unlikely. There seems to be no intention among those in authority to release even an ounce of gold. So we must adjust ourselves to the use of paper money that can't be turned into gold on demand.

We have been doing just that for several years, with a 59c dollar—and who's been hurt? Doesn't your \$1 buy goods in the market? Does it work well when applied to a debt or to the doctor's bill? There's been a great deal of talk about inflation already being here—but the common people aren't excited over such political propaganda, for they know a paper dollar buys just about what it bought four years ago, and a whole lot more than it bought in the years from 1925 to 1929.

Inflation may be in the cards—I'm no prophet—but it seems to me that a whole lot more will have to happen before we begin even to approach such a calamitous state. Inflation, even the beginnings of inflation, isn't here and won't be here for a long time. I don't believe we're going to see the time, in our generation, when a newspaper is going to cost \$1,000,000,000, or a loaf of bread selling for more money than the gov-

ernment owes, as was the case in Germany. That kind of inflation seems ridiculous to get worried about. There's a possibility that the dollar may be further revalued—below our present 59c dollar—but such devaluation, within strict limits, will likely do no harm.

* * *

In several of his works, Joseph McCabe makes the statement that Buddha was a Rationalist, but I'm still to meet with a few direct quotations to support such a conclusion. Can you supply me with several?

Joseph McCabe, in one of his books, goes to elaborate pains to explain that it was the original, unadulterated Buddha who was a Rationalist and an Atheist, not the Buddha of the priests who came after him and interpreted him so that he became an instrument of religious propaganda. The original sources show, of course, that McCabe is right—Gautama Buddha was a Rationalist and an Atheist. If you will turn to Paul Carus' *The Gospel of Buddha*, you will find the following two sentences from Buddha—words which couldn't have come from a religious thinker:

"Better than worshipping gods is obedience to the laws of righteousness."

"Only through ignorance and delusion do men indulge in the dream that their souls are separate and self-existent entities."

Edwin Arnold, in his *The Light of Asia*, proves the sage of India's Rationalism with this quotation:

"Do not accept anything that is either written or spoken by any teacher of any age unless such harmonizes with reason and bears the test of examination."

When I debated with the Rev. Burris A. Jenkins on the subject "Is Theism a Logical Philosophy?" he made much of the fact that I was wrong in claiming Buddha among the Atheists. At the time I didn't happen to have the above three quotations, but I'd like to know how Dr. Jenkins could explain away their rationalistic viewpoint. I intend to insert these sentences from Buddha as a foot-note when the printed version of my debate with Jenkins is reprinted, which I see will be soon.

* * *

How many radios are there in this country?

On January 1, 1936, we had 22,-

869,000 radios. It was found that 74 percent of the families in the U.S. have radios. During 1935, we bought 4,400,000 radios for home use, exclusive of radio sets for motor cars. During 1935, 1,100,000 motor car sets were sold, bringing the number of such sets now in use up to 3,000,000.

* * * * *

What percentage of mothers give birth to twins and triplets?

The Department of Health, New York City, reports that its records show out of 100 mothers one gives birth to twins. Only one in 20,000 gives birth to triplets.

* * * * *

In your various articles on the cooperative movement, you refer only to working people and farmers. How about professionals?

Professionals certainly are beginning to learn the advantages of organizations along consumer lines. The Cooperative League News Service, New York City, recently made a study of the types and activities of 138 college cooperatives in this country, which were established during the past four years. In May, 1936, the following facts were compiled:

	Members	Annual Estimated Business	Savings
21 Book Stores ..	23,149	\$1,874,300	10%
18 Cafeterias	1,175	184,400	40
48 Dormitories	2,413	286,500	40
2 Cleaning, Pressing	2,000	15,000	50-65
4 Buying Pools ..	1,760	288,000	10-20
45 Miscellaneous ...	1,780	110,600	35
138	32,277	\$2,758,800	

* * * * *

Which reaches the widest public—the printed word, the movies or radio?

The printing press is still, by far, the greatest medium for the communication of news, ideas, information etc. The movies and radio reach wide publics, of course, but supporters of these media are given to the wildest exaggerations. For example, the advertising department of *Time* writes me that its news magazine's circulation is 600,000. This, of course, I accept as a fact, because the figure was reached by verifiable means. But the same source then speaks of its screen pictorial—*The March of Time*

—and offers the highly debatable conclusion that it appeals to an audience of 12,000,000. Then, the same writer ventures to say that the *March of Time* on the air reaches "something like 30,000,000." You see, as verification becomes more difficult the figures become more extravagant—first with the movies, and next, and worst of all, with radio. I seriously doubt that when the broadcast of the *March of Time* begins, one-fourth of the population of the country puts everything aside to listen. But I can't prove my skepticism by facts, any more than the advertising manager can prove his claim of 30,000,000 by indisputable evidence. So, by and large, the advertising manager wins out by force of iteration and reiteration. But that doesn't stop me from inserting a Bronx cheer.

* * * * *

What's the meaning of "gaga"?

It means screwy, wild, extreme, nutty.

* * * * *

Which of our Presidents were lawyers?

The two Adamsses, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Van Buren, Tyler, Polk, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan, Lincoln, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, McKinley, Taft, Coolidge, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Theodore Roosevelt and Harding studied law, but never were admitted to practice.

* * * * *

What were the professions of our Presidents, other than those who were lawyers?

Before becoming President, their professions or occupations were: Farmers and planters, Washington, W. H. Harrison, Taylor; educator, Wilson; engineer and stock promoter, Hoover; tailor and pants presser, Johnson; soldier, Grant; newspaper editor and publisher, Harding; public official, Theodore Roosevelt.

* * * * *

Are there many open platforms in this country where public discussion goes on freely?

School Life, April, 1936, reports there are over 1,000 public forums in the U.S., distributed as follows:

East, 294; Middle West, 150; Pacific Coast, 130; South, 82; New England, 67; South West, 25; Rocky Mountains, 20.

A study shows that forum publics are interested in 22 general subjects,

of which the five most popular are: 1. International situation. 2. Economic recovery. 3. Fascism and war. 4. New Deal legislation. 5. Liberty and democracy.

I'd say, roughly, that these five subjects are also the most popular with my readers. After all, this questions and answers policy amounts to a public forum, and I've found that discussions on the international situation usually come first.

* * *

How do newspapers apportion their space to various subjects and departments?

The Review of Reviews, June, 1936, contains an article in which it's estimated that newspapers devote space as follows:

Sports	24%
Business and markets	18
Politics	14
War and other foreign news	10
Murders and divorces	8
Society and social events	8
Syndicated features	8
Local news	10

* * *

I've read there is ample evidence to prove that Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy was a plagiarist. Can you produce at least one deadly parallel?

Mrs. Eddy, the "founder" of Christian Science, was an incorrigible literary thief, as has been shown in hundreds of instances. She stole quotations, which she palmed off as her own, from the Rev. Hugh Blair's sermon which appeared in the *Lindley Murray "Reader,"* which was published in 1800, long before Mrs. Eddy turned to her mystical clap-trap. Quotations from Carlyle, Amiel, Ruskin, Charles Kingsley (which appeared in a book that was compiled by Jeanne G. Pennington, entitled *Philosophical Nuggets*) were dipped into at will by Mrs. Eddy. In addition, she stole her Christian Science notions from the Quimby manuscripts. Finally, she was an assiduous scrap-book keeper, from which she stole whatever could be used in her moonish vaporings. As for a quotation, I'll have to be content with only one, because space won't permit me to go into an elaborate demonstration of her literary crookedness. Let's quote a piece from Mrs. Eddy, and then put alongside it a piece from the Blair address. This piece has been used frequently to discredit Mrs.

Eddy, the latest instance being the June 8, 1936, issue of *Letters*.

(Mrs. Eddy)

"...The man of integrity is one who makes it his constant rule to follow the road of duty, according as Truth and the voice of his conscience point it out to him. He is not guided merely by affections which may some time give the color of virtue to a loose and unstable character.

"The upright man is guided by a fixed Principle, which destines him to do nothing but what is honorable, and to abhor whatever is base or unworthy; hence we find him ever the same—at all times the trusty friend, the affectionate relation, the conscientious man of business, the pious worker, the public-spirited citizen..."

(Hugh Blair)

"It will not take much time to delineate the character of the man of integrity, as by its nature it is a plain one, and easily understood. He is one who makes it his constant rule to follow the road of duty, according as the word of God, and the voice of his conscience, point it out to him. He is not guided merely by affections, which may sometimes give the colour of virtue to a loose and unstable character.

"The upright man is guided by a fixed principle of mind, which determines him to esteem nothing but what is honourable; and to abhor whatever is base or unworthy, in moral condition. Hence we find him ever the same; at all times, the trusty friend, the affectionate relation, the conscientious man of business, the pious worshipper, the public-spirited citizen..."

* * *

What are the possibilities of failure for the Blum government?

Failure, unfortunately, is always possible in the present situation in France, because Blum's regime rests on a bloc of minority parties—Radical Socialists (liberals of the New Deal type), Socialists (Blum's party) and Communists. The Radical Socialists are most numerous and could, at will, overthrow the Blum administration.

But there are several serious possibilities, and the Radical Socialists (who, of course, aren't Socialists at all) will hesitate before throwing the

fat in the fire. This party hates Fascism and wants Democracy protected. If it lets Blum down, the Fascists (who are numerous and prepared, despite the fact that their military formations have been ordered dissolved) might precipitate an armed reaction, which would, if victorious, end the Third Republic and bring Fascism to the French masses.

All this isn't quite as simple as it sounds. The Fascists are facing millions (against their hundreds of thousands) of thoroughly aroused workers—white collar, skilled, technical, professional and unskilled—who are militant and on the alert not only to stamp out Fascism but go beyond the policies of Blum should there be weakness on the part of the Blum administration.

So, while it's possible for Fascism to win out, it's also possible—by a heavier margin—for the extreme Left to assert itself in all its might, bringing about not the political and social reforms of the Blum government but a complete social revolution, with labor taking charge of the country's means of production, distribution and exchange. That would mean Communist France, if it wins. If it loses, the Republic will die and the Fascist reaction will set in.

Blum, who honestly and correctly holds that he was put into office by non-Socialists and therefore had no mandate from the people to inaugurate Socialism, is in a difficult position. The fact that he is a Jew complicates the line-up. The reactionaries are bringing in anti-Semitism to help them establish Fascism, and should Blum fail he will not only be criticized for having been a Socialist but he will bring on the Jews the full blame for his individual acts. The French Jews, therefore, will be in for it.

If French revolutionary labor is able to ward off Fascism and bring a regime of social change to Communism, there may first be seen a wave of violence and terrorism, greatly unlike the recent good-natured "stay-in" strikes. Real, actual revolution may be in store for France. If the revolution wins and French labor establishes Communism in France, Russia will have a more reliable ally in case Germany should decide to carry out its threat of war on the U.S.S.R. in

order to give Hitler possession of the rich Ukraine district, a vast section that can grow almost anything. In such a situation Russia must move cautiously. If Fascism wins, Germany will have a new ally in a war against Russia. If Blum wins, the government will proceed with its policy of numerous substantial concessions to labor without the destruction of the Capitalist system. Blum, incidentally, would stand by Russia in case Germany turned to aggression, but he wouldn't be as reliable as a Communist regime.

Yes, the French situation is interesting, continually sensational, and fraught with menacing possibilities or glorious advances for the future of civilization.

* * *

Please comment on the Louis-Schmeling event.

I heard the blow-by-blow reports over the radio, read a good many articles by the sports writers, and wound up with a ringside seat when the fight was shown on the screen in a nearby city. I don't pose as an expert on fistiana, but after reading the dope handed out by the professional writers before and after this fight (and a good many other fights, including the Braddock-Baer scrap) I feel just as competent as any of them to spill my dope.

First of all, I want to say that Joe Louis didn't put up a bad fight. The boy was a brave, courageous, stubborn, manly figure during the 12 rounds that ended in his defeat. And I don't believe he's through, by any means. Louis, to my layman's slant, is still to be considered, and the future will establish what the past almost proves—that he stands in the same class with the great Jack Dempsey, who was a natural fighting man, if ever there was one. And, while I'm talking about the great Dempsey, let's not forget that that barrel of wildcats took several knock-outs when he was in his early twenties, only to come back a few fights later and prove himself the greatest heavyweight since the one and only John L.

The movies showed a Joe Louis who was magnificent in defeat, a mighty boy who could take it. Until then Joe had been giving it—but here, as plain as day, he showed he

could take Schmeling's worst, especially in the fourth round and at the close of the fifth, when, after the bell, Schmeling landed a terrific right on Louis' unguarded left jaw. That, to my amateur eye, marked the end of Joe Louis in that fight, but the boy was so stout that he could keep going until the 12th round, proof in itself of his ability to take it.

Of course, the fight has given those addicted to race prejudice an excuse to say that the "Nordics" are "superior," that the white man is "better" than the black man. Hitler wired this fighting brown-shirt his congratulations, and Dr. Goebbels issued a statement claiming that the defeat of Louis meant the superiority of the Nazi ideology, which, to my notion, is a new low in Fascist intellectuality.

If the defeat of the black man by a Nazi means a brown-shirt is the race's crowning jewel, let's not forget that Schmeling was knocked out by Max Baer, a member of the hated, "inferior" non-Aryans. The Nazis prefer to forget about that. And, while we're raking up the old fights, let's not fail to mention that Max Baer, after whipping Schmeling, was defeated by Joe Louis.

Joe Louis is still a boy—only 22 years old—and his future is before him. He has a great deal to learn as a fighter, but there's no reason to assume that he'll refuse to train himself into a real champion, for he's made of the real champion stuff—heart, brain and brawn. The fight with Schmeling showed that Louis is woefully careless. I could see with my untrained, amateur, layman's eyes that Louis was too confident and that he was laying himself open to the German's strong right. Louis should have hunched his left shoulder, to protect at least part of his left jaw. Instead, he left himself wide open. When the Schmeling rights came towards him, he didn't weave to the right or duck. Schmeling's right is a hay-maker, of course, but any second-rate fighter ought to know what to do about it. I'm sure Louis and his trainers will remedy this in future fights.

Give Joe Louis a little more time. In a few years he'll put on more weight and take on a few more tricks. Then watch him become—in my cock-

eyed opinion—a real world champion. Schmeling may be able to beat Braddock, but I'm convinced Louis is going to be able to dispose of both of them, when he gets wise to himself, works away from over-confidence, and refuses to lay himself open to blows that a second-rater ought to be able to duck.

* * *

I want to go to a labor college—either Brookwood or Commonwealth. Which would you advise me to take?

Both institutions are worthwhile educational establishments for those who would improve and educate themselves sufficiently to be able to render constructive services to the union and political movements of labor. You will find that Commonwealth College, at Mena, Arkansas, will cost you much less money. It might be feasible for you to spend a year at each. You will find the time well spent. At Commonwealth, you will have to endure rather "primitive" conditions, but they are of a kind that are conducive to good health. These two colleges prepare young men and women for the trade or industrial unions and organizational work along political lines. There is a third phase—the cooperative movement—which, so far as I know, they treat only from the theoretical side. However, there has been established a college (founded by a group of large cooperative societies) in Kansas City, where students are trained to understand the theoretical side of cooperation and, what is of great importance, the mechanics of the business, by which is meant general management, buying, selling, keeping accounts, business practice, and the like. It's pretty safe to say that the cooperative movement is going to make tremendous headway during the next 25 years (especially since we are beginning to learn the meaning of the great advances made by the Swedish cooperatives) so it's here, I believe, that a young man or woman can find an outlet for his impulses to serve the working masses in a useful, constructive way and at the same time earn for himself a decent living as an official or employe of the consumers' cooperative movement. The two labor colleges can, and do, give instruction in the economics of cooperation, but I believe you'll have to go to the col-

lege in Kansas City if you want to learn how to start, organize and run a cooperative. We have been very slow in learning the lessons of co-operation, but the depression has compelled us to take stock, with the result that substantial progress has been made during the past five or six years, but nothing when compared to what this country is going to see in our own time. I may be unduly optimistic, but it's my notion that the cooperative movement in the U.S. will, before very long, become the biggest business in the land. I urge all alert, intelligent, self-disciplined, intelligently ambitious, social-conscious young men and women to become interested and active in this great movment of the near future.

Do Socialists believe the Roosevelt policies have made conditions better or worse?

A survey conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion showed that the Socialists, by a small majority, voted that Rooseveltian measures have not improved matters. The nation-wide poll was on the following question: "Are the acts of the present Administration helping or hindering recovery?" The results:

	Helping	Hindering
Democrats	93%	7%
Republicans	10	90
Socialists	48	52
Others	24	76
All voters	55%	45%

The above facts were gathered early in June, 1936. About the same time in 1935 a poll showed that 57 percent voted that Roosevelt's New Deal was holding back recovery.

Are there any figures which show how many farmers do part-time work off the farms?

The Bureau of the Census reports that in 1934, 30 percent of our farmers added to their incomes by doing part-time work off their farms.

In your articles on the Swedish cooperatives you fail to mention whether or not the membership has been growing in recent years. Please go into this.

According to a report issued by our Department of Commerce, 1935 showed a membership of 568,000 in the Swedish Cooperative Union, as against 550,000 in 1934. In 1934 total sales were 165,000,000 crowns; in

1935, 178,000,000 crowns. In addition, the sales of consumers' cooperative societies amounted to 414,000,000 crowns in 1935; in 1934, 376,000,000 crowns.

What is the attitude of the public towards the CCC camps?

A survey conducted (June, 1936) by the American Institute of Public Opinion shows that the CCC project meets with overwhelming support from all shades of political opinion. A large number of citizens were asked: "Are you in favor of continuing the CCC camps?" The answers showed:

	Percentage Favoring	Percentage Opposing
Democrats	92%	8%
Socialists	79	21
Republicans	67	33
Third Party	67	33
Nation	82%	18%

The same citizens were asked: "Should military training be part of the duties of those who attend?" On this question the Socialists were the only ones to register a majority vote against making military drill a part of CCC routine. The vote:

	Yes	No
Democrats	80%	20%
Republicans	74	26
Socialists	43	57
Third Party Voters	59	41
Farmers	77	23
Persons on Relief	79	21
Young Voters	68	32

Is Japan's birth rate holding up?

The Cabinet Bureau of Statistics, at Tokio, reports, that during 1935 there were 1,028,600 more births than deaths. This was the largest increase in the country's history. In 1932, during which there occurred a previous high, there were 1,007,400 more births than deaths. Japan's population is now put at 69,000,000

What are the main business principles in a consumers' cooperative organization?

The major principles are as follows:

1. Each member is to have only one vote, no matter how many shares he may own.
2. All sales must be on a cash basis, without exceptions or evasions.
3. Prices of commodities are to be

the same as the general market, in order to avoid price wars.

4. The members of cooperatives are to receive their rewards as co-operators in proportion to the amount of money they spend with the society, the reward being in the form of a dividend out of profits, at six- or 12-month intervals.

5. If the society plans to expand or go into a promotion campaign for the enrollment of new members, the money for these projects should always come out of profits, but they shouldn't be on so large a scale as to preclude dividends to the buying members.

6. No discriminations against members because of race, occupation, religion, political affiliations, etc. The membership is to be unrestricted and voluntary.

7. If the cooperative decides to borrow invested capital, interest, if any, is to be no higher than the rates that prevail in the society's locality.

* * *

How much net profit has the Ford Motor Company made?

The Wall Street Journal, June 15, 1936, reports that during 33 years the Ford Motor Company made an aggregate profit of \$782,016,000. The official figures:

Gross earnings	\$12,951,338,000
Paid for materials and labor	12,109,322,000
Balance	\$ 842,016,000
Commitments, Taxes accruing, Wages coming due	60,000,000
Net profit	\$ 782,016,000

* * *

Where does the U.S. get its greatest volume of news?

The White House. Everything the President does is news, even if he were to walk across the street just to buy a bag of peanuts.

* * *

Nazi propaganda claims that Germany has the largest labor organization in the world. Please comment.

Dr. Goebbels says there are 25,000,000 men and women in what he calls the "labor front." The workers are herded into this organization in order to make possible their complete enslavement to the Hitler regime. To call such regimentation a "union" is to make a mockery of the splendid ideals of the labor movement. Compulsory membership in the "labor front" brings the Nazi party an estimated yearly revenue of \$400,000,000

from dues and other payments which the laws compels the employers to deduct from wages and turn into the treasury of Hitler's gangsters. This amounts to more than \$1,000,000 per day, which German labor must pay for the "privilege" of having its cost of living go up, its wages down, its right to organize in free unions outlawed, its denial of everything that goes to make life worthwhile in a civilized community—such as freedom of expression, the right of a free press, free assembly, and inquiry. It took the Hitlerites to figure out a racket in which labor is made to pay for the "privilege" of being enslaved. That's the unkindest cut of all.

* * *

Where are all these pro-Fascist and semi-Fascist organizations getting their funds?

Investigations conducted by a Senate Committee show that our dozen or more U.S. versions of the Nazi movement are getting their money—gobs of it—from industrialists, bankers, utilities and corporations. The inquiry showed that the following Fascist outfits received financial aid from the nation's red-baiters, labor exploiters and robbers of the consumers: American Liberty League, Crusaders, Minute Men and Women of Today, National Economy League, the Sentinels of the Republic, and a few others. During 18 months prior to June, 1936, the above organizations of tin-pot Hitlers received from wealthy exploiters the tidy sum of \$1,084,604.62. Here are some of the important contributions and the open-shoppers who coughed up the kale:

duPont family	\$204,045
duPont associates	152,622
Pitcairn family	100,250
J. P. Morgan associates	68,226
Mellon associates	60,752
Rockefeller associates	49,852
Hutton (E. F.) associates	40,671
Sun Oil associates	37,260
Banks and brokers	184,224
Utilities companies and associates	27,069

Total \$929,974

* * *

How efficient are boughten teeth compared to a natural set?

About 10 percent.

* * *

Please comment on the new Russian Constitution.

The Soviet Union will have a new

Constitution when the present period of discussion and correction passes and the document is ratified. The result, in the main, of the mind of Stalin, this new declaration of fundamental law indicates one thing above everything else—Russia is headed away from dictatorship and is going in the direction of real democracy.

I haven't seen the original document, but several careful resumes have been received in this country, which show conclusively that Russia, despite the threats of war on two fronts, feels strong enough to voluntarily abdicate its dictatorship and turn to parliamentarism, the secret ballot, equal rights for all citizens, the national guarantee of employment or its equivalent in the form of social insurance, the protection of the full civil rights of the individual citizen, the right to hold personal property, free speech, free press, free assembly, and the full answerability of government officials to the demands of the citizenry.

It would be the essence of folly to question the sincerity of this gigantic move. American capitalistic newspapers have already voiced their skepticism over this "conversion," but almost two decades of treating Russia have shown American editors to be notoriously incompetent or acutely dishonest. During the first few years of the Soviet regime they were sure the administration would collapse—usually next month or the month following. Then they were sure the Five-year Plan would be an appalling failure. Then they were sure the Second Five-year Plan wouldn't result in the country's industrialization. Now they're sure Russia's democracy will be found only on paper. I hate to break bad news to these incurable victims of wishful thinking, but it seems pretty certain that Russian democracy is going to be the real thing—as real as Stalin's tremendous program of industrialization.

What was the result of the recent poll on the question of six-year terms for our Presidents?

On June 14, 1936, the American Institute of Public Opinion, released to its string of newspapers (the body has a high-sounding name for a newspaper syndicate) the results

of its inquiry into the question: "Would you favor changing the term of office of the President of the United States to one six-year term with no re-election?"

According to the Institute's director, Dr. George Gallup, the American people are, by a heavy majority, still in favor of the old-fashioned way of electing a President every four years. The poll shows that 74 percent of the people opposed limiting Presidents to one six-year term.

The party votes were: Democrats, Yes, 26 percent; No, 74 percent. Republicans, Yes, 27 percent; No, 73 percent. Socialists, Yes, 26 percent; No, 74 percent. Others, Yes, 29 percent; No, 71 percent.

At the same time the Institute asked: Should a President be eligible for a third term? The party votes were: Democrats, Yes, 56 percent; No, 44 percent. Republicans, Yes, 22 percent; No, 78 percent. Socialists, Yes, 39 percent; No, 61 percent. Others, Yes, 29 percent; No, 71 percent. Nationally, the vote was: Yes, 43 percent; no, 57 percent.

The polling expenses are paid by the 72 newspapers which accept the Institute's services. Thus far, the Institute has been uniformly accurate. It was organized early in 1934, with offices in Princeton, N.J.

You have, on several occasions, referred to Mussolini's syphilis. Have you any independent quotations to offer in substantiation?

I have, in the past, quoted from authentic sources. I can add a quotation from Isaac Goldberg, which is, in turn, a quotation from George Seldes' *Sawdust Caesar*. Goldberg, who has just written a book about the international journalism of Seldes, and which I have read in manuscript form, refers to Mussolini's lover of years ago, Dr. Angelica Balabanoff, for it happens that Mussolini, unlike pansy Hitler, has had a varied, and quite normal, sex life. Says Goldberg in his new work, entitled *Mussolini Exposed*:

"And now, one of the simplest, most damaging lines in Seldes' book: 'There is no mention of her in the Duce's autobiography.' She is a part of a repudiated past. It was to her that he first confided his wretchedness; his father's drunkenness and the gloom it cast over the

son. It was to her that he confided, too, 'a congenital sickness for which I have to thank him.' This is important, not as scandal, but as a contribution to the history of Europe today. If Mussolini is syphilitic, much in his paranoid career finds a pathological explanation, and serves to emphasize the effect of a ruler's physio-psychological condition upon the course of events. There is likewise material for thought in the story of Hitler's homosexuality. History may, by and large, move inexorably to its crises, channeled by the major forces of economics; it nevertheless is colored by the characters of its exponents."

I consider the above to be most emphatic and conclusive substantiation.

* * * *

What size is the average path of a tornado?

Thirty miles long and 1,000 feet wide.

* * * *

Did any of our Presidents ever show anti-Semitism?

So far as I know my American history, only one, U. S. Grant, showed himself to be a bigoted, crass anti-Semite, in a single Civil War incident. The facts will be found re-stated in the magazine *Letters*, June 8, 1936.

When Grant was a major general in charge of the Department of Tennessee he pretended to be concerned seriously over the activities of cotton smugglers, who sneaked cotton (worth about \$1 per pound) through the North's lines from the South. I say "pretended" advisely, because the facts show that Grant's father, Jesse Grant, was himself engaged in this traffic at the very time Grant took drastic and unjust action against the Jews, an unwarranted attack on a people as a whole in order to camouflage his own father's cotton smuggling. In fact, while it's true a few Jews were engaged in that business, most of the cotton speculators were non-Jews, as was Jesse Grant. After Grant issued his amazingly unfair order, the facts were placed before President Lincoln, who quickly rescinded the Grant order. This all sounds strange, but it's well to remember that Grant was a man of very low character and integrity. Even as President he countenanced one of the worst orgies of graft in

our nation's history. Brilliant, courageous and resourceful in so many ways, especially as a military leader, Grant was given, in ordinary transactions, to a low grade of ethics and meager respect for the truth. The order, as issued by Grant, follows:

Headquarters 13th Army Corp,
Department of Tennessee,
Oxford, Miss., December 17, 1862
General Orders—No. 11.

The JEWS, AS A CLASS, violating every regulation of trade established by the Treasury Department Orders, are hereby expelled from the Department within 24 hours from the receipt of this order by Post Commanders. They will see that ALL THIS CLASS OF PEOPLE are furnished with passes and required to leave, and any one returning after such notification, shall be arrested and held in confinement until an opportunity occurs of sending them out as prisoners, unless furnished with permission from these headquarters. No passes will be given THESE PEOPLE to visit these headquarters for the purpose of making personal application for trade permits.

BY ORDER OF

MAJOR GENERAL GRANT

In its issue of January 3, 1863, the Louisville, Kentucky, *Daily Democrat* published an editorial which shows how Grant's outrageous order was received at the time, and which I quote below:

"General Grant has issued an order expelling all the 'Jews as a class' from his lines within 24 hours. His lines extend to Paducah, where all the Jewish citizens, some of whom have resided there for the past 12 or 13 years, were expelled. This is certainly the most extraordinary, unwarrantable order we ever heard of. The expulsion of a whole class of people by wholesale, and that, too, allowing them only 24 hours to leave! Of course this order will be rescinded even in these strange times; but the injustice in the meantime, and the fact that a military order of such a character could be issued, is startling. We understand the matter will be laid before the authorities in Washington, when we shall, of course, expect to see it nullified and repudiated."

In the Grant anti-Semitic outburst we see the time-worn tactics of the Jew-baiters. If anything goes wrong, or if it's necessary to find a

goat, blame everything on the Jews. That's what Hitler and his hoodlums did, and the same has been the practice wherever charlatans and frauds have found it necessary to cover a grave injustice with a serious crime against an innocent, helpless people. Anti-Semitism is a disease of the mind—a phobia that requires the knowledge of a psychiatrist in order to be properly understood.

* * *

What's the state of public opinion regarding the shortening of the work week in order to reduce unemployment?

The American Institute of Public Opinion, whose polls I've referred to frequently, took a nation-wide vote among 100,000 citizens on the question of whether the hours of labor should be reduced, and whether existing wages should be maintained. The average vote was 84 percent in favor of the shortened work week; 16 percent against such a change. The yes-votes follow:

	Shorter work week	Same wage level
Democrats	86%	90%
Republicans	61	74
Socialists	98	94
Third Party	78	90
Principal groups of voters:		
Farmers	63%	66%
Women	80	87
Young people	80	89
On relief	86	94

* * *

Can you tell me how the fertile areas of the world compare in size with the deserts?

Recent estimates place the earth's fertile area at 33,000,000 square miles; deserts, 5,000,000 square miles; steppes, 1,000,000 square miles.

* * *

How far can thunder be heard?

Scientists claim that thunder can't be heard more than 20 or 25 miles.

* * *

What kind of cars and tractors are being produced in the Soviet Union?

The Soviet Union's motor car plants have an arrangement with Henry Ford whereby they are permitted to have access to Ford's processes and patents, with the understanding that none of the cars is to be sold outside Russia. The financial terms haven't been made public, so far as I know. If you saw a Russian motor car running down the main street of your town you'd imagine it was made in Detroit, because it's

almost an exact replica of the cars we buy from Henry. Production is fairly large, compared with countries other than the U.S. Roughly speaking, our plants could turn out Russia's entire year's production in about a week, which gives one an idea of how vast our industry is.

* * *

What are the latest figures on losses caused by fires?

The National Fire Prevention Association reports that during 1935 U.S. fire losses amounted to \$259,000,000, the lowest since 1916.

* * *

What is Balbo doing? Did he participate in the air force activities during the Italo-Ethiopian War; and if not, why?

When Balbo led a squadron of airplanes from Rome to the Chicago Exposition a few years ago he received such a vast volume of favorable publicity that Mussolini began to fear he had built up a rival for his position of power over the Italian people, so he "promoted" him from the office of director of aviation by kicking him upstairs to the governorship of Libya, in North Africa. Balbo had no part in the war on the Ethiopians.

One of the original Fascists, Balbo helped put Mussolini in power and always served him with all his powers, not even stopping at the most terrible crimes imaginable. It was Balbo who carried out Mussolini's orders to have the great Socialist senator, Matteotti, murdered because of his caustic criticisms of Mussolini's policies. Balbo has the perfect Fascist psychology, which means he is capable of any act of blackguardism, hoodliganism, assassination, persecution and tyranny. But loyalty isn't enough for Mussolini, for the dictator is always jealous about his future powers. No sooner does a lieutenant become too popular or too powerful than the Duce turns on him and strips him to the skin.

Another case is that of General (now Marshal) Pietro Badoglio, who conquered the Ethiopians so rapidly. When he returned to Rome, Mussolini met him as he landed and rode with him to his palace, but at a speed of 40 miles per hour, which meant that the tens of thousands of spectators got only a glimpse of the "hero" and hardly a chance to let loose a cheer.

This is typical of Mussolini. He is ever jealous and can't tolerate a situation in which someone other than himself gets a cheer or a pat on the back. In Badoglio's case the fear was especially acute, because this old fighter isn't a Fascist and never was one. He is a regular army man and therefore strongly in favor of the king and his House of Savoy. He looks on Mussolini as an upstart bulldozer and hates the sight of him.

If the House of Savoy were ever to decide to put Mussolini on the shelf, the job, most likely, would be done by Badoglio, who has shown, in the past, a readiness to give Mussolini the boot. Some years ago, as I mentioned before, Mussolini planned on wiping out the House of Savoy and having himself declared king. When Badoglio heard of this, he moved a large number of regular army men into Rome and sent word to the Duce that a single move to carry out his plan would result in a grave crisis. Mussolini backed up, but never forgave him.

When he started his campaign in Ethiopia, he hoped to make it a purely Fascist spectacle, putting at the head of the troops the old and inefficient General De Bono, who, as the record shows, made a glorious mess of things in Northern Ethiopia. After taking Adowa without resistance. Had this Fascist—who took part in the original march on Rome—remained at the head of the Italian army, it might by now have gone perhaps 100 or 150 miles into Ethiopia.

In order to remedy this situation, Mussolini had to swallow his pride and take the Fascist from power and put in his place the regular army man who knew a few things about fighting. Until then the press reports gave the world the impression that the war was being fought by a few Fascist minor bosses, Mussolini's two sons and his son-in-law. The press reports released from Rome made it appear that these three young men and two or three other Fascists were conducting the war all by themselves. But Badoglio soon stopped this, ordering Mussolini's pets out of the three-ring circus and settling down to serious fighting. Mussolini hated this, but knowing that his own tools had just about spoiled

his chances, he took what Badoglio had to offer, knowing all along that he was building up a personality who might some day unhorse him.

And that's all the dirt I can think of now.

* * *

How far is a light-year?

A light-year is 6,000 billion miles.

* * *

I've heard tell that Hoover had several millions worth of gold which he tried to smuggle out of the country when Roosevelt first took office, and that it's because Roosevelt confiscated this gold that Hoover's so sore at him. Is this true?

Our recent Lord High President, Herbert Hoover, has been guilty of many shady practices during his career, but this particular yarn is all bunk.

* * *

What political parties did our Presidents belong to?

Federalist, 2; Republican-Democratic, 4; Whig, 3; Democratic, 9; Republican, 13. Total: 31.

* * *

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Reviewed by H. Emery, in *The Llano Colonist*, June 13, 1936.

When E. Haldeman-Julius changed *The American Freeman* over to a "question and answer" publication, he paved the way for the issuance of this series of books. All six volumes are reprints in convenient, more permanent form of the material first issued in newspaper format.

Here are questions and answers on almost every conceivable subject . . . the answers being written by E. H.-J. himself. Moreover he occasionally refers to someone who can speak with authority, or quotes from such a source.

The whole idea, of course, builds the reader-interest which leads other papers to run special departments or columns of answers to reader-questions. Going further, Haldeman-Julius has decided that if a department is good—and a commercial success—a whole paper will be better and more of a success. But even that does not exhaust the possibilities, for many of his 25,000 readers and other customers will buy the same material again in its more convenient and usable form.

Really, however, the books are valuable and educational, and in large

part carry on the ideas that E. H.-J. has stood for. Several times in the series he states these aims very clearly. "It happens that I am just a small town printer who thinks ideas are important," he says in one place; and in another adds, "I'd rather publish one book by a Joseph McCabe than a thousand tomes by a Harold Bell Wright."

Many of the questions are purely factual, and are answered with the most reliable information to be had. Others seem to call for a facetious answer, and sometimes get it. Many give the author a chance to get in some good licks against censorship, Fascism, Hitlerism, and the thousand and one varieties of bunk that he delights in exposing. Some give him the opportunity to venture on an essay of several columns in length.

As one would expect, there is considerable variation in the quality of the material. . . .

Some answers are almost epigrammatic in their quality. For example, when a reader inquires as to why he still believes in "the democratic nonsense of counting of heads," E. H.-J. replies: "Because it is better to count heads under a democracy than to break heads under a dictatorship."

A careful index adds greatly to the value of the books, making it easy to locate the most important points. Every question is indexed once. However, I hope that in future editions some of the longer answers will be indexed under a number of possible headings, so as to make this part of the book a complete guide.

The first three volumes have the questions and answers classified into several departments of thought, such as Democracy vs. Dictatorship, Banking and Finance, Medicine and Health, Philosophy, Science, etc.

All six are attractive, stimulating, and valuable books for the person who wants short, informative bits, and are a worth while addition to his series of publications.

* * *

Don't tell me that the United States is "different" from Nazi Germany, with all our lynchings, K.K.K.'s, Black Legions, Kansas City elections, labor-spy systems, and our War Department 1933 plans for the regimentation of all persons over 18, when necessary.

To take a few conditions which are really superficial and use them as

arguments for the claim that America is in the same class with Hitler's Germany is to resort to eccentric thinking. I certainly don't believe it's necessary to review the horrors of today's Germany—I've done more than my share in exposing them since January, 1933. I'm yet to meet a civilized person who would even dream of defending Nazi Germany. But once in a while I hear remarks along the lines of the above, regarding the United States, and frankly I'm pained by such shallow thinking.

The first thing that puts the U.S. a million miles away from Germany is the fact that horrors and the terror are government-inspired and government-supported in Germany, while in the U.S. we find that the anti-social acts of minorities are nothing more than behavior outside the sphere of the regular government. For example, if lynchings were legalized, if we conducted a propaganda department to teach our young men and women how and when to lynch, if we protected lynchers with all the powers of the courts, the Constitution, the laws, etc., then, and only then, would it be fair to even compare the U.S. with Germany. I've done my best, during almost 30 years of journalism, to arouse public sentiment against lynching, but my feelings against lynching won't permit me to put my intelligence aside and exaggerate a situation out of all fairness, though our lynchings are certainly most deplorable.

As I've shown before, more than 95 percent of our lynchings (which, by the way, have been growing fewer in number as the decades pass) occur in rural, backward sections of the country, particularly in the deep South. The great cities of the South rarely have a lynching, while there are entire States in the North that have NEVER had a lynching since the foundation of the Republic. It's unfair to blame the entire country for the criminal activities of a section inhabited by uneducated, unprogressive, primitive people. Your best educated Southerners—men and women—are strongly opposed to lynchings, as the activities of Southern organizations have shown during the past five or 10 years. Yes, lynchings are terrible things, but the answer isn't to say we're like Germany (where lynchings

of Jews are conducted under official auspices); the real remedy is to get behind the federal anti-lynching law, which could, in a few years, make the crime of lynching a thing of the dark, terrible past.

Yes, we have hoodlums who function under the banners of the K.K.K. and the Black Legion, but let's be fair about this matter. The K.K.K. gangsters who conducted that flogging in Florida recently were tried in court and found guilty by a jury of 12 Americans. In Germany they would be given rewards by the State if they were careful to beat up the people Hitler, Goebbels and Goering think ought to be flogged. As for the Black Legion, let's not forget that the full powers of the State of Michigan are being used to bring that gang of murderers to justice. The criminals who have been detected are in jail, while in Germany they would be parading the streets looking for new victims, with the full approval of a mad, medieval, sadistic government.

Yes, Kansas City elections are disgraceful. The machine run by Catholic priests and Pendergast is a source of shame and humiliation to all Americans who believe in the principles on which the Republic was founded, but here again we are finding what amounts to an exceptional condition which can be remedied once the people are aroused to the enormity of a priestly-political lineup of crooks and grafters. The American people have the weapons in their hands with which to drive out such rascals. But, let me hasten to add that there are few cities quite as rotten as Kansas City, while most of them—with Milwaukee at the head—are run decently and honestly, with the smaller communities and the rural sections frequently showing that democratic methods and ideals can be maintained when the citizenry believe in such ideals. But in Germany, the kind of people who have corrupted Kansas City are the officials of the entire country, and they indulge in graft, robbery, tyranny, gangsterism as a regular part of governmental policy. There's quite a difference, I insist.

The labor-spy condition is rank, I agree, but here we could easily outlaw such hoodlums if we were to make proper use of our ballots. America is

one of the few countries in the world to permit labor-spies and organized gangs of strikebreakers and gunmen to terrorize labor. In Mexico, such riff-raff are thrown into jail. In England there have been strikes for 75 years **WITHOUT A SINGLE DEATH FROM VIOLENCE**. Look at France during June, 1936, when about a million men and women went on strike—and won—without a peep from anything that even remotely resembled a labor-spy or provocateur. If American labor were to organize itself with the same energy and intelligence as have been shown by the workers in England and France, it would have nothing to fear from gangsters employed by the bosses.

But in Fascist Germany the system of labor-spies is a fundamental department of the government itself. Every worker is spied upon in order to learn what his opinions are regarding the government and the capitalist system, what he reads, what he listens to over the radio, whom he meets when he goes to a beer hall—all in the name of Hitlerism and the Fascism that enslaves and degrades labor. American labor is free to fight a fair fight, and it can win tremendous victories, if it will learn to function in the field of unionism, in the field of political action, and in the field of consumers' cooperatives.

It's true, as my correspondent says, that our War Department, in 1933, drew up a plan (which hasn't been accepted yet by Congress) to practically make every able-bodied man over 18 a part of the war machine, either in the army or in the fields of industry. When a bunch of officers get together to consider any future war they can't see anything less than an army that holds every man in the country. That's the military mind, and it's hard to change it. But, let's not forget that the American army and navy are both answerable to the civil government, even in war time, and the civil government is directly answerable to the people, so if the American people don't want to be regimented during the next war they have the power to assert themselves and show the officers just where they belong in the American scheme of things. But, in Germany, in peace times, we already have the

regimentation of every man and woman in the country. You can't go to school, work, or do almost anything else without answering to the government. You are already, in peace-time Germany, in the army, whether in the army itself or on the labor front. One's occupation, education and culture are made subordinate to the will of the military masters of Germany, and that's regimentation that's working in the here and now. Think of comparing the paper scheme of a bunch of officers for some future event (which can be nullified by the people if they wish) to the everyday, living, tyrannical, militaristic, uncivilized regimentation of Hitler's Germany. The comparison just doesn't make sense.

America isn't perfect. There's room for improvement. We haven't reached utopia, by any means. But we still have our full rights as American citizens, and if anything is wrong (and lots is, of course) we should, by all means, use our powers as free men to make America worthy of the founders' highest ideals. I doubt that America or any other country will ever be perfect. We shall, like the rest of the civilized world, always have dislocations, crime, anti-social behavior, individual violence, and the like, but a society can defend itself against such difficulties. That's the important thing.

Let's remember to appreciate the good while we criticize the bad. It's foolish to be eternally destructive about a country that has a fine and great constructive side. The sensible thing to do is to work hard to clean up the country's evils, but at the same time defend the things that make the country great and worthy of admiration.

* * *

I'm in great sympathy with liberal political ideas but I don't feel as though I should vote Red (Socialist or Communist) in the coming national election. What would you advise me to do, as a practical proposition?

Since you've already made up your mind, I see no reason for giving you a lecture on political theory or writing for your benefit an essay on social philosophy. I believe I know your type, and, while I disagree fundamentally, I respect your honesty and good intentions.

My advice, therefore, is to avoid

like poison the Coughlin-Lemke Union party, for it's only a stooge for the Landon-Hearst machine. The Liberty League-Hearst-Landon-Wall Street outfit are determined to kick Roosevelt out of the White House, so they organized this bastard Union party to draw votes away from the Democrats and thereby help the chances of Landon, which, by the way, are looking better as we approach the heat of the campaign.

You now reduce your choice to the two old parties, and here I can be brief and to the point. Roosevelt believes in the capitalistic system—he saved it in March, 1933, during the bank crisis—but he is by no means a reactionary. Technically, he fits slightly to the left of center, which isn't at all bad from the viewpoint of the general masses who aren't ready for a social change. Roosevelt enraged the great industrialists and financiers by taking the position that the problem of relief is a national question, and not a puzzle to be solved by the municipality, county or State. He therefore didn't hesitate to put at the command of the relief forces (and these included all the machinery of public works, CCC, TVA, REA, etc.) the immense, and almost limitless, credit of the U.S. treasury. He has spent a great deal of money, but he hasn't done a thing to injure the credit of the nation, which means that the federal government is as stable and solvent as ever it was in its entire history. Furthermore, Roosevelt has shown a willingness to compel Capitalism to make compromises and concessions to the new needs of the masses. This, also, outraged the individualistic elements that live by exploiting the people through private ownership of the large-scale industries, means of communication, and exchange. Roosevelt is called a dictator—or would-be dictator—by his political enemies in the Republican party, but I defy anyone to bring one fact or act to support such a charge. There isn't an iota of Fascist doctrine in Roosevelt's make-up—he is a strict believer in democracy, academic freedom, unlimited political and social discussion, and the bill of Rights of the Constitution.

Landon, on the other hand, is the spearhead of the nation's Fascists—

particularly his sponsor, Hearst. Landon hopes to take Roosevelt's place with the sole argument of balancing the budget—which, as I've explained before, means that the problem of relief for the masses is to be thrown back into the lap of local charity, as was held by our late Lord High President, 'erbert 'oover. The masses, I'm sure, won't welcome such a reactionary philosophy. That this is part and parcel of Landonism was shown during his governorship in Kansas, where he saw to it that only a few dollars of State funds went to relief, though there's a possibility he may throw the masses a sop between now and election day. This will be done as a bluff in order to fool the people into electing him—and then will follow the deluge. Capitalism will rule supreme and the masses will be told to hustle for themselves—or starve. The election of Landon will mean the worst wave of political reaction in American history, and I refuse to believe that the people care for such a line-up.

The situation, therefore, is very simple, so far as a choice is concerned. If you vote for Roosevelt, you put your vote slightly to the left of center, which means that while you aren't supporting radical liberalism you are, at any rate, refusing to back up complete reaction. Landon represents the Right forces who aren't quite ready for Fascism. In other words, he isn't an extreme Rightist. He is on the Wall Street-Hearst side of the fence, but only to the extent of wanting to save Capitalism without having to spend any federal money to do so; in other words, to balance the budget. Fascism isn't an immediate threat in this country. Republican institutions are still safe. But there is a strong move among the Right element to keep the government from going "collectivist," as 'erbert 'oover likes to call Roosevelt's behavior. Roosevelt is closest to the real liberals of the country, and even the radicals, in that he is willing to abandon the age-old favorite philosophy of the political conservatives—that is to say, he is ready to have the government participate in the everyday problems of the masses, at the same time preserving the economic structure of Capitalism. He is therefore a limited friend of

the radicals, and as such should be recognized and respected.

The choice is Roosevelt, because he is capable of friendly action and incapable of Fascist enterprises. The enemy, therefore, is Landon, because he represents everything that is reactionary and anti-social in American life. Roosevelt is, by far, the lesser of two evils. In fact, I'd word it differently. Instead of being the "lesser of two evils," he is the *potential* ally of the people who look forward to a day of social, economic and political cooperation for the well-being and prosperity of the working masses.

* * *

Editor, The American Freeman:

When The Freeman—dated August, 1936—came in my mail this morning (June 10), I started reading it, continued as long as possible, and expect to finish tomorrow (as I usually do every month).

But: while most of its contents are really "up-to-date" today or other days, and some of them will stay up-to-date tomorrow and much longer, it seems so-to-say funny when one reads in a paper of the year 1936 (dated August) that the leader of the French Socialists, Leon Blum, may become Premier of France when the new Chamber of Deputies meets in June; and again on page 4 "should Leon Blum become France's Premier in June. . ."

It surely will seem funny to a future reader, years hence, who will contemplate whether our present-day news was still brought to us by sailboat and pony express, or why Haldeman-Julius didn't read the contemporary newspapers.

Dumont, N.J.

Arno Hartenstein

(Comment: I'm sure that when some long-bearded historian, in the year 2036, issues his 10-volume biography and 150-volume set of the collected works of this scribbler, he'll add a footnote to the effect that the August, 1936, Freeman, which said Blum might become premier, was read in Dumont, N.J., on the morning of June 10, but was penned on the afternoon of May 25, the same year. It seemed pretty certain to me in May that Blum would be accepted as premier when the Chamber of Deputies gathered in June, but there was still a chance in a thousand that he mightn't, so I had to put in my face-saving "perhaps." My other readers know why I issue *The Free-*

man two months in advance of its date of issue, but for Mr. Hartenstein's benefit I'll repeat myself. This is a personal organ, and if I were to get sick or jammed in some kind of an accident I'd be on the spot for a paper, thereby endangering my second-class entry. I get around this (to a limited extent, of course) by bringing out the paper a little ahead of time. So much for that. But always try to remember that my comments are to be judged by the time they're written, not by the date on the paper's masthead.)

* * *

America's No. 1 anti-Semite, the Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, writes in his Defender, again and again, that Jews are in control of Communist Russia. Is this true?

I've shown before, by the recital of actual facts, that the charge is absolutely false. The Jews, in the Soviet Union, have equal rights with all other citizens, and they, like the members of other races, are protected against anti-Semitism or any other form of racial prejudice by strictly enforced laws which make it a penitentiary offense to even suggest any kind of racial persecution or discrimination. There are some Jews in places of secondary importance in the Soviet government, but that is because of their ability to render competent services to the community and not because they happen to be Jews. Trotsky is a Jew, and yet he was ousted by Stalin and forced into exile—a queer way of proving Jewish domination! Recently, the Soviet ambassador to the U.S., Alexander A. Troyanovsky, was asked the question printed above, and his answer is so candid and convincing that I'm glad to quote it in full:

"Our enemies sometimes attempt to discredit the Soviet Union by the statement that the Soviet Union is governed by Jews. This would not be discreditable if it were true. It happens not to be true. It is enough for me to say Stalin is not a Jew, nor is Molotov, nor Voroshilov, nor Ordjonikidse, nor Mikoyan. I can name many others.

"Some of our citizens of Jewish stock have also won high position in their own fields. That is to their credit and to the advantage of their fellow citizens. We are proud of the achievements of Russians, of Jews, of Georgians, of Turks, of men

of other stocks among our people. They are all citizens of the Soviet Union, not only by name, but also in spirit.

"The Soviet Union is a conglomeration of a multitude of different nationalities, every one of which has its own national culture, its own national pride and its national achievements. We Russians have our own part in the great cause of building the Soviet Union, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But Russia is only part of the Soviet Union, and, for this reason, not rejecting the word Russia, we must stick to the name Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, since otherwise we shall be excluding all our non-Russian citizens, such as Ukrainians, Turks, Uzbeks, Caucasians, Tadjiks and the rest.

"I wish to add that the Soviet Union, like the United States, is a melting pot of different racial stocks. With all these stocks blended within the one country, there is a spirit of internationalism along with a common Soviet culture. Here we have, in voluntary association, a new great nation of many stocks in process of creation and integration looming before our eyes. The various stocks replenish and strengthen it, like rivers flowing into the great ocean.

"The history of humanity has already recorded the names of different nationalities of various racial and national origins, with their precious treasures of culture. Among them we find Americans, French, Italians, Russians, Jews, Armenians, Japanese, Chinese, and so on. I am convinced that the names of the great Jews among them will not be placed at the end of the list. And I am convinced also that the service rendered to the Jewish people by the Soviet Union will not be regarded as either the least or the last."

* * * *

Please comment on the following statement by Mrs. Alf M. Landon: "We (women) will do well to broaden our horizon, but not to the extent that we neglect our homes. Love of our homes and genuine patriotism are inseparable."

I'm sure we aren't expected to take seriously the political remarks of Mrs. Landon, who, so far as I know, is a charming woman and a pretty good harpist, though she doesn't hesitate to join in the political campaign by taking a slap at Mrs. Roosevelt. Mrs. Roosevelt has done the Ameri-

can home no harm by showing a keen, intelligent and humanitarian interest in social problems. Mrs. Roosevelt has always been a good mother, and is, today, a good grandmother, and yet she exercises her right as an American citizen to study and take a stand on questions that concern the well-being of the entire nation. Mrs. Landon may have her hands full in caring for her two lovely children and her ambitious husband, but she shouldn't leave the impression that the wife of a political opponent is not quite desirable because she "meddles" in the spheres of labor, sweatshops, social rehabilitation and human welfare generally.

* * *

What is the combined cost of our Federal, State and local governments?

The National Industrial Conference Board, on June 10, 1936, released the results of an inquiry on the above question, that showed:

	Fiscal year of 1934	1933
Total expenditures ..	\$14,449,000,000	\$12,232,000,000
Per capita expenditures ..	114.11	97.26
Total tax collections ..	8,767,000,000	7,501,000,000
Per capita tax collections ..	69.24	59.64

State, county and municipal costs, from 1931 through 1934, declined, but during the same time Federal spending increased substantially because of public improvements, relief, CCC camps, etc. The summary shows:

"Federal share of total government expenditures in 1934 was 47 percent against 38.7 percent in 1933 and 35.1 percent in 1932. Taxes collected by all governmental units in 1934 amounted to 16 percent of national income, against 12.4 percent in 1929 and 10.9 percent in 1925.—Gross debt of all governments as of Feb. 29, 1936, was estimated at \$50,000,000,000, against nearly \$48,000,000,000 on June 30, 1935; since 1929, the increase was about 50 percent. Per capita gross public debt was \$376.24 on June 30, 1935, against \$363.24 one year ago, and \$331.13 two years ago."

* * *

Your Darrow-admiring reader should be

told that Charles Scribner's Sons have recently published Clarence Darrow's "Story of My Life," an exceptionally fine book.

Thanks for the reminder. Anything from the pen of Darrow is always worth reading. He's been my favorite for over 30 years. I admire his wit and humor, homely philosophy, intellectual honesty, rugged personality, social conscience, love of freedom and fair play, defense of unpopular causes, anti-clericalism and Freethought. He has retired from active life now that he's approaching his 80th year, but his mind is as keen as ever it was. He always impresses me as one of the most civilized men in the world today—the kind of person who makes life worth living after one has to endure the torture of watching the insane cavortings of a bunch of Hitlers, Mussolinis, Father Conghlins and the other degraders of civilization. I don't consider a person even half educated unless he's familiar with most of the writings, speeches and debates of Clarence Darrow.

* * *

Your numerous reports on the gold situation throughout the world during the past few years have been of real value to me. Have you data for 1935? If so, where does Russia now stand as a gold producer? How much of the world's supply does the U.S. Treasury hold?

The Union Corporation, Ltd., Johannesburg, South Africa, has a statistical bureau which specializes in gold research. The June, 1936, issue of the *Stock Exchange Bulletin* contains a digest of these late statistics. The most outstanding fact is Russia's sudden development as a producer of gold, with second place securely held. Russia hopes, in time, to become the world's first producer, but the figures show the goal still far distant, if we combine the output of South Africa, Canada and other British sources into the single heading of the British Empire.

Here are a few valuable sets of figures which I take from the *Bulletin*, mentioned above:

ANNUAL GOLD PRODUCTION

(Amounts in millions of fine ounces)

	1929	1935
Union of South Africa ..	10.41	10.77
Canada	1.93	3.28
Other British Empire	1.77	3.08

Total British Empire	14.11	17.13
U.S.S.R.	1.09	5.65
United States	2.06	3.11
Elsewhere	2.33	5.11
World Total	19.59	31.00

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL

British Empire	72%	55%
U.S.S.R.	5	18
United States	11	10
Elsewhere	12	16

The U.S. continues to be the world's greatest owner of gold, with a stock of 292,300,000 fine ounces at the close of 1935, out of a world total of 734,300,000 ounces. The holdings of the various important countries are given below, in millions of fine ounces:

	At End of: 1929.	1935.
United States	188.7	292.3
France	78.9	125.6
United Kingdom	34.4	47.3
Russia	7.1	*24.0
Spain	23.9	21.0
Belgium	7.9	16.7
Switzerland	5.6	13.0
Netherlands	8.7	12.5
Japan	26.2	12.1
Argentina	19.6	11.5
Italy	13.2	*8.0
India	6.2	7.8
Elsewhere	82.9	55.9
<hr/>		
Total in Central Banks and Treasuries	503.3	647.7
Total world stock of monetary gold	553.6	734.3
Difference (in Western hoards and exchange in equalization funds)	50.3	86.6

*Partly estimated.

Percentage of Total World Monetary Gold

United States	34%	40%
France	14	17

There are two reasons for the above increases in output. First, of course, is the greatly increased price now being paid for gold. Second, gold's increased value has made it commercially feasible to exploit new deposits and work over low grade ores which couldn't be mined profitably in the old days.

* * * *

I heard a radio sermon by a Catholic bishop, in which he made the assertion that Russia's godlessness has resulted in a tremendous increase in crime. He offered no data to support his statements, so I'm led to believe he was talking the usual clap-trap. Have you any facts?

The Moscow News, May 1, 1936, gives a report on crime in the Soviet

Union, which is summarized, as follows:

"The number of persons convicted of criminal acts dropped 45 percent from 1932 to June, 1935. Property crimes declined 90 percent. Convictions for theft dropped 61 percent in June, 1935, as compared with 1933. Convictions for sexual crimes dropped to 25 percent of the 1929 figure. Over the same period, number of assaults dropped 40 percent, and murder convictions 50 percent.

* * *

Henry R. Luce, publisher of Time and producer of the movie, The March of Time, asks me to comment on his screen pictorial. "I will appreciate it very much," he writes, "if you will let me know how many issues you have seen and (pulling no punches, please) what you think of them.

I've seen all issues of "The March of Time," an experiment in pictorial journalism which I've watched with great interest, but with hardly enough admiration. The trick of staging scenes from the news would be perfectly legitimate journalism if only the announcer would be careful to identify such fabrications. As for the announcer, I'm sure he's giving the service he's paid for, but I find him altogether too theatrical—especially that turgid, stentorian cry of "Time marches on!" at the end of each episode. I like my news presented in quiet form—I don't follow sensational newspapers—and that, I suppose, is why I have an underlying dislike for the sensational presentation of this movie of the news. But then, a public that's fed thrilling westerns and multiple murders isn't in the mood for a quiet, dignified review of the big events of the day. One shouldn't be too critical with an experiment of such recent introduction. The pictures have been growing better steadily, so perhaps a little patience will reward us with a pictorial presentation that'll be true, interesting, unsensational and intelligent.

* * *

In your various articles on the antics of Pelley you fail to mention that nut's mania for prophecy. How come?

It's pretty hard to cover all the bunk, especially when we are so liberally supplied with bunk-shooters, quacks, charlatans and plain and fancy crackpots. I've given quite a little attention to William Dudley Pel-

ley's activities as head of the Silver Shirts and writer of Fascist propaganda in the manner and spirit of Hitler. I even told about his seven-minute journey to heaven, where he visited with Gawd and had a right nice conference with that aged and innocuous gent. As for Pelley's prophecies—they deserve treatment, for purposes of entertainment, if nothing else.

Pelley went into a spasm some months ago and saw a vision—or rather, a nightmare—which he set down for the readers of his Silver Shirt periodical. The prophecy, he told his moronic readers, was based on "expert divination of the secrets of the Great Pyramid of Egypt," and dealt with what was going to happen in these benighted States on June 9, 1936. The great hater of Jews, rabid red-baiter and propagandist for dictatorship, according to the Federated Press, wrote that the following things would positively happen on that fateful June 9:

(1) The banks were to be closed in a Communist plot to avoid paying the soldiers' bonus (the Communists always supported the bonus);

(2) President Roosevelt was to be seeking refuge in Canada despite his part in the conspiracy;

(3) The 48 States were to have been abolished;

(4) Christians over 25 were to have been murdered;

(5) New York City was to have been renamed Reedsville in honor of the late John Reed, American chronicler of the Russian revolution. After "two weeks of Bolshevism" Pelley was to ride into power, and do away with strikes, Jews, Roosevelt and radicals. Just who would be left alive after the double purge was not made clear.

And now that we've all had a good, long belly-laugh, let me turn serious long enough to mention that Hitler got off stuff, prior to 1933, that was every bit as screwy as Pelley's brainstorm—and look what's happened to Germany. These candidates for the booby-hatch (and Pelley I consider a straight lunatic) are funny—and dangerous.

* * *

I notice that you have held, several times, that it's not necessary to have colonies in order to satisfy the need for raw materials. Can you mention

any nations that made economic advances without such sources?

The London Economist, April 18, 1936, says:

"Lack of colonial markets has never impeded the furthest and most rapid strides in national economic development; witness the historically uninterrupted advancement of Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries to the highest levels of European economic standards. Germany's colonies before the World War took only 0.6 percent of her exports in 1912 and 1913; they provided only 0.5 percent of imports. They were negligible factors in Germany's overseas development."

* * *

The elements opposed to the federal government's expenditures to finance public works and provide relief argue that we are saddling future generations with a load of debt. Please comment.

I have shown repeatedly that the federal government's debt—now about \$35,000,000,000—is in no way threatening the national credit, and that if we were to increase our debt to that of Great Britain's (in proportion to population, etc.) we could, without straining ourselves in the least, increase our national debt to, roughly, \$90,000,000,000. And yet, these capitalistic elements who are worried about the debts the future generations will pay are the very ones who like to praise Great Britain for its quick steps in the direction of recovery.

But let's look into this argument about the future generation's having to pay off debts incurred in these days when millions of people must be provided with relief or starve on our hands. To put the issue simply, let's suppose that Uncle Sam sold today \$1,000,000 worth of bonds payable 25 years from now. When the bonds fall due, taxpayers will have to provide the government with \$1,000,000, if the obligation is to be met. It's therefore true that a definite job of liquidation awaits a future generation.

But there's a point which the opponents of spending fail to stress, for it shatters their argument to powder. It's this: While the taxpayers put up the \$1,000,000 to pay off the bonds, those same bonds are in the hands of people who are to collect \$1,000,000 on their day of matur-

ity. So, we find that while \$1,000,000 is taken away from a future generation, a part of that future generation receives that same \$1,000,000 in payment for its bonds. And, of course, those same bondholders will be taxpayers. The point is all too simple. We are not doing future generations the slightest injustice. And they aren't going to go through life burdened with saddle sores because more than 11,000,000 unemployed received relief.

* * *

How much did we pay to the States in gasoline taxes during 1935?

The total revenue collected by the States from gasoline taxes in 1935 was \$619,000,000, according to a report issued by the Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D.C. Gasoline consumption in that year increased 6.4 percent over 1934. Every State reported increased gasoline consumption. The nation's average tax was 3.8 cents per gallon. Motor cars and trucks used up 16,000,000,000 gallons during the year. (This tax money is in addition to that collected by the federal government.)

* * *

Is there any truth in the report circulating in union circles that Frank Knox, Republican candidate for Vice President, once broke a strike?

It's not only true, but it's admitted boastfully in the official biography of Mr. Knox, released during his campaign for the Presidency. You will find the quotation (first discovered by Heywood Broun) on page 100, under the chapter-heading of "A Rough Rider in the World War." Here it is:

"Camp Dix was not finished when draftees began to pour in to form the 78th Division. Quarrels arose among the union workers over union jurisdiction. A Trenton electrical union ruled that the men working at Camp Dix had to join it, paying \$10 initiation plus dues. Some of the union men resisted this ukase, and the Trenton workers walked out, trying to pull all union electrical workers on the job. Electrical work on the camp was not nearly complete. A strike meant delay in training work and in making the soldiers comfortable.

"Knox heard of the trouble and acted. He made a proposal to his superior officers, and it was accepted. He pulled out of the personnel files the cards of all the soldiers

who had been electrical workers. He called them together. The story of the fight over union jurisdiction was explained to them. The men were asked whether they would carry on the electrical job dropped by the civilians. They roared approval. But they never went to work. When the union men heard of this, they rushed back to work. There was no more union trouble on any part of the construction."

* * *

What do you think of the Roosevelt family as individuals?

I have been impressed by the way the members of the Roosevelt family—from the President down—respect one another's personal rights. They all—young and old—seem to live in an atmosphere of civilized freedom and mutual respect. The President had to see two of his children go through the divorce courts while he was in the White House—and he took it on the chin, like a good scout. So far as I know, he made no attempt to keep his children from bringing criticism and abuse on his head from those puritanical elements which like to bark at those who would seek legal means of remedying an unhappy emotional situation. Nor does the President dictate to his wife as to her beliefs or activities. He leaves her alone to live her life as she likes, even though her behavior often (unjustly) brings him a deluge of complaints. The Roosevelts, it seems to me, are thoroughly civilized people, who live intelligent lives and maintain fine contacts, regardless of the protests of the blue-nosed gentry. I admire them for it and commend them for their simple ability to get away with it. The personal side of the Roosevelt family is a good, wholesome influence nationally.

* * *

What is the farm population of the U.S.?

The latest report of the Bureau of the Census shows a farm population of 31,800,900.

* * *

I have been hearing a report about President Roosevelt which sounds sensational and about which I would like to know the truth. The tale has it that F. D. R., years before he became President, was declared incompetent by legal action and his personal fortune was placed in the control of three administrators. Now, when he wants a little money for himself, he has to ask at least one administrator. If he wants a

sizable sum, he must get the consent of all three. What are the facts?

I've heard the same yarn. The inference always is that since the President is "incompetent" to handle his own money he must be incompetent to handle the public's. The story is a great favorite among the Republicans, who, to my observation, have become quite rabid when the President is mentioned. The story to which you refer hasn't an iota of truth in it. But, just for the sake of the record, I wrote a letter of inquiry to the White House, in which I repeated the slanderous story you heard, and received the following reply from Stephen Early, Assistant Secretary to the President:

"As you probably know, this being the year of the Presidential campaign, many attacks are being directed at the President. Some of those who attack do not hesitate to hit below the belt; to resort to unjust and despicable methods of attack. It would appear that the story to which you refer probably is being circulated for that purpose."

* * *

Has work-relief employment increased or decreased in recent months?

The Works Progress Administration, Washington, D.C., reports that there has been a decrease. The figures:

	May 16	Feb. 29
WPA	2,417,581	3,039,000
CCC	411,900	459,000
Other Fed. agencies	619,665	355,000
of which PWA ...	142,259	
Total	3,449,146	3,853,000

It has been the policy of the WPA to take its employes from the relief rolls, to the extent of about 95 percent.

* * *

Please discuss the religious beliefs of our Presidents.

I have already written or edited a great deal of material on this subject. Abraham Lincoln's religious indifference (he was an infidel) was treated in a well-documented piece printed here recently. Joseph McCabe has written a book, in which he devoted a chapter to each of our well-known infidel Presidents, beginning with Washington and Jefferson and ending with Lincoln and Grant.

Prof. Charles A. and Mary Beard, authorities on questions of American history, in their book, *Panorama of*

American History (Vol. 1, page 449), comment freely on the religious liberalism or religious emancipation of the great figures in our history. The following sentences will give you the key to their argument:

"When the crisis came, Jefferson, Paine, John Adams, Washington, Franklin, and many lesser lights were to be among either the Unitarians or the Deists. It was not Cotton Mather's God to whom the author of the Declaration of Independence appealed, but 'Nature's God.' From whatever source derived the effect of both Unitarianism and Deism was to hasten the retirement of historic theology from its empire over the intellect of American leaders and to clear the atmosphere for secular interests."

The facts about our American Presidents indicate clearly that the great work of secularization was accompanied, in the majority of instances, by Freethought, Agnosticism, Deism, Indifferentism, Liberalism, anti-Orthodoxy, Unitarianism, and in some cases even open anti-Clericalism. Franklin Steiner, of Milwaukee, Wis., long a student of the subject of presidential religious beliefs, has compiled a great mass of data, from which I draw the following:

George Washington. Joseph McCabe, as I've already said, gives the first President considerable attention, and shows that Washington was NOT a member of any church or a communicant. He wasn't even a regular attendant. Steiner adds that so far as is known he never communed. "On communion Sundays he walked out of the church just before this sacrament was administered," says Steiner. "There is no evidence that he was a believer more than a Deist. Bishop White, his intimate friend, says he never uttered a word in his presence that would indicate him to be a Christian believer. Rev. Dr. Abercrombie, whose church he attended, says, 'Washington was a Deist.'" Steiner also exposes "Washington's Prayer for the United States" as a fraud, and proves as a mere fiction the pretty story about his being found on his knees at Valley Forge praying to the Lord God Jehovah.

John Adams. A Unitarian, he hated religious orthodoxy even more intensely than was shown by Thomas Paine. As a young man, Adams

studied to be a preacher, but later, after becoming a lawyer, wrote he would rather stand in the rear rank of lawyers than in the front rank of ministers. His letters show a great enthusiasm for enlightenment and intellectual progress and a deep contempt for religious thinking.

Thomas Jefferson. We now come to an out-and-out Freethinker. During his eight years as President he studiously refrained from even going through the empty formality of issuing a Thanksgiving Proclamation. Even our preachers pass him up when they go searching for facts or fictions to nail religion onto the heads of our government. Jefferson's heterodox views on religion, published in 1829, shocked the Fundamentalists of that time, who demanded the book's suppression.

James Madison. Like John Adams, Madison studied for the ministry in his youth. But he couldn't swallow the thorny religious fare, so he quit that mumbo-jumbo and became a great believer in and fighter for the precious principle of religious liberty, to which he tied a firm demand for complete separation of church and state. Bishop Meade is authority for the statement that Madison never kneeled in prayer and never expressed the slightest belief in the Bible. When Madison wrote about religion, he resorted to extremely modest language, perhaps because of his unwillingness to offend.

John Quincy Adams. A Unitarian, like his father, the second President. Had no regard for Sunday laws and expressed deep contempt for religious revivals.

Andrew Jackson. Didn't join up with the church until he was a sickly, infirm, old man. It was only after he'd left the presidential chair that he entered the Presbyterian church.

Martin Van Buren. He never was a church member, though he often attended services. His *Autobiography* contains a terrific attack on preachers who meddle in political matters. Indifferent.

William Henry Harrison. Was never a member of any church, nor did he even own a Bible until after he became President. Thoroughly indifferent.

John Tyler. He never became a communicant of the Episcopal

Church, though he attended. He never showed an excess of piety.

James Knox Polk. Here we have another President who was completely indifferent about religion. Wasn't a member of any church before he became President. After leaving the White House, a few weeks before his death, he became a member of the Presbyterian church, an act to please his old mother and his wife.

Zachary Taylor. He never was a church member, nor did he ever show any signs of being a religious man. "A preacher's prayer while he was on his deathbed failed to move him."

Millard Fillmore. He was a Unitarian, and of course the liberal ideas of the Unitarians are common knowledge. Someone has called the Unitarian sect a church for retired Christians. In addition to being a Unitarian, Fillmore expressed himself as strongly favoring the separation of church and state and opposed the giving of public money to church schools, insisting that all such funds should go to the public schools.

Franklin Pierce. Another indifferentist. Was without church connections until he was an old man, when he joined the Episcopal church.

James Buchanan. Still another President who, all his life, was indifferent to religion. After he left the presidential chair, he was worked on by a minister, who, after strong urging, got him to enter the Presbyterian church.

Abraham Lincoln. He was a Deist and a great admirer of the great infidel, Thomas Paine. A mass of material is available to prove Lincoln's Freethought. I have used some of these facts, which will be found in several of my books of questions and answers.

Andrew Johnson. He joined no church. His wife was a member of the Methodist church, where he attended services. Later he went to Catholic services. If he wore any religious garments, they hung lightly. Indifferentism would just about describe him.

Ulysses Simpson Grant. Never joined a church. The Methodist bishop, John P. Newman, while a preacher, tried to convert Grant, but without success. "He once said he was willing to take his chances in the next world with the majority of peo-

ple." He was coldly indifferent to religion, suspicious of clerical influence, and sought always for separation of church and state.

Rutherford Birchard Hayes. Never became a member of any church, though he has been wrongly claimed as belonging to the Methodist church. He held to liberal Unitarianism and was a great admirer of Emerson, who was a Deist without the slightest traces of religious Fundamentalism or orthodoxy.

James Abram Garfield. Was a "Campbellite" preacher while still a young man. Outgrew the religious notions of that primitive and intellectually backward church and went into secular activities, particularly in law and politics. "Later studied Evolution and accepted its teachings."

Chester Alan Arthur. Another President who was no communicant but attended church (Episcopal) with his wife.

Grover Cleveland. There's nothing to show that Cleveland joined the Presbyterian church before he was elected to his first term. He became devout in his old age.

Benjamin Harrison. Now, believe it or not, we come, for the first time, to a President who was a member of an orthodox church at the time he was elected to office. Presbyterian.

William McKinley. Member of the Methodist church, the only President to belong to that denomination.

Theodore Roosevelt. Belonged to the Dutch Reformed Church but took his religious ideas casually. Now and then he'd give the Christian notions a passing nod.

William Howard Taft. He was a Unitarian of the most liberal ideas. During his political career he was frequently attacked for his religious heterodoxy.

Woodrow Wilson. Though a member of the Presbyterian church, he was modernistic and wrote a letter saying he accepted the scientific teachings of Evolution.

Warren Gamaliel Harding. He was a Baptist, the only President to come from that church.

Calvin Coolidge. Never joined up until he became President, when he became a member of the Congregational church.

Herbert Clark Hoover. Quaker.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Mem-

ber of the Episcopal church, but rarely attends. Thinks nothing of going fishing on the Holy Sabbath. Has been criticized by the orthodox for his liberal ideas on religious behavior. Seems to me the kind who belongs to a church for the appearance of things and then forgets about it. He qualifies as an indifferentist.

Steiner sums up with this: "... but 11 of our 31 Presidents were, at any time in their lives, communicants in any orthodox church; that the others were either liberally inclined or indifferent upon the subject of religion; that not until 1888 did the American people elect a 'professing Christian' President."

* * *

What is likely to come of the Louis Waldman-Old Guard defection from the Socialist party?

I got pretty well fed up with their fight long before they decided to split away from the party and from their own organization. I may be indulging in wishful thinking, but it seems to me they'll soon simmer down to just another splinter organization known only to specialists who putter around looking for eccentric political line-ups. Waldman, who is a bright young man, seems to be suffering acutely from the delusion that a kindly Jehovah has chosen him to fill the shoes of the late Morris Hillquit. But Hillquit, with all his faults, wore shoes several sizes too large for Waldman. I rather fancy the idea that Waldman's followers will drift back into the Socialist party, leaving him and his minor Napoleons as so many generals without buck privates. I don't think their new federation will injure the Socialist prospects in the current campaign. The real damage will come from those who hold it's necessary to support Roosevelt in order to prevent the Old-Guard-Hearst-Liberty League Republican party from capturing the government.

* * *

How did you like Sylvia Sidney in "The Trail of the Lonesome Pine"?

Miss Sidney hasn't been one of my favorite actresses, though I admire her work occasionally and pulsate to her personality at times. To be perfectly frank, the picture you mention bored me to the point of exhaustion. The color photography was impressive, but after five minutes of that, I was ready to follow a real story—

and who, in his right senses, would expect to get anything that looks like a story out of this old piece of sentimental balderdash? I didn't like the story as a book; I hated it as a silent film, and I walked out on the color-talkie version. This hoary theme—Southern feudists rarin' to shoot one another to pieces—has been done to rags, with the final knockout given in recent years by short burlesques. I always like these feudist pictures in their comic form, for there's many a laugh to be squeezed out of the idea, but once the author and director get serious I get bored.

* * *

In your summation of the steps needed for an economic liberation of the farmers and industrial workers, you could, in addition to outlining the three bases of organization (production, consumption, politics), have, with perfect propriety, called attention to the need of worker-support for the radical press.

You're right. It's important, and should be emphasized constantly. The radical press certainly deserves far more support than it's receiving. There'll never be a great labor-political-cooperative movement in the U.S. unless we build a tremendous radical press. We have the beginnings of such a press now, but most of them are suffering financial malnutrition. Good radical periodicals should get some attention from all persons who want to see social justice prevail. The best medicine I know of is getting these publications some additional readers.

* * *

What do the daily sales of consumer cooperatives total?

More than \$1,000,000.

* * *

What volume of business is being done by some of the larger cooperative societies?

Current History, for June, 1936, contains a valuable article on the general subject of American cooperatives. During 1935, the leading groups did a great deal of business. The facts are summarized as follows:

Eastern States' Farmers Exchange, Springfield, Mass. Business with 62,000 members increased 13.5 percent over 1934 to a total of \$14,067,500. About \$100,000 was returned as patronage dividends, and \$50,000 was set aside for expansion.

National Cooperative, Inc., federa-

tion of 11 cooperative wholesale associations serving retail consumer cooperatives in 21 States; business increased 32.2 percent to \$25,438,400.

Grange Cooperative Wholesale of Seattle: business increased 40 percent to \$3,000,000; estimated savings to members \$250,000.

Farmers Union Central Exchange, one of the largest cooperatives handling oil and gas, recently acquired an \$80,000 oil compounding plant; sales last year increased 54 percent to \$4,028,100. (Since 1921, more than 2,000 cooperative gas and oil stations were organized throughout the West, with compounding plants to blend their own petroleum products; cooperative distribution of gas and oil last year totaled \$10,000,000 according to the Cooperative League.)

* * *

Will you comment on Germany's exchange students?

For many years, German and American universities have exchanged students, but since the advent of Hitlerism this cultural practice has become unbearably difficult. Recently, the German Ministry for Education issued an order under which German students, before they can attend universities abroad, must be entitled to receive a "certificate of political responsibility," which means, of course, that they can leave Germany only if they are died-in-the-wool Nazis. When this piece of Hitleristic bigotry reached the president of Williams College, Dr. Dennett, the American educator decided on an act of protest. As a result, Williams College won't accept a German exchange student during 1937. Dr. Dennett, in a press statement, said "a student officially committed to a political program and without liberty to change his mind, would not profit by study in an American college for which an open mind is a 'conditio sine qua non.'"

* * *

How many aspirins do we Americans swallow per year?

About 4,500,000,000.

* * *

How'd you like "Fury"?

I thought it was an exceptionally honest treatment of one of the worst and most damnable phases of American provincialism—lynching. The story is drama-

tic, and the picture is mature, with strong acting and fine direction. The theme, towards the end, wobbles somewhat, but not enough to destroy the film's vigorous indictment of mass sadism. A few more pictures like *Fury* will help undo the damage done by semi-Fascist pictures like *Riffraff*, with their Hearstian glorification of flag-waving, red-baiting, pop-gun Mussolinis.

* * *

"The publicity you gave to the dress habits of one Percy L. Gassaway is interesting, to say the least. In my opinion his defense of boots, high hats, etc., is just another example of rationalization in favor of something which is itself completely irrational. I think that when it's hot there is no such thing as a cool hat, shirt, shoes or pants. (We'll not mention a coat.) And some day, after we have generally taken the liberty to lay aside all raiment on all suitable occasions, to the immense betterment of our physical and mental health, our appearance, and our mores (not morals—that's too indefinite a word), the perusal of such pitiful palaver as that about cooling systems within a leather boot inside of a jeans pant-leg, or under a 10-gallon hat, will be really hilarious; much more gleeful than it can possibly be today while we are so intimately bound up in that complicated mess of clothes-consciousness which the clothiers and fashion designers in league with the moralists (?) foist upon us."—C. A. Lang, Mo.

[The above letter from Reader Lang comes on June 12, 1936, exactly one year after he dropped in at my office, accompanied by his two young and intelligent daughters. He was motoring to spend a vacation at several southwestern National Parks, among them Mesa Verde, in Colorado. I was glad to have a nice visit with him, my only squawk being that his stay was too short. I consider Reader Lang one of my most understanding, informed and intelligent readers. I always get a thrill out of his neatly-written, pithy letters. And I usually get ideas from him for at least a column of matter for each issue. Such readers are hard to get. But, I'll say this much: I've a dandy bunch of readers, in the main. If they're dumb and wander into my circle of pious readers by mistake, they soon get mad over something and cancel their sub-

scriptions with words of pity or abuse. But, I'd rather have one reader like Lang than a thousand who expect an editor to cater to their ignorance, superstition and prejudice.]

* * *

If inflation comes, wouldn't it be better for one to move his capital to a foreign country until the storm blows over?

Let's suppose you have \$10,000 in gold—the kind of capital you could move out of the country. The law, as it stands, would prevent your doing so. Or, let us say you owned stocks or bonds and moved them to a bank in a foreign country. The government could, during a period of inflation (as was done in European countries like Italy) compel you to recall those securities and accept paper money on their surrender to the federal treasury.

But, just for the sake of argument, let's suppose you had \$10,000 worth of gold in such a position that you could move it to a foreign bank. What assurance have you that that foreign government wouldn't decide to confiscate your gold—by legal action, of course—and compel you to accept, lire, marks, francs, or whatever it is the foreign government had available for your gold.

Furthermore, you would have to have a tremendous knowledge of international finance to know which country to ship your gold to, for this is a subject that would tax the judgment of the greatest monetary expert. The plain fact is, you'd take a stab in the dark. There's no telling what luck, or bad luck, you'd have. The chances are just about three to one that you'd lose at least 75 percent of the value of what you tucked away in a foreign country. Even the greatest financial wizards have been defeated in their attempts to ship capital from country to country during periods of storm and stress. And if the big fellows usually get whipped under such circumstances, just what chances do you think a little fellow with a mere \$10,000 would stand?

No, shipping your capital out of the country will cause only grief.

* * *

What is the attitude towards one another of William Randolph Hearst, Mrs. Hearst and Marion Davies because of their unconventionality? Do they

take themselves as emancipated super-people, but who think they shouldn't be followed by ordinary folk? Or is there friction among them?

The arrangement is quite orderly. Hearst and his movie star live together quietly on his immense ranch in California, while his wife lives like a queen in New York City. Hearst provides his Phoebe with all the money she can possibly use—including enough for her charity milk fund—and limitless publicity for her charitable enterprise in his powerful newspapers. Frequently one reads columns about the humanitarianism of Phoebe and, in the same issue, pages of palpitating gush about Marion and her latest movie masterpiece. So, everything is hanky-panky, which is as it should be if the great Hearst is to be free to turn his powerful journalistic guns on immorality, especially as it's expressed in cinemaland. Some people, buried in crass barbarism, believe it's somewhat off-color for a man to pose as a moralist publicly and go in for the latest wrinkles in bedroom etiquette privately, but the mighty Hearst is above ethical trash who hold to the old-fashioned notion that condemning publicly what one does secretly is plain hypocrisy. But Hearst knows better than any of us that Marion has something that's worth the bother. I've seen Marion in many of her pictures, and while I don't put her in the same class with Marlene or Greta, still the gal's got sex appeal—and Hearst, let's not forget, is now in his seventies. A man of that age may have ambitious ideas, but it takes a great expert in the art of love to handle him properly—and maybe Marion is up on all the tricks.

You speak of the "ruthless persecution of holders of various shades of left philosophy unacceptable to the Stalinites," etc. I presume this category includes the counter-revolutionary elements operating all the way from Paris to Manchuko, does it not? Along with the task of building the first Socialist state, which everybody admits to be Herculean in proportion, what would you have the Soviet Union do with respect to enemies within and without; serve them cakes and ale in true Ascot Garden party style?

The counter-revolutionary elements you speak of are technically described as "White Guard," which suggests

czaristic and capitalistic forces out to destroy the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Union has always been within its full rights in meeting such groups with the severest penalties. The words you quote from my brief note refer to entirely different people—Socialists who were sent to prison by the thousands or to labor camps by the tens of thousands because they insisted that a Socialist society should be constructed along democratic lines, with protection for those who would exercise free speech, press, assembly, petition, demonstration, criticism of governmental policies, etc. I have written several pieces about the new democratic Constitution which the Russians are sure to adopt within the next few months. A reading of digests of that Constitution shows that the principles for which these Socialists were persecuted have now been accepted as valid Communist doctrines, after 18 long years of abuse and scorn for the "rotten liberalism" of "capitalistic democracy." The least the U.S.S.R. can do is to declare an amnesty, if that hasn't already been arranged. We defenders of "bourgeois democracy" have lived to see the day when the Stalinites were at last brought around to confessing that a nation resting on a democratic base is sounder than one enslaved to a dictatorship. Of course, Stalin and the other official Communists will deny that Russia is going to accept "bourgeois democracy"—it'll be "proletarian democracy," of course, but we won't stop to quarrel about words, remembering what Shakespeare wrote about a rose smelling just as sweet by any other cognomen.

What would the defeat of Roosevelt mean?

If he were defeated by Norman Thomas, the country would go forward. If he were defeated by Landon, the country would go backward.

When the French strikers took possession of the establishments in which they had been employed, weren't they using the same tactics employed by the Italian Communists in 1920, which prepared the way for Mussolini?

The tactics of the Frenchmen and Italians are quite dissimilar. In Italy, the strikers took possession of the plants with a view to operating them cooperatively for their own profit.

The French workers held their plants merely with a view to keeping the employers from putting strikebreakers in their places.

* * *

Please comment on the French "stay-in" strike.

It was, without a doubt, one of the most inspiring incidents in the history of the labor movement. And, to the satisfaction of the workers of the world, it ended in a smashing victory. About 1,000,000 men and women went on a new kind of strike—remained on the job at least eight hours per day, but refused to perform any work. Instead of leaving their shops, factories, department stores and offices—which would most likely be a signal for the installation of strikebreakers they remained at their posts, ate and slept in their plants—and waited for the acceptance of their fair, reasonable terms.

Throughout the stirring crisis the workers conducted themselves with praiseworthy discipline. There was no disorder or violence. Nothing was destroyed. No damage was done to property. These men and women were too intelligent to resort to sabotage and violence. They had better weapons at hand—order, discipline, solidarity, and an intelligent comprehension of the issues at stake.

To show their respect for legalism, note, for example, how a department store's employees conducted themselves. They put a notice in the store window, informing the public there was a strike going on. But, said one of the strike leaders, this notice was really a public advertisement, and French law calls for a revenue stamp on all such advertisements—so, in a sincere mood of solemn formality, a messenger was hurried to the proper public official, from whom he purchased stamps that were later affixed to the strike notice. Also, the same employees, who were compelled to sleep in the store, showed their amazing respect for private property by refusing to sleep in the store's beds or chairs. The new chairs were covered with dust cloths, and the beds were untouched. Instead, they slept on the counters. As a part of their strategy, the strikers decided that foremen and managers must remain with them in the establishments, but they were taken care of with the

most meticulous solicitude, their lunches being brought to them with the polite remark: "This is for you, comrade."

The government—led by Socialist Leon Blum—respected every right of the strikers while it hurried through the formalities of a settlement. The administration refused to call out the troops to drive the "stay-in" strikers from the shops. The police were ordered to take no steps so long as no blood was shed or property destroyed. Everything was in perfect order and the best of humor. And there wasn't a strikebreaker or a gunman—a la U.S.—in the entire strike zone.

Blum, after heroic efforts, brought them the fruits of victory—wage increases of from 7 to 15 percent, 40-hour work-weeks, and the like. Here was a perfect lesson in the power of intelligently directed democracy. The workers had, by a majority, elected Radical Socialists (liberals of the New Deal type), Socialists and Communists. The government, headed by Blum, was therefore pledged to the Popular Front's program. The strike was the use of the industrial weapon to back up the powers of the government, which was their political weapon instead of their class enemy. Had the strikers voted into power an administration pledged to the capitalists, their "stay-in" demonstration would have been greeted with force and murder. French labor has given the world of labor a lesson in strategy. I believe it will be taken to heart wherever labor has preserved its democratic, political and economic rights.

* * *

Please comment on Hoover's convention speech.

Our former Lord High President, Herbert Hoover, threw quite a fit before the Republican convention at Cleveland. His clarion calls in the fight for liberty moved me almost to tears as I caught his thrilling words over the radio. But I couldn't quite forget what little respect the Hoover administration had for freedom; how his postoffice department used its powers to suppress and persecute editors of periodicals that voiced unpopular doctrines. It all sounded as hollow as Hitler would if he were to ask the world to treat Jews decently and to respect the liberties of the people. The delegates cheered Hoover

for a full half hour after the gentleman finished, but here again there was no sincerity or honesty, for these Liberty Leaguers don't want real freedom but seek only the liberty to exploit the people and enable the great corporations to enjoy free sway in piling up new billions in dividends.

Had the convention been sincerely concerned over the future of liberty, it would have paid some attention to—and accepted—the suggestions formally submitted to it by the officers of the American Civil Liberties Union, a body that is always loyal to the spirit of freedom and civil rights.

The Union, in a letter to Henry P. Fletcher, then chairman of the Republican National Committee, urged that a plank in the platform be devoted to civil rights. Said the Union: "We ask support for liberty of opinion, for personal rights as distinct from, though in no sense opposed to, property rights."

The letter continued:

"A decisive stand by the Republican party in favor of traditional American freedom of expression would be a blow to those who would use force and violence to limit free speech, who would rule by the tar and feathers of the vigilante, the whip of the hooded flogger, the rope of lynch law, the bayonets and tear gas of martial law, or the barbed wire of the concentration camp."

And here are the five points which the Union suggested for acceptance in the Republican platform—points which are "fundamental to any guarantee of the fullest exercise of freedom of speech, press and assemblage":

"1. That mere language should never be punished in the absence of overt acts of violence or disorder.

"2. That public or private interference with labor in its rights to organize, strike, and bargain collectively should not be tolerated.

"3. That the crime of lynching denies judicial process, and should be dealt with by the federal government where States fail to act.

"4. That freedom of teaching in our schools, being essential to democracy, should not be restricted by legislative interference.

"5. That no censorship or control should be exercised in advance of production over the theater, the mo-

tion pictures, the radio or newspapers."

Of course, the party of 'oover, Landon, Mellon and Standard Oil didn't see fit to adopt the above five points. So, we are given to understand that 'oover can talk for liberty until his voice breaks with emotion, but we aren't permitted to look forward to a diminution of the terrorism and espionage in the anti-labor activities of great industrialists, the murderous attacks of the Black Legion, the torture and flogging of Socialists and others by the Ku Klux Klan in Florida, the attacks on union organizers in California, and the persecution of striking sharecroppers in Arkansas.

How long would it take a land snail to travel a mile?

About 30 days.

Which of our Presidents had military rank?

Washington, Monroe, W. H. Harrison, Taylor, Pierce, Buchanan, Lincoln, Johnson, Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, Benjamin Harrison, McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt had military rank. Franklin D. Roosevelt was Assistant Secretary of the Navy during the World War.

Please comment on the enclosed clipping, which describes the Catholic Church as being pacifist.

The clipping is unidentified, so I can't say where it's taken from or who wrote the piece. But here it is, anyway:

CATHOLIC PACIFISTS

Catholics throughout the world outnumber the Protestants by at least three to two. While unpromising war resistance has made great strides forward in many Protestant communions, the Catholic Church has generally confined its peace activities to educational and official government efforts.

The above qualifies as a bunkette of first rank. Oh yes, the Pope showed great concern over the rape of Ethiopia by that gentle Christian philosopher and saint, Benito Mussolini. Believe it or not, the world rang with the protests of Italian cardinals and priests when Mussolini's blackshirts were sent to Ethiopia to destroy that independent Negro country. The Catholic Church surely refused to bless the banners of Mussolini's armies

in Ethiopia. The propaganda machinery of the Catholic Church was used to arouse public sentiment against Mussolini's imperialism.

All of the above may sound strange to persons familiar with the black record of the Catholic Church, especially during the invasion and theft of Ethiopia, but, after all, maybe we all misread the news. Maybe the Catholic Church has really been converted to the peace philosophy of Jesus, unbeknownst to infidels and other low characters.

* * *

Have you data dealing with the changing emphasis on various school subjects?

The New York State Education Department has prepared a table which gives you some of the information you seek. It deals with secondary (four-year high school) pupils in the schools throughout New York State. The 1919 and 1934 percentages show the changing emphasis, as follows:

Subject	1919	1934
English	84.2%	91.7%
Latin	32.8	15.9
French	27.2	27.3
German	5.8	6.1
Spanish	17.4	7.9
Mathematics	58.2	46.8
Science	62.5	64.8
History	32.2	37.4
Civics	19.6	24.3
Economics	1.2	5.7
Economic geography ..	2.9	7.5
Bookkeeping	15.9	12.6
Commercial arithmetic	11.5	7.0
Shorthand	10.1	12.7
Typewriting	14.1	20.9
Drawing	43.8	34.3
Music	28.1	17.7
Home economics	7.8	7.6
Agriculture9	.8
Industrial arts	5.7	8.2

* * *

How many of our Presidents were college graduates? Name the colleges.

Nineteen Presidents were graduates of colleges, as follows:

John Adams, Harvard; Madison, Princeton; John Quincy Adams, Harvard; William Henry Harrison, Hampden-Sydney; Tyler, William and Mary; Polk, University of North Carolina; Pierce, Bowdoin; Buchanan, Dickinson; Grant, U.S. Military Academy; Hayes, Kenyon; Garfield, Williams; Arthur, Union; Benjamin Harrison, Miami University, Ohio; Theodore Roosevelt, Harvard; Taft, Yale; Wilson, Princeton; Coolidge, Amherst; Hoover, Leland Stanford

Junior; F. D. Roosevelt, Harvard. Four others attended higher educational institutions without graduating. Jefferson and Monroe took some courses at the College of William and Mary. McKinley attended several terms at Allegheny College. Harding irregularly attended Ohio Central College without graduating. Our Presidents who had only what we'd call common school educations were: Jackson, Van Buren, Taylor, Fillmore, Lincoln and Cleveland.

* * *

Is there any truth in the statement that married people live longer than bachelors?

The statistical department of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company answers this question, as follows:

"Annual mortality reports of Canada, held equally applicable to U.S., show that the mortality rate of males over 15 years of age is 1,218.2 per 100,000 for bachelors, as compared with 855.9 for married men. Similarly, marriage appears conducive to longer life of women, whose death rate is 1,039.1 for spinsters, but 856.6 for the married of all ages. Only during the early part of the childbearing period, married women have a higher death rate: in the age group of 25 to 44, mortality for the married is 444.6 as against 458.0 among the single. The married person's life is better regulated with regard to sleeping hours, meals and recreation; most married men avoid conditions and adventures likely to impair their capacity as wage-earners."

* * *

Have "iodine socks" any curative values?

"Iodine socks" are sold in England quite extensively, but I've yet to see any advertised in this country, though I don't doubt there'll be some smart quack who'll cash in on these fakes before long, for the American public is always ready to spend its good money on "magic" cures. "Iodine socks" are dipped in iodine, or, more often, iodoform. They are "guaranteed" to relieve gout, rheumatism, colds, varicose veins, corns, bunions and aching dogs, but, of course, they are fakes, pure and simple. They have absolutely no therapeutic value.

* * *

Isn't it a fact that most criminals are mentally sick?

The facts don't support such an inference. I have shown repeatedly that economic conditions or environment predominate in the world of crime.

Poverty is the great breeder of crime.

The Society of Medical Jurisprudence, of New York City, issued its *Statistical Bulletin*, in April, 1936, in which it reported:

"Of nearly 10,000 criminals who passed through the psychiatric clinic of the N.Y. City Court of General Sessions during the last four years, 82 percent were found average, normal individuals, 14 percent on the borderline between normal and abnormal, 2.4 percent mentally defective, and 1.5 percent psychotic cases. It is concluded that mental disease plays a comparatively minor role in causing crime."

* * *

Can you explain Mickey Mouse's popularity?

Mickey Mouse is the perfect hero—small, brave, inventive, imaginative, and ever on the side of right and justice. If Mickey were a giant, his reputation would decline considerably, because the public, it seems to me, prefers its heroes to be undersized, thereby magnifying their achievements. A big hero knocking out the villain is only doing what's expected of him, but when a little feller like Mickey routs the enemies of righteousness he takes on the stature of a superman. Mickey Mouse is humanity as it would like to be—possessed of a true and beautiful love, victory after struggle, health, vigor and vitality, ability to overcome the most difficult obstacles, and with it all a love of fun and a general good time. Humanity, expressed in a mouse, is a right pleasant, kindly, friendly, decent thing. Mickey Mouse is Charlie Chaplin in reverse. The little mouse always wins, while the feller with the funny mustache and queer walk is the frustrated hero who fights manfully, but loses. But when Charlie loses, we know he isn't out—he'll be back for another round, and will fight nobly, even though he'll get another kick in the pants. Chaplin is the little feller who's always trying, and that makes him dear to our hearts, while Mickey—the perfect optimist and extravert—takes one look, reaches a decision, lands out, and comes through with a K.O.

* * *

What's the best speed the railroads make between California and Chicago? Does it cost less to run these Diesel trains?

The Union Pacific is now installing

two 11-car, stream-lined, articulated trains for service between California and Chicago, to make the trip in 39½ hours, which is 19 hours under the fastest time made before. Pulled by Diesel engines, these trains will be able to make up to 115 miles per hour. They were built in the South Chicago Pullman shops and are the latest in speed, absence of jolts and noise, and the most modern improvements, gadgets and decorations.

I've written before on the low fuel cost of Diesel engines, but I have some new data. The Burlington road, between Denver and Chicago, makes the trip in 16 hours (best previous time, 23 hours). This 1,000-mile run of its two Zephyr trains costs only \$17, as compared with the \$250 fuel cost of the steam-powered super-train, the "Aristocrat." These Zephyrs contain only three cars, without Pullmans, so an increase in the cost of fuel may be expected when larger trains are put into service.

* * *

When the consumer shops does he buy the exact brand he wants or does he order on impulse?

The Du Pont Cellophane Company made a survey of the retail field, which showed that 62 percent of women buyers and 42 percent of all customers buy:

"On impulse, without advance decisions as to the brand desired. It is held that a wider choice of products and brands, and new diversions absorbing the housewife's time, have caused the changed buying habit, necessitating packaging of impulse merchandise in such a way that it will have quick appeal to the customer."

* * *

How many telephones are there in the world, and how many of these are in the U.S.?

The A.T.&T. Company reports there were 33,540,000 telephones in the world, in January, 1935. The U.S. had 16,869,000 of these, or 50.3 percent; Europe, 36 percent; Canada, 3 percent; Japan, 3 percent. The U.S. has 13.36 telephones per 100 population. Canada comes second with 11 per 100.

* * *

Why doesn't the federal government establish a great university?

Ever since the formation of the U.S. the idea has persisted that the government should establish, at

Washington, a super-university. Dr. Edgar B. Wesley, of the University of Minnesota, has written a book, in which he studies this suggestion. He proposes an institution that would be run only for graduate and research students and for students intending to make government their career. Dr. Wesley has found, among other things, that George Washington left \$25,000 in his will for the founding of such an institution, and that the money was never paid to the U.S. or never came to light in any way.

What are the reading habits of the average high school student?

The New York City Association of Teachers of English made a study of 47,000 high school students in New York City in order to learn their reading interests. It was found that shallow fiction was in greatest demand instead of books capable of developing judgment or refining the emotions. The survey shows that of books reported five times or more the classifications were:

	No. of books	Percent
Fiction	45,980	69.50
Very light fiction	4,371	6.66
Biography	4,266	6.45
Plays	3,513	5.30
Science	2,204	3.23
Poetry	1,656	2.50
Travel, adventure	1,668	2.52
Unclassified	2,475	3.74

In newspaper and periodical reading (where they were almost independent of the influence of their teachers) the students sank to even lower standards, as follows:

"In four high schools surveyed, tabloids were most widely read, constituting the daily paper for 70 percent of the youngest and most retarded group. In newspapers, the interest concentrated on comic sections, sports and the front page; in magazines on sports, motion pictures, popular science, mystery and detective stories. Hundreds habitually read magazines of doubtful standards."

Why is Virginia called "the Mother of Presidents"?

Because this State gave the country the most Presidents—eight. The natives of "The Old Dominion" were: Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, W. H. Harrison, Tyler, Taylor and Wilson. Ohio comes next with

seven Presidents: Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Benjamin Harrison, McKinley, Taft and Harding.

How many U.S. Presidents were from New York?

Four, as follows: Van Buren, Fillmore, Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Would a good egg-laying hen slow down on production if she weren't domesticated?

A hen that lays about 200 eggs per year does about 10 times the laying she'd do if she were undomesticated. Dr. W. A. Hagan, of New York State Veterinary College, says it takes a hardy bird to stand the strain of high egg production. He figures a hen that lays 200 eggs produces at least five times her own weight in eggs in a single year.

Is it a fact that there is danger of a shortage of timber because we are using up our forests faster than they can reproduce themselves?

P. A. Hayward, chief of the forest products division of the Department of Commerce, says there is no possibility of a lumber shortage before "some far distant time." He believes this country will always have sufficient timber to meet "all reasonable needs and that the immediate and pressing problem is that of expansion of markets for forest products." Mr. Hayward calls attention to the fact that timber is one natural resource that is reproducible and should therefore be looked on as a crop which must be utilized or it "ceases to be an important asset."

Are pin ball machines games of chance or skill?

Dr. C. C. Clark, Science Department, New York University School of Commerce, was invited by Mayor F. H. LaGuardia and the New York City Police Department to undertake a study of nine machines taken in legal test cases. Dr. Clark and a number of tabulators watched students play the machines in order to answer whether the machines were games of skill or gambling devices. The results of 67,000 plays showed that practice has almost nothing to do with playing the games; that the results were almost the same when the faces of the machines were

covered so that the player couldn't even see where the ball was going after he released it.

Dr. Clark put 10 assistants to work to become skilful with the devices. After they played the machine 30,000 times it was found they were only from 2 to 9 percent better than those students who played them blindly or casually. Dr. Clark added:

"This 2 to 9 percent represents the maximum element of skill involved under the most liberal interpretation. It is so slight that it may even represent only the error of the data. The absence of any ability to develop skill in playing pin-game machines is to be explained primarily on the basis of the construction and operation of the machines.

"The machines consist of an inclined table containing a number of holes into which the balls may fall when the machine is being played. The holes are surrounded by numerous pins and springs, all of which affect the direction of the ball. Unlike other established games of skill where balls are used, such as billiards, golf or baseball, the player loses all control of the ball long before the scores are made.

"The ball is shot up an inclined runway and after rebounding against a spring or pin it returns down the inclined table largely through the force of gravity. It is in the return of the ball that the scores are made, but the player has lost all control of the ball after that first rebound. In all other ball games the scores are made primarily as the ball moves away from the player with a force which he imparts."

Dr. Clark's numerous and careful tabulations showed the pin ball machines are even worse nickel-grabbers than slot machines. The chances of getting the top winning scores or combinations, according to Dr. Clark, range, on different machines, from 5 to 1 in 1,000. His tabulations also prove that the chances of getting any kind of a winning score, on different machines, range from 54 to 12 in 1,000. Dr. Clark said:

"The playing records reveal that in most of the machines approximately 80 percent of the balls played will fall into one hole or another. This high chance of getting the ball into some hole serves as a stimulus to the player. The chances of getting the balls into the proper combination of holes neces-

sary for winning, however, are very small."

Those pin ball machines which deliver money to the player for each hole he makes pay only an average of 54 percent, which is an unusually low rate. Other types of gambling machines—such as roulette and slot machines—do much better, if they haven't been fixed. An honest slot machine pays back from 65 to 75 percent of the money put into it.

* * * * *

What are some of the problems scientists are working on?

This is a vast subject, and I've given various outlines in the past. The latest will be found in a new book, *The Next Hundred Years*, by Dr. C. C. Furnas, professor of chemistry, Yale University, in which he suggests the following tasks for science:

1. In chemistry: road surfaces that will last 100 years; roofs that won't ever leak; a super-conductor for electricity; a perfect insulator for heat; artificial molars that will look and work as well as natural ones; food containers that are perfect, non-corrosive, non-chip and cheap; paper that will endure as long as parchment.

2. In engineering: "We will all be much better off when agriculture develops into a highly specialized, large unit industry employing all scientific, engineering and financial ability available."

3. In biology: "If hogs, dogs, poultry, cows and horses can be bred up to some ideal, why not humans?"

4. In social sciences: "We have taken away security and added automobiles, but that security . . . is the king pin of our social existence. We must have it back."

Of course, Dr. Furnas' suggestions have value, but they only touch the surface. Frankly, I'm puzzled by his fourth proposition. I know of no period in human history when the masses enjoyed social security. It hasn't been lost, because we never had it. Science's job is to establish social security for the first time in history. And that, I insist, will have to be achieved only through a system of socialized industry. The job can be done, but it's going to take a lot of sound thinking and planning. Our mood, for the present, isn't in

the direction of a scientific solution of the problems of poverty, unemployment and violence. We still have the childish notion that utopia can be achieved by some brilliant stunt—a la Townsend or Father Coughlin. But we'll learn, from bitter experience, that these problems won't ever be solved by magicians. When the charlatans and quacks have finished, perhaps we'll come to our senses and turn to the only force capable of establishing a cooperative commonwealth of peace, plenty and social security—science.

* * *

What does it cost to govern our big cities?

The U.S. Census Bureau reported, in May, 1936, the following costs to operate municipal governments:

Cities	Per Capita	
	Cost	Total Cost
New York	\$88.42	\$747,436,000
Chicago	45.62	185,087,000
Los Angeles	70.56	126,871,000
Philadelphia	54.08	111,126,000
Detroit	61.87	107,661,000
Boston	89.01	76,876,000
Cleveland	60.37	60,597,000
Buffalo	83.50	52,886,000
San Francisco	69.24	51,312,000
Pittsburgh	62.20	47,174,000

The same report says it cost \$2,-522,520,000 to operate, in 1934, the municipal governments of 93 of our cities which have a population of 100,000 or more.

* * *

If the average man didn't shave during his lifetime, how long would his whiskers be?

If he never shaved, and if his whiskers kept right on growing he'd have a beard about 16 feet in length on his 60th birthday.

* * *

Can explosives be made from any other vegetable matter besides cotton?

The American Chemical Society reports that Professor Edward Bartow, of the University of Iowa, has discovered a method of extracting a super-explosive from corn, which may now be produced commercially. "The agent," says the report, "is made from inositol, a waste product obtained from the water in which the corn has been soaked in the manufacture of corstarch. Heretofore, this sugar-like substance—also being tried clinically as a possible sugar substitute in the diet of diabetics—was extracted at such cost that its price was

\$500 a pound; only five pounds a year were made available for experimental purposes; all other inositol is being thrown away as waste. The new process permits to extract as much as 1,000,000 pounds a year at a reasonable cost."

* * *

What are the facts regarding deaths among medical doctors?

The Journal of the American Medical Association, April 8, 1936, says that during 1935 there were 3,319 deaths of physicians in the U.S., against 3,231 in the previous year. The average age of death was 64.2 years. The life expectation for the general population is 61.26 years. The 1935 deaths among doctors included:

510 between the age of 60 and 64
499 between the age of 65 and 69
455 between the age of 70 and 74
400 between the age of 55 and 59
385 between the age of 75 and 79

Most deaths occurred in the month of January. Leading causes were:

Heart diseases	1,345 deaths
Cerebral hemorrhage .	375 "
Pneumonia	360 "
Arteriosclerosis	322 "

* * *

What is the cause of color-blindness?

This condition may be caused by congenital (inherited) conditions, or disease or injury to the optic nerves. Nothing can be done to remedy congenital color-blindness. There are about 18 different forms of color-blindness, ranging from complete inability to detect any colors, everything appearing to be grayish, down to normal vision with certain colors and blindness with others.

* * *

Have you any figures dealing with abortions in the U.S.?

The Birth Control Review, April, 1936, estimates there are 681,000 abortions per year in this country, resulting in about 8,000 deaths. The same authority continues:

"In the past 40 years, there has been a marked increase in the number of abortions with a decrease in the number of births, the ratio of abortions to confinements changing from 1 to seven 40 years ago to 1 to 3 at the present time. In some industrial centers, the number of abortions approximately equals the number of full term deliveries. Of total abortions, 25 percent to 30 per-

cent are spontaneous, 10 percent to 15 percent are therapeutic, and about 60 percent to 65 percent are illegally induced. Over half of the latter are done by physicians, one-fifth by midwives and the remainder by the patients themselves. About 90 percent of all abortions occur in married pregnant women, especially those between 25 and 35 years of age who have had several children. Abortions constitute the greatest single factor in the high puerperal mortality, namely one-fourth of the total."

These figures—and they are pretty accurate—expose the utter futility of our laws against the dissemination of birth control information. Women denied the right to scientific information resort to abortion—with appalling results. Our church-ridden, puritanical elements think they are serving "morality" when they make birth control education illegal, but see what the price is—death and ruined lives! The same criticism goes for the allied element that opposes open, candid attacks on venereal diseases, for fear the people will indulge in an orgy of vice! Millions of people are infected unnecessarily—science says the two great venereal diseases could be wiped out in a generation if our puritanical taboos were removed—but hypocrisy must have its place in the seats of the mighty!

Don't you think we ought to have a new national anthem, without the present one's glorification of militarism?

I certainly agree with you. Persons who love peace and order certainly don't get a thrill from singing about "the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air," etc. But, it happens that new words were written to the music of The Star Spangled Banner, and they express the ideals of peace and brotherhood, instead of violence and destruction. They were written by Katherine Devereux Blake, several decades ago, and for a time, before the World War, the first stanza was used in the public schools of New York City. But when we joined in Wilson's war to make the world safe for democracy and Morgan's investments, the stanza was stricken out of the school textbooks. The stanzas by Miss Blake make much better sense, but I still feel that our national anthem is an unsingable, clumsy song, however good the words

may be. The Blake stanzas follow:
O say can you see, you who glory in war,

All the wounded and dead of the red
battle's reaping?

Can you listen unmoved to their agonized groans,

Hear the children who starve, and the
pale widows weeping?

Henceforth let us swear

Bombs shall not burst in air,

Nor war's desolation wreck all that is
fair,

But the star spangled banner by
workers unfurled

Shall give hope to the nations and
peace to the world.

O work toward the future when all wars
shall cease,

And the watchfires of murder no more
shall be lighting,

When 'gainst ignorance, poverty, dirt
and disease,

Humanity's brains shall be valiantly
fighting.

Then the world shall be fair,

Powers of earth, sea and air,

Shall bow before science, their secrets
lay bare.

Then the star spangled banner with
the peace flag shall wave,

The whole world shall be home of the
free and the brave.

* * *

Can you explain why members of the
professional classes indulge in child-
less marriages?

The Eugenics Research Association, at its New York convention, brought out the facts of a survey of 576 childless marriages among professionals in this country. The following reasons were submitted:

Involuntary	33%
Self-centered attitude, such as wife's preference for a profes- sional career	31
Economic pressure	16
Poor health	9
Unwillingness to pass on unsound hereditary traits	5
Dislike for children	6

o * * *

Is anything being done to honor the
memory of Thomas Paine in the manner
his services to civilization deserve?

I'm glad to be able to report that a distinguished committee of scholars, public men and libertarians are now at work gathering funds, under the direction of Joseph Lewis, to celebrate the bi-centennial of Paine's birth with the erection of a statue in Paris, on January 29, 1937. The project will go through if the money is finally raised, because the Leon Blum So-

cialist government now in power, according to a letter I've received from Mr. Lewis, is enthusiastically in favor of it. The committee is headed by Edouard Herriot, leader of the Radical Socialist party (Liberal) of France.

Paine—an Englishman by birth, a French citizen by decree, and an American by adoption—has been neglected disgracefully, mainly because of his unorthodox ideas on religion. Some of the greatest figures in the last century and a half have expressed the keenest admiration for the great Thomas Paine. Let me quote a few eulogies, which were compiled by Joseph Lewis, as follows:

"Others can rule, many can fight, but only Thomas Paine can write for us the English tongue."—BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

"Your presence may remind Congress of your past services to this country, and if it is in my power to impress them, command my best exertions with freedom, as they will be rendered cheerfully, by one who entertains a lively sense of the importance of your works."—GEORGE WASHINGTON

"History is to ascribe the revolution to Thomas Paine."—JOHN ADAMS

"That you may long live to continue your useful labors, and to reap the reward of the thankfulness of nations is my sincere prayer."—THOMAS JEFFERSON

"The crime of ingratitude has not yet stained, and I hope never will stain, our national character. You are considered by them as not only having rendered important services in our own Revolution, but as being, on a more extensive scale, the friend of human rights, and a distinguished and able advocate in favor of public liberty. To the welfare of Thomas Paine the Americans are not, nor can they be, indifferent."—JAMES MONROE

"I never tire of reading Paine."—ABRAHAM LINCOLN

"No writing ever more instantly swung men to its humor."—WOODROW WILSON

"Free America without her Thomas Paine is unthinkable."—GENERAL LAFAYETTE

"Thomas Paine! A statue of gold should be erected to you in every city of the world."—NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

"With his name left out, the history of liberty can not be written."—ROBERT G. INGERSOLL

"That Illustrious American."—VICTOR HUGO

"We never had a sounder intelligence in this Republic. He was the equal of Washington in making American liberty possible. Where Washington performed, Paine devised and wrote. The deeds of the one in the field were matched by the other with his pen. I consider Paine our greatest political thinker."—THOMAS A. EDISON

"Paine practiced what he preached and some day will be recognized as one of the clearest of thinkers."—THOMAS A. EDISON

I have been, since my boyhood, a great admirer of the writings of Thomas Paine, one of the world's greatest liberators. He fought priestly and kingly tyranny without compromise and without fear. And with it all he possessed a literary style that was perfect for its ends. Paine's *Age of Reason* is still a popular book, and still opens the minds of tens of thousands of persons everywhere from month to month, because the book is a deathless classic—a work that will endure not only because it serves a useful purpose but is in itself a supreme masterpiece of informative writing.

Let me close this tribute to one of my greatest admirations with a baker's dozen of gems from the writings of Thomas Paine, the great patriot who said: "Independence is my happiness, and I view things as they are, without regard to place or person; my country is the world, and my religion is to do good."

Paine's sentences follow:

These are the times that try men's souls. The Summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like Hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: 't is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed, if so celestial an article as Freedom should not be highly rated.

I love the man that can smile in trouble, that can gather strength from distress, and grow brave by

reflection. 'T is the business of little minds to shrink, but he whose heart is firm and whose conscience approves his conduct, will pursue his principles unto death.

Some people can be reasoned into sense, and others must be shocked into it.

As to religion, I hold it to be the indispensable duty of all governments to protect all conscientious professors thereof, and I know of no other business which government hath to do therewith.

It is an affront to truth to treat falsehood with complaisance.

The sublime and the ridiculous are often so nearly related that it is difficult to class them separately. One step below the sublime makes the ridiculous, and one step above the ridiculous makes the sublime again.

When it shall be said in any country in the world, "My poor are happy; neither ignorance nor distress is to be found among them; my jails are empty of prisoners, my streets of beggars; the aged are not in want, the taxes are not oppressive; the rational world is my friend, I am a friend of its happiness"—when these things can be said, then may that country boast of its constitution and its government.

When we consider, for the feelings of nature cannot be dismissed, the calamities of war and the miseries it inflicts upon the human species, the thousands, and tens of thousands, of every age and sex who are rendered wretched by the event, surely there is something in the heart of man that calls upon him to think! Surely there is some tender chord, tuned by the hand of the Creator, that still struggles to emit in the hearing of the soul a note of sorrowing sympathy. Let it then be heard, and let man learn to feel that the true greatness of a nation is founded on principles of humanity, and not on conquest. War involves in its progress such a train of unforeseen and un-supposed circumstances, such a combination of foreign matters, that no human wisdom can calculate the end. It has but one thing certain, and that is to increase taxes. I defend the cause of the poor, of the manufacturer, of the tradesman, of the

farmer, and of all those on whom the real burden of taxes fall—but above all, I defend the cause of women and children—of all humanity.

Poverty is a thing created by that which is called civilized life.

The most formidable weapon against errors of every kind is reason. I have never used any other and I trust I never shall.

Certain I am that when opinions are free, either in matters of government or religion, truth will finally and powerfully prevail.

To argue with a man who has renounced the use and authority of reason, and whose philosophy consists in holding humanity in contempt, is like administering medicine to the dead.

When will men stop condemning in others the things they do themselves?

* * * *

I have read that Roosevelt is the 32nd President, but is also the 31st individual to have gone into the White House. What does this mean?

It's true that F. D. R. is both our 32nd President and 31st individual President. This is explained by the fact that Grover Cleveland's two terms were not consecutive, which made him our 22nd and 24th President.

* * * *

How long have envelopes been in use?

Envelopes came into commercial use only about a century ago. However, there is in the British Museum a hand-made envelope (4½ x 3 inches) used by the Right Honorable Sir William Trumbull, England's Secretary of State, to carry a letter, in 1696, to Sir James Ogilvie of London. The same museum has samples of envelopes used by the government in 1755 and 1760 to carry important documents. At that time, and for many years before, the Japanese used envelopes to hold powders and scents. One of the reasons envelopes were slow to come into commercial use, especially for mailing purposes, was because the British postoffice department charged double postage for matter sent in envelopes. When the British established the Penny Post in 1840 and permitted letters to be carried in envelopes at no extra

charge, the envelope business made rapid progress, as did the general use of postal facilities. Lower rates, permission to enclose letters in envelopes, the invention of adhesive stamps, and the increase in weight from a half ounce to an ounce at the penny rate resulted in a large increase in the number of letters mailed. Prior to 1840 the British post-office handled about 76,000,000 letters annually. The new rates and conditions saw this number increased to 169,000,000 in 1840, and 350,000,000 in 1850. At first, London booksellers supplied the envelope demand, using their clerks in their spare time to manufacture the handy articles. The first Londoner to make envelopes was a Mr. Brewer, a bookseller in Brighton, England.

* * *

FACTS ABOUT SNAKES

Editor, The American Freeman:

In the August, 1936, Freeman you mentioned that an African cobra attacked an Indian cobra at the New York Zoo and the latter apparently succumbed to the poison. The following appeared in the magazine "This Week":

"It has often been said that captured poisonous snakes can and do kill themselves by self-inflicted bites. Recently an African yellow cobra bit its cage-mate in the Reptile House, an Indian cobra, and the latter died two weeks later with evidences of poisoning—yet Dr. Ditmars does not believe that snakes of the same species can poison each other. These cobras, while of the same genus, were of different species.

"As evidence, Dr. Ditmars cites the fact that he has often brought in bags of rattlesnakes from field trips and found that they had bitten themselves or each other many times. Scores of times he has seen noosed snakes bite themselves, with no ill effects. Sometimes one rattlesnake will bite another and the bitten specimen dies, but autopsies have always revealed that the fangs punctured a vital spot and had the same effect as if a knife or a needle had been plunged into the creature. One copperhead was bitten by another copperhead and died almost instantly. In that instance, the snake's heart had been punctured."

Detroit, Mich.

Hugo A. Jinsky

* * *

Have you any figures on the loss of

life in maternity cases?

The Maternity Center Association, New York City, reports that a study of conditions in that city proves one mother dies in every 160 confinements. To show how enormous this figure is, let me add it means an average of one in every 40 women having four children dies in confinement. The survey just quoted continues:

"It has been demonstrated in a poor section of the city that proper maternal care could reduce the maternal death rate from 6 to 2 per 1,000. In the whole of the U.S., more than half, possibly two-thirds, of mothers who died in child-birth in recent years, could have been saved by pre- and post-natal care. The rate of maternity deaths in the U.S. is higher than in most civilized countries because of ignorance and a general lack of interest in maternity care, in contrast to the provision of planned care for every expectant mother, regardless of ability to pay, in certain European countries." (If maternal deaths could be reduced to the level prevailing in most European countries, the lives of more than 7,000 women would be saved each year.)

* * *

Have you any facts dealing with the scientific researches conducted by the steel companies?

The American Iron and Steel Institute, on May 12, 1936, reported:

"Expenditures for research by 42 steel companies, accounting for nearly 90 percent of total capacity, will reach about \$9,200,000 this year, against \$8,100,000 last year, and \$8,700,000 in 1929. About 40 percent of the research outlay will serve to improve the quality of products, 10 percent to find new markets and uses, the balance to develop new types of products and to reduce costs. Facilities and equipment used in research are valued at more than \$6,000,000; nearly 2,200 engineers, metallurgists, chemists, physicists and other experts devote their full time, an additional 300 a major part of their time, to research."

* * *

How much money have foreigners invested in the U.S.? How much money have Americans invested in foreign countries?

The Department of Commerce reports about \$5,035,000,000 was invested by foreigners in the U.S. at the end of 1935, which is \$765,000,000 over the amount of long-term investments held at the same time in

1934. To the above figure must be added foreign-held bank balances in the U.S., and other short-term items, which bring the total up to \$6,235,000,000. It was \$4,870,000,000 at the close of 1934. The main reason for this increase was the heavier purchase of American common stocks. There is the additional feature of increased prices (a gain of 37 percent) for these shares. Five countries account for 76.4 percent of the holdings of foreigners in the U.S., as follows:

Great Britain ...	\$1,374,000,000	27.3%
Canada	1,000,000,000	20.0
Netherlands	800,000,000	15.6
Switzerland	399,000,000	7.9
France	282,000,000	5.6

Barron's, June 8, 1936, reports American long-term investments in foreign countries as follows:

Par value of investments in foreign bonds, Jan., 1935	\$5,300,000,000
Less repatriations in 1935	500,000,000
Settlement values (50% of American holdings in default securities; \$1,-650,000,000)	800,000,000
	<hr/>
	\$4,000,000,000
Par value of direct investments abroad, Jan., 1935	\$7,700,000,000
Less 35% depreciation ..	2,700,000,000
	<hr/>
	\$5,000,000,000
Estimated present value of American investments abroad	\$9,000,000,000

Were there any scientific results from the balloon stratosphere flight made in South Dakota last year?

On November 11, 1935, Captains Stevens and Anderson made a balloon flight into the stratosphere, the scientific results of which were summarized by the research department of Greylock Corporation, as follows:

A picture taken automatically at the record height of 72,395 feet covers 105 square miles of South Dakota and shows curvature of horizon 330 miles away, as well as a marked boundary between the troposphere (dust-laden region of rising and descending air currents interspersed with clouds and smoke reflecting light) and the stratosphere (region of nearly constant temperature, above dust and air turbulence).

The sky at 72,000 feet appeared only about a tenth as bright as from

the ground, while sun light was 20 times brighter.

Living spores were captured above 36,000 feet in special traps.

Samples of air collected revealed no difference in the chemical composition of the atmosphere at high and low altitudes.

Air conductivity of electricity at 61,000 feet was found 81 times that prevailing at sea level; above that altitude, it falls off slightly.

* * * *

How many of our Presidents were Masons?

Twelve Presidents were Masons, as follows: Buchanan, Garfield, Harding, Jackson, Johnson, McKinley, Monroe, Polk, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft and Washington.

* * *

Who uses all the electricity produced in the U.S.?

The *Annalist*, June 5, 1936, analyzed the sales of electricity for the first quarter, as follows (millions of kilowatt hours):

	1936	1935
Large commercial (wholesale)	10,730	9,372
Small commercial (retail)	3,983	3,529
Domestic	4,060	3,653
Street and interurban railways	662	636
Municipal street lighting	1,275	1,206
Electrified steam railroads	279	196
Municipal and miscellaneous	201	152
Total	<hr/> 21,190	<hr/> 18,744

* * *

What does it cost to buy time on the great radio networks?

The Columbia network (96 stations) costs \$18,395 per hour. WEAF (65 stations) costs \$16,040. WJZ (63 stations) \$14,640. A broadcast over a coast-to-coast coverage of more than 200 stations, at night, costs \$52,000 per hour.

* * * *

I have read somewhere that it's possible to produce crops of vegetables without soil. Have you any information on this subject?

A great deal of publicity has been given to this recent development in scientific agriculture, the best summary appearing in *Business Week*, May 9, 1936, as follows:

"Great advances have been made in the production of food in laboratories and greenhouses where seasonal influences and toil in the

fields is eliminated. Tomato plants laden with hundreds of perfect tomatoes grow 15 feet high out of shallow tanks of liquid nourishment without soil. The plants grow under natural light and temperature changes in greenhouses. Under these conditions, tomato plants yield at the rate of 217 tons per tank acre of surface, compared with an average of five tons per acre when grown in the field. Potatoes have been grown at the rate of 2.4 lbs. per sq. ft., or 2,465 bu. per acre of tank surface, compared with an average of 116 bu. for the entire country in 1934. Tobacco plants have been grown 20 feet high, and successful experiments were made with beets, turnips, celery and cucumbers."

Have eugenists ever made scientific comparisons of the children of polygamists and monogamists?

Dr. Will Durant, at a meeting of the American Eugenic Society, discussed this subject, as follows:

"From the point of view of eugenics, polygamy has worked out much better than monogamy. In a polygamous society it is the more successful men—and therefore the most able—who have many wives and thereby more children."

Frequently I hear over the radio that a certain program is "electrically transcribed." What does it mean?

The Kablegram, June, 1936, defines it as follows:

ELECTRICALLY TRANSCRIBED.

—An expression now well established in radio parlance. It refers to a program prepared and performed in exactly the same way as the direct program, except that instead of being put immediately on the air, it is first recorded on a disc, and is then sent to the broadcasting station. Such programs can be sent to any number of stations. By this method the advertiser can secure national, or strictly regional, coverage, and a wider choice of radio time.

I agree with your statement, which you say is based on the researches of Prof. Leuba, that the higher institutions of learning produce the greatest proportion of skeptics, unbelievers, and Atheists among students, honor graduates, instructors and professors. I have the feeling that an investigation among the lesser institutions will show a surprising trend in the direction of Free-thought, and here I have in mind

especially the religious colleges that are supposed to be invincible fortresses of faith and orthodoxy. Have you any information on this point?

I receive a surprising number of letters from instructors and professors in theological institutions, and the conclusion I draw is that Free-thought is invading even those centers of obscurantism. Recently I received a copy of a letter written by Dr. Edward Dickinson, of Oberlin College, at Oberlin, Ohio, to Joseph McCabe. I found the missive delightful, intelligent and candid. It showed that anti-religious ideas are taking hold not only in the great seats of learning but in the very training schools that are supposed to keep the faith alive and thriving. I consider Dr. Dickinson's letter so important and revealing that I'm quoting it in its entirety. I don't feel in the slightest sense that too much space is being allotted to Dr. Dickinson's review of an interesting situation. Every word of it is valuable and should be studied carefully by my readers. The letter:

I have been reading with great interest your Little Blue Book entitled "The Revolt Against Religion." I consider your statements and inferences absolutely correct. As science advances orthodox religion declines. Perhaps I should say ALL religious belief declines: but many scientists, like Robert Millikan, and even many who call themselves Agnostics, maintain a vague and shadowy faith in the supernatural.

I have lived long enough to see an enormous shrinkage in belief in Christianity among educated people. I have been a professor for 43 years (counting 14 years as professor emeritus) in a college which has been for over 100 years eminent for its religious influence, notably for its support of the cause of missions. When I joined its faculty it would be safe to say that all of its faculty were church members and regular attendants upon religious Sunday services. Most of them were connected with the two Congregational churches, which have since been united into one. I have asked members of the faculty who are in a position to know, how many of the teaching force and other officials—numbering about 330—are in the habit of attending church services: the estimate is about one in six or seven.

Now here comes a point that should be considered in taking enrolled church membership as indicative of the amount of religious belief of this country. You admit that when the population of this country was 110,000,000 the number of church members was about 50,000,000. But there is no way of knowing how many of the enrolled church members are believers in the church doctrines. I know that in Oberlin, for example, there are very many whose names are on the church rolls who no longer believe in Christianity—many who have lost belief in any religion. They cease to attend church services. They do not formally withdraw because to do so would cause grief among the faithful who are their friends and neighbors, or because apparent support of the church is an asset in business, or because to order the expunging of their names would cause them trouble, or perhaps in many cases they consider that the community church has a social value in its aid to social interests, especially those of a benevolent purpose. One of the trustees of the "First Church in Oberlin," which has by far the largest membership in town, especially among the college people, told me that only about 40 percent of the members contribute to the church expenses. Indifference is the only explanation of this. If faith and interest in the church decline as fast in the next 40 years as they have in the last 40, religion in Oberlin—which I once heard a pulpit orator call "the most pious place in America"—will be but a shadow of what it once was, if it remains perceptible at all.

If instead of the number of church members in America the number of BELIEVERS could be enumerated in the census, the result would give very little joy to the orthodox.

You have undoubtedly recognized another great movement in our country, as sweeping, as fundamental, as significant as the movement away from religion—and this is the detachment of the principles and sanctions of morality from their association with religion, and their removal to a secular, rational basis. Educated and intelligent people no longer derive their law of life from an imaginary "will of God," conveyed to the church by inspiration, or from an imaginary "conscience." Morals are seen to be relative, not absolute. They are judged by motives, circumstances, and conse-

quences—their actual influence upon the individual and society.

This applies especially to sex morality. Among educated young women this development of a new code—entirely dissociated from religion, casting off the authority of the church—is notable and extraordinary. To them chastity is no longer the supreme virtue, by which alone a woman's merit is judged—a sacrosanct, mystical element and object of distinctive veneration. The terms "purity" and "impurity," "honor" and "dishonor" are no longer connected in their minds with conduct relating only to sex. Sex behavior is not good or bad in and of itself; it is prudent or imprudent, desirable or undesirable. No external authority is admitted as coercive. No categorical imperative, assumed and imposed by religion and the church, is allowed to interfere with their own judgments and decisions.

In my large acquaintance with young women in my long career as a professor in a large coeducational college I have continued delightful friendships with superior young women after their graduation, and as they have entered into the practical world of affairs. I know the opinions upon this subject of more than 20 highly intelligent and cultured young women between the ages of 22 and 35, and not one of them holds in principle to the right of religion and the church to impose restrictions upon their conduct. They recognize inhibitions and controls, but they are not those of religion and theological tradition. These independent young women make their laws for themselves and they are ready to assume the responsibilities. If they choose to follow their belief in sex freedom into actual experience—as some of them have—they do not appear to have been intellectually or morally harmed by it, and they are not at all troubled by an "accusing conscience."

There is no reason to imagine that these score and more of my fine young friends are exceptional in the class to which they belong. They are representative of those who have come from our colleges in the last 20 years. That they are in most cases engaged in serious and serviceable pursuits and interests is an assurance that society is receiving no injury from their "new freedom." They merely mark the downfall of another hoary superstition.

Dr. Robert Briffault, in his brilliant work, "Rational Evolution," declares that "there never was an age so moral, in the strictest sense of the term, as the present one," in spite of the fact that "not only are dogmatic faiths today in a state of dissolution, but all traditional standards and sanctions of moral values are being subjected to unsparing criticism." "It is certain," he says, "that the appeal of sentiments of justice, equity, humanity, has never been so powerful and so general; that sensitiveness to wrong, oppression, injustice has never been so keen; that the conscience of human society, wherever suffering, evil, abuse exist, has never been so lively and susceptible." The explanation, it seems to me, is that the Christian church has from the beginning fixed its thought and motive upon a supposed "other world" rather than upon happiness and well-being in this world—individual salvation from hell and from "sin," rather than the rescue and health and progress of society. Not so much the discoveries of science as the adoption and extension of the scientific spirit and method turns the interest of men upon what is KNOWN, and away from hope and reliance upon a hereafter, for the reality of which no evidence exists. There will never be a reaction against this new spirit which seeks to improve the lot of man in the world in which he now lives. If religion will support this great longing of humanity by making men realize that only in social justice can happiness be found, then religion will survive. But it will be a NEW religion, not any religion now existing in the earth.

* * *

Every now and then I come on the story that our army was compelled to pay rent to the French government for the trenches it occupied in the World War. Is there any truth in this persistent report?

It's bunk, from beginning to end. *The New Republic* investigated this myth and reported to its readers that Major General James G. Harbord, commander of the Services of Supplies for the American Expeditionary Forces, showed that "no rent was ever paid for trenches in France occupied or used for offensive or defensive purposes and, so far as he knows, no request for payment was ever made." Such myths usually start with some innocent fact, and

The New Republic seems to have found the source of the yarn, as the following shows: "It is true, however, that land back of the divisional areas was rented for training purposes, and when trenches were constructed on this land the damages were paid for. This was the practice in the United States, and General Harbord is confident that it was the practice of the other Allies in France and of the French themselves."

* * *

The public opinion column of David Stern's newspaper, *The Camden Courier*, has been running a long series of letters by Everett R. Meves, 424 N. Fifth Street, Camden, N.J., in which he argues that Socialism is false because it's at variance with the principles of biology. I enclose some of his letters, which I've clipped for your benefit.

Mr. Meves summarizes his argument in one of his letters, as follows:

Biology is the science of living organisms, and one must understand it to understand man. It includes biology proper, physiology, psychology, anthropology, genetics, eugenics and some other studies. Even a very slight acquaintance with biology will show the absurdity of Socialism and other proposed collectivist systems. They are contrary to all the laws of nature. The only way to conquer nature is to cooperate with it. Capitalism, imperfect as it is, is a natural growth, not the creation of a lot of dreamers, and is more in harmony with what biology shows man really to be than any of these systems.

If this is a sample of the writer's philosophy, it's clear that he knows little about biology, Socialism or Capitalism. It has always been one of the claims of scientific Socialists that Capitalism's appearance was the result of social evolution. Capitalism applied science to the production of wealth, with startling success. It grew to world dominance because of its scientific foundations. Socialists are always the first to admit this simple fact.

Socialists object to Capitalism on the score that it concentrates on wealth production, but insists on unscientific methods for the distribution of wealth. Also, despite the growth of political democracy, Capitalism insists that the economic basis of society shall be a dictatorship, while the Socialists claim it's necessary to

combine political democracy with industrial or social democracy.

Socialists aren't the enemies of Capitalism, in that they would destroy the material basis of the system. They're hot for it. But they do insist that while the mechanisms of Capitalism must be protected and preserved, it is necessary to the social well-being that it be democratized, that it be used for the good of the greatest number, instead of for the profits of a small owning class. Socialists, like true scientists, would cautiously save the good in Capitalism—its science, machinery and other facilities, and place them under the control of society. In other words, they insist on the social ownership of the means of wealth production. I fail to see anything about this program that's in conflict with the laws of biology.

Alfred Russel Wallace was a great biologist, second in fame only to Charles Darwin. In fact, the records of science show that Wallace discovered the principles of evolution and also outlined the theory of the origin of species through natural selection several years before Darwin released his epoch-making book that took the whole educated world by storm. Wallace, true to the scientific spirit, was glad to see Darwin get the credit as the discoverer of the theory, because he realized that his own conclusions were based on a rather brief essay while Darwin presented his case with a tremendous mass of substantiating data. And, to get to my point, Wallace was one of the early British Socialists. His being a great biologist didn't deter him from seeing the advances possible through the inauguration of a social system in which the masses will be in control of the means by which they make their livelihoods.

And, let's not forget that one of America's greatest biologists, Dr. Jacques Loeb, was, until his death some 15 years ago, a firm materialist and Socialist. I recall vividly that while I was Sunday Editor of the *New York Call*, over 20 years ago, he delivered to me personally the manuscript of a paper he had read before a scientific body, in which he uttered ideas acceptable to scientific, democratic Socialists.

If what I've written thus far sounds

like ancient history to Mr. Meves, let me bring the argument right down to 1936. On Friday, June 19, 1936, Professor Edwin Grant Conklin, of Princeton University, delivered a scientific address before a learned society meeting at Cornell University. Dr. Conklin, let me add at this point, is not only considered one of the greatest biologists, but is also president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, probably the greatest scientific body in the world today. Dr. Conklin is a Socialist—the kind who comes right out and says so. And here are some of the words uttered by this great biologist in defense of his advocacy of Socialism:

"Democratic Socialism avoids the extremes of Communism, Fascism and Individualism. It conforms to the biological principle of the necessity of preserving balance between opposing forces. Fanatical extremes of individual freedom or of social regimentation have no successful prototypes in biological or human history. Democratic Socialism best preserves the balance in the social order."

Mr. Meves should study Dr. Conklin's words carefully. And he should give additional thought to the biologist's objections to Capitalism, which, according to our authority, has concentrated on the problems of wealth production without seeking to establish any purposeful collective control of social relations. He recognizes its activities in the world of knowledge, but it is in conflict with the real needs of social man. This "conflict between knowledge and conduct, between science and the social order," Dr. Conklin said, gives us "the strange paradoxes of overproduction and underconsumption, improved transportation and unimproved distribution, vast prosperity and appalling poverty, multiplied occupations and unparalleled unemployment, triumphant medicine and widespread disease, prolonged life and dependent old age, scientific internationalism and economic nationalism, greater armaments and less security, larger social units and less social unity."

Dr. Conklin—a great biologist, let's not forget—attacked the philosophy of "rugged individualism," because it was predicated on the anti-social doctrine of "Each for himself and the

Devil take the hindmost." He granted that individualism might be a desirable philosophy in a primitive society, or some form of pioneer life, but that it was entirely destructive and anti-social in a highly complex, organized, developed, scientific society. The speaker also objected to Communism (this was before the announcement of Russia's new democratic Constitution) because it "treats them (individuals) as passive material to be fitted into a rigid social framework, and by suppressing the play of individual thought and action tends to make society static and stagnant."

Turning his guns on Fascism, Dr. Conklin said:

"It destroys liberty of press, speech, thought, and conscience. It censors science and religion, reduces the mass to the condition of robots and cannon fodder. Based on war psychology, it does not educate the people for peace and freedom, but puts everything under a dictator who must maintain a reputation for supernatural grandeur. It always ends in disaster."

Dr. Conklin, returning to his constructive argument, defended democratic Socialism because it preserves liberty. Democratic Socialism, this biologist argued, "brings about order and social efficiency, not by eliminating the freedom of the individual members of society, but by enlisting their intelligence in the service of the common good."

"Social progress," Dr. Conklin held, "is a process of collective education. Society advances and solves its problems in so far as men learn to think clearly together about matters that affect them all. In other words, to solve social problems and continue social progress. **THE SPIRIT OF SCIENCE MUST SPREAD TO SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT**"

Dr. Conklin's argument was brought to the following climax—words which deserve the most thoughtful consideration:

"Democratic Socialism best preserves freedom of experimentation. The scientific method of learning is by experiment, trial and error, and finally trial and success. There is no other path of progress. Many mistakes are made, but with freedom to experiment they will be eliminated. This is the great advantage of free government. In

this sense it is true, as Lincoln said, that 'a free government is better than a good government.'

"Democratic Socialism is best for the education of the masses. The ultimate aim of all education, whether of children or of nations, should be to fit for freedom and co-operation, and both children and nations must learn by experimentation."

Socialism has always attracted the best scientific brains of the world. When Dr. Albert Einstein lived in Germany he was an outspoken supporter of the Social Democratic (Socialist) party. Enrico Ferri, the famous criminologist who suggested that crime is, in the main, the result of social conditions, was an active Socialist in Italy until his death. And, while we're pointing out famous scientists who were Socialists, let's not forget the "Wizard of Schenectady," Dr. Charles Proteus Steinmetz, discoverer in the field of electro-physics. He was a member of the Socialist party and was a Socialist candidate for office several times before his death.

Before closing this discussion, let's record the fact that when Leon Blum established a Socialist government in France, in June, 1936, one of his first acts was to create a new cabinet office—under-secretary for scientific research—which he put in charge of Madame Irene Joliot-Curie, the daughter of Pierre and Marie Curie, discoverers of radium in 1898, one of the greatest contributions to science in the last century. Their daughter, who is now an active official in a Socialist administration, won, with her husband, M. Joliot, the Nobel prize for chemistry in 1935.

I'm afraid our newspaper letter-writer, Mr. Meves, is unfamiliar with the facts of biology and other branches of science or he'd know that Socialism has always been friendly to science and has always been in the good graces of truly great masters of scientific research. That's one of the deathless glories of scientific, democratic Socialism.

* * *

Please comment on the interest the various American churches are showing in economic, social and political questions.

During the past decade—especially since the depth of the depression—our

preachers, rabbis and a few priests—have been saying less about the glories of heaven and more about worldly, material problems. In this, of course, they reversed themselves without even stopping to explain the conversion, which is the church's usual method. Before the collapse of the 1925-29 boom, the world was warned against its emphasis on materialistic things to the neglect of the spiritual; now the leaders of the church think it's in better order to play down the spiritual and emphasize the material—which means whatever you care to make it mean.

During the war, the church was patriotic, militaristic and even jingoistic—as selections from war sermons have established beyond question. Now, when we are at peace, the church attacks militarism, jingoism and even assures its hearers that it prefers to be unpatriotic—all, of course, when the country isn't engaged in a war. I'm not ready to say what these newly converted pacifists will do when the war drum sounds again. But, judging the church by its long history—see the Catholic Church only a few months ago when Mussolini sent his blackguards into Ethiopia—I'd venture the guess that the preachers will, at the call of the militarists, abandon their peace-time pacifism and whoop it up again for official, legal slaughter.

During the last war it was the materialistic, atheistic Socialists and other radicals—of the breed of Eugene V. Debs—who fought kaiserism at home and abroad. They may be the ones who will have to call the world to ideas of peace when the rulers go mad again, which ought to be soon. We've always been sure of the humanitarianism of the Atheists and radicals; we've always been skeptical of the vague, untested idealism (mainly expressed in words) of the church.

But, there they are—orating like so many "Bolsheviks" on minimum wages instead of Transubstantiation, cooperatives instead of Immortality, production for use instead of the Virgin Birth, shorter work weeks instead of the Crucifixion. It sounds radical, until we look below the surface.

We hear glowing sermons on why

business must take on the ethics of the church, but we who have watched the church in action have always been critical of the church's ethical standards. We wonder just what gives the church the right to criticize business when its own record is loaded with questionable practices. We see the churches raising money by the most dubious methods—gambling devices, lotteries, social blackmail, and threats. We see its lay workers paid wages just one notch above the incomes received by Arkansas sharecroppers. We see its publishing and other business institutions run like so many sweatshops, with the one, holy, sacred goal of showing a big profit. We see its great educational and other institutions based on foundations that draw their revenue from gifts or purchases of stocks and bonds in the worst labor-exploiting corporations. We even see church organizations investing a part of their funds in the munitions industry (as was shown by an examination of the shareholders' books of Vickers, Ltd.) or in the worst vice-breeding, death-dealing slums of a New York tenement district. We see a preacher (The Rev. Gerald B. Winrod) acting as America's No. 1 Jew-baiter. We see all these things—and many others too numerous to list—and wonder how many fine words it would require to blind the public to realities.

The church, as one of the world's biggest real estate and business corporations, needs mass support in order to function—and it learned from bitter experience that when the world is in economic distress it isn't in the mood to cure its sickness with the salves of religion. So the ministers have changed their line of goods slightly in order to fit into the times a little better. But the whole thing looks insincere—like its eloquent phrases for peace when the boys aren't marching.

In the case of Father Coughlin we know, from the record, that his broadcasts in favor of "social justice" are nothing more than Hitleristic blinds for Fascism. Hitler and Mussolini used radical phrases before they stole power and reduced their people to serfdom. Father Coughlin has the same objective.

The church generally has always been one of the most effective tools

of social injustice. It has helped militarists fight their wars. It has helped slave-owners keep their human chattels chained to their tasks of piling up wealth for the plantation owners. It has fought education, medicine, science, astronomy, social decency and simple justice. It has always been on the side of the exploiters, so long as these respectable pirates supported the church with their blood-stained money. It has always tempted the workers with pictures of a blissful life in paradise while they were kept from organizing into unions for their mutual protection. The church's social record is rotten, and a few sermons in depression days won't undo that sad betrayal of the aspirations of the toilers.

It has met social injustice with the poison of charity. It has helped unfurl the war banners with hypocritical prayers for "peace with honor." It has struck at true knowledge by doling out intellectual dope that aims at turning helpless victims into superstition-laden morons. It has taught the slave to obey his master and the woman to breed so that the church may have more followers and the war lords more cannon-fodder.

* * *

I have heard that Nan Britton repudiated her story about Harding's daughter. Please comment.

There's no truth in that report. Nan Britton has thoroughly established the truth of her claim that President Harding was the father of her child. I investigated the facts shortly after her book appeared, even meeting the mother and child. A single glance at that child ought to convince the most skeptical. She's the spittin' image of her father. I'm not ready to discuss Nan Britton's motives in giving the facts to the world, but that doesn't stop me from believing that what she says is the literal truth. Harding, who was unhappily married to a dried-up, shrewish, unpleasant, sexually unattractive woman, found a brief round of happiness in the company of a slip of a girl who had long admired him. Of course, Nan Britton ran him down. It was a case of a girl chasing after a famous personality—and in this case the man was about 25 years older, but that didn't matter. Harding's happi-

ness was short-lived, for after the birth of the child he became, by a freakish set of circumstances, President of the United States. What followed was complicated, but this fact stands forth—Harding gave Miss Britton plenty of money—thousands of dollars—but that rather firm, determined, willful woman wanted still more—and when she didn't get it she spilled the dirt. But that doesn't have any effect on her original claim—that Harding was the little girl's father. She couldn't very well repudiate that, because it was the truth.

* * *

What's become of Robert W. Service?

The famous author of that exciting, stirring ballad, "The Shooting of Dan McGrew," is living in France, where he's made his home for the last 25 years. During the last decade he has done very little writing, but the Associated Press reports he will have a new book, entitled *Bathtub Ballads*, in the fall of 1936. Here's a sample chorus:

Please, Mother, don't stab Father
with the bread-knife;
Remember 'twas a gift when you
were wed.
But if you must stab Father with
the bread-knife,
Please, Mother, use another for the
bread.

Mr. Service, who is now 62 years old, is probably the most popular poet, among the men, at least. Men everywhere like his Kiplingesque swing, his mannish expressions, and the sturdy, strong rhythm of his lines. I've found, as a publisher, that even the semi-illiterate hanker for his verses, where otherwise they run from poetry as from the plague.

I remember having received several letters from Mr. Service about seven or eight years ago, in which he discussed problems of Free thought. He seemed to be having some difficulties with the subjects, though at the moment I can't recall what they were. He impressed me as a sincere, whole-hearted, friendly person, and I was proud to have him as a good customer, though, to my regret, I haven't seen his familiar handwriting in our letter files during the last half dozen years. He describes his life in France as follows:

"I live largely in the open air,

swim, tramp, ride a motorbike, play the accordion, compose and sing my own songs and generally amuse myself."

Mr. Service, who was born in Preston, England, spent many years in Canada and the U.S. He visited the Klondike, where he gathered material for many of his most popular ballads. Of this period he writes:

"I have little heart for contacts with society. As to the Klondike stuff, that is a part of my life which I have long forgotten and have no particular wish to remember. I fear I have outgrown that sort of thing."

Mr. Service, who is married and lives with his wife and daughter, was for many years a wanderer and the follower of dozens of occupations, some of which were: Bank clerk, ranch hand, cowboy, logger, lumberman, miner, navvy, fruit picker, teacher, postoffice assistant, trader, shoe clerk, dishwasher, sandwich man, actor, journalist, verse writer and novelist.

* * *

Please comment on the following words, which the press says were uttered by the Archbishop of York: "The law of love is not applicable to nations consisting in large measure of unconverted or very imperfectly converted citizens."

Our great churchman is putting the philosophy a little crudely, but that, after all, is what our Christian rulers believe—and practice. The Bible, like religion generally, is used as a weapon of exploitation and aggression—and it can always be relied on to produce its handful of quotations to support any uncivilized behavior or any piece of dubious ethics.

John Haynes Holmes, liberal preacher and editor of *Unity* (according to an editorial by William Floyd, in his interesting little publication, *The Arbitrator*) challenged the archbishop's remark and offered a reward to "anyone who pointed out a scriptural passage upon which could be based the idea expressed. . . ." Mr. Floyd, who is a fine liberal and libertarian in politics and economics, and a Freethinker in religion, submitted 13 verses from the Old Testament to show that the Bible supports the policies of those who would rob, exploit, ravish and enslave those who are not of our particular faith or who hold the Christian faith only on

a part-time basis, whatever that may be.

The Rev. Holmes rejected Mr. Floyd's 13 verses on the ground that Christian love "is found in the New Testament." Mr. Floyd was not discouraged by this rebuff. Instead, he searched out 11 verses from the New Testament which urged the archbishop's philosophy, and which "convinced the Rev. Holmes that anything can be proved from the Bible."

Realizing he was whipped, Dr. Holmes gave the prize to Mr. Floyd—a concordance. On the fly leaf, Dr. Holmes wrote:

"In payment of a debt, and in helpless connivance at work destined in due course and full often to make my ministerial flesh creep and my clerical blood grow cold."

Mr. Floyd, amused by his victory, adds this comment:

"With this concordance at hand we offer to prove that any action which any person wishes to take can be justified by the Word of God."

* * *

Please discuss the differences between our heritages as individuals and as members of a race.

One of the greatest authorities in the fields of anthropology and ethnology is Professor Franz Boaz, who, on July 1, 1936, retired as head of the department of anthropology at Columbia University, on his 78th birthday. This eminent scientist—one of the finest intellectual forces in the academic world—discussed the subject of your question, as follows:

"With the present condition of the world I consider the race question a most important one. I will try to clean up some of the nonsense that is being spread about race these days. I think the question is a particularly important one for this country, too, as here also people are going crazy.

"The race question is so acute at this time that you can't speak about it too often. People confuse individual heredity with race heredity. Individual heredity is a scientific reality, but to speak of 'race heredity' is nonsense.

"What we know as 'race' is largely a matter of environment. There is no such thing as 'pure' race. All European races are mixtures of many stocks, particularly so wherever you have a large group. Germany is one of the most mixed

stocks in Europe, and it is pure nonsense to speak of a 'Germanic race.'"

* * *

The reports of the suicide of Paul Bern (husband of Jean Harlow) several years ago were filled with ambiguous references. Will you please give us the facts in simple language?

A psychiatrist would discuss that fascinating case with a vocabulary that would be so much Greek to the average person. Being a layman myself, I have the courage of my ignorance—and therefore agree to say in plain English what our scientific friends hand out in \$4 words.

Paul Bern, soon after his marriage to the beautiful Jean Harlow, found that her prodigious sex appeal worked in reverse with him. That is to say, he was struck with a psychological hazard which he couldn't overcome—a fear neurosis that paralyzed his sexual powers. His sexual incompetence with Miss Harlow was baffling to our subject because he had been conducting a love affair for 20 years with a woman, then living in San Francisco. The facts show that this old lover of his was rather plain looking, and it was possible for him to enjoy her favors without the slightest difficulties. The whole thing sounds strange and inconsistent, but those who understand the complicated basis of man's emotional nature will not be puzzled. Men, when they enter the world of sex, are strange, almost incomprehensible creatures who seemingly defy analysis or logical explanation.

It's a fact that certain men are better able to function when thrown with a plain—even homely—woman. A beautiful, ravishing, glamorous siren can unnerve and emotionally shatter such a split personality. Bern was a bundle of contradictions. He found that his old lover could arouse him to the greatest ecstasy, while his new mate—one of the world's most beautiful love instruments—left him completely frustrated and helpless. After several months of this existence—during which Miss Harlow showed the greatest consideration and sympathy for her unhappy husband—he collapsed and killed himself. It isn't all very simple, even when put in plain language, but I believe it's understandable. Another climax to this

tragedy (not an anti-climax, by any means) was the suicide of the San Francisco woman when she learned what had happened to her pathetic and humiliated Paul.

The above theory is based on the facts as I gleaned them from the press at the time of this great drama. What happened there is by no means unusual. I have known of dozens of cases in which husbands would find themselves no longer able to prepare themselves for emotional experiences with their wives, and who would find somehow a woman (usually much younger) who could bring the aging male back to his much-sought paradise in what the poet called "the perfumed garden." Divorce would follow; then a new marriage—and the restored man would bounce around like a young billy goat in a new herd. Sometimes the new woman would be plainer than his wife—sometimes she would be far more beautiful—the matter works almost mysteriously—but the underlying fact is that man is sexually highly complex and usually quite unpredictable, except when he comes under the observation of persons trained to observe such behavior.

* * *

1. How old is our present patent system? 2. How many patents have been issued? 3. How many patents are pending today? 4. How much money did the patent office take in during its first year? How much money was taken in last year?

1. It's 100 years old, having been started on July 4, 1836, when President Andrew Jackson put his signature to the Act that provided the system that laid the foundation for the greatest flood of patents in the world's history.

2. About 2,050,000 patents were issued in the 100 years since 1836.

3. Over 100,000 patent applications are pending today.

4. The Patent Office's receipts, during 1836, amounted to \$29,289.

5. In 1935, the Patent Office received \$4,264,874. The Patent Office more than pays its expenses.

* * *

I notice that the Christian Science Church sends out a crew of swanky lecturers who look like directors of billion-dollar corporations. What do they get from their racket?

The Christian Science Church pays

these lecturers handsomely—an average of \$1 per minute while they are talking their drivel. An average Christian Science lecture lasts 75 minutes, for which the usual fee is \$75, with all expenses additional. During the lecture season each staff speaker gets five dates per week, with six-month tours.

Next to the lecturers come the "teachers," who are permitted to go around quietly and gather together the rich suckers, in classes of 30 persons. The courses last two weeks, for which each student forks up \$150. Figure that up for yourself.

The Christian Science organization isn't vast, but for efficiency and profit it can't be topped—in proportion to size, of course. The mugs at the head of this outfit are quiet, dignified and shrewd. They have learned the art of gathering in millions of dollars with the air of one who is utterly, even unutterably, bored by the very mention of money. That's where the science comes in.

Does George Bernard Shaw believe in immortality?

Shaw, in his *Parents and Children*, rejected the idea of life after death in the following vigorous words:

"If some devil were to convince us that our dream of perpetual immortality is no dream, but a hard fact, such a shriek of despair would go up from the human race as no other conceivable horror could provoke. . . . What man is capable of the insane self-conceit of believing that an eternity of himself would be tolerable even to himself?"

As recently as March 30, 1936, as he neared his 80th year, Shaw was asked if he still rejected immortality, to which he replied: "I have not changed my mind on the subject of immortality."

Please define Rationalism.

Most of my output as a writer—during more than a quarter of a century—is, in effect, a definition of Rationalism. Instead of digging into what I've already contributed, in my small way, to this great and beautiful philosophy, let me pass on a definition of Rationalism which will be found in William Margrie's book, *English Grass*, as follows:

"Rationalism is the attitude of

mind which resolutely puts aside all superstition and vague tradition, faces the realities of life, repudiates religious, political, and scientific infallibility, believes in free discussion about everything, and considers every problem according to the objective facts. In other words, Rationalism is Mental Health. People who have emerged a little way from orthodoxy are apt to think that by becoming thoroughgoing Rationalists they will lose much of the romance and mystery of life. That itself is a delusion. There is always likely to be plenty of mystery, but you will do no good in the long run by living in a fool's paradise. Rationalism is a sound philosophy in the sense that health is better than disease; light better than darkness; sanity better than lunacy; a clear vision better than a blurred one."

The above definition, in my humble opinion, is as good as anything ever offered.

In an article, on the front page of the July 3, 1936, issue of *The Christian Science Monitor*, W. Y. Elliot, Professor of Government, Harvard University, writes: "Without the light of Christian values it would have been totally impossible for liberalism to have spread and permeated the western world with the great concept of human rights." Please comment.

The great English historian, Henry Thomas Buckle, author of *The History of Civilization*, wrote a few sentences on the subject Prof. Elliot discusses so ineptly, from which I select the following excerpt:

A careful study of the history of toleration will prove that in every Christian country where it has been adopted it has been forced upon the clergy by the authority of the secular classes. At the present day it is still unknown to those nations among whom the ecclesiastical power is stronger than the temporal power; and as this, during many centuries, was the general condition, it is not wonderful that in the early history of Europe we should find scarcely a trace of so wise and benevolent an opinion.

By liberalism and human rights Prof. Elliot means, of course, toleration, and we find, as Buckle so well says, that it's the secular-minded people—not the Christians—who have blessed humanity with the rationalistic ideals of Freethought.

Joseph McCabe, in many of his books, has shown, again and again, that liberalism and toleration grew as Christianity became weaker. When the Christian religion ruled most of Europe, the people lived in intellectual darkness. It was only after the 18th Century Freethinkers and other heterodox thinkers began to question the sanctions of the Christian religion that human rights came to mean anything. From then on the world—in the main—has gone forward to newer and greater victories in science, humanism, government, social ideals, human rights, and the like—all of them the result of the tireless, brave, sacrificing work of Atheists, Rationalists and other non-religious elements.

You will notice that Prof. Elliot, like other theistic thinkers, is given to making his assertion without thinking there's the slightest need for evidence in support of such a position. Here he is typical. Generalizations are the favored tools of the superficial.

* * *

Has the American cosmetic market reached its saturation point?

According to a study made by the National Beauty Institute, 580 Fifth Ave., New York City, the cosmetic market is just about at its saturation point, which means that real expansion in the business will have to come through sales to women in foreign lands. The survey proved that 86.7 percent of our women use lipstick; 76.9 percent use rouge; 59.4 percent use perfume; 42.5 percent use talcum powder.

* * *

What percent of women are blondes, and red-haired?

When you ask about blondes, I assume you mean real ones, not synthetic. A survey by the National Beauty Institute, New York City, showed only 11 percent of the women are blondes; 7 percent are red-haired.

* * *

How many blind people can read Braille?

Of the 120,000 blind persons in this country, only 25 percent can read Braille, the system of reading by using the fingers to feel embossed dots. It is said that this bad condition prevails because Braille can be learned more readily by young persons who naturally have a more sensitive touch, while the facts show that

most cases of blindness happen after middle life.

Another reader asks how fast one can read Braille, compared to conventional type. The average speed for Braille is 80 words per minute, compared with 200 to 500 words per minute for persons who read in the usual way.

* * *

I enclose a newspaper clipping which argues that environment has little to do with mortality, the real factor being heredity. The life-span is supposed to be controlled by nature at the birth of a person—he is "wound up" to live just so long, regardless of economic conditions. Please comment on this theory.

It's a theory that asserts itself without bothering about facts. I'm reminded of the remark a scientist made to another when he heard an explosion down the street. "That," he explained, "is the result of one of Herbert Spencer's theories colliding with a fact." To prove how empty the theory you refer to really is, let me point to an investigation reported in the June, 1936, issue of *The Survey*, in which a study of mortality in Cincinnati was conducted by competent experts. Two groups of 100,000 each were studied—one group being among those having the lowest incomes and the other being among the highest. It was found that those with the lowest incomes had death rates nearly twice as high as among those with the highest incomes. When we come to the babies of the poor, we find even worse results. The survey revealed the startling fact that a baby born among these poor 100,000 low income people has only one-third the chance to survive that is enjoyed by a baby born into the environment of the 100,000 largest incomes. Among Negroes the death rate was even higher. But here we find another interesting and revealing fact—the death rate among Negroes is higher among the poor than among the rich Negroes. The facts therefore show that environment is of prime importance to a baby that is born into the world and hopes to stick around a while.

* * *

What kind of news leads all others?

News of a political nature and about the activities of the government comes first in the papers. According

to the June 13, 1936, issue of *Newsdom*, "over 10,000 columns a day on political matters appear in American newspapers, or over 60,000 columns a week, and over 3,300,000 a year."

Have you any figures dealing with the distribution of political control of the population of the globe and its land area?

The Balance Sheets of Imperialism, by Grover Clark, published by Columbia University Press, contains the information you seek, as the following table shows:

Countries	Population	Surface
Great Britain	24.4%	23.9%
China	20.3	6.9
Soviet Russia	8.2	16.0
United States	6.9	7.3
Japan	6.2	1.5
France	5.1	9.3
Netherlands	3.5	1.6
Italy	2.2	2.1
Belgium	1.1	1.9
Other Western Countries	18.0	22.5
Other non-Western Countries	4.1	7.0

How many students are receiving aid from the government?

The last figures I have are for March, 1936, which show that 390,500 students in high-schools and colleges, and graduates, were receiving financial aid from the federal government. The services which the students or graduates render for the money paid them aren't all performed on the campus. Campus activities consist mainly of work in libraries, laboratories and museums. The off-campus work includes: 1. Assisting in day-nurseries; 2. Leading town forums; 3. Providing leadership in community houses and boys' clubs; 4. Helping county agents and librarians.

Can scientists change one form of living matter into another?

According to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, bacteriologists connected with the University of Rochester have succeeded "for the first time in transforming the virus of one specific disease into the virus of another entirely different disease." The report says this work was done on rabbits. The experimenters took the virus that caused a comparatively harmless local tumor and turned it into a virus that produced a fatal tumor

that was cancer-like. This compares roughly with changing an animal from one breed into another of the same species. This work is of the greatest importance, for if it proves entirely successful it will be possible to change the virus that produces a deadly disease into one that is harmless.

You write that the U.S. national debt is small when compared to the British debt. What is our per capita debt? Also, what is the per capita debt of the English?

Our per capita debt is \$270. Britain's is almost \$850.

With Great Britain's national debt larger than ours, as you state, how long would it take for the U.S. to owe as much as the English if we were to continue spending money the way we have been doing during the past three years?

About 20 years.

What is the status of writing and publishing in Nazi Germany?

Germany, before the advent of Hitlerism, had many fine, independent, candid, gifted authors and a number of honest, pioneering, free-spirited publishers. But all this is gone now. Mrs. Alfred A. Knopf, who runs a publishing house in New York City with her husband, returned from Europe, on July 14, 1936, after making a first-hand study of the condition of the profession of letters in Germany. She described Nazi persecution as "fantastic beyond belief," and added:

"There's not a German writer left in Germany who is worth thinking about. The gifted writers and enterprising publishers who had any independence have all left Germany. Only Nazi writers and publishers remain. They write and publish to please the Nazi government."

How much money have we in circulation?

The U.S. Treasury reported, as of June 30, 1936, money in circulation amounting to \$6,240,793,900. This was an increase of \$288,195,200 over May 30, 1936. It was also an increase of \$673,701,400 over June 30, 1935. Per capita circulation, says the report, was \$48.79 on June 30, 1936; \$43.78, on June 30, 1935.

Are rents headed upward?

The Mortgage Bankers Association

tion, Chicago, made a nation-wide study and concluded that 1936 will see average rent increases as follows:

Eastern States, 9.8 percent; Southern States, 9 percent; Middle West, 9.9 percent; Mountain States and Pacific Coast, 8.1 percent.

How large is the membership of the Communist party of the U.S.?

The New Republic, July 15, 1936, says the Communist party in the U.S. had 25,000 members in 1934. The 1936 membership is 40,000. The Young Communist League has 11,000 members, as against 5,000 two years ago. The total increase is 66 percent. The same source says:

"The recent convention was attended by 750 delegates, mostly native-born; 88 percent of delegates claimed a proletarian origin; two-thirds were under 35 years of age; a large proportion were members of the A.F. of L.; 85 delegates were union officials."

"Pardon me for correcting a statement in the advertisement of your American Rationalist Annual. You say yours was the first attempt at such a document in this country. The Truth Seeker for years published an annual, the last issue, I believe, being that of 1893. Then they quit it, they said, because they lost too much money on it."—Franklin Steiner, author of *"The Religious Beliefs of Our Presidents."*

I hope that you will have sufficient success with the book, *"The Autobiography of a Pimp,"* to warrant bringing out other similar works. I read this book through twice with equal enjoyment. It seems genuine and sincere. In no place is it even the least erotic or obscene and it does impress any intelligent person again that there is no such thing as "easy money." The insight into human nature which it displays is admirable and the subject has been handled with tact, humor and appreciation. The interest was well sustained throughout. I should think it could stand on its own merits as a serious study of what it purports to be.

A companion book has been announced, and will be ready soon, entitled *The Autobiography of a "Madame."* I'm sure this social document will be given the same warm welcome which met the strange, bizarre, candid and baffling confessions of a professional pimp—one of those little understood "business managers" of the daughters of joy—or rather, as

the incorrigible Rex R. Eastman wisely cracked in this office the other day, "Merchants of Venus."

Many thanks for your enlightening comments on the religious ideas of our Presidents.

As I explained in my article, the material I used was drawn from a manuscript by Franklin Steiner, entitled *The Religious Beliefs of Our Presidents*, which I have accepted for publication. It'll make a book of 128 large pages. Mr. Steiner spent 40 years gathering his data and two years writing this book, an historical volume that will be of value to all intelligent students of American affairs. His chapters on Washington and Lincoln are especially valuable. Watch for announcements of this exceedingly important and readable book by that warrior in the ranks of Freethought—Franklin Steiner.

We hear a great deal about the losses caused by soil erosion, dust, storms, bugs, etc., but very little about weeds. Have you any data?

The Agricultural College, University of California, estimates that the U.S. suffers an annual loss of \$3,000,000,000 as the result of weeds. California, which has the greatest loss, suffers a yearly destruction of about \$60,000,000.

I was glad to see your numerous articles in support of the cooperative movement. Don't you think that it's necessary to watch out for a type of promoter who will try to cash in on this great project of the organized consumers?

You are right. It's going to be necessary to be extremely vigilant, for it's possible to advance enterprises that are really private projects under the guise of cooperation. If I get hold of any cases I'll be sure to warn my readers, for I believe in the cooperative movement and want to do my share in getting it going on a big scale. Of course, a chain of stores or filling stations are either cooperatives or they are private concerns. It's easy to tell the difference. A glance at the constitution and by-laws will tell the whole story. If the society provides one vote to each member, regardless of how many shares he owns; if the salaries to officials are reasonable; if the profits are returned to the members in the form of dividends; if the financing is

done at regular interest rates, without commissions or bonuses to promoters, then we know that the society represents true cooperation.

The shady promoters will tie up their schemes to the cooperative movement in other ways. For example, let's say a slick promoter gets an option, or other form of control, over a large tract of worthless land, or land that belongs to sub-marginal farming—the kind that produces a crop now and then, but which, over the years, registers an average loss for the workers. Such a promoter can organize a bunch of gullibles to put their money into a fake “cooperative farm” in order to get for himself an enormous profit on his option.

When he gets the suckers settled on their farms, he walks away with his boodle, leaving the “members” to hold the bag. Watch out for that kind of thief. I'm sure the present wave of sentiment in favor of co-operatives will produce a crop of such manipulators. On paper, such a schemer can show every conceivable advantage to the “members”—schools, low taxes, good roads, etc.—which the society will have to build or which may be available many miles from the scene of his activity. Everything will look rosy in his prospectus, but the catch in the whole scheme is merely this—he wants to put on the land he has for sale, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of families that can produce heavy initial payments (to him or his associates who own or control the practically worthless land), and then he presents the “members” with a nice constitution and by-laws which are “guaranteed” to shove the suckers into an economic paradise. Such a promoter can, in time, even get the original land back again for a new crew of victims, once the clipped lambs are compelled to move away.

The labor, Socialist and cooperative movements have always attracted slickers who are capable of pulling off stunts like that. The laws are stricter today, but the racket I've just described can be got away with today with only slight danger, if any. I remember, in the days of the not remote past, when so-called Socialist promoters did amazing things to their sincere followers. I recall one case

in which a leader of the Socialist movement in one of our States organized a \$250,000 company to found a daily newspaper. He sold the stock—\$10 here, \$25 there, and even \$1,000 in some cases—and after issuing a few editions found it convenient to suspend publication. Then followed some involved court actions, with the Socialist leader always talking about how he was protecting his followers, but in the end he and his family became the outright owners of the beautiful piece of printing property which had been paid for out of the sweat and blood of the workers and farmers. That fine plant is still running today—but as the promoter's private property.

Yes, the cooperative movement is going to attract such fakirs. But an honest, candid, critical press can help the movement by calling attention to their activities once they begin to show up with their dubious schemes, especially when the projects are based on farm cooperatives.

* * *

The newspapers are printing long reports in which the Democrats are criticized for bringing the “religious issue” into the national campaign. Please comment.

The Kansas City Star, a powerful, thoroughly dishonest newspaper, is Landon's Bible and it, among others, has pussyfooted around this “religious issue” without telling its readers what it's all about. The *Star* has a genius for eliminating anything from the news that sounds the least bit unfriendly to its reactionary political views. In this, of course, it's not much worse than most newspapers, for it's a fact that the American press, by and large, is prejudiced, unfair, unprogressive, and capitalistic to the core.

The “religious issue” isn't to be dismissed so lightly, for the facts indicate a most serious situation. Governor Landon, who poses as a liberal, democratic, homey, tolerant leader, is really an anti-Semite, as shown by facts he has seen fit to ignore, but which cry to heaven for explanation.

What the rumpus is about, runs like this:

Governor Landon, Republican candidate for President, is chairman of the board of the Ossawatimie State Hospital for the Insane. His name

appears on the institution's official letterhead. On March 19, 1935, the Superintendent of this Kansas hospital wrote a letter to the Dean of the Medical School, University of Minnesota, asking for a graduate who would be competent to join the staff of the hospital as a neuropsychiatrist. HE ADDED THE PROVISIO THAT "ALL APPLICANTS, MUST BE GENTILES."

That can mean but one thing. An institution belonging to the State of Kansas, which is run under the direction of the Governor of that State, is officially anti-Semitic.

Before the letter was reproduced in a New York newspaper, Governor Landon was asked by wire for an explanation. He CHOSE TO IGNORE THE COMMUNICATION. The wire plainly told the Governor: "Before making public the letter, we want to know your stand regarding this discrimination against Jews and what steps you in your official capacity will take to end it." This wire was signed by Clarence A. Hathaway, editor of *The Daily Worker*.

Landon refused to answer Hathaway's telegram. Why?

A second wire stated: "... You, as chairman of the hospital administration board, bear responsibility for that policy. We request a clearcut answer: do you approve this discrimination against Jews? If not, what public steps will you take to end it? ..."

Again the answer was—silence. The above facts, of course, never were printed in the capitalistic newspapers, especially in *The Kansas City Star*. But the facts, somehow, should be brought to the attention not only of the Jews, who have been openly insulted by Candidate Landon, but to all Americans who believe this country doesn't want to be cursed with the poison of Hitleristic anti-Semitism. Yes, the "religious issue" was introduced into the campaign, all right, but with every good reason. The facts should be aired in the open. The people have a right to know that Governor Landon refuses to deny that he endorses an anti-Semitic policy in an institution supported by the money of the taxpayers.

* * *

What are the main causes of insanity?

A study of 660 cases, by the Amer-

ican Medical Association, showed the following causes:

Drunkenness, 110; venereal diseases, 100; ambition, 73; excessive labor, 73; misfortune, 69; old age, 69; disappointment, 54; love, 47; religion, 29; politics, 26; crime, 10.

* * *

How many people are treated in our hospitals?

The American Medical Association reports that one person every four seconds enters a hospital for treatment—or 7,709,942 per year. There were 6,246 registered hospitals in 1935.

* * *

What is the position of the Socialists with regard to a Central Bank?

Socialist policy envisages nationalization of all banking, beginning with the central banks. In France, where the Bank of France belonged to private interests, the Blum government (Socialist) succeeded in having parliament pass, by an overwhelming majority, a bill to nationalize that vast institution.

In Canada, in June, 1936, the Finance Minister, Charles A. Dunning, a liberal instead of a Socialist, submitted to parliament a bill that proposed to have the government pay \$5,100,000 for a 51 percent interest in the Bank of Canada, the Dominion's privately-owned central bank.

The leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Socialist), J. S. Woodsworth, offered an amendment which proposed to authorize the Dominion to purchase 100 percent of the bank's stock and make the institution the property of the nation, but the amendment was declared out of order.

When the Canadians become intelligent enough to elect a government (with Woodsworth as its premier) that is pledged to a policy of the socialization of nationally necessary industries and institutions, one of the first steps will be to make the banking system the tool of the people instead of the racket of the bankers. When that day comes no one will rule as out of order an amendment to have the people become the masters of their financial interests.

* * *

Please express your opinion on the Father Coughlin-Lemke Union party.

The sudden appearance of the Union party is explained by the plan-

ning of Hearst and the Liberty League, both of them using Coughlin in order to defeat Roosevelt. Coughlin, on the other hand, is using the crackpot Lemke in order to give his Wall Street-Fascist masters what they want and are willing to pay for.

Coughlin, as I've said many times in the past, is America's No. 1 Fascist voice. He, like Hitler, has patched up a program that contains a hodge-podge of "radical" phrases, but the whole drift of the man is in the direction of Fascism.

We now see the nation's three worst demagogues in an alliance—Coughlin, the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith, and Dr. Townsend—to injure Roosevelt, and help Landon.

The whole conspiracy isn't aimed at electing Lemke. That eccentric nitwit hasn't one chance in 10,000,000 of making the White House. Lemke is expected, however, to pull enough votes from Roosevelt to assure the election of the pet of Hearst and the Liberty League—Governor Landon. If the scheme works, America will be set back 100 years. Repression will become a federal tool. Relief will be cut to the bone. The poor will be made to bear the costs of government and relief. The budget will be "balanced" at the expense of humanitarianism and social justice.

The great industrialists and financiers, who are almost solidly behind the Landon ticket, want the government to be used only as an instrument of exploitation, not as an agency of social reform. Therefore, the issue is clear: get rid of Roosevelt and elect Landon.

A clearcut fight between Roosevelt and Landon would certainly result in the President's re-election, but this new Coughlin maneuver throws a little doubt on the outcome. The Hearst-Liberty League outfit is shrewd and knows its political racket. But if the people can be made to realize what's going on in this campaign—made to understand the gigantic efforts of the fascistic elements to throw Roosevelt out of the White House—they will act to restrain these vicious conspirators and expose for all time the rottenness of those three racketeers—a priest, a Protestant preacher, and a simple-minded, but acquisitive, leader of the aged dupes who are willing to chase after the

\$200 pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

Roosevelt has made his mistakes, of course, but he has never shown the slightest tendency in the direction of Fascism—he has been a firm believer in democratic processes. And he hasn't hesitated to make use of the tremendous powers of the federal government to help the millions of victims of Capitalism who are still in distress, but who would be in their graves if the Roosevelt policies of emergency relief hadn't been instituted.

For Coughlin, the Rev. Smith and Townsend—the tools of Wall Street and the Liberty League—to put over their conspiracy will mean one thing—the country will then be in the grip of its fascistic demagogues. Such a calamity must be avoided by every lover of social justice, freedom, the Constitution and the fine, libertarian traditions of the country.

This demagogic trinity is the echo of Hitler before he assumed power early in 1933. We are facing grave danger, should these fakirs and misleaders of the ignorant masses succeed in undoing the work begun by Roosevelt and his group of New Dealers. Lemke, the poor, benighted nitwit, is Coughlin's cat paw. He should be given no support by citizens who have real regard for their country's future. Let there be enough support aroused in favor of Lemke and we will see the democratic Roosevelt driven out by the wolves of Wall Street and the "Kansas Coolidge" put into office in order to "front" for their war on social security.

Capitalism will stop at nothing to bring it the victories it seeks. It is using a Catholic priest and a southern Protestant rabble-rouser in a holy war to defeat the man who wasn't afraid to advance a few measures that were intended to serve humanity instead of balancing the budget so that Wall Street and the great financial interests might feel free in their drive for greater profits.

I don't believe Roosevelt, during the three years he has already served, has been radical enough in his policies, but I'm practical enough to know that he's been as radical as the masses expected, for it's a fact that the American public isn't quite adjusted to liberalism, let alone radical-

ism. Roosevelt, the shrewd politician, has gone as far as the people will permit him to go—but I feel fairly certain the people will find him responsive to more progressive legislation should they grow more radical—and by “radical” I don’t mean violence and disorder, I mean merely the impulse to go to the roots of social questions.

I feel certain that Roosevelt has still greater things in store for the masses, should he be given the power to continue his work. I refer, in particular, to the great and vital co-operative movement. Roosevelt is mysteriously silent on his plans here, but the signs indicate that it’s his purpose to use the gigantic financial and economic powers of the government in order to get the cooperatives going on a scale that will make the tremendous cooperatives of Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and England look like so many cross-road grocery stores.

The capitalistic elements know this, and their alarm is real. They see a reelected Roosevelt lending perhaps billions of dollars to cooperative societies that will strive to serve the consumers with a view to their own aggrandizement, instead of for the dividends of the vast corporations of private Capitalism. As I’ve said before, it seems to me that the next 25 years will see prodigious things happen in the field of consumers’ co-operatives in the U.S. Capitalism feels that the time to head off this movement is NOW, while it’s almost in its formative stage. Fascism in Germany destroyed the great co-operatives just as soon as Hitler stole power. Fascism in America must destroy the New Deal in order to keep our country from enjoying the economic benefits of cooperation.

* * *

I see frequent references to the Coughlin-Smith-Lemke-Townsend combination as a movement in the direction of Fascism. Please comment.

I’ve written, during the past three years, enough to fill a book on the Fascist threat of Coughlinism. The new line-up of the four worthies you mention certainly bears all the earmarks of Fascism. The Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith hasn’t received much attention from me, because, until Huey Long’s assassination, he played only

second-fiddle to the Louisiana dictator, but now that he claims he has inherited Long’s mantle he becomes as menacing as Father Coughlin.

The Rev. Smith is every bit as effective a rabble-rouser as Coughlin, and in some ways is his superior. His oratorical tricks leave one baffled—and frightened. For example, when he began his wild speech before the Cleveland convention of the Townsendites, on July 16, 1936, he told his audience of over 10,000 gullibles that he had information there was a conspiracy afoot to bring 800 men into the hall to break up the meeting. Of course, it was all pure bunk, but it served to drive his hearers into a frenzy. “When they show up,” Smith shouted, “will you promise to hang the first one who tries to interrupt my speech?” And the audience shouted back its promise to conduct a lynching on anyone who might even rise to heckle the demagogue. Hitler would never dream of hanging anyone who tried to interrupt one of his speeches. He would behead him.

Sinclair Lewis, author of the anti-Fascist novel, *It Can’t Happen Here*, gave *The New York Post* an interview, in which he said:

“That’s the whole trouble with a democracy. Dictatorships always seem impossible in a country that has had some liberty. That’s the whole point of my book, ‘It Can’t Happen Here.’ People won’t believe it can happen. Certainly it can. I’m as convinced now as when I was writing the book.

“It’s got to the point now where it’s squarely up to the average citizen who has been used to letting other people do his thinking. And that’s another trouble with a democracy. People talk about freedom as a priceless heritage, yet you’d think they wouldn’t expect to leave a priceless heritage kicking around in the road without some bright thief coming along and nabbing it.

“Take this Lemke, Coughlin, Gerald Smith, Townsend business. It’s the ideal beginning for Fascism. Perfect! Promising everybody something for nothing. And, like all such beginnings of a Fascist movement, they offer a great liberal program. You’ll find that most dictatorships have come out of allegedly liberal beginnings. . . .

“I have a vague, general fear that if somebody like Coughlin gets in, there’ll be hell to pay. Either this

group could put over a real dictatorship or they could have it taken from them by a hard-boiled group of reactionaries who, to save themselves and their families, would overthrow the whole Government and substitute their own brand of Fascism."

When we realize that behind the men mentioned above are such sinister figures as the unspeakable Hearst, the duPonts, the American Liberty League, 95 percent of the capitalistic newspapers, Landon, Knox, every tin-horn Mussolini who wants to terrorize his neighborhood, America's No. 1 anti-Semite (the Rev. Gerald B. Winrod), and a solid body of industrialists, bankers, public utility magnates, steel barons and monopolists, we begin to realize that **IT CAN HAPPEN HERE.**

I believe this gang can be whipped, as the Popular Front saved France from Fascism, but it's going to take a whole lot of courageous fighting. The best weapon is the searchlight of publicity. Let the people have the facts. Keep the public informed. America will never fall into the abyss of Fascism if the anti-Fascists do their duty and educate the masses against the dangers of an Americanized form of Hitlerism. But let there be no false sense of security. The facts must be faced squarely, and the truth must be told again and again. Every lover of liberty and social justice should enlist, in the words of F. D. R., "for the duration of the war."

* * *

What's the attitude of Norman Thomas towards Father Coughlin's Union party?

Norman Thomas understands the whole scheme behind Father Coughlin's Union party. Speaking of the movement recently, Thomas said:

"Its chief purpose is to 'get Roosevelt,' which is to say 'help Landon.' There is nothing democratic about the organization. It was proclaimed by one political Messiah and seeks the support of a couple of other would-be Messiahs. Not William Lemke, but Father Coughlin and possibly Dr. Townsend, are the important figures."

The above was written in June, 1936, about a month before the Townsend convention in Cleveland, where Coughlin, the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith and Dr. Townsend joined hands to do exactly as Norman

Thomas foretold. The rabble-rousing speeches were made to destroy Roosevelt, though, in order to appear favorable to their own fake Lemke ticket, they gave Governor Landon a few slaps on the wrist.

The most vicious elements in the land are now in full attack on Roosevelt. They are determined to "get Roosevelt," as Norman Thomas says. Radicals of every shade of opinion must be careful in the present campaign to do nothing to help these fascistic enemies of the working masses. They must realize that the Lemke front is intended only to help elect Landon, and any kind of a student of current political and social questions surely knows that the defeat of Roosevelt by Landon will mean a tremendous victory for the despicable Hearst and the fascistic American Liberty League.

Only a few years ago Coughlin cried "Roosevelt or Ruin." Now the cry is "Ruin Roosevelt." Why the change? Because Coughlin and the Catholic Church know that Roosevelt's policies, in the main, have been forward-looking—and social progressiveness is anathema to our orthodox religionists, be they Protestant or Catholic. The Catholic Church, being the greatest real estate corporation in the world, and being the most orthodox of all Christian churches, can't tolerate even the milder phases of Roosevelt's New Deal. It has always stood by and helped the worst forms of Capitalism assert themselves. It has been the main supporter of Fascism in Italy, Austria and Poland. It started out with a concordat with Fascist Germany, but found itself double-crossed by Hitler, who had other plans and found that the Vatican stood in his way. Father Coughlin couldn't utter 10 words in public if those words didn't meet the approval of the Catholic hierarchy. The fact that Coughlin speaks publicly as a priest and not as a citizen proves that the Catholic Church has joined with the fascistic elements of the U.S.—Hearst and the Liberty League—to destroy the Rooseveltian policies.

* * *

Does Norman Thomas consider Landon and Roosevelt as being equal representatives of capitalistic policies?

Norman Thomas, Socialist candi-

date for President, is careful, in his campaign speeches, to differentiate between the progressiveness of Roosevelt and the reactionary torism of Landon. In an address before the Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia, July 17, 1936, Thomas said that President Roosevelt is "unquestionably . . . more progressive, more alert to the human problems of his time than Mr. Landon, or the men and forces who made that highly synthetic candidate, and can break him."

One of Norman Thomas' objections to Roosevelt is the fact that he is surrounded by some highly unprogressive figures, particularly Vice-President Garner, Senator Robinson, of Arkansas (who openly defends the lawless behavior of the landlords in their attacks on cotton sharecroppers), or Farley, who has all the tricks of a Tammany politician.

Thomas also objects to the way in which the Roosevelt administration aided the dictatorial regime in Cuba to crush the liberal, democratic forces. To this he added the fact that he is disappointed over the following flaws in the Roosevelt administration:

1. The President's failure to insist on the passage of such important measures as the pure food and drug act, and the housing bill proposed by Senator Wagner.

2. The unsystematic use of made work to combat unemployment, when plans are at hand to conquer the slums with a well-worked-out housing plan.

3. The President's failure to protest publicly against violent acts by terrorists and floggers in Democratic States like Arkansas, Florida and elsewhere. (Of course, this doesn't imply that the President approved of such behavior. The facts indicate that Roosevelt is sympathetic to the ideals of those who are so frequently the victims of night riders.)

One of the splendid things about Norman Thomas' leadership is his fairness and reasonableness. He isn't the kind of a partisan politician who must say only bad things about his political opponents when the facts plainly don't permit one to make sweeping generalities of a negative nature. Thomas, in his speeches, makes just charges against the Democratic party, but at the same time

he knows that the Roosevelt type of statesman is new in that organization (meaning, of course, his passion for social reform and security) and that one should allow time for such a leader's influence to transform the body. Just because Roosevelt isn't a member of the Socialist party, let us say, is no reason for a Socialist leader to deny the man his numerous virtues. We must, at all times, grant true leadership its recognition and praise, reserving the right to criticize when acts fail to measure up to such standards of political excellence.

Roosevelt certainly isn't perfect, but we all know enough about him to admire him as a man, appreciate his readiness to travel as far down the road of social progress as the voting masses will support, a spontaneous feeling against the injustices and inequalities of the present system, and a wholesome, honest, sincere desire to cut the claws of the jungle-bred exploiters of the people. With the menace of Fascism always to be considered, it's a source of relief to consider that there is a real possibility of his serving the nation another four years while the people are gradually brought around to a more complete acceptance of social policies that make for progress in the direction of a stronger labor movement, socialization of public utilities, key industries, etc., and the building up of a vast cooperative movement for the purpose of protecting the economic rights of the great consuming class.

We know what to expect from a Roosevelt, and we at least know that he doesn't hold in store for us the spirit of repression, racial persecution, religious bigotry, and hatred for cultural and academic freedom.

On the other hand, we know that the election of a Landon would mean a Roman holiday for the various elements out to destroy Roosevelt—Hearst, the Liberty League, the great financiers and industrialists, the open-shoppers, the rugged individualists who would throw the hungry and helpless unemployed on their own "resources" or into the lap of local charity. There isn't a single Fascist in the nation who wouldn't like to see Landon elected. Father Coughlin and the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith may pretend they are for Lemke, but the facts indicate clearly that they are

against Roosevelt in order to help Landon.

This is no time for political sectarianism. We must keep ever on the alert. We mustn't take a stand for something that can't be realized now and blindly permit personalities rather close to our ideals to be defeated by persons and interests that are definitely known to be reactionary, and even fascistic. As I've written before, we mustn't stand by and let a man who is a little left of center to be beaten by a group that is at the extreme right.

* * *

Just before going to press, word was received at this office that several Socialist "leaders" are offering "shares" in a "farm cooperative." The land belongs to or is controlled by an option which is held by these promoters. The whole matter should be investigated carefully. If any of my readers have received "literature" from this outfit, I'll be glad to analyze it free of charge. I've had a little experience in spotting such outfits and exposing them. Don't put any money into such a scheme without the most exhaustive investigation. I have only one interest—to help protect genuine COOPERATION from the shady financial schemes of cunning promoters. If you have any of their circulars, send them to me by air mail.

* * *

After reading Father Coughlin's speech before the convention of the Townsendites the thought came to me that only a few months ago the priest attacked Dr. Townsend's plan. Has he withdrawn those words of criticism?

When Norman Thomas followed Father Coughlin, on the platform of the Townsend convention, Cleveland, Ohio, July 18, 1936, he called attention to the fact that before Coughlin went through his lovefest with Townsend and the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith, he had referred publicly to the Townsend plan as "economic insanity." Thomas added that Coughlin didn't retract this statement, and thereby put his finger on just one more insincerity of a political priest who is out to establish Fascism in the U.S.

Incidentally, let me add that Coughlin's superior, Bishop Gallagher, of Detroit, admitted, after the radio priest made his hysterical speech to the Townsendites, that copies of all speeches delivered by Coughlin are forwarded to the Vatican. Thus far, the Pope hasn't objected to a single

sentence in Coughlin's numerous political and Fascist speeches, thus proving that Coughlinism is also Catholicism. As I've said before, the Church knows what Coughlin is doing, and lets him continue because it knows he is doing its own dirty work. The discipline of the Catholic Church is so strict and powerful that it never fails to gag or unfrock any priest who dares to attempt political or other activities not within the accepted policies of the hierarchy.

* * *

Is Father Coughlin continuing his anti-Semitism?

He never fails to follow his subtle trick of keeping the fires of anti-Semitism burning by referring to the International bankers and then naming only the Rothschilds. In his speech before the Townsend convention, July 16, 1936, Coughlin worked his usual anti-Semitic line, which was noticed on the front page of *The New York Herald Tribune*, the next day, as follows:

"If there was any anti-Semitic sentiment among the perspiring thousands he got at that, too, for whenever he spoke of the international bankers to whom he said the New Deal had sold out . . . the only ones he mentioned by name were the Rothschilds."

Another choice Coughlinism was that Roosevelt was a "betrayal and liar" because he had promised to drive out the money-changers (meaning, to Coughlin, the international bankers, or rather, the Rothschilds) but had surrendered to Communism instead. Here, of course, we get another glimpse at the amazing muddle-headedness of Father Coughlin. It stands to reason that if Roosevelt "surrendered to Communism" the money-changers wouldn't have lasted 10 minutes. To bawl out the President for NOT having destroyed the money-changers and at the same time charge him with having sold out to the Communists is to show utter recklessness about simple truth and consistency. But his audience of over 10,000, according to the press, cheered both arguments.

* * *

Father Coughlin, in his address before the Townsendite convention, July 16, 1936, said, concerning the war loans, "We canceled \$40,000,000,000 of European war debts and repudiated \$11,000,-

000,000 more of post-war debts, simply to save the international bankers, simply to save the gold standard." Please comment.

This is just another Coughlin inaccuracy. The man makes a great flourish over facts and figures, but doesn't seem to care when they're all wrong. If he had looked into a good reference book he would have found that the World War and post-Armistice loans made by the U.S. to various European governments amounted to \$10,338,058,352.20. There is, in addition, the matter of interest. It's true that we reduced or canceled interest, but we haven't canceled a penny of the principal.

I am enclosing a clipping of Father Coughlin's speech before the Townsend convention, July 16, 1936. I have marked one paragraph which I would like to see you comment on.

The passage referred to reads:

"Government in this beloved nation of ours is represented by its three branches: the legislative branch, where the laws are made; the executive branch, where the laws are enforced, and the judicial branch, where the laws are adjudged to be in harmony with our Constitution before they can be enforced."

Father Coughlin's career as a student of government, politics, economics and sociology presents one with the constant necessity of correcting his innumerable misstatements, for the man has a positive genius for offering the most sweeping generalizations with the minimum of information. During the past three years I have written literally hundreds of columns about his eccentric ideas, and it looks as though the future will require even greater treatment, for the man's influence is growing.

The quoted paragraph contains one important error, when he speaks of the judicial branch, "where the laws are adjudged to be in harmony with our Constitution before they can be enforced." It's Coughlin's quaint notion that the judicial branch sits as a board of censors, passing on acts of Congress before the executive branch can take on itself the task of enforcing them. A high-school student who does only moderately well in his course on American government certainly knows better than to give ut-

terance to such a nonsensical interpretation.

The courts don't censor our laws before they are enforced. In fact, the courts can pass on a question of constitutional law **ONLY AFTER THE LAW HAS BEEN ENFORCED AND SOME CITIZEN FINDS THAT SUCH ENFORCEMENT INJURES HIM BECAUSE OF ITS UNCONSTITUTIONALITY.** It's only then that the courts can pass on an act of Congress.

In his speech before the Townsend convention, at Cleveland, Ohio, July 16, 1936, Father Coughlin said: "He who promised to drive the money changers from the temple (President Roosevelt) has built up the greatest debt in all history, \$35,000,000,000, which he permitted the bankers the right, without restriction, to spend." Is this true?

Father Coughlin's statement is loaded with inaccuracies. First of all, the President didn't build up a debt of \$35,000,000,000. Most of this debt was incurred by previous administrations. The actual increase caused by the Roosevelt administration is \$10,800,000,000, and this amount could be wiped out in a day with the gold stock held by the U.S. Treasury, amounting to more than \$10,000,000,000. This increase in the public debt, which was caused by the President, wasn't made to turn money over to the bankers to spend, "without restriction." Most of this money went to public works, unemployment relief, CCC, AAA, FERA, REA, WPA, PWA, etc. Money that went to the bankers came from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for which the bankers put up collateral and paid minimum interest of 4 percent. These loans have been repaid almost to the extent of 90 percent.

Father Coughlin says our national debt is the largest in all history. Is this true?

It's the largest in the history of the U.S. But he should have added that \$6,000,000,000 of this money is in recoverable assets, being protected by loans made to banks, insurance companies, farm- and home-owners. This, of course, leaves a net of \$28,000,000,000, which is only \$2,000,000,000 over the national debt left by Hoover on the day he left office, March 4, 1933. (Our national debt, as of June

1, 1936, was \$34,000,000,000.)

If Coughlin really meant what he said—that our debt is the largest in all history—he's wrong again—and the man has shown, during recent years, a vast capacity for inaccuracies. It seems as though I'm being kept busy tracking down his misstatements.

It happens that the United Kingdom of Great Britain has a national debt of \$35,000,000,000. As we have three and a half times the population of Great Britain we could increase our national debt to over \$120,000,000,000 and still be no worse off than the British are today—and our Tories never seem to tire of praising the British for the manner in which they are handling their affairs and coming out of the depression.

* * *

What's the origin of the phrase "Almighty dollar"?

Ben Jonson fathered the phrase "almightie gold," back in Shakespeare's time. Washington Irving, in his "Creole Village," *Knickerbocker Magazine*, 1836, coined the phrase "almighty dollar," probably under Jonson's influence. Later, Charles Dickens used it in *Martin Chuzzlewit*.

* * *

Have the anti-Semites learned yet that the drought and dust storms are Jewish plots?

Your question is put facetiously, but I'm going to answer it seriously, for it's a fact that the Jews HAVE already been blamed for the drought and dust storms. If you will refer to William Dudley Pelley's Silver Shirt weekly you will find the charge made in all earnestness.

Here's the "logic" of Pelley's charge: The Federal government is controlled by Jews. By misleading the farmers with communistic-Jewish schemes, it was made possible to "cultivate the soil too intensively, thus breaking up the land so that the top-soil can be displaced by the winds." Therefore, the Jews are responsible for the drought and dust storms. Who could ask for a better explanation? Perhaps Gawd whispered the facts to Pelley when he granted him that famous seven-minute interview.

Pelley is working his racket out on the Pacific Coast at this writing, so

we may expect to get the low-down on how the Jews are responsible for the earthquakes that visit California. It seems to me that the case can be built up good enough to stick. Pelley could show that the Jew-caused dust storms in the Middle West brought about a vast displacement in the earth's surface, which, in turn, could cause new settlements of the crust, thus shaking gentile Californians out of their beds.

* * *

What is the Socialist position on the Townsend plan?

The Socialist movement has always been in favor of old-age pensions. Long before the country ever heard of Dr. Townsend, the Socialist party of the U.S. (and the parties of the world) invariably carried a plank that demanded social security for the aged. So, when I say that the Socialist party is against the Townsend hysteria, it doesn't mean that the organization stands with the reactionaries who would throw the old people on their younger relatives or on local charity.

I have, during the past few years, written many articles attacking the Townsend pipe-dream, and each piece brought me stacks of letters (mainly abuse) and scores of cancellations of hard-won subscriptions I could ill afford to lose.

The Socialist standard-bearer, Norman Thomas (who has been the party's presidential candidate four times) spoke before the Townsend convention, Cleveland, Ohio, on July 18, 1936, and because he gave his honest, candid criticisms he was booed roundly again and again. That's the usual reaction of Townsendites to people who disagree with them. If they're dealing with a speaker, they hiss him. If they're reading an editorial article, they hawl out the editor in scorching letters and cancel their subscriptions pronto.

But booing Norman Thomas didn't make Townsendism true. Hissing a speaker doesn't answer his arguments. Thomas could quite easily have whipped his Townsend audience into demonstrations of enthusiastic endorsement if he had wanted to, but that would have meant an insincere espousal of an economic program that is shot through with bunk and lunacy. Thomas

preferred to receive the abuse of his audience of Townsendites, because it was only through their hissing that he could advance his valid objections to the plan—objections that will be reckoned with when the delegates come to their senses, if they have any sense. Then they will realize that Norman Thomas was the only truth-teller who addressed that five-day convention.

Thomas' first objection was on the score of a sales tax. Such a tax, he said, "would be pyramided, multiplied over and over, on the various transactions between the original product and the consumer. If I had to pay the taxes it would create, I'd have more taxes than coats on my back."

The speaker's next objection to the plan to give every oldster over 60 years of age \$200 per month was on the score that the money couldn't be raised with the "existing value of the dollar." To disregard the facts and pass such a law anyway, regardless of consequences, would mean "you're likely to get inflation and \$200 that would be equal to about \$20 in purchasing power as you know the dollar now."

Norman Thomas continued:

"We Socialists are not promising a far-distant Utopia. You can win abundance and carry out a sharing of abundance. We believe that Capitalism can pay a much bigger old-age pension than the present security bill proposes. We are the pioneers for old-age pensions. But might I say, in regard to the Townsend plan, that I do not think you can keep Capitalism and have it pay you twice as much for not working after 60 as the average one of you got for working before you were 60. Do you think you can perform vivisection on Wall Street?"

"You can't keep Capitalism and do this trick. And I don't think you can do it on a 2 percent transaction tax—not without inflation."

Incidentally, Norman Thomas took a fine shot at the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith, of Louisiana, the rabble-rouser who says he has inherited the late Huey Long's "5,000,000 followers" who believe in Sharing Our Wealth. Saying that he endorsed the expression in favor of democracy (Thomas here was quoting from one of the banners on the convention walls), he went on to say that "here I have to

ask a question of one of your leaders, the Rev. Smith. I want to know how he expects his candidate, Mr. Lemke, to be on the ballot in his own State of Louisiana, that State controlled by his hero, Huey Long. Louisiana is the one State where it is hardest of all for a minority party candidate to get on the ballot. It has been so for years."

The Rev. Smith, who is aspiring to become America's No. 1 Fascist, made no reply to this charge of betrayal of democratic principles.

Norman Thomas also paid his respects to Father Coughlin, at one point charging the priest with hating Roosevelt because the President refused to carry out the orders of the Catholic Church, which wanted the U.S. to mix in the internal affairs of Mexico. The Mexican government has, for some years, demanded that the priests obey certain laws—which are obeyed without complaint by other Christian Churches—and such a policy has been construed by the Catholic hierarchy as "persecution," a charge which I have answered many times in the past, showing that there are no grounds for the charge of "persecution" of religion in Mexico. Norman Thomas told his audience he didn't favor our going into Mexico just to satisfy the craving for revenge on the part of the priests.

In all, the Norman Thomas speech was a right good job.

* * *

Would you say that there's any man in public life today, in this country, who's the potential counterpart of Hitler?

Two names come to mind instantly—Father Coughlin and the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith. Of Coughlin, I've written reams, so I'll pass him up for the moment. The other worthy is somewhat new in national life, so he deserves elucidation. The man is built on the lines of a Hitler, and if he ever perfects an organization powerful enough to effectuate his policies, he'll give us every vile thing that Hitlerism gave Germany.

For example, when interviewed by the press, in Cleveland, Ohio, on July 18, 1936, the Rev. Smith warned that he planned to organize bands of youth in every State "for the preservation of democracy." (American Fascism doesn't use the word that

describes Hitlerism in Germany, preferring to pose as the power that will "save" the country from Communism and "preserve" democracy.)

The Rev. Smith said the groups of young men will be used "to break up Communist and even Socialist meetings, if necessary, to save America from Communism."

All such Smithites would need is a brown uniform to put the finishing touch on American Fascism. A clever, forceful, shrewd, cunning demagogue like the Rev. Smith could wrap the American flag around his brand of Fascism and go forth to crush every expression of traditional Americanism, free speech, free assembly, unionism, cooperative consumers' movements, political gatherings of radical or liberal organizations, etc.

Yes, the country is facing a set of hoodlums who threaten to destroy everything that's precious in American life. The immediate need of the American people is a press sufficiently strong to bring its messages of warning to the masses. Without a powerful, free press the fight will be almost hopeless. Let us, while we still are free to act, rally to the great work of building our first line of defense for real Americanism—a great, truth-telling, educational press.

Please comment on Father Coughlin's attack on Roosevelt as "the great betrayer."

The priest didn't stop to explain his hysterical outburst. When a President is charged with being a betrayer we are to conclude that he treacherously violated his oath of office, delivered the country to its enemies, committed acts of treason, and in other ways earned the punishment of being impeached. I doubt that Father Coughlin could make a case against the President if Roosevelt were asked to defend himself in an impeachment trial. The fact that the President refused to be bullied by Coughlin doesn't make him a "betrayer" of the American people. Roosevelt may have made his share of mistakes, and he may have failed to measure up to his opportunities or responsibilities during his administration, according to the viewpoint of the man's critics, but he certainly never betrayed the American people.

Coughlin, like the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith, the Bible-shouter from the Bayous, has learned the mean trick of low, false invective. Such conduct disgusts the intelligent public, but it's a great show for the dumb crowds that think "pouring it on" is the proper way of discussing great social and political issues. It now remains for the Rev. Smith, the would-be generalissimo of the proposed Coughlin-Smith Storm Troops, to go the priest one better.

* * * * *

In his book of dialogues, "Three Gods Give an Evening to Politics," Richard Rothschild makes Lenin say: "I have always maintained that democracy and a highly developed industrialism cannot be merged." Please comment.

The book you quote from contains an imaginary conversation between Jefferson, Lenin and Socrates. The words our author puts into Lenin's mouth show him to be unfamiliar with Lenin's real views. Lenin wasn't against real democracy. His point was that democracy was impossible in a society which permitted a small class to own the great keys to industrial production. That's an entirely different idea. The inference, of course, is that if the masses were to socialize the industries it would be possible to inaugurate true democracy. Lenin favored a dictatorship of the proletariat purely as a temporary expedient, to give the social builders time to erect a Socialist state on a sound, secure foundation, after which democracy could be practiced. The record of history proves the correctness of his position, for we find now, 18 years after the Revolution, that the U.S.S.R. feels strong enough to establish democracy, as may be seen from an examination of the new Constitution, which will most assuredly be adopted in November, 1936.

* * *

As I write this the issue of Progress or Reaction in Spain is being bitterly fought. The Fascists have captured half the country, but the government seems to be pretty strong and confident. Whatever happens, the days of clerical domination of Spain are numbered. Reaction will not be able to hang on to any victory for long. Spain is, after centuries of lying in a death coma, its mind decerebrated, its spirit drugged, and its body in rags, at last awakening. The priest-dominated land is about to boot

its exploiters where they deserve to be booted! I wouldn't bat an eyelash in horror or regret if every priest and large landowner in Spain were exterminated. As long as they are not exterminated, utterly crushed, decimated, and smashed to pulp, they will endeavor to enslave Spain with all the despicable means at their disposal. I agree with Robert Briffault when he says that only another tyranny (a tyranny of the Left) is able to effectively deal with the age-old tyranny of Reaction, and the Rightists are perfectly welcome to call it persecution if they want to.

My correspondent waxes eloquent over the punishment he would mete out to the Catholic-Fascist rebels against the Spanish Republic. As a warm believer in Republicanism, Democracy and free institutions, I insist, as many times in the past, that a Democracy has the right to defend itself.

In Spain, the situation is clear as sunlight. The clericals and the Fascists decided to knife the Republic in the back by causing a large portion of the army to become insurrectionists. The army which the Republic organized and paid for—the army which was sworn to uphold the Republic—turned treacherously and attempted to crush it. As I write, the issue is still in the balance. The rebels, whom I hoped to see crushed weeks ago, are still holding parts of the Republic, where they are slaughtering thousands of Socialists, Communists, Liberals, Republicans and anti-Clericals. The priests are carrying rifles and participating in the massacres. The retaliatory acts of the Republic were measures of necessity. The Republic was threatened, and it fought back with all its strength.

Fascism is organized murder, open gangsterism, blackmail, torture, persecution and tyranny. It's the same wherever it shows its ugly head. And Catholicism always marches hand in hand with Fascism, whether it be in Ethiopia or in Spain. Should the Left crush the Catholic-Fascists, it won't be an act of tyranny but a war to preserve the liberties of the masses and the ideals of civilization.

The two great murderers—Hitler and Mussolini—are, at this writing, helping the Spanish Fascists with bombers and other weapons of war. They are standing together to de-

stroy a young Republic and prepare the way for new Fascist conquests. The Catholic-Fascists envision a world-federation of tyrants and mass exploiters. But, tyrants turn on one another when they have killed off the enemies of tyranny.

* * *

One of my friends said he had read the Russian Constitution and that he found it less liberal than that of the U.S. Is the Russian Constitution published in America? What are the outstanding features that make it more liberal than our own?

It would be interesting to have a number of my readers study both Constitutions and make comparisons, incorporating their conclusions in letters to this publication. Such a discussion would be of real significance.

Yes, the full text of the new Soviet Constitution is now available, as previously announced. Every student of international affairs should get a copy at once, because this new document makes it necessary for us to revise all our previous ideas about the Russian form of government.

I have already given many columns of space to a discussion of the main points of this new Constitution, so I don't believe it is in order for me to go into that matter again, especially since the document itself is now available in cheap form.

* * *

I saw pictures and news reports recently of the marriage of a young man to one of the famed Siamese twins. In a case like that what's the status of the one he didn't marry?

The one he married is his wife, while the other one is thrown in as a bonus.

* * *

Please comment on Father Coughlin's challenge to the Jews.

Father Coughlin's words are summarized as follows:

"We are a Christian organization in that we believe in the principle of love thy neighbor as thyself. I challenge every Jew in this nation to tell me whether or not he believes in that principle. Since the Jewish doctrine of a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye has failed, I ask the Jews to accept Christ's principle of brotherhood."

The above is only one more proof of Coughlin's deep anti-Semitism, which grows more aggressive each time he delivers a speech. I don't

pose as a student of the Bible, leaving that to professional theologians like Father Coughlin, but even I, in my naive innocence, know that Coughlin's challenge is pure bunk. If Father Coughlin will turn to the 19th chapter of Leviticus, in the Old Testament, he will find the following sentiment:

"The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the home-born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself."

Note carefully that the quotation not only urges one to love his neighbors but insists that the stranger shall also be included in the Golden Rule. I recall vividly that 14 years ago I invited Charles J. Finger to write a little book for me on "Lost Civilizations." One of the points I was careful to call to his attention was the antiquity of what we call the Golden Rule. I suggested research intended to show that the Christian claim to exclusive ownership of the Golden Rule was just another myth, that careful inquiry would show that the Jews, Chinese, Hindus, Persians, Mohammedans and the ancient Greeks had worded the Golden Rule in their own several ways. Only an ignorant boor would claim that the Golden Rule came only with Jesus. The facts explode such a false idea.

As a result of my suggested investigation, page 58 of the little book gave the following precepts on the Golden Rule, which I recommend to Father Coughlin and other obscurantists:

1. The true rule in business is to guard and do by the things of others as they do by their own.—Hindu.
2. Do as you would be done by.—Persian.
3. One should seek for others the happiness one desires for one's self.—Buddhist.
4. What you would not wish done to yourself do not unto others.—Chinese.
5. Let none treat his brother in a way he himself would dislike to be treated.—Mohammedan.
6. Do not that to a neighbor which you would take ill from him.—Grecian.
7. All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.—Christian.

Father Coughlin—whose mission

has taken on its true purpose of propagandizing racial hatred and persecution, hypocritically "challenges" the Jews to accept "Christ's principle of brotherhood." Brotherhood is a beautiful ideal, and you will find it expressed magnificently in all periods of recorded history—Egyptian, Hindu, Persian, Buddhist, Chinese, Mohammedan, Grecian, Roman, Jewish and Christian. The quotations, which Finger garnered for me a decade and a half ago, follow:

BROTHERHOOD

1. He loved his brethren. He was a brother to the great men, and a father to the humble ones.—Egyptian.
2. The narrow-minded ask, "Is this man a stranger, or is he of our tribe?" but to those in whom love dwells the whole world is but one family.—Hindu.
3. He who is indifferent to the welfare of others does not deserve to be called a man.—Persian.
4. One should seek for others the happiness he desires for himself. There is no higher duty than to work for the good of the whole world.—Buddhist.
5. The good man loves all men, he loves to speak with all. The mean man sows that he himself may reap, but the love of the perfect man extends to all men.—Chinese.
6. Be good to thy neighbor whether he be of your own people or a stranger.—Mohammedan.
7. It is not the life to live for ourselves, but to help each other.—Grecian.
8. We are members of one great body, and we must consider that we were born for the good of the whole.
I will look on the whole world as my country, and on all men as my brothers.
I am a man and nothing that concerns human being is indifferent to me.—Roman.
9. Thou shalt not say, I will love the wise and hate the unwise; thou shalt love all mankind.—Jewish.
10. Let us not love in word and in tongue, but in deed and in truth.—Christian.

We now come to that part of Father Coughlin's disgraceful appeal to prejudice which says the "Jewish doctrine of a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye has failed." From

these words we are asked to infer that the Jews accept, IN ITS ETHICAL SENSE, the savage idea of revenge. The charge is false and malicious. On this point I prefer to quote from an editorial which appeared in the August 21, 1936, issue of the *Kansas City Jewish Chronicle*, entitled, "Father Coughlin's 'Challenge,'" as follows:

"The doctrine itself, as anciently propounded, was merely one of just compensation for damages and injuries inflicted. It is a phrase not literally applicable but illustrative of the very philosophy of the law incorporated in the criminal and civil statutes and judicial decisions of the United States and of every civilized country on earth. If a thief broke into Father Coughlin's office of his National Union for Social Justice and stole therefrom some of the thousands of dollars entrusted to the priest's care by his followers, would the good Father merely shrug his shoulders and say: 'Let the thief have the money'? Hardly. He'd be the first to rush to the telephone and call the police to arrest the criminal to be punished by the law according to the degree and the enormity of his crime, according to the doctrine of 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' which is just as much Catholic and Christian as it is Jewish and American, and Father Coughlin well knows it."

The facts, I believe, fully warrant me in inviting Father Coughlin to challenge himself to be intellectually and ethically honest.

* * *

What did you think of the screen production, "The Green Pastures"?

When I saw the stage production in Kansas City, some years ago, I wrote a piece for my pious readers, telling them I thought it was a fine show and a devastating attack on orthodox Christianity. I mentioned (if my memory isn't putting one over on me) that religious propaganda, to be effective, must be presented in such a way that it'll be taken seriously. There's no room for levity in this twilight zone. Priests, preachers and rabbis come a cropper when their hearers laugh—and the audience that saw *The Green Pastures* laughed in long, loud shrieks. Laughter murders religion.

The movie version impressed me as

a good job, perhaps almost as good as the stage show. The singing was fine, the acting flawless, and the direction simply great. The audience that saw the movie with me didn't laugh, but here I detected the reason—the director, who knew where the stage show got its dozens of bellylaughs, adroitly changed the timing or emphasis at the critical moments, thus pushing aside the sure-fire laughs. Even at that, a few guffaws managed to slip through, and dozens of snickers.

The whole spectacle, presented with all the reverence and awe Marc Connelly was capable of drumming up, was still a comedy of primitive minds trying to explain great moral and worldly issues without the aid of science. To me, *The Green Pastures* serves to help Freethought by making religion—in its Christian form—ridiculous and childish. It's amusing to read the glowing things our preachers write about this picture. They seem to have the naive idea that the "simple religiosity" of the Negro will tend to move the hard hearts of our materialistic skeptics and bring them down to their knees in reverence and adoration. The movie can do no such thing. About 15 seconds after its close we were all looking at a news-reel in which Lew Lehr, the comedian, sent us into spasms with his comments on some freakish zoological oddity. The thing changed so rapidly that the audience—including this pious scribbler—didn't have time to get salvation, sanctification and baptism. Besides, the whole thing works in reverse, when we see that scientific technique, through triumphs of physics, can repeat most of the Old Testament miracles right before our eyes. A miracle that is done over again by a film that comes out of a can isn't going to win our unbelieving masses to the notions that popped out of the heads of ignorant, primitive, almost savage, fanatics and crackpots.

Yes, I thought *The Green Pastures* was such amusing spoofing that I want to see it again. If we didn't know its sponsorship and the people who are ballyhooing it, one might suspect it was put over by Materialists and Atheists out to discredit religion by showing it up for the mumbo-jumbo it really is. If the

Bolsheviks in Moscow are wise they'll order a hundred copies of the negative and send them out through Russia and Siberia to kill off the stray remnants of religion that still linger in that land of anti-bunkistic Rationalism.

There's just one more point I want to dwell on, and that's the false impression this picture gives regarding the Negroes. While it's true that some of our colored folks believe this terribly unintelligent and insane pish-posh—as there are whites who have minds equally unbalanced—the great bulk of our Negro friends are rid of such nonsensical balderdash and hogwash for good and all. I know plenty of Negroes, and I'm still to meet one whose mind is as low as *The Green Pastures* represents it to be. Our educated Negroes, of course, are just as rationalistic as our educated whites. And the general mass of Negroes are, by and large, as void of piety and childish faith as the run of other people. We shouldn't insult our black brothers by letting the impression go out that we believe them to be hopelessly immersed in superstition and intellectual darkness. Intelligent Negroes resent such an insult, and with justice. Let's laugh at the religious nonsense of *The Green Pastures*, but let's remember to dismiss the notion that the picture represents Negro life as it's to be found today. It applies only to a small minority. The people everywhere are throwing off the shackles of religious obscurantism.

* * *

Do the Socialists hold that Roosevelt's policies make for a dictatorship?

A survey conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion, published early in August, 1936, showed that 70 percent of the Socialists held there was nothing in Roosevelt's acts or policies to lead to dictatorship. The general vote was: Yes, 45 percent; No, 55 percent. The vote by parties was:

	Yes	No
Democrats	9%	91%
Republicans	83	17
Third Party Voters	53	47
Socialists	30	70

* * *

What's your opinion of the movie, "Things to Come," by H. G. Wells?

This British-made spectacle, produced by Alexander Korda, is an im-

pressive, artistic, dramatic, and, in places, highly beautiful picture. The first half of the picture impressed me most, especially where we're shown how the next world war will destroy every evidence of man's constructive efforts. This picture's appeal is decidedly adult—a long stride from the usual 12-year-old level of intelligence demanded by the average Hollywood chunk of tripe. In all, Wells has succeeded in making a powerful appeal for peace based on science instead of sentimentality. I'm more than glad I saw it, and if ever the chance comes again I'll see it a second time. As an indication of how the picture didn't please the moguls in control of the box-office (or rather the businessmen controlled by the box-office) I might mention that I had to go to a 15c house given to wild west "horse operas" while the town's best movie (which charges 35c per ticket) was content to rest its case on the cavortings of Joe E. Brown as a "natural salesman" of tractors. H. G. Wells must take a back seat when Joe E. Brown's in the neighborhood.

* * *

Henry J. Allen, in his *Topeka State Journal*, August 18, 1936 (page 4), writes that "the judgment of the clever diplomat who was . . . sent by Russia to Washington after the recognition, was that Roosevelt is the Kerensky of the forthcoming American revolution, and that someone like John Lewis will eventually be the Lenin." Please comment.

Henry Allen, who proposed Fascist measures in Kansas long before the world even heard of Hitler, has a tremendous capacity for inaccuracies and the use of forged documents. He belongs with Father Coughlin and the Rev Gerald B. Winrod in the matter of spouting "facts that ain't so." In another piece I called attention to Allen's lying use of a nonsensical oath which he crassly attributed to the Communist party of the U.S., a hoax which carries internal evidence of mendaciousness. Since writing that piece, Allen retracted under threat of a libel suit, though he added new lies to his retraction, one of them being that the oath he ascribed to the Communists really belonged to the old I.W.W.

The above quotation from Allen is stupid on its face. First of all, Alex-

ander A. Troyanovsky, the Soviet Union's ambassador to the U.S., has always scrupulously refrained from interfering with, or commenting on, internal matters in this country. He leans over backward in avoiding any sort of act or word that might be construed as meddling in our affairs.

Shortly after Roosevelt became President, there was a great to do in the press over the charge that F. D. R. had been described as the American Kerensky, but the man who was supposed to have said that wasn't Troyanovsky but Lawrence Todd, a Washington newspaperman who was, at that time, the correspondent of the Federated Press. Todd, under oath, denied ever having said it.

The second part of Allen's lie is equally silly. At the time of the Kerensky excitement, John L. Lewis was still a conservative craft unionist in the A.F. of L., so no Soviet spokesman could have had any reason for looking on that person as a future Lenin. It was only recently that Lewis threw off A.F. of L. conservatism and came out for industrial unionism.

The editorial quoted from doesn't tell its readers how or when Troyanovsky submitted his "judgment" that Roosevelt was the American Kerensky. A statement like that should be verified and its sources identified, which, of course, can't be done, because it never was said. Can you imagine Troyanovsky remaining as ambassador to this country 24 hours after getting off such a remark?

What is the latest development looking toward building a rocket for exploration of outer space?

P. F. Cleator's new book, *Rockets Through Space—The Dawn of Interplanetary Travel* (Simon and Schuster), is the latest contribution to the scientific discussion of astronautics. I have, in previous issues, given considerable space to this fascinating project, a romantic form of science which I have always taken seriously. This science made progress when a Russian, K. E. Ziolkovsky, in 1903, first called attention to his discovery (which was based on Newton and others) that "the rocket does not require the presence of air for its operation."

A great deal of money is being

spent on this form of research and a sizable group of scientists are constantly applying themselves to its advancement, which is rather slow, but truths are being garnered steadily. The subject is highly sensational, but its students are uniformly modest and shy of publicity-seeking.

Great strides are being taken, the latest being the report of the American Rocket Society that Rocket No. 4, in 1935, traveled at a speed of 700 miles per hour in successful trips. Of course, editors of Sunday feature stories like to draw bizarre, Jules Verne pictures of giant rockets being shot to the moon through immense space guns, but such sensationalism isn't welcomed by the leading figures in this new science. Before conquering the universe, it'll be victory enough to be able to send a rocket into outer space for something like 10,000 miles—perhaps carrying an observer and recording instruments—and have it return safely to earth. That seems to be a reasonable possibility.

Our author figures that 4,380 tons of fuel will be needed to carry a rocket weighing 20 tons, including passengers, equipment, instruments, supplies, etc. An interplanetary journey to Venus, let us say, would require a vessel weighing more than 20,000,000 tons. So that field is out, for the present, though it offers opportunities for interesting and valuable speculations.

I was impressed by the manner in which you outlined a history of Freethought, in a recent issue. I have been a student of world affairs, specializing in what has happened since 1918. If you, as an editor, gave an author an assignment to write such a work, how would you go about the job of outlining the material? I always thought editing merely meant reading submitted works and accepting or rejecting them. Now I realize that a real editor outlines his subjects and then goes out and hunts up a writer to do the work.

It would be quite a job to condense such a history into 60,000 words, but I believe it can be done. I'd prefer to call the work *A History of the World Since 1918*, and I'd outline the contents as follows:

Introduction: Description of the ghastly economic and political and social condition of the world—the irony of this culmination of 100 years of

heroic struggle. What blunders led to the renewed power of medievalism.

PART 1. TEN YEARS OF FOLLY

Chapter I. The Crime of Versailles.

1. The Leading Statesmen. 2. The Greed of the Victorious Nations. 3. Sowing the Dragon's Teeth. 4. Frenzied Finance and Fraudulent Plebiscites.

Chapter II. Prolonging the Agony. 1. Five Years of French Hysteria. 2. The Wanton War on Russia. 3. The Attempt to Cripple Turkey. 4. Fostering Chaos in China. 5. Other Countries.

Chapter III. The Destruction of International Faith. 1. The League of Nations. 2. Juggling with International Debts. 3. Navy and Armament-Reduction Pacts. 4. Back to Machiavelli.

Chapter IV. The Hectic Flush of Prosperity. 1. The Harding-Coolidge Golden Age. 2. The Tragi-Comedy of Prohibition. 3. The Abuses of Capital. 4. International Economic Anarchy. 5. Unemployment Grows Rapidly.

Chapter V. How the Public Was Duped. 1. Social Evil of the New Journalism. 2. Fatuous Assurances of Writers and Statesmen. 3. Lies about Russia and Mexico. 4. Playing Fast and Loose with Science.

Chapter VI. The Beginnings of Fascism. 1. The Sordid Beginning in Italy. 2. Corruption and Incompetence in Spain. 3. Pilsudski's Brutality in Poland. 4. Scandalous Acquiescence of the Churches and the World Press.

PART 2. THE PRICE IN BLOOD AND TEARS

Chapter VII. The World-Depression and Its Causes. 1. The Tragic Year 1929. 2. The Earthquake-Wave Rolls over the World. 3. The Most Paradoxical Age in History. 4. Alleged and True Causes of the Collapse. 5. Can the Capitalist System Survive? 6. Experiments in America, Britain, France, etc.

Chapter VIII. Fascist Claims of Efficiency. 1. The Rake's Progress in Italy. 2. The Debauching of Germany. 3. Ruin and Gloom in Poland. 4. Chaos in Rumania and Yugo-Slavia. 5. Brutality in Austria, Hungary, Spain and Brazil. 6. Lies in the World-Press.

Chapter IX. The Development in Asia. 1. Gandhi and the Struggle in India. 2. Stirring from Turkey to the China Sea. 3. Japan's Crime and the World's Acquiescence. 4. The Situation in China.

Chapter X. Russia Finds the Way Out. 1. Appalling Task of Russian Statesmen. 2. From Lenin's N.E.P. to the Five-Year Plan. 3. Industrial, Agricultural and Social Progress. 4. All-Round Application of Science. 5. Russia Explodes Every Moral, Social and Political Convention.

Chapter XI. Other Socialist and Semi-Socialist Experiments. 1. What the So-

cialists Did in Austria and Spain. 2. Brutality of the Reaction. 3. The Development in Mexico. 4. Stirrings in South America. 5. Situation in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Great Britain, France, Czecho-Slovakia, and Turkey. 6. The Cooperative Movement.

Chapter XII. The Future: World-War or the New Era? 1. Conspiracy of Fascist Countries for World-Conquest. 2. Forming a Central-European Bloc. 3. Japan to Exploit China and Engage Russia. 4. State of Parties in All Lands. 5. The Chances of a New Middle Ages.

I believe the foregoing outline covers the situation pretty well, considering the limited space I allowed myself. I'd like to hear from my readers regarding this proposed outline. Suggestions are invited.

* * *

How'd you like the Marx brothers in "A Night at the Opera"?

I thought it was good entertainment. Those three lunatics are always favorites of mine. I like them even when they're not up to par, which shows how I feel about them. My favorite is the dumb cluck who does all his acting in pantomime. Next comes Groucho. Then follows the brother who plays the piano so cleverly and gets off such outlandish puns. But Harpo, I insist, comes first. He, to my notion, stands with Charlie Chaplin as an artist. Groucho's nonsensical patter always amuses me. *A Night at the Opera* was especially happy because the story was so good. George S. Kauffman and the fellows who helped him did a good job of comedy.

* * *

What's your opinion of Senator Capper?

Senator Arthur Capper, of Kansas, is as good a politician as the nation has ever produced, barring not even F. D. R. himself. Quiet, soft-spoken, kindly and cordial, Capper—the perfect Christian statesman—doesn't know what political defeat means, for he knows every kink and twist in the old-time joust. He has the kind of political ears that can pick up the mutterings of 16 farmers in Osage County, the resolution of a Kiwanis club in Clay Center, a dry splash (pardon my undry use of the word "splash") in the ladies' federation meeting in Dodge City, and the vaguest hint from wheat growers that more federal money ought to come out this way but this here ad-

ministration is goin' to have to do a little less spendin' or the country's goin' to rack and ruin. If ever you want to know the state of public sentiment on any question, just ask the good senator for his notions. He'll tell you what's what in a slow, hesitating, halting speech—so quiet you'll think he doesn't know what he's talking about, but later you find out he had his finger on the pulse, or his ear on the ground, or his eye on the main chance, or his whiffer sniffin' the aromas that emanate from the masses—or whatever it is that a great statesman uses to gauge what's going on in the heads—or stomachs—of his constituents.

A Republican, Capper soon gave F. D. R. better support than half of his Democratic lieutenants. AAA was from heaven, for most of its money would go out to the section which includes Kansas. The administration mustn't spend too much money, because the nation mustn't be saddled with debt, but Capper could always forget his mild, gentle protests while he saw the proper administrators and got them to pass on the proper sums of money to the Kansas counties that needed money even more than they needed rain. A Democratic dollar is just as good as a Republican dollar, especially when it comes from F. D. R., who must take the ultimate blame, and goes to Capper's constituents who will, most likely, remember Capper with deep gratitude when they see his name on the ballot.

Capper has opponents, but no enemies. He's too innately friendly to have anyone agin' him. Immensely wealthy, he likes to let the poor know he's with them, that his vast publishing business can't produce another million spondulicks without tearing out his heart when he reflects that so many of his constituents must get along without a million dollars. He gets over the impression that nothing could suit him better than to see every man and woman in this nation—not a king or a queen—but at least a millionaire. "Oh, if only there were less greed in the world," he mutters, as he pockets his own hefty income. That's the Christian statesman in action.

Others may yell like so many rabble-rousers. Capper's technique is more subtle, and intelligent. I don't

think he's ever raised his voice in his long, successful career. In his own gigantic publishing plant he is more shy and timid than his most inconspicuous apprentice. He never shouts an order to his employees; he always makes a timid, faint suggestion. And he is the same way with the citizens of his great State. The voters listen to his murmurs, they look into his tired eyes, and they walk away undecided whether he's Jesus Christ or Abraham Lincoln. A fellow like that can't be whipped.

The only disappointment in his life, I'm positive, is that he's just about 15 years too late to have presidential ambitions. Somewhere in his middle 70's, Capper knows everything about the great game of politics, but must be content with a "mere" senatorship because his gray hairs are too numerous.

* * *

I see that you neglected to mention the religious beliefs of James Monroe in your September, 1936, Freeman.

It was an oversight. There is no evidence to show that he ever became a member of any Church. He was careful to avoid all mention of religion in his writings.

Monroe, who was a great admirer of the great infidel, Thomas Paine, was able to use his influence to have Paine freed from Luxembourg prison. Monroe's predecessor in Paris, Gouverneur Morris, left him in prison to be executed, even going so far as to conspire against one of America's greatest patriots.

Joseph McCabe, in his *Seven Infidel U.S. Presidents*, calls attention to the fact that the most recent biography of Monroe (*Life of James Monroe*, 1921) says nothing about his religion, "and one can gather from it only that Monroe died without prayer or religious ministrations—like his four predecessors."

McCabe adds the interesting fact that Paine wrote the second part of *The Age of Reason* in Monroe's home.

* * *

Your discussion of the new Soviet Constitution misses the most important point—the fact that the trend is not towards Democracy but towards Capitalism.

Your point isn't at all well taken. In fact, it's highly inaccurate. If Russia, as you say, is veering towards

Capitalism, the Constitution would, of necessity, have to provide for the restoration of the capitalist class and the liquidation of social ownership of the means of production, distribution, communication, exchange, etc. I'm sure you couldn't prove such a transformation, in practice or theory. Capitalism—the private ownership of socially necessary industries, etc.—is quite dead in Russia, and the new Constitution has no intention of reviving it.

* * *

The Topeka State Journal, Henry J. Allen's Republican newspaper, prints in its issue of June 25, 1936, what it claims to be the oath of the Communist party. I enclose the clipping and ask your comment.

According to Henry Allen's newspaper, the Communist oath reads as follows:

"I do solemnly swear that I hold in contempt, all institutions of capitalism, including ecclesiastical and secular; its flag, its courts, its codes, its churches and religions; that I will obey all summons of the elected officials of this order under penalty of death, and spare neither time, effort or money to obey, even to the last drop of my blood."

The foregoing is a monstrous lie. This is the first time I've ever seen this obvious hoax, so it's quite possible the alleged oath was fabricated by Henry Allen himself. If he did, his hoax stands on a par with the forged Knights of Columbus oath and the frequently-exposed Protocols of the Elders of Zion.

I understand the Communist party intends to sue *The Topeka State Journal*, unless the editor retracts his malicious falsehood.

* * *

When do you think Hitler and Mussolini will get the gate?

Whenever I'm asked to act the role of a prophet I'm reminded of the sane words of Josh Billings:

"Don't never phrovesy yung man, for if yu phrovesy wrong, noboddy will forgit it, and if yu phrovesy right noboddy will remember it."

* * *

OSCAR AMERINGER'S LATEST PROJECT

[A Freeman reader, who received a letter and booklet describing Oscar Ameringer's "cooperative" scheme, asks me to analyze the proposition. After

studying the literature I decided not only to dissect Ameringer's venture but, since he is exploiting the idea in a Socialist paper, *The American Guardian*, I incorporated my arguments in a letter (August 1, 1936) to Clarence Senior, Executive Secretary, Socialist Party, 549 Randolph St., Chicago, Ill., so that the matter might receive official notice. My readers who are Socialist party members should also write to that official, urging that the situation be investigated.]

Dear Comrade Clarence Senior:

I was very happy to get your letter of July 31, in which you say such nice things about the pieces I've been writing. It's necessary for every lover of democracy and social justice to give of his best efforts to counter the sinister forces that are conspiring to destroy our blood-bought Americanism and inaugurate a reign of Fascist terrorism. As I've written many times, it's our job to educate the masses, build up a great political party that will serve to strengthen the position of labor by giving it the governmental facilities that will be at hand once we get a sufficiently large vote, build up a great trade (or rather, industrial) union movement, and, what is equally important, do everything in our power to build up a great cooperative movement. I'm delighted to see that the Socialist party has endorsed the cooperative movement, for it's my firm belief that the next generation will see this country studded with immense consumers' cooperatives.

But, if we are to have a real cooperative movement we will have to be vigilant during this formative period, for there are elements—in and out of the Socialist movement—which would scheme to make immense personal profits through the misuse of the cooperative movement. I have in mind the activities of a famous Socialist leader, Oscar Ameringer, editor and owner of *The American Guardian*, who is launching a scheme that will do untold harm to the new-born cooperative movement if his project isn't exposed in time.

To be specific, one of my readers, who is also a reader of *The American Guardian* (which, I believe, is recognized as an official Socialist publication), sends me a letter and commercial catalogue he received from Ameringer. A careful examination of both leads me to believe that he, Ameringer, is attempting to use the prestige of the Socialist party in order to put over a venture that is shot through with commercialism. Now, mark you, making a legitimate profit, under Capitalism, certainly is no crime, but trying to make a capitalistic profit in the name

of the cooperative movement strikes me as being a heart-thrust at the future of cooperation in America—a blow which can, unless checked, set back the movement a decade or two. In these formative years, a misapplication of the ideal of cooperation can easily result in a scandal that will destroy public confidence in the genuine humanitarianism of the cooperative idea.

According to the booklet sent out by Oscar Ameringer, the project is a plain real estate stunt, a land-selling campaign, which offers farms (of 40 acres) belonging to the Garden Home Company, in Louisiana, along the Mississippi River. This is described as "a virgin empire of 25,000,000 acres," which you and I know to mean that the land hasn't even been cleared, without fencing, buildings, or other improvements. We find such to be the case. We are even informed in this pamphlet, which Oscar Ameringer is sending out to readers who answer his announcements in *The American Guardian*, that the purchaser of this land will have to spend at least \$12 per acre clearing his land before he can get "rich" running "a pecan grove." The fact that the booklet—elaborately illustrated, with all the lingo of the high-pressure land salesman—says nothing about cooperatives leads me to conclude that the original land-selling scheme didn't attract a sufficient volume of inquiries and that it was felt necessary to tack on the cooperative idea in order to land the Socialists who still happen to have a few thousand dollars in savings.

The letter which accompanies the booklet talks about establishing a Cooperative Farm, etc., and it's this feature which makes the venture subject to the inquiry and just criticism of the Socialist movement, which, in turn, is in duty bound to protect the cooperative movement from highly questionable enterprises.

Let us look at a few facts, as stated in Ameringer's sales letter:

Each prospect is to pay \$1,000, for which he is to receive 40 acres of unimproved, uncleared land in a section which is reported to have been under water in the last flood to the extent of 40 percent of its area. That means \$25 per acre, for land that is worth, at the most, \$2 per acre, to which must be added another \$12 per acre in order to get it cleared and answer "the Opportunity that knocks but once."

Ameringer says his company owns this land outright. Having tried to sell it through a regular sales booklet, and failing, he now rings in the cooperative feature, and it's this, of course, which is my only excuse for writing. Incident-

ally, Ameringer's letter is written on a plain sheet of paper, which is a peculiar fact when one considers that he is the editor of a Socialist organ and is writing to inquirers who are answering his articles in an official Socialist journal. If his movement were genuinely cooperative, he wouldn't hesitate to use his editorial letterhead.

The scheme, as I understand it, is to get rid of the land—unload it on our Socialist comrades, who will find themselves in a malaria-infested country, subject to floods, with uncleared land, without fences, houses, etc. There is nothing said in Ameringer's letter that the land will be given to the cooperative he is proposing. No, it's to be strictly business there. He is to get the money for the land, and when the sales are finished, Comrade Ameringer will give the members and their families a scheme on paper for THEM to live by, leaving him free to return to his editorial duties or look up another parcel of land which can be picked up at anywhere from \$1 to \$3 per acre and sold for perhaps \$25, with still another "charter" of cooperation left among comrades who will be told to cooperate or starve.

Just how the purchasers of Ameringer's land will get their cooperative he doesn't tell. He is specific about the money for the land (\$1,000) and another \$12 per acre for clearing the swampy or stump-covered land, which is to go to Ameringer, but when we come to cooperation we learn, in Ameringer's own words, that:

"I also have the assurance that the government will aid in the establishment of the cooperative processing plants mentioned."

Just how much is that "assurance" worth after Ameringer steps out with the money paid for the land and leaves the buyers to cooperate? If "assurance" means "guarantee" then I don't know the meaning of English. Then, there's nothing to show that the government will aid. Will it be with a booklet offering advice or money to pay for the structure, machinery, etc.? It's out of such thin air that the Ameringer cooperative scheme is blown.

It's my deep conviction that the Socialist party should investigate and report on Ameringer's latest promotional scheme. If it's strictly commercial, it should be advertised as such. If it's a real cooperative, then the evidence should be produced that no land-selling promoter is first out to move perhaps hundreds of families to a section that still belongs to "a virgin empire," at so much per acre in order to dispose of his real estate company's holdings.

I feel certain that this is not a gen-

vine cooperative movement. If it isn't, the Socialist public which Ameringer has gathered from the ranks of the party should be warned. Failure to act may result in a scandalous situation, to the deep injury of the Socialist party and the cooperative movement.

Sincerely,

E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS

Since writing the foregoing open letter I have received a number of letters from my readers who asked me to comment on Ameringer's real estate sales ballyhoo in his paper, *The American Guardian*. One reader forwards a copy of the August 7, 1936, issue, which shows the amazing cleverness with which Ameringer works to influence his large Socialist following. Socialists are given to trusting their leaders implicitly, so that it's possible for men with personal axes to grind to get the comrades to do the dirty work of turning the stone. In the present instance we find an advertisement, signed by Ameringer, on page 3, col. 7, entitled "A Golden Opportunity," in which readers who have \$1,000 to "invest" are urged to answer "the knock of opportunity that calls but once." Of course, this announcement doesn't say that the land belongs to Ameringer's company and that it'll require at least \$12 per acre to clear.

The same issue contains, in addition to the "come-on" announcement, a four-column editorial article, by Oscar Ameringer, on page 1. This amazing article, which is nothing more than a tie-up with the page 3 advertisement, extols the very locality which Ameringer—the real estate promoter—is exploiting. The whole point of this editorial article is that *The Delta* (Ameringer's Louisiana land that is still "a virgin empire of 25,000,000 acres") is the solution to America's land problem—provided, of course, the readers of *The American Guardian* connect this editorial article with the commercial advertisement, sign up on the dotted line and pay the good money that will enable the Ameringer land concern to dispose of its holdings—all in the name of "farm cooperation."

The facts, I insist, indicate a major project that is intended to bring money into the coffers of Ameringer's land company under the banners and slogans of the real cooperative movement. The connection is so raw that it constitutes a scandal. A few such ventures, put over shrewdly at this time in order to make a howling success of some land-selling campaigns, can do the real cooperative movement immeasurable harm.

As for my personal interest in this situation, let it be accepted as final that I'm only "a knocker," as Ameringer's

paper dubbed me the last time I discussed certain "business" features. Yes, I'm glad to be known as a "knocker" when such schemes are floated. The labor and cooperative movements need plenty of "knockers" to put such schemes out of whack. I'm delighted at the epithet and hope to keep my hammer swinging. Would-be victims who listen to my "knocking" may yet thank me for keeping them out of the outfit when the facts are finally established that the great and growing cooperative movement was used as a cover-all for a cheap land-selling scheme.

* * * *

A reader objects to my using the word "pansy" when writing about Hitler, insisting that Der Furore's harsh voice and demeanor would tend to nullify the idea that he is a passive type of pervert (the feminine, pansy type). If he is perverted, writes my correspondent, it is more likely that he is an active type (like Captain Roehm and many other Nazis).

The same writer says there is also evidence—"not too conclusive to be sure"—that Hitler has had relations with women. This brings to mind the allegations made in a Paris newspaper, which drew a protest from the Nazi government not long ago. The facts were taken by this Paris journal from Konrad Heiden's biography of Der Furore, which is available in an English translation. Heiden gives a number of interesting facts to prove that Hitler has had some experiences with women, and Heiden is the kind of writer who isn't given to scandal-mongering.

This, of course, is a difficult question to settle. It may be that Hitler has done a little experimenting emotionally. I have claimed in the past that Hitler hasn't been known to have sexual affairs with women, because his nature is so constituted that he isn't interested in the opposite sex. Such a pathological case might conceivably "try" out a woman now and then just to see what it's like—only to learn that his inner nature will not be denied. These instances are supposed to have happened many years ago, before he became really prominent.

During the past five or six years (when he could take his pick of beautiful women) he has been strictly chaste, so far as daughters of Eve are concerned, and it may be that because of his conspicuousness he has even avoided relationships with sons of Adam. The whole issue of Hitler's emotional nature is a moot question. There are many authorities who insist that Hitler is a thorough-going homosexual, and there are a few who insist there is

little or no evidence to support the allegation.

John Gunther, in his book, "Inside Europe," insists there is no factual support for the charge of Hitlerian homosexuality. Others—and they are quite numerous—argue that homosexuality is a vice of hidden places. Very few of the men who practice this perversion are as frank as the late Captain Roehm (who made no bones about admitting his love for young men). One certainly can't produce letters by Hitler in which he confesses his love for Roehm and others, nor can one place before our skeptics photographs and other forms of evidence. But let's consider this overwhelming fact: During his entire career, Hitler has attracted to his side every kind of pervert. The Nazi party is filled with such individuals. Homosexuals are quick to detect one of their own kind—frequently only a word or a move of the eyelid is enough. They have, literally by the thousands, swarmed to Hitler's banners. It's insisted that such a mass congregation of homosexuals must be taken into consideration when one considers the strange phenomenon of Hitler's complex, queer, mysterious nature.

* * * *

How'd you like the Dionne quintuplets in "The Country Doctor"?

That was an excellent picture. Jean Hersholt, as the doctor, was splendid. Slim Summerville, as the village constable, was at his comical best. These two, at the time the five babies were popping into the world, were funny. The author got every possible bit of humor out of the birth scene. The five little stars, as always, were delightful. Some of my friends insist they are fed up with these five youngsters (they're quite young ladies now) but I can't see enough of them. I always stare at new pictures of them and read every news item. To me, they're wonderful, lovable, amusing, charming rascals. I'm sure I'll always be interested in those babies. Right now, I'm hoping for the day, some three or four years hence, when they will all go trooping to school at the same time. And later, I want to see pictures of them going out with their boy friends. And then, of course, when they marry, which I hope will be a mass wedding.

* * *

Please comment on Mencken's enthusiastic support of Landon's candidacy.

Henry L. Mencken built a good part of his reputation on his cam-

paign against Rotarianism, the Bible Belt, Methodism, Kansas dry fanaticism, the Middle West's arid intellectualism, and the other buffooneries of the dumb booboisie. (You see, I revert unconsciously to Mencken's lingo.)

And now, behold, the great Mencken travels all the way to Topeka (the heart of the chinch bug and Kiwanian sector), issues heart-moving statements and sends home to his *Baltimore Sun* articles which tell his aristocratic followers he has found his messiah at last—Alf M. Landon.

Landon is the paragon of "common sense." He is the "Kansas Coolidge," and Coolidge, *American Mercury* readers no doubt recall, was one of Mencken's pet aversions. Alf is a Rotarian and a popular speaker at Kiwanis luncheons. He goes to Methodist services, though the evidence seems to indicate that piety and Landon never got along well together. Landon writes letters telling the good Christians of the Bible Belt that "ree-lee-jion" (the pronunciation is really Coolidge's) is necessary to social morality. Landon isn't a fanatic on the liquor question (he's quite tolerant about good burghers who like to gulp an occasional Budweiser) but he's darn strict on hard liquor and helped keep Kansas away from its legalization. (A few years ago that alone would have damned Landon to Mencken's Hell, along with Harding, Coolidge (the man who was weaned on a pickle) and Bishop Cannon.)

Roosevelt—the Nietzschean aristocrat, the superman, the reincarnation of Zarathustra and the embodiment of the possessors of superior germ plasma—is given the boot by the great Mencken. Why? Maybe there's something to the fact that Mencken is one of the owners of the immensely valuable *Baltimore Sun*, and is deeply hurt by Roosevelt's crass ignorance in saying that labor laws intended for employers are also meant to be obeyed by newspaper publishers. That, incidentally, means that child labor is to be abolished—and newspapers, need I add, are America's greatest exploiters of child labor. Besides, Roosevelt has rejected Mencken's philosophy, which has it that anyone who lacks a bank balance must be biologically inferior and therefore shouldn't be coddled with relief

(which helps unbalance the budget) but should, instead, be shipped off to some boneyard to die quietly and be dumped into a pit along with millions of other misfits. Roosevelt has disappointed Mencken. He has shown himself to be a traitor to the Nietzschean system, as interpreted by the sage of Baltimore. He must be destroyed. The government must be above such policies of relief for millions of worthless beggars who never should have been permitted to get born.

Roosevelt—the aristocrat—has sold out to the Devil of Communism, the Brain Trust and soil conservationists. The new Messiah is at hand. All hail! Landon will save us from Socialism! Hurrah for the Superman of Topeka, the blond Nietzsche of Kansas, the aristocrat of the grasshopper-and-corn belt, the Schopenhauer of Methodism and the Stendhal of Rotarianism. (Yes, it all sounds goofy, but that's what Mencken's conversion really amounts to.)

* * *

Editor, American Freeman:

A few issues ago you had discussions on mental telepathy. Let me relate my experience not only as a witness but as an actual participant. A woman stood blindfolded on a platform surrounded by a crowd of people. Her associate went through the crowd touching various objects, such as coins, bills, etc., while the woman yelled out the names of the objects. In many cases she called out the dates on the coins or serial numbers on the bills. This might all have been doubted by me, but—

The man approached me and asked my name. I whispered it to him so inaudibly that it couldn't be heard three feet away. The woman on the platform called out the name, although she was 40 feet away and surrounded by the noisy crowd. The man asked me the date of my birth and the woman spoke this correctly also. Was this all faked or was it mental telepathy between that man and woman? Even if an imitation, it was clever, and I wish I could do it. Ramsey, N.J. Milton M. Berger.

Of course, it was clever. There's no denying that. But there was nothing supernatural in your experience. There are dozens of ways in which these pairs of tricksters work together. It's a business with them—they make their bread and butter that way—so they must think up various stunts to mystify the public

and thereby earn their pay. The late Harry Houdini showed that he could do any of their stunts by trickery. But Houdini was an honest man. He didn't confuse the public with "scientific" hanky-panky.

Recently I was in a public place, where a man and woman were doing the act described in the letter above, except that the man was blindfolded and did the telling, while the woman went around the hall. The man, true to form, called off dozens of objects, including dates on coins. When she came to my seat she touched my tie and the man mentioned the fact, which caused me to laugh impishly out of the side of my cynical mouth.

The woman noticed this and said: "You seem to think it's a trick."

"I certainly do," I responded, with Barrymore gestures. "Here's a test that'll mean something. I have a \$20-bill in my pocket, and you and your partner up there can have that bill if you'll get him to call off the serial number." She then asked me to show her the money, which I refused. She then asked me to let the usher hold the money, and again I refused. Muttering something about the hazard of counterfeit money, the lady then quietly moved on to more important matters. I still have the \$20—no, that's not quite accurate. The money's spent, but I did the spending, not that pair of mountebanks.

* * *

Please comment on the second plank in the Coughlin-Lemke platform, dealing with the money problem.

The section you refer to reads as follows:

"Congress and Congress alone shall coin, issue and regulate all the money and credit in the United States through a central bank of issue."

The charlatanry of Father Coughlin and his tool is plain as day in this muddle-headed proposal. It is Coughlin's Fascist trick to grab "radical" issues and pour "radical" phrases around them. This trick comes into effective use when he tackles money and credit, two economic issues about which he knows nothing or wants to confuse the uninformed public.

The idea of a central bank is perfectly all right. Socialists and liberals in Europe have always sup-

ported the idea of a central bank, but being thoroughly scientific in their approach they demand that the entire banking system be nationalized. If you have the thousands of banks in this country—large and small—remain in private hands, how is it possible for a central bank to control money and credit?

If Coughlin were really sincere in his "fight" on the money-changers in the temple, he would stand firmly for nationalized banking that was controlled by a central bank. But, as his motive is merely to muddy up the waters, he ignores the heart of the question (nationalization) and calls for a central bank that would be unable to control the country's money and credit so long as the private banks continued to hold that money and dictated who shall or shall not receive credit.

If a central bank alone could solve this problem of money and credit, a little tinkering with the Federal Reserve System would fill the bill. But, and here's the ringer, Coughlin has declared himself in favor of the liquidation of the federal reserve banks. That, it seems clear, shows that Coughlin, while talking about the money-changers, is really doing their dirty work, by calling for a central bank that won't be able to control money and credit in a system of individual banks or chains of banks, and at the same time seeks the destruction of the Federal Reserve System that could easily be set in motion as the central bank if the banks were nationalized.

The plank also demands that Congress shall coin the nation's money. It's common knowledge that only U.S. mints are permitted to coin money, so just what does this mean? Is he calling for a law against counterfeiting?

Coughlin's demand that Congress issue all money is another empty piece of verbiage, for the federal government certainly has complete control over the issuance of money today. It's true that national banks which have government bonds or other approved securities can turn them into the Treasury Department and have money printed against them, but just what's wrong about using certificates that represent wealth as the basis

for the issuance of paper money? To listen to Coughlin and Lemke one would imagine that any national bank could, at its own sweet will, order the government to print all the money it wanted. His trick of ignoring the fact that such money can't be issued out of thin air, but only on approved bonds and the like, shows the utter emptiness of the Coughlin policies.

It stands to reason that if any national bank could print money as it saw fit, there would have been inflation of the worst kind generations ago. When we realize that only about \$6,000,000,000 of money is in circulation throughout the country we see that something has been holding back the private bankers from going on a money-issuing spree—and that was the power of Congress to demand the conditions I've already described.

The next word that Coughlin uses, "regulate," has already been covered in this piece. To repeat, Congress can't "regulate" money and credit so long as we have a private banking system, regardless of the fact that we might establish the central bank that Coughlin so insincerely calls for. To regulate credit, one must have control of money. How could a central bank regulate credit throughout the nation if the nation's money remained in banks that were owned by financiers? The contradiction should be apparent to a school-boy.

* * * *

A few words of comment by you on Walter Duranty should be of value to your readers.

About 15 years ago, Walter Lippmann did a neat job of exposing *The New York Times'* news about Russia by printing in *The New Republic* a cold, bald digest of what the *Times* had printed about the U.S.S.R. Of course, I'm relying on my memory, but it seems that Lenin murdered Trotsky at least eight times, while Trotsky assassinated the great Lenin a half-dozen times. During something like two years the *Times* printed at least a dozen news stories which said the Bolshevik regime had fallen or would surely collapse within another 30 or 60 days. Most of this news came from Riga, near the Russian border but in an

unfriendly neighboring country. I don't doubt that it was Lippmann's perfect hit that gave the editor of the newspaper under fire the perfectly revolutionary idea that it might be good to ditch those fakirs in Riga and get Russian news from Russia itself. Walter Duranty got the job to tell the story of what was happening in the land of the Soviets.

Duranty took his job seriously. The results, during the past 15 years, have been almost miraculous. A great capitalistic newspaper, through the journalistic ability and honesty of this one correspondent, undid its shameful, really childish, treatment of the early years of the Russian revolution and established itself as the best medium for the truth about what was taking place in that vast domain, where more than 150,000,000 people went through the gigantic job of building a new civilization while suffering years of famine, blockade, civil war, intervention, sabotage and treachery.

I suppose I've read every word Duranty has written about Russia, for I haven't been without my *New York Times* since before the World War. I soon realized that Duranty could be relied on to at least try to get the facts straight. He never made the fatal mistake of underestimating the Bolsheviks, as did so many others. He approached them objectively. Now and then Duranty fell into the traps of mysticism, moonshiny sentimentalism and inept generalizations, but such sinful escapades are rarely indulged in now. The materialistic, atheistic, fact-loving, worldly, realistic, practical Russians have influenced him, to his own good.

I haven't read Duranty's recent autobiography, *I Write as I Please*, and perhaps won't, because I believe I know as much as I care to know about the man's life. I have followed his work for a decade and a half—and that's the best autobiography I could ask for.

Duranty is an honest correspondent, who works hard to get the truth. He has intellectual integrity. He doesn't care what the editor thinks about his work. If he doesn't like it he can fire him—but thus far the *Times* has preferred to keep this brilliant reporter on the job, and give

him the widest latitude. It's been good business for the *Times* to do this. And, besides, it has enabled the *Times* to live down that period so mercilessly exposed by Walter Lippmann, who, by the way, is now himself in need of just the kind of an overhauling that he gave to the *Times*. He has become the country's most distinguished time-serving hack.

* * *

Is the U.S. one of Canada's competitors in the wheat market?

No. The U.S., instead of being a competitor, is Canada's second best wheat customer. According to official reports, we buy wheat from Canada at the rate of \$4,000,000 per month.

* * *

Are any benefits to be had from fat-reducing preparations?

All are bad and should be avoided like poison. A reporter visited the Los Angeles General (County) Hospital one day in July, 1936, and found eight men and women receiving medical aid for serious conditions caused by these patent medicines. Public health officials should join in an educational campaign, supported by strict laws making it a serious offense to offer such dangerous concoctions for sale.

* * *

Do you believe that an alien has a right to criticize the country he is living in but of which he isn't a citizen?

Yes, provided he voices his criticisms in non-violent language and doesn't suggest the breaking of any of our laws. A good example of how an alien shouldn't act is the conduct of Father Coughlin in calling our President a "liar and betrayer" because our chief executive refused to accept the padre's Fascist doctrines. Coughlin—let's not forget is an alien. He was born in Canada and was never naturalized. If he were a Communist, and indulged in his propaganda, he would have been shipped out of the country long ago.

The readers who ask me why Coughlin named Lemke for President, when he could have run for the office himself, should remember that the priest doesn't want to do anything of an overt nature to bring his non-citizenship to an actual test. Once he tried to get his name on the ballot (or presidential electors committed to him) he would have to do a whole lot of explaining, and all the pussy-

footing in the world couldn't explain away the fact that America's No. 1 Fascist is an alien.

We should remember that Hitler also was an alien when he began his propaganda to destroy the German republic. But when Hitler's movement became strong enough to assert itself, he had a law passed legalizing his status. Coughlin could do the same thing if his Fascist drive were to meet with success. We would then find the Catholic hierarchy (with headquarters in the Vatican) ruling the U.S., through a priest who was born in a foreign country and never became an American citizen until he was able to put aside our naturalization laws and declare himself a citizen by decree, which would be a typical act of dictatorship.

* * *

Do you think Joseph McCabe would consider taking time off from his serious works to write a detective story?

It's true that McCabe has read many detective yarns—he's quite a fan—but why conclude from this that he could write one? I have a great passion for playing symphonies on my Victrola, but why assume I could dash off a symphony or two? McCabe is a philosopher, scientist, logician, historian and popularizer of knowledge—these jobs he does well—so why load him with such a doubtful assignment, especially when I, his editor, know nothing about detective stories, having always loathed such a form of literary entertainment. There's no telling what the result might be. I shudder at the thought of it. I'm reminded of a story told about Bernard Shaw. He was approached—was it by Isadora Duncan?—with the request that he have a sex affair with her. Said the dancer: "The reason I want you as my mate is to produce a child with my body and your brains." To which Shaw replied: "Did you ever stop to think that the child might have my body and your brains?"

* * *

I've just heard the Rev. John Brown, of Arkansas, say "the church, like God, is ever the same; it never changes." Please comment.

The Rev. Brown—who is one of the most orthodox of Fundamentalists—has never changed, I'm sure, and most likely never will, for he is a thoroughly fossilized specimen of

hide-bound Theocracy. But if the Rev. Brown would give a little study to the history of the Church—Catholic and Protestant—he'd find that the Church does change. It usually takes the Church about 75 or 100 years to catch up with a new fact, so to the superficial observer it seems as though the organization is completely static, but here appearances are deceptive. The Church has changed many, many times.

Let's take, for example, the delicate question of birth control. When that brave pioneer—Charles Bradlaugh, the great British Freethinker—advocated the dissemination of birth control information, during the second half of the last century, he was jailed and persecuted for his daring heterodoxy. The Church—from top Fundamentalism and orthodoxy to the more liberal sects—condemned Bradlaugh to Hell and perdition and stood solidly against birth control, an antagonistic position which was quite in harmony with the Church's illiberal traditions. But the world moves, albeit slowly—and even the Church moves with the world, albeit 75 years late. Today, we find that many dignified, respectable, powerful Protestant Churches are endorsing birth control. Even the august House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church passed a resolution several years ago approving birth control. And, as for the Catholic Church, it still stands against chemical and mechanical devices in the field of birth control, but it has quietly compromised its position by giving its imprimatur to the rhythm method of birth control, a new development in contraception that still has many dubious aspects. Of course, the Rev. Brown, I'm positive, is still opposed to birth control in any form, so he may say that he, like Gawd, never changes, but even here he is wrong. Perhaps a century hence a Bible-thumping grandson of the Rev. Brown will, in a quavering voice, say that the Church never changes, that it believed in birth control right along, its only objection having been that the wrong people were trying to get the birth control information.

I could, of course, multiply illustrations. We see many signs today of the ferment of change in the Church. There is a vocal, but small,

minority which seeks a genuinely pacifist position should war break out again. If this minority grows strong—let's say after another 75 or 100 years—we'll see the Church change its position from mere idealistic mouthings about peace in times of calm to a stand against militarism in times of war—and that, my friends, will be a complete change for the Church, the record showing that the Church has always blessed the banners of the marching legions, as was shown in Italy only a few months ago.

The Church's traditional stand has been to insist on individual salvation as a remedy for the world's numerous evils, social and otherwise. But we see the beginnings of a change—still represented by a minority, of course—which insists that the problems facing the world are social, economic, industrial and political and must be approached from such directions instead of from the old, discredited path of individual salvation.

In the past, Churches have changed on some subjects and remained stubbornly uncompromising on others. The Church changed its attitude towards science, after hundreds of years of a losing battle with the forces of enlightenment. The Church changed its attitude towards scientific medicine when it learned, almost too late, that the problems of health can best be handled by science instead of mumbo-jumbo prayers and superstitious incantations. The Church stood for many centuries as one of the foundation stones of slavery, but the Church changed on the position of slavery.

Yes, the Church changes, but slowly, like a melting iceberg. The transformations are so gradual that they seem to be as set as the Rev. Brown's brain, but even the Church can't be charged with being quite as adamant as this Arkansas pulpit-pounder and sky-pilot. In the past, one favorite way of changing the Church was by organizing new Churches. Step by step more liberal and rationalistic Churches were founded, side by side with the traditionalistic institutions—until today we come to the Unitarians, who are so liberal that many of their preachers attract and hold Agnostics and even Atheists among their congregations. Of course, here our

friend, the Rev. John Brown, would retort that the Unitarian Church isn't really a Church, because it isn't exactly like the outfit he runs.

Yes, the Church, like other human institutions, makes its compromises with history.

* * *

An editorial writer in a tory newspaper, speaking of Sinclair Lewis' "It Can't Happen Here," says that Lewis obviously had Franklin D. Roosevelt in mind when he described the dictator, Berzelius Windrip. Please comment.

You should tell me the name of the newspaper (and the precise date) when you request such comment. I don't like to take stabs in the dark. If possible, attach the original clipping to your question, so I can quote with absolute accuracy.

It's hard to believe that the editorial writer of even the world's most tory newspaper could give utterance to such a stupid piece of clap-trap. A schoolboy should know that the character is a composite of Huey Long, Father Coughlin, the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith, Dr. Townsend, Governor Tallmadge and the other rabble-rousers and would-be dictators who are trying to capture the government, in the same way the Hitler-Goering-Goebbels gangsters and blackmailers stole the German government.

Sinclair Lewis accepts the belief that Roosevelt is a strong believer in our democratic institutions and has no policies that aim in the direction of Fascism.

* * *

I was told recently that the Communist candidates for President and Vice President couldn't serve, if elected, because of the fact they are from the same State. Is this true?

I have received several inquiries regarding this matter since the appearance of a syndicated cartoon, entitled "Stranger than Fiction," which used pictures of Earl Browder and James Ford, Communist candidates for President and Vice President. Under the portraits appears the following comment:

"If the current Communist candidates for President and Vice President of the United States should be elected both could not serve . . . for under the law the offices must be filled by citizens from different

States. . . Earl Browder and James Ford are both from New York."

This question was put before South Trimble, Clerk, House of Representatives, who answered as follows:

In response to your letter of July 7, requesting information concerning qualifications required of Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates, I beg to quote from Article II, Section I, of the Constitution of the United States as follows:

"No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States."

Nothing is said concerning candidates being residents of different States.

* * *

"Your brief reply '10 percent efficient' as to boughten vs. natural teeth may be a bit discouraging to some who should for their health's sake make the change. Perhaps a word of explanation to the effect that the comparison was with a full set of 32 perfect Ivories would not have been out of order. Very few have such an equipment and especially not when they are about to fall back on artificial dentition, at which time the boughten ones may be equal or in fact even superior to such natural teeth as they have left."—C. A. L.

* * *

If Europe goes to war again—which seems probable—do you think it will be able to get any money out of Uncle Sam?

The Johnson Act forbids any loans to a foreign government which has failed to pay its debts to this country. This act, if continued in force, might lead some of the European powers to attempt some kind of a settlement of the war debts, in order to be able to come back for more money, which, in turn, could be repudiated at a convenient moment. I don't pretend to be able to speak for the future, but it seems unlikely that the American people will allow our government to open its treasury to foreign militarists.

The European governments still have an ace to play. Europeans have about \$6,000,000,000 of stocks, bonds and other holdings in American corporations, utilities, railroads, land, buildings, and Federal and State se-

curities. This immense investment could be commandeered by the foreign governments, which would compel the holders to liquidate their equities in the open markets. The American dollars that such sales realized could be used by the foreign governments to purchase needed raw materials. The investors could be compelled to accept lire, marks or other kinds of dubious money for American dollars that would be good for cotton, copper, scrap iron, steel, chemicals, and the like.

* * *

Is the use of cotton in road-building a success?

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, in July, 1936, said the use of cotton fabrics in road-building is still an experiment. The work is being studied in 24 States, the aim being to develop new uses for cotton. Over 500 miles of bituminous-surfaced roads are being reinforced with cotton. The Department will study these roads under every conceivable test condition. From five to eight bales of cotton are used per mile.

* * *

Which is our fastest growing business? According to the Federal Census, the beauty parlor business is growing fastest.

* * *

Do banks in the Soviet Union pay interest on deposits (money) just as U.S. banks do?

Yes.

* * *

I was impressed by your article on the anti-Semitic policy of the Kansas State Hospital for the Insane, of which Governor Alf M. Landon is chairman of the board. I am a student at the Kansas State Teachers College, and as such received a copy of a quarterly (April, 1936, issue) published by the institution. I refer you to the article beginning on Page 8, and invite your comment.

Thanks for letting me see this amazing publication, the reading of which has led me to write a letter to Governor Landon, which I quote in full below. This college—one of the largest in the State—is headed by President W. A. Brandenburg, who has been discussed before in these columns. This man, as I told my readers during 1935, permitted the use of the college's assembly hall and other facilities to spread the most

despicable lies about the Soviet Union and the Russian people. Now he permits one of the college's official publications to libel the Jews.

The letter:

July 23, 1936

Governor Alfred M. Landon,
Topeka, Kansas.

Dear Governor Landon:

I am enclosing a copy of a quarterly magazine published by the Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kansas, entitled "The Techno," and which contains an article, "The Semite as the National Socialist Sees Him." If you will read this article, you will be impressed with the fact that the publication is offering its readers (most of whom are not familiar with the various phases of the controversy) perhaps 100 libels on the Jews, without so much as a hint that these cruel falsehoods against a racial minority have been demonstrated as being merely the malicious outpourings of anti-Semites. For example, we are even told, by this Kansas State publication, that the Jew is biologically inferior to the so-called Aryan, when the great authorities in the field of anthropology, headed by Professor Franz Boas, have demonstrated factually that the notion is without scientific validity. This Kansas State magazine ignores this constructive side. In addition, the same publication, in more than a half-dozen places, quotes from the so-called Protocols of the Elders of Zion, in an effort to prove that the Jews are in a conspiracy to ruin or rule the world. Not a word is said about the fact that these Protocols have been proven to be crude forgeries. If you will read this article you will be told that Jews are liars, thieves, swindlers, cheats, rapists, conspirators against the social order, mainstays of international finance and Capitalism, lacking in idealism, materialistic, anti-nationalistic, Communist, inartistic, anti-social, money-grubbing, hypocritical, diabolical, given to rascality, and, therefore, worthy of persecution and oppression. The only charge that is omitted from this Kansas State publication (which, by the way, bears on its masthead the name of President W. A. Brandenburg) is the ancient charge of ritual murder. It is a curious fact—one, I believe, which brands this Kansas State publication as indulging in anti-Semitic propaganda along Hitleristic lines—that not a single line is given to the vast literature which has exposed the utter falsity of the anti-Semite's case. The article I'm referring to could appear in a German anti-Jewish, Nazi publication without so much as the change of a single word,

which leads me to claim that a Kansas State institution is being used to malign and libel an innocent, helpless people.

You, as Governor of our State, are not immediately responsible, even though you stand as the official head of our educational institutions of higher learning, because it's obvious that you could never be expected to supervise everything that's issued by the presses of our State colleges. But, needless to say, you have an ultimate responsibility which can't be evaded. If you, as the Governor of our State, learn that one of our great and powerful educational institutions is being used for Nazi propaganda, it's your obvious duty to conduct a careful investigation. If you find that the facilities of the State's plants have been misused, you are compelled to undo the damage done to a minority group that's unable to protect itself, unless, of course, you are in quiet sympathy with such anti-Semitism.

I am a strong believer in academic freedom, but this doesn't include the "right" to lie about a race and perhaps increase the volume of hatred and abuse directed against them. These lies against the Jews could have appeared in "The Techno," had they been accompanied by the truth. The verifiable facts being omitted from this Kansas State publication, the article ceases to be an academic inquiry and becomes hateful propaganda. The fact that the author gives a short sentence to stating he has no opinion one way or the other is no valid defense, for the inference is still there that the awful charges leveled against the Jews are uncontradicted and therefore most likely must be established truth.

You, in your official capacity, should make an immediate investigation. If the Kansas State publication is deliberately anti-Semitic, then the perpetrators of this libel should be disciplined severely and the injustice corrected by an article which gives the full truth regarding these unfounded attacks on the Jews. To ignore this situation would imply that you approve of the use of the State's property and good name to vilify a racial group that has never failed to serve the State and Nation constructively and usefully.

I'm sure that if this Kansas State magazine had printed an article that gave only false and negative views of the Catholics, you would soon look into the matter, especially if a State publication told its student-readers that the Catholic Church, through its Knights of Columbus, has an oath which binds its members to violent designs on American liberties, without informing the

readers that this Knights of Columbus oath has been exposed as a hoax and a forgery. The comparison is reasonable, because it happens that the article I'm referring to gave space to numerous references to the Protocols of the Elders of Zion (which alleges that the Jews admit they are in a conspiracy to dominate the world), without passing on the necessary fact that the "document" is as crude a forgery as the so-called Knights of Columbus oath. Are we to assume that the Catholics can demand fair and just treatment at the Pittsburgh State Teachers College because they are a sizable group, while the Jews must take it on the chin because they are such a hopelessly small minority?

Will you be good enough to reply to this protest as soon as possible, as I desire to push this matter to its logical conclusion.

Sincerely,

E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS

The foregoing letter brought the following reply from Governor Landon:

August 3, 1936

Dear Mr. Haldeman-Julius:

I thank you for your letter of July 23rd, calling my attention to an article published in the March-April number of "The Technic" of the Pittsburgh State Teachers College.

My own reading of the article by R. Tyson Wyckoff leads me to believe your stand is well taken. I am writing President W. A. Brandenburg today, asking him to investigate the circumstances which prompted the publication of the article. Under the State's policy of absolute academic freedom I can do nothing officially save to urge that this policy be maintained in all instances and to urge the importance of tolerance.

Yours very truly,

ALF M. LANDON
Governor.

Governor Landon enclosed a carbon copy of his letter to President Brandenburg, which follows:

August 3, 1936

Mr. W. A. Brandenburg, President,
Kansas State Teachers College,
Pittsburg, Kansas.

Dear Dr. Brandenburg:

An article published in the March-April number of "The Technic," written by R. Tyson Wyckoff, entitled "The Semite as the National Socialist Sees Him," has been called to my attention.

I have been advised that this article presents almost entirely quotations and citations derogatory to the Semitic race. Many of these citations have been known to be definitely unfounded.

I understand that articles published in "The Technic" are principally of a scientific nature or of a technical nature for the teaching profession. I can see very little of professional or technical value in this article. Furthermore, its presentation indicates lack of the proper tolerance and understanding which I sincerely believe should predominate in our educational institutions.

I am asking you to investigate the circumstances which prompted the publication of this article. Kansans are proud of our policy of many years standing assuring academic freedom. Such a policy recognizes the importance of religious and racial tolerance which applies in this instance.

I trust I may hear from you regarding this important question.

Yours very truly,

ALF M. LANDON
Governor.

[The question now arises in the mind of the editor of *The Freeman*: What will come of the above inquiry?]

* * *

Please give the ages of the members of the Supreme Court.

Charles Evans Hughes, 74; Willis VanDevanter, 77; James C. McReynolds, 74; Louis D. Brandeis, 79; George Sutherland, 74; Pierce Butler, 70; Harlan F. Stone, 64; Owen J. Roberts, 61; Benjamin N. Cardozo, 66. Average age, 71. *The Review of Reviews*, September, 1936, says our insurance companies claim, from mortality tables, that three of the nine men named above may be expected to die during the next four years.

* * *

How much business does the Panama Canal do?

During 1935, \$22,421,000 was received from transits through the Canal, which was a drop of 8 percent from the 1934 receipts. Vessels going through the Canal numbered 5,052, a decline of 5.4 percent from the previous year.

* * *

Recently, in conversation, I heard the remark that the world's ills—war, crime, depression, etc.—are to be blamed on the Jews and the bicycle-riders. What does it mean?

You've heard part of the story that's going the rounds. As I heard the yarn, a gentile, seated next to a Jew in a bus, remarked: "If it

hadn't been for the Jews there wouldn't have been a world war, the economic collapse and the crime wave."

"Yes," agreed the patient listener, "the Jews and the bicycle-riders."

"But why the bicycle-riders?" asked the "Nordic."

"But why the Jews?" asked the Jew.

* * *

It would be interesting to compare the wage scales of Fascist and Democratic countries.

The International Labor Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland, in July, 1936, released a summary of a survey of wages paid in numerous countries. The statisticians made full allowances for different costs of living, which means that the figures below are an accurate index of real income.

The computation shows clearly that the democratic countries—the U.S., Canada, Denmark, Sweden, Great Britain, Ireland and Netherlands—top the list, with the U.S. in first place. Incidentally, two of these democratic countries—Denmark and Sweden—are ruled by Socialist administrations. The figures:

Country	Wages
United States	190
Canada	155
Denmark	133
Sweden	109
Great Britain	100
Ireland	93
Netherlands	82
Germany	73
Poland	61
Austria	48
Jugoslavia	45
Spain	40
Italy	39

From the foregoing it will be seen that Fascist countries like Germany, Poland, Austria and Italy (Yugoslavia is semi-Fascist) use the powers of government to destroy labor's right to organize for the improvement of conditions, with Italy at the bottom of the list. Labor, in Fascist countries, has no rights, except to toil at starvation pay. Spain, as I write this piece, is still a Republic, but is, and has been, in a state of chaos before and since the ousting of the monarchy in 1931. Spanish labor has been, for centuries, under the iron heel of absolutism and clericalism. The priests and militarists have worked together

to grind the Spanish workers down to a state of serfdom. If the Republic survives the present assault of the Catholic-Fascist insurrection (I'm writing this on August 1, 1936), the road will be opened for Spanish labor's march to industrial, political and social emancipation. If the priests and Fascists destroy the Republic, Spain's toilers will remain at the bottom of the scale, along with the industrial and agricultural slaves of Italy, Poland, Austria, and Germany.

Any workingman who supports Fascists like Father Coughlin, the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith, and other supporters of tyranny and dictatorship, lends himself to a movement which would crush American labor and reduce it to the status of Mussolini's gangster-terrorized vassals.

* * *

How does the price of gold compare with platinum?

Gold is worth \$35 an ounce. Platinum sold at \$39 per ounce in July, 1936. For some time before July, platinum's price was the same as gold's. Shortly after August 1, 1936, platinum went to \$43 per ounce, and then took another hike to \$53 on August 20. During the World War platinum soared to over \$160 per ounce. Recent price increases in this metal are the result of expanded demand among the makers of war munitions.

* * *

"I agree entirely with your remarks on 'The Trail of the Lonesome Pine,' although I had never seen any other version of the picture nor read the book, which made it entirely new to me. Sylvia Sidney is a dear, but she has been given some awfully inane work. The color work is what attracted me to that film. It was exquisite. It is just too bad something like 'Henry VIII' or 'Mutiny on the Bounty' couldn't have been done in this perfected technicolor instead. Perhaps it's a good thing you walked out; had you sat it through, you wouldn't have needed an emetic at the finish. They killed Spanky McFarland by dynamiting a bridge on which was parked a steam-shovel (of all places), and then the singing fool had to whittle a coffin for him, after which, everyone having kissed and made up, they all gathered with Touching Simplicity and knelt and prayed and crossed themselves while a hybrid sort of priest-parson intoned sonorous platitudes as to the inscrutable ways

of the Most High! Really with a little exaggeration here, a slight shift of emphasis there, etc., it could easily have ended as you suggested it should, in grand high burlesque comedy."—C. A. Lang, Mo.

* * *

What do you think of Hollywood's child stars?

I don't care for child actors, but I make an exception in Spanky McFarland. That little comedian always makes me feel good. I remember him when he was just a baby—and now he's growing up into quite a lad. Shirley Temple is always cute, of course, but she's doing the same thing over and over again, so I'm quite through, unless her bosses let the child show off a little less so that better stories can be worked out. The little charmer is wonderful box-office, so we're to expect her to keep right on doing the same things over and over again. Freddie Bartholomew wasn't at all bad in *David Copperfield*, but I don't get wild over him. To be perfectly frank, I can't stand that Oxford accent of his and those perfect, prissy manners. Jackie Cooper I liked in *The Champ*, except when he finds it necessary to go on an emotional spree and splatter the screen with tears and sighs. Jane Withers is the best actress of the lot, and several little things she did proved to my satisfaction that the child can emote or splash around for a laugh, but still, in all candor, I could get along without child actors for the rest of my life, if only Hollywood would insist on Spanky's remaining before the camera. And, while I think of it, I like a tiny black boy who sings with four or five colored youngsters. He's the little shaver who's always scratching his head. I love to watch that cute little kid.

* * *

What do you think of double-feature movie shows?

I'm for 'em. Usually, when I want to see a certain picture I have to sit through some terrible dose of sheep-dip, which gets me out of the mood by the time the wanted film begins unwinding. I liked the old system better—a feature picture and several shorts, preferably a news-reel, a travel picture, a Mickey Mouse or Silly Symphony, and a musical short. If a short was had (which

was frequent, of course) you could always go out for a drink of water or shake the dew off a lily.

The fans are overwhelmingly against double features, as was shown by a nation-wide poll conducted by Warner Brothers Pictures, Inc., through the cooperation of newspapers, radio announcers and organizations. Of 725,824 votes cast, almost four-fifths were against the bargain program of two features for the price of one. The vote:

For double features, 157,073, or 22 percent.

For single features, 568,751, or 78 percent.

Here's a case where I prefer to stand with the majority.

* * *

Does night baseball bring out bigger crowds?

Night baseball brings out three customers to day baseball's one, on the average. The people who are able to get away from their jobs for an afternoon game prefer night games, because the bleachers are cooler and the general atmosphere more comfortable. It's also said that the night games bring out a public that can't get away during working hours.

* * *

As a consistent reader of *The Freeman*, I am taking the liberty of bringing matters regarding Thomas Paine to your attention, and hope that I may see an item in *The Freeman* relative to the references which I shall quote.

My correspondent, Gerald P. Dwyer, Chicago, Ill., forwards several valuable quotations from W. E. Woodward's *George Washington—the Image and the Man*, published in 1926. The book he draws on presents an accurate estimate of Washington's career and character, though he's careful to avoid giving the impression that the great patriot was a plaster saint. Washington, as Woodward presents him, was a man filled with the warm juices of life—salty, pungent, human. Washington wasn't perfect, by any means, and our author's presentation of his hero as a real man of the world, instead of the bloodless figure in a steel engraving, makes the Father of our Country all the more appealing. By taking off the halo, Woodward didn't make Washington smaller—if anything, he became a greater man.

But my correspondent's quotations

from this Woodward book aren't concerned with Washington. He copies those which deal with Thomas Paine, and somehow Mr. Dwyer has come around to the conclusion that Woodward was unfriendly, perhaps even prejudiced, against the great propagandist for libertarianism, republicanism, social insurance, freedom of thought, separation of Church and state, debunking the Christian myths, and other warrior-like attacks on tyranny, persecution and intolerance. I have studied the quotations and don't think any admirer of this great figure, who was of the tradition of Voltaire, need lessen his regard for Paine a single iota. Here's one of the Woodward quotations which Mr. Dwyer forwards:

"Like all great propagandists, he (Paine) met prejudice with prejudice. . . . There was nothing remote about Paine's ideas. While the cooler Revolutionary writers, such as Dickenson, floated above the heads of the crowd and took a bird's eye view of things in general, Paine stood on the earth and took a bird's eye view of nothing. His writings were born of grime and dust."

I certainly am a great admirer of Paine's, and yet I agree substantially with every word of the foregoing. To say that Paine met prejudice with prejudice doesn't mean that the brilliant pamphleteer resorted to distortions or falsehoods—he was a careful writer who weighed his words and refused to resort to misrepresentations or lies even when he was attacking his political and social enemies with all his strength and courage. This means that Paine was partisan, in the sense that he was against tyranny, social parasitism, slavery and superstition, without compromise or concession. There are many men and women today who are fighting Hitlerism in the same spirit that Paine fought his powerful enemies, and they too are prejudiced and partisan, but only in the sense of prejudice against intolerance, persecution and the corruption of culture and civilization in general. Such partisanship, or prejudice, is praiseworthy.

The rest of the quotation is a high compliment, and was meant as such. The "cooler Revolutionary writers"

were ineffective as propagandists (in the best sense of that abused word) because what they wrote went over the heads of the common people. Paine got under the skin of the average person—the men and women who were to do the hard, sweaty tasks of ridding a country of its political parasites. In other words, Paine refused to get off the earth and soar into the clouds for a bird's eye view of the scene he wanted to describe. He preferred to keep his feet on the ground, in the "grime and dust." A person who intends to move the masses should always strive to emulate Paine's brilliantly effective methods—to be as earthy as the dust below one's feet.

We now come to another phase of Paine's life—something much more delicate and mysterious. Woodward mentions Paine's marriage, its mysteries, and its brief duration. Woodward turns to F. J. Gould, a Paine biographer, and repeats a quotation dealing with the fact that Paine's marriage had culminated in separation, after which "he never approached any woman on intimate terms and the curtain has never been withdrawn from the mystery of his temperament or physique."

Gould touched on a difficult subject, one on which we can only hazard guesses. It may be that Paine was impotent. That's quite likely. He certainly had no love affairs throughout his long life. He had no use for women, and at the same time he wasn't homosexual, by any means, for there isn't a single fact to indicate any kind of an interest in subnormal sexual relations. It may be that Paine was asexual, completely indifferent to any form of sexual experience. There are such people—not many—and sometimes one meets them in intellectual, cultivated circles. Woodward goes into this phase of the question with these words:

"We may picture him as a highly sensitized youth, devoid of physical charm, solitary, and far superior in intellect to people around him. Bound to a manual trade which he despised (stay-maker), he lived in poverty and spent his time reading books. Destitution, aggressiveness, intellect, sexual impotence, loneliness and sensitiveness went into the life of this rebel."

In the main, Woodward's infer-

ences are valid and shrewdly conceived, though some of them—particularly the one dealing with sexual impotence—can't be established beyond dispute. He may have hit on the key to his emotional character, and again he may have missed it a mile. I'm too poor a student of psycho analysis to work out this problem.

Mr. Dwyer discusses this mystery, as follows:

"Perhaps in reading Paine's works, this author (Woodward) has taken a really competent view of the great rebel's emotional aspect, but I am under the impression that as far as the marriage is concerned, there is nothing so phenomenal about that, as many a man may suffer dissatisfaction with his choice, and yet there is no disgrace in overcoming the difficulty in a respectable manner, as many have done."

This point is well taken, but it generalizes a little too much. Had Paine broken up his unhappy marriage and turned to other women, during the many decades he was free to indulge his emotional interests, we could understand the situation, but the facts, as I've already stated, show his continued indifference to sexual experience, and that suggests the answer—that Paine went into marriage unaware of the fact that he couldn't function, and when faced with the difficulty (and immense disappointment) he got out of the embarrassing arrangement and thereafter carefully avoided all sexual contacts. Mr. Dwyer continues the argument, thus:

"However, the impotence question may have a little to do with Paine's high temperament, and with his abhorrence of human imposition and tyranny. A thoroughly potent person may resent this factor with just as much vigor, but I believe a person suffering from a disorder of this nature is more apt to flail human wrongs, especially if he happens to be equipped with extraordinary persuasiveness and eloquence, as was Paine."

This is a difficult subject and one must be careful not to fall into dogmatisms. Voltaire, for example, was, with Rousseau, one of the fathers of the French Revolution, a hater of tyranny and shams. He certainly wasn't impotent, but the facts indicate that he must have been rather

indifferent to sex because he had so very few affairs with women, in a time when cardinals lived openly with their mistresses and nobody thought a thing about the matter. Voltaire, while potent, burned up his emotional energies in his great crusades for liberty and justice. On the other hand, Rousseau, who also fought for great social ideals, was a thoroughly over-sexed genius who had a tremendous capacity for sexual experiences, and never made the least effort to curb his sexual life. The same goes for Lord Byron, who could fight for liberty or make love to a dozen women with equal enthusiasm. The problem is a difficult one and I don't feel competent to utter the last word.

* * *

After reading a press report to the effect that Great Britain has made a loan to the Soviet Union, the question arises whether this means Russia's position is stronger or weaker internationally.

Russia's commercial indebtedness to the entire world is only \$75,000,000, which is practically nominal. It's because of this solvent position that the British government decided to open a \$50,000,000 credit, at 5½ percent. The Soviet trade delegation at London will be able to place orders with British industrialists, who, in turn, will have their accounts guaranteed up to the amount of the loan. Russia, under the terms of the loan, agrees to spend the money in England during the next 12 months, but will have 10 years in which to repay the government.

Russia's foreign trade policy is to accept only long-term loans at low rates of interest in order to conserve its rapidly-growing stock of gold. The Russian government feels that an immense gold reserve will be an effective means of defense should Germany and Japan begin the war which seems almost inevitable. Germany, in particular, is practically devoid of gold, and this, in case of war, would mean that its offensive powers would be held down to the actual time in which it could command raw materials. The country which has the larger stock of gold will be able to buy in the world market, thereby increasing the chances of victory. Every month that Hitler delays his threatened war means the job, when

finally assumed, will be that much more difficult. Russia is growing industrially self-sufficient, and in a few years may be entirely independent of outside sources of materials.

The army is being expanded rapidly, but not inefficiently, so that there are 1,300,000 men now under arms ready to defend the proletarian nation. Russia's strides in the field of aviation have been immense. While the authorities refuse to release any exact figures, it's safe to assume there are well over 1,000 bombers in the Far East, where quick trips can be made to Japan's tinder-box cities. Japan knows Russia is strong in the air, while the Japanese, who have centered most of their efforts on the navy, are notoriously weak in aircraft. Even if Japan were to have a great fleet of bombers, they would be of little use in a war in eastern Siberia, because of the few large cities in that section.

Russia, early in August, 1936, proved that its airplanes compare with the best in the world. This was shown when three of its crack fliers broke the non-stop record by a trip through Arctic Siberia, in which the flying conditions were bad. This means, of course, that Russian bombers could easily make a round trip to any country that attempts to strike at the territory controlled by the Soviet Union.

In addition to an immense fleet of bombers and pursuit planes, the Russians have concentrated on tanks, which have been constructed in three groups—10-ton tanks, which will have large numbers of four- and five-ton tanks in reserve, and, for purposes of attacking entrenched positions, super-tanks that weigh 40 tons—veritable moving forts.

The British know all these facts, so they are putting their money on the Russian line, even though they are strongly opposed to Russian ideas of social organization. Germany, on the other hand, hasn't been able thus far to command British credit, even though its policies are capitalistic.

* * *

What effect is the Fascist threat having on the smaller nations?

Thirteen small nations in Europe, before the appearance of Fascism, kept close to a policy of restricted expenditures for armaments. They

were able to save great sums of money from being spent on their military machines and thus appropriate larger sums for measures of social security, public health, public works, unemployment insurance, maternity care, public education, etc. None of them had aggressive designs against their neighbors, so militarism was toned down, and this, of course, meant quicker recovery from the depression and a better social set-up. But all this, unfortunately, changed when Hitler took power and Mussolini crushed Ethiopia. They were compelled, reluctantly, to turn to thoughts of defense, for they saw that the two gangster-murderers were headed for further acts of aggression. As a result, during 1936, 13 smaller European governments are being compelled to increase their military budgets by a total of \$370,000,000. Germany's neighbors—Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Austria, Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden and Lithuania—increased their military budgets by \$280,000,000. Finland, Hungary, Turkey, Yugoslavia, and Portugal added another \$90,000,000 to their military expenses. None of these small countries has designs on Germany or Italy.

* * *

1. How many persons do the cooperatives of Great Britain employ? 2. How many members do they have? 3. What is their gross business?

1. The cooperatives of England, Scotland and North Ireland employ 50,000 men and women in their factories. About 250,000 are employed in the cooperatives generally, which includes factories, stores, wholesale establishments, etc.

2. In 1935, the cooperatives of the countries named above had 7,482,000 members, a record high. This was an increase of almost 300,000 over the previous year. There are 11,000,000 families, of which 9,500,000 are expected to join eventually.

3. Their gross business, in 1935, was \$1,101,705,000, an increase of \$66,635,000 over 1934.

* * *

I've noticed, during the past year, five or six references to Charles Laughton, as your favorite movie actor. Where does he stand as a box-office puller?

The Hollywood Reporter, a trade journal of the industry, says a questionnaire sent to the country's most

important theater-managers doesn't even show Charles Laughton's name on the list of good box-office names. I'm sorry to learn this surprising fact, but my admiration for Laughton's artistry isn't shaken in the slightest. He's still No. 1 with me, and my hope is that the movie public will catch up with this great actor. The theater operators aren't interested in a man's ability as an actor. They judge him solely on his power to bring the customers in. I don't blame them for wanting stars who can fill their theaters, for they, like other businessmen, need customers if they're to survive. Some day, let's hope, the very finest artists will be the best producers at the box-office, thereby giving perfect entertainment to the public and hefty incomes to the managers.

The magazine just quoted sent its questionnaire to managers in every State, and the results are interesting. It appears that the top pullers, from the viewpoint of the managers, are Fred Astaire and Ginger Rogers, that excellent, lively, entertaining dancing team. Next comes little, cute Shirley Temple. The 20 heavyweights at the box-office follow:

Fred Astaire and Ginger Rogers, Shirley Temple, Clark Gable, Norma Shearer, Claudette Colbert, Robert Taylor, James Cagney, Joan Crawford, Dick Powell, Myrna Loy, W. C. Fields, Mae West, Irene Dunne, Charles Chaplin, Gary Cooper, Carole Lombard, Edward G. Robinson, Paul Muni, Janet Gaynor.

The Marx Brothers come in at 21. Marlene Dietrich, 23; Harold Lloyd, 25; William Powell, 26; Bette Davis, 27; Ronald Colman, 35; Merle Oberon, 38; Leslie Howard, 42; Katherine Hepburn, 43; Robert Montgomery, 49.

You see, my favorite, Charles Laughton, isn't even listed. I notice that Charlie Chaplin is among the first 20, which shows good judgment on the part of the managers, though I'd put him at or near the top. If Chaplin worked harder and did at least two pictures each year I'd put him ahead of Charles Laughton.

Others who aren't even mentioned in the list: Greta Garbo, Frederic March and Frank Morgan. I'd certainly put Greta near or at the top of my favorite woman stars.

But, taken by and large, the managers' list of their favorites isn't at all bad. One can always disagree here and there, especially when one consults hundreds of different individuals with their own kinks and taste, but the survey shows a great deal of sound discrimination. But, I still insist that Laughton should get a high rating.

* * *

Is it true that German Jews are pouring into this country?

The U.S. Department of Labor reports there has been an increase in Jewish immigration from Germany, but the figures don't permit one to say they are "pouring" into this country. The influx is moderate, as shown by the following table:

Fiscal Year	From all Countries	Percentage from	
		From Germany	Germany
1931	5,692	98	1.7
1932	2,755	45	1.6
1933	2,372	72	3.0
1934	4,134	1,736	43.
1935	4,837	1,683	35.
1936 (Est'd.)	6,100	3,200	52.

The above figures show a decline, when compared with the 10 years after our government set immigration quotas (1921-1930), during which time we admitted from all countries a total of 119,036 Jews, or a yearly average of 11,904. During the 10 years when there were no quotas (1911-1920) the yearly average was 49,117, or a total of 491,165 Jews. Thus, the figures show a slight increase during the past five years (with total figures quite modest) but a marked decline when compared to the previous 20 years.

* * *

What is your opinion of the fight between President Green of the A.F. of L. and John L. Lewis?

Progressive elements in the labor movement agree that Lewis' position is right, and it's freely predicted that he will win out in the end. Lewis, who is far-seeing, intelligent, resourceful and energetic, says our labor unions shouldn't be organized along craft lines but on the basis of industrial unionism. That means, for example, that all the workers in the building trades would belong to one organization, instead of to dozens, as at present, which results in inefficiency and endless jurisdictional

disputes. The old-line A.F. of L. officials are opposed to industrial unionism because such a method of organization would deprive hundreds, even thousands, of union officials of their jobs. The schism has reached the point where President Green is moving towards the expulsion of all unions which have acted in harmony with the Lewis plan of organization. Such a move, if carried out, will, result in the death of the A.F. of L. In the end, it is said, Lewis' plan will result in a wider, more militant organization of skilled and unskilled workers.

Another cause for discord in the labor movement is the earnest, sincere, thorough-going manner in which Lewis and his large, well-financed committee have gone about the useful, necessary task of organizing the workers in the steel industry. The A.F. of L., which should have done this work years ago, fought shy of the issue, but when Lewis met it head-on, the Green machine became jealous and sorely offended, claiming that it was the intention of the A.F. of L. all along to do something about the steel workers. The argument is unsound, in the eyes of those who are familiar with the record of the A.F. of L.

Before the American workers can go forward to real achievements it'll be necessary to do away with the reactionary policies of the A.F. of L. The new trend is all to the good, and Lewis is showing himself to be made of the stuff that will get results. He's labor's man of the future—in the industrial field.

* * *

How many of the persons employed by WPA are skilled and unskilled?

The Works Progress Administration reports that in March, 1936, 77 percent of its workers were unskilled; 23 percent, skilled. This means that 700,000 workers belonged in skilled classifications, of whom about 25 percent were given specialized work. The following table shows how many skilled workers were used in 15 out of 83 classifications of skilled employees:

Actors	6,200
Artists and sculptors	4,700
Bookkeepers and accountants ...	6,137
Carpenters	53,500
Clothing and textile operatives ..	32,000

Dressmakers and milliners	1,300
Musicians	13,200
Nurses	4,300
Painters	28,000
Payroll clerks and timekeepers ..	46,600
Playground and recreation workers	18,500
Teachers	40,200
Truck drivers	15,500
Typists	10,400
Writers and editors	3,400

* * *

Please comment on the enclosed clipping of an interview given by John Boles.

The handsome, but rather vacant, movie star, according to this published interview, has many nice things to say about the men in the South who are described as "warm, natural, romantic and gallant." He then points out wherein they differ from the men of France and Italy, who are given to hand-kissing. "They (Southern gentlemen) do not kiss the hands of the ladies they admire or shower them with exaggerated compliments. . . . Hand-kissing, etc., is usually a blind for what is in the European mind."

As I catch the drift of Boles' profound philosophy, foreigners, when they kiss a woman's hand, are out for something dirty, while Southerners can be ardent, gallant, warm and romantic without letting a single thought of sex enter their minds. It's my ambition to meet such a man some day. I'm reminded—without bothering to establish too great a degree of relevancy, though the incident suggests a crude form of gallantry—a sign I saw in a Joplin saloon, which read: "Ladies may smoke, but must be careful where they lay their butts."

* * *

Editor, The American Freeman:

I was much impressed by what Joseph McCabe has to say in appraisal of you and your work. Especially by the paragraph where, one by one, he considers and dismisses succinctly for their shortcomings, several of our other contemporary sham-smashers. One is left with a lonely feeling that this debunking ability is a very rare one, and one which is usually easily deflected onto ineffective or futile tangents.

But I cannot help feeling that this ability is always intrinsically much more common than we suspect and only awaits favorable conditions in order that it may flourish. We see on every side however that there are many who might be effective in "the liberation

war" who are dragging every imaginable kind of ball and chain. Sometimes only by tactful conversation does one discover these; and also that because of a woeful absence of training they lack the facility of expression which would make them useful, and perhaps further and more serious yet, that the time-and-energy-consuming business of grubbing for a living prevents them forever from even thinking of doing anything about it.

It may be said on the other hand that those who feel the urge and do not in spite of their handicaps deal a blow now and then, would not ever amount to much anyhow, which may be partly true. But I still think that if this elementary business of getting a little more security and a little more time in which to think, can to some extent be achieved, even veteran debunkers such as you and McCabe will be surprised at the lift you will get on every side from many who are now groping in obscurity.

Maplewood, Mo.

C. A. Lang

* * *

Editor, The American Freeman:

I am one of a small group of professional men who are conscientious readers of your "The American Freeman." A problem has arisen among us which causes us considerable concern, and the solution of which is vital to our interests and those of our dependents. In view of the difficulty of getting impartial opinion on this subject, we have decided to be governed by your judgment.

We have just read "Life Insurance: A Legalized Racket," by Mort and E. A. Gilbert, in which the authors advise the carrying of term insurance for the purpose of protection alone and saving elsewhere the amount of money over and above the cost of the insurance which we now allow the insurance companies to save for us. They state that any other plan does not work toward the best interests of the insured. They state further that the cash value of one's policy becomes a liability in the event of death of the insured in view of the fact that this money is lost in the shuffle—meaning that only the face value of the policy is paid, and what we thought we were saving has been consumed by the company.

I mention these few specific statements because they are the ones of especial interest. . . . What do you, in general, think of forms of insurance other than term insurance—carrying insurance on your life as on your car, etc.?

The time we have in which to make up our minds is comparatively short in view of the fact that some of us

have premiums coming due which would put our insurance in force for another year and thus delay action in case we should decide to make changes. Would you discuss these problems for us and give your advice on how to act? . . .

Please accept my thanks for this favor. Washington, D.C. Jerome J. Krick, M.D.

(I have written quite a number of pieces about insurance, in which I pointed out how we must overpay for protection. But it's my feeling that once a person gets tied up to a contract—especially if he has been carrying the policy for a rather long period of time—he should stick to it and see it through. I advise strongly against any kind of switching, for laymen can easily be led astray in this complicated field. It's going to cost you more, as I said, but my sincere advice is to let a bad bargain stand.)

* * *

Your statement that the Coughlin-Lemke lineup is a pro-Landon maneuver should be supported by some authoritative quotation from the conservative side.

The Kiplinger Washington Agency supplies an expensive letter service on national and international news, which goes to bankers, industrialists, businessmen and moneyed people in general. Its letter of July 25, 1936, contains statements which back up everything I said about Coughlin's political trick to defeat Roosevelt by injecting his stooge (Lemke) into the campaign. I quote:

Lemke Union Party (Townsend, Coughlin, Share-the-Wealth, etc.): This third party movement will be taken with increasing seriousness. It will poll enough votes to be an influence in swinging certain states from Roosevelt to Landon. There is no longer doubt that votes for Lemke are votes subtracted mainly from Roosevelt. Politicians KNOW this.

Conservatives who hate Roosevelt will give money to Lemke Party. Conservatives who love not Lemke et al. nevertheless will use them. This is deniable at present but in due course will become an open secret. Lemke, Coughlin, Townsend and Gerald Smith (who is Huey Long's successor) will say worse things against Roosevelt-and-New-Deal than against Landon.

* * *

Editor, The American Freeman:

Some months ago, when I read the statement by Dr. E. Boyd Barrett, that

he expected Father Charles E. Coughlin to write for you some day, I was not surprised. In fact, I expected the same results. Being an ex-Catholic myself, I know that a really sincere person, who studies, eventually comes in contact with scientific facts which demolish all myths and unsound beliefs. It was expected therefore that Father Coughlin, if he is a sincere person, would sooner or later break away from the crafty business of befuddling the people and begin to enlighten the people.

It appears, however, that Dr. Barrett, and probably many others, including myself, were wrong about the sincerity of Father Coughlin, and you were correct. Evidently the fettered education he has received can never be undone, and he will continue—willfully and and knowingly or not—to be a subtle obscurantist for the rest of his life.

If the credulous people will be duped by his organization of his kind of "social justice," then he will have a profitable racket and at the same time do the right thing by his Pope. Mighty cunning, these priests.

CHICAGO, ILL.

F. J. OSMAN

Please write a few words about the movie, "The Mutiny on the Bounty."

That, without a doubt, was an outstanding picture, especially the acting of Charles Laughton, my favorite among the male stars.

Are the Socialists fighting Roosevelt and Landon equally?

An extraordinary situation has developed in the present national campaign, in which all the forces of reaction and full and partial Fascism are combining to defeat the President. If Roosevelt is defeated by Landon this November, we will have taken a great step in the direction of Fascism. If such a calamitous thing were to happen, men like Father Coughlin and the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith could lead a great national "crusade" to destroy the Constitution, the nation's democratic institutions and libertarian traditions, and institute a reign of persecution, racial prejudice, anti-liberalism and authoritarianism equal, if not worse than, the regime of the bloodthirsty, gangsterized, blackmailing Nazis.

A reader lists a number of symptoms and then asks for the cause of the condition, the remedy, and whether a surgical operation is necessary.

I'm not competent to discuss such

matters. Readers should take such things to a good medical doctor. A writer's long-range diagnosis and his guess at a remedy would be nothing more than stabs in the dark. I don't intend to act the part of a family doctor, for two sufficient reasons—it can't be done by means of a letter and a piece in this publication; second, I don't know a thing about such subjects. I must refrain from giving medical or legal advice. If something's wrong with your body-machine, see a good doctor; if some legal question comes up, see a lawyer.

1. What is the world's production of motor cars, trucks, buses, etc? 2. How many of the cars in the U.S. are defective? 3. What does a small motor car cost on the basis of weight and horsepower?

1. During 1935, according to the *Bulletin of Statistics*, of the League of Nations, issued in June, 1936, there were 5,172,000 motor vehicles produced throughout the world, as follows:

U.S.A.	4,009,000
Great Britain	417,000
Germany	245,000
Canada	173,000
France	166,000
Soviet Russia	97,000

2. The Fidelity and Casualty Company, in June, 1936, estimated that 15,700,000 motor cars in the U.S. (60 percent of all cars in the country) are defective, the main faults being:

Defective brakes	4,411,700
Inadequate headlights	4,877,000
Wheels out of alignment	785,000

3. Automobile Facts and Figures (page 11) answers the question with regard to cost of a car according to weight and horsepower. Taking the low-priced four or five-passenger models that are manufactured in the U.S., and figuring them F.O.B., we find:

	Per Car	Per Pound	Per Horsepower
1925	\$887	\$38	\$27.7
1929	743	.28	14.7
1933	555	.21	8.5
1934	585	.22	7.4
1935 9 months	580	.21	6.9
Nov.'35-Feb.'36	603	.21	7.0

Is a formal education necessary to a person who would follow intellectual pursuits?

A formal education will be of value to a person of natural intelligence,

but it isn't an absolute essential. If a person has a brain that functions well and if that person has an aptitude for subjects that require a great deal of thought, the lack of a formal education shouldn't prove unfortunate. The Commonwealth Fund put several scientists to work on this question, and in July, 1936, claimed that formal schooling isn't as important as generally supposed. The investigators reported:

"The intelligent man with poor schooling makes up for his lack of opportunity by continuing his learning in adult life. On the other hand, the duller person given more schooling than his talents seem to warrant gains little from this advantage. Either they never profited by it, or they had forgotten most of what they once knew by the time they took the tests."

In my own experience as an editor, I've found that many individuals without formal education were able to grasp the fundamentals of science, philosophy, history, logic, Rationalism, etc., through careful, profitable reading and good personal contacts that permitted intelligent, instructive conversation and exchange of ideas. Some of the most muddle-headed thinkers (mental muffers) I've met were decorated with as many as six university degrees. Instead of developing knowledge and the ability to interpret knowledge, they permitted themselves to be loaded down with mountains of irrelevant and inconsequential data that they couldn't digest because they lacked the all-important quality of intellectual discrimination. On the other hand, I've met men and women who went to school only long enough to learn to read, write and figure—and they could discuss difficult problems with extraordinary acuteness because they had gone to the authors of good books and taught themselves the things they might never have mastered had they left themselves only to the devices of a formal education.

Let me give my readers one parting suggestion: Young or old, you can become educated in the finest sense of the word, through your own efforts. Learn to turn to the printed word for inspiration and guidance. Read widely, of course, but learn to

discriminate. Go through the great intellectual experiences of the human mind with the assistance of competent, informal, unpretentious guides. There are many such in the world. Joseph McCabe is the first to come to mind. Self-improvement—self-education—self-help—they are real keys to culture.

* * *

Please comment on the way the press continually harps on the Soviet Union's "propaganda" abroad, but hardly mentions the open propaganda of the Fascist governments.

Your point is well taken. Russia leans over backward in its attempt to avoid even the suspicion of foreign propaganda. The Soviet authorities prefer to work their own garden. One little incident served to impress this fact on my mind, taken from my own experience. Until about six months ago I exchanged books and pamphlets that came from my presses with Russian cultural organizations that issued many pieces of literature in the English language. Suddenly, the stream of publications stopped, because the government didn't want even such a small trickle of printed matter to arouse suspicions, perhaps even antagonisms.

Mussolini, on the other hand, conducts open propaganda everywhere in Europe and the Americas, especially in the U.S., without a word of protest from our government or our press. An Associated Press dispatch, from Rome, August 8, 1936, reports that Mussolini has appropriated 60,000,000 lire in this fiscal year to propagandize some 6,500,000 Italians living in the Americas with a view to making them "put the fatherland first."

The same report says every U.S. city that has its complement of Italians "either has its Fascist organization or has one coming up." We are told, in addition, that dozens of Italian language newspapers published in our cities have been bought up by the propaganda department of Mussolini's Fascist party. Not only are their editorial policies dictated from Italy, but their editors, in increasing numbers, are being sent to us direct from Rome, Milan and other Fascist cities. Even Italian-American fraternal orders, mutual benefit organizations or ordinary so-

cial and sports clubs are being compelled to bow before Mussolini, who insists on passing on their political trends (which means propaganda for Fascism) and that they submit lists of officers to Rome before they may be elected. For many years we have had, in the U.S., the Dante Alighieri schools, which were organized and financed by Italian-Americans. These schools now employ only those instructors who wear Mussolini's black shirts.

This year, thousands of Italian-American boys were shipped over to Italy, at the expense of the Fascists, to be indoctrinated with the theories of Fascism, so that when they return to our shores they will be useful to Mussolini as propagandists for the theories of dictatorship and enemies of the ideals of Democracy.

Our politicians and newspapers are busy charging Russia with propagandistic designs (mostly unfounded) but shut their eyes to the open campaigns to miseducate our people so they will accept "the glories of Fascism" and scorn the Democracy of Lincoln and Jefferson and the Republicanism of George Washington and the other patriots who founded this Republic.

Has science done anything about the problem of keeping bread fresh?

A. K. Epstein and B. R. Harris, Chicago inventors, have received a patent for a method of keeping bread fresh for a longer time than is the case with ordinary bread. This process is reported by Science Service as being simple. Wood sugar (zylose, which is obtained from straw and other vegetable matter) is added to the dough. Only one pound of zylose need be added to 200 pounds of flour.

What was, and is, the gross income of our farmers?

Official figures, from 1909 to 1934, follow:

Year	Gross Income
1909	\$ 6,238,000,000
1910	6,643,000,000
1911	6,372,000,000
1912	6,784,000,000
1913	6,975,000,000
1914	7,028,000,000
1915	7,395,000,000
1916	8,914,000,000
1917	12,832,000,000
1918	15,101,000,000

1919	16,935,000,000
1920	13,566,000,000
1921	8,927,000,000
1922	9,944,000,000
1923	11,041,000,000
1924	11,337,000,000
1925	11,968,000,000
1926	11,480,000,000
1927	11,616,000,000
1928	11,741,000,000
1929	11,941,000,000
1930	9,454,000,000
1931	6,968,000,000
1932	5,337,000,000
1933	6,406,000,000
1934	7,300,000,000

The foregoing figures will be understood better if they are translated into net annual income per family, including the value of the rental of the home and the farm's produce that was used by the family, as follows:

1924—Average Farm Income	.. \$ 966
1925—Average Farm Income	.. 1,022
1926—Average Farm Income	.. 920
1927—Average Farm Income	.. 939
1928—Average Farm Income	.. 931
1929—Average Farm Income	.. 942
1930—Average Farm Income	.. 641
1931—Average Farm Income	.. 396
1932—Average Farm Income	.. 244
1933—Average Farm Income	.. 437
*1934—Average Farm Income	.. 510

*This includes payment from AAA.

If Germany and Russia were to go to war, which side would Americans favor?

The Review of Reviews conducted a poll on the question: Which side would you favor in a war between Germany and Russia? Its August, 1936, issue gave the results, as follows:

For Russia, 1,588 votes; for Germany, 844; neutral, 280.

The foregoing shows that Americans, by about two to one, are for Russia and against Hitler. Even our businessmen supported Russia, by a small majority. *The Review of Reviews* comments on the poll (which closed on July 24, 1936) as follows:

"The verdict seems to be clear. A majority of these typical Americans feel that Russia is essentially interested in home-abiding reconstruction, via the Five Year Plans and a new democratic constitution, while Germany is dangerously restive and headed for plans of foreign conquest in the 1914 fashion. To them it is a case of the plough versus the sword, and of humanitarian values."

The magazine printed the tabulated results, showing how persons in

various occupations and professions voted. In the table below, the Russian vote is given first, the German vote comes second, and the neutral vote is last. The tabulation:

By Occupations:

Business 306; 285; 62.
Lawyers 135; 87; 18.
Doctors 114; 30; 6.
Clergy 39; 15; 15.
Literary 165; 48; 27.
Teachers 180; 81; 24.
Students 45; 24; 0.
Engineers 48; 21; 12.
Clerks 123; 42; 6.
Farmers 30; 39; 3.

The man who conducted the foregoing poll, Roger Shaw, adds the opinion that the impending struggle between Hitler and the Soviet Union (a war which the chief Nazi frankly says he is preparing for) can be prevented by any of three things—1. Hitler driven from power; 2. the collapse of Germany's unsound economic structure; 3. the defection of Poland, "through which Germany must go in order to invade Russian Ukraine as the Japanese attack Siberia."

The poll which I have thus reported strikes me as being of great value. The vote, in my opinion, isn't to be considered in any way as an endorsement of Communism. I'm sure a poll among the same voters, on the question of Communism, would have found an overwhelming sentiment against the proletarian philosophy. These Americans (scattered in every State and a few in Canada) voted for peace—that's what the poll means. The American people, by about two to one, know that Russia is sincerely in favor of peace. And our people also know that Hitler has only one objective—war. The poll, therefore, is a vote for peace and a vote against Hitlerism.

* * *

The Topeka Daily State Journal, in its issue of September 1, 1936, editorializes as follows: "Kansas has always been a little more interested in Trotsky than in the other revolutionary officials of Russia, because for a brief time he helped to edit a Socialist newspaper at Girard. We hope he will be able to stick it out in Norway. If he can't, we feel sure they would welcome him back to Girard. They have welcomed all sorts of crooked thinkers there, and they have all done very well." Please comment.

The editor who wrote that, Mr.

Henry J. Allen, ought to change his name to Baron Munchausen, for he's qualifying rapidly as journalism's prize disseminator of inaccuracies. I ought to know whether or not Trotsky ever worked in Girard, and I can say definitely that Trotsky never was within a thousand miles of Kansas. In fact, when he lived in this country he never got west of the Hudson River. This piece of foolishness—about Trotsky's having worked on a Socialist paper in Girard—keeps hobbling up regularly. Red-baiters who want to scare their Kansas audiences into larger contributions usually wind up an attack on the Soviet Union with the alarming news that Trotsky once worked on a paper right in our own State. Such bunk goes over big. And Henry J. Allen—who is aspiring to the dubious honor of being the tin-pot Hearst of Kansas—joins in the silly chorus. But we've come to expect any kind of howler from Mr. Allen, who goes right on telling fairy stories and insisting he's dealing only in stark realism. I may be a "crooked thinker," as Allen charges, but I can spot an inaccurate thinker a mile off, and Allen's the worst in the country today—which calls for a peculiar kind of genius.

* * *

Have you any figures on the number of divorces in the U.S.?

There were 195,939 divorces in 1928; 112,036 in 1916; 72,062 in 1906; 27,919 in 1887; 9,937 in 1867. I have no figures since 1928, but it's certain the number has been growing steadily from year to year. Putting the figures differently, the rate of divorce per 100,000 population was: 163, in 1928; 73, in 1900; 28, in 1870.

In 1870, the number of marriages to one divorce was about 33; in 1900, 12.3; in 1928, 6. The facts, therefore, indicate that divorces are increasing faster than marriages. (The above information was asked for by the Birth Control League of Canada, the secretary sending me a dollar for a personal answer, which I sent, but as the question impressed me as being of general interest I decided to print it here. I am always glad to answer questions from my readers, if they send me a dollar for a personal answer which can be written on one side of an ordinary letter-

head. If I find I can't answer the question [and that happens sometimes] I make a refund in the form of trade coupons, which are good for anything published by this plant, now or in the future.)

How are inventions encouraged in the Soviet Union?

G. Melnichansky, chairman of the Inventions Committee of the Soviet Council of Labor and Defense, issued a table of Russia's inventions during 1935, which showed the wide field covered, as follows:

INDUSTRY	Number of applications	Percentage of total
Metallurgy, mining	990	4.9
Chemical (incl. silicate, artificial leather, rubber and paper industries)	3,117	15.3
Metal working	1,186	5.8
Machine mfg.	1,905	9.3
Transport	2,763	13.5
Electro-technical	2,760	13.5
Agriculture	1,059	5.2
Building	608	3.0
Textile	519	2.5
Printing	135	0.6
Photo-cinema	356	1.7
Precision instruments and various physical and chemical apparatus	2,108	10.3
Miscellaneous groups	2,945	14.4

The same official's report shows that the U.S.S.R. now stands fourth in the number of applications for patents, the U.S.A. still holding the world's first place, Germany second, and Great Britain third. In 1935, the Russian patent office received 23,590 applications from inventors, which is a growth of 17.1 percent over 1934, when 20,146 applications were received. The same report says that in 1913, "the period of the greatest prosperity of industry in czarist Russia, only 5,800 applications for patents were received, and the majority of these (75 percent) came from foreigners abroad."

Since 1931, it has been the practice of the U.S.S.R. to issue to the inventor "either patents (documents, securing to the author the right of ownership of his invention) or an 'author's certificate,' which secures the inventor's priority and the right to a premium (reward), while the invention itself belongs to the state."

Soviet inventors prefer author's

certificates to patents. During 1935, only 39 requests for patents were received, the remainder preferring author's certificates. Inventors in foreign countries have the right to register their inventions in the U.S.S.R. and take out either form of protection. The U.S.S.R. respects foreign patent rights and uses them only after arrangements have been completed with the person holding the certificate.

The report adds the interesting bit of information that many Russians, mainly young persons, seem to have the idea that it's unsocialistic to ask the government to declare priority or ownership in an invention, preferring to give their discoveries to their industry without going through the formality of a patent. The department appreciates such enthusiasm but frowns on the notion that taking out a patent is "unethical." Since patents or author's certificates are issued by law, it follows that there is nothing "unethical" in taking advantage of procedures provided for those who participate in the field of invention. Besides, the report adds, injury is done to Soviet industry by such behavior, for many inventions are thus kept from general knowledge. In addition, by failing to register an invention in the homeland, the invention falls into the public domain in foreign lands, depriving the inventor of just rewards and keeping his country from getting the credit for what may be an important discovery. As a result, Russian inventors are being urged to avail themselves of the benefits of their own patent office.

I am always interested in the problems you ask your readers to solve. Let me suggest that you give us, now and then, a problem that has no known solution.

Dr. Ronald Aylmer Fisher, University of London, presented a new problem before several hundred distinguished mathematicians who were holding a meeting under the auspices of the Mathematical Association of America, at Harvard University. The problem, which was offered "as a challenge to our mathematical intuition," and which has no known answer, follows:

"The agricultural land of a pre-dynastic Egyptian village is of un-

equal fertility. Given the height to which the Nile will rise, the fertility of every portion of it is known with exactitude, but the height of the flood affects different parts of the territory unequally. It is required to divide the area between the several households of the village, so that the yield of the lots assigned to each shall be in predetermined proportions, whatever may be the height to which the river rises."

Commenting on his problem, Dr. Fisher said:

"If this problem is capable of general solution, one of the primary problems of uncertain inference will have reached its complete solution. If not, there must remain some further puzzles to unravel."

Dr. Fisher's words "uncertain inference" have reference to the mathematics of probability, a comparatively new development in this science. During the past 200 years considerable progress has been made by mathematicians in what they call "approximations of the unknown."

The problem given by Dr. Fisher ought to satisfy my reader who wants to work on a problem that has no known solution. If he solves the one given above, I hope he will let the world know about it through the columns of this publication.

* * *

How much waterpower have we available in this country?

The Geological Survey's report for 1936 shows the U.S. has a potential waterpower of 42,753,000 horsepower, available 90 percent of the time, with storage. On the basis of 50 percent of the time (with storage) we have 57,184,000 horsepower. The same report gives the 10 States which lead in potential horsepower (90 percent of the time, with storage), as follows:

	Horsepower
Washington	8,768,000
California	4,605,000
Oregon	4,361,000
New York	4,296,000
Arizona	3,710,000
Idaho	2,706,000
Utah	1,500,000
Montana	1,306,000

Tennessee	1,280,000
Alabama	880,000

* * *

Do the Southern States have the highest death rates from sunstroke?

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company's statistical department has made a study of deaths from heat during the past three years and reports the highest death rates from sun and heatstroke are in the Northern States. Also, the Negro is a greater sufferer from sunstroke than the white man.

Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio and Missouri are among the worst States. North and South Carolina, Florida and Alabama have mortality rates from heat 50 percent below the country's mean. Mississippi, Tennessee and Arkansas have higher rates, but are below the average for the country. Nevada and Arizona have high mortality rates, though they are surrounded by States with low rates.

The statisticians report that "a white person living in Wisconsin is approximately 20 times more likely to suffer death from heat stroke than is a white resident of Florida, about 13 times more likely than one of North Carolina, Alabama or Mississippi, and about 10 times more likely than one who resides in Virginia or South Carolina."

Men are more prone to be stricken by sunstroke than women, the ratio being 3 to 1 for white people. Among the colored people death rates for men are only slightly higher than those for women. The same authorities report that Negro susceptibility to heat deaths should be laid to the black man's inferior economic position and the great exposure he suffers to sunstroke because of his occupations.

Almost 50 percent of the deaths from heat happened among persons more than 60 years of age. Babies under one year of age also suffer exceptionally high mortality rates from this cause. Heatstroke is more common in cities than in rural communities, because environmental conditions in cities are more conducive to heat prostrations.

Index

- Abortions, statistics of in the U.S., 52, 53.
- Are a natural result of the suppression of birth-control information, 53.
- Adams, John, facts about his religious beliefs, 40, 41.
- Adams, John Quincy, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Age of Reason, is a deathless classic, 54.
- Aircraft Year Book, shows that U.S. aviation leads the world, 5.
- Alien, has he the right to criticize, 95.
- Allen, Henry J., followed a fascistic labor policy while governor of Kansas, 14.
- Has a tremendous capacity for inaccuracies, 85.
- Ascribes to Troyanovsky the statement that Roosevelt is the Kerensky of the forthcoming American Revolution, 85, 86.
- His newspaper printed spurious Communist "oath," 89.
- Aspires to be the tin-pot Hearst of Kansas, 112.
- Should change his name to Baron Munchausen, 112.
- "Almighty dollar," how did the phrase originate, 79.
- American Civil Liberties Union, urged the Republican Convention to adopt a civil liberties plank, 47.
- American Federation of Labor, will be destroyed by expulsion of unions favoring Green, 107.
- Its reactionary policies harm American labor, 107.
- American Freeman, its readers display most interest in international situation, 22.
- Why it is dated several months ahead, 34, 35.
- American Guardian, promotes Oscar Ameringer's land-selling scheme, 89.
- Advertises Ameringer's scheme as "A Golden Opportunity," 91.
- American Institute of Public Opinion, result of its poll on Roosevelt policies, 25.
- Conducted poll on CCC camps, 25.
- Results of its poll on six-year term for U.S. Presidents, 27.
- Conducted poll on shorter work week, 29.
- Result of its poll on question of whether Roosevelt's policies are leading to dictatorship, 85.
- American Iron and Steel Institute, gives facts on scientific research by steel companies, 56.
- American Rocket Society, reports remarkable progress, 86.
- Americans, extent of their investments abroad, 56, 57.
- Would favor the Soviet Union against Germany in war, 111.
- Ameringer, Oscar, his latest project, 89, 90, 91.
- Seeks to unload land on Socialists under the banner of the cooperative movement, 90.
- Is vague about details of proposed cooperative, 90.
- Does not use American Guardian letterhead in answering inquiries about his land-selling scheme, 90.
- Seeks to tie in cooperative movement with his land-selling scheme, 90.
- Details of his land-selling scheme, 90.
- A Night at the Opera, is good entertainment, 87.
- Anti-Semites, blame the Jews when anything goes wrong, 28, 29.
- Anti-Semitism, is a disease of the mind, 29.
- Arnold, Edwin, his *The Light of Asia* cites evidences of Buddha's Rationalism, 20.
- Arthur, Chester Alan, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
- Artificial teeth, comment on, 98.
- Aspirin, annual consumption of in the U.S., 43.
- Automobiles, world production of, 109.
- How many in the U.S. are defective, 109.
- Average person, is not attracted by scientific, logical thought, 13.
- Badoglio, Marshal Pietro, hates the sight of Mussolini, 30.
- Would like to give Mussolini the boot, 30.
- Baker Eddy, Mrs. Mary, was she a plagiarist, 22.
- Examples of her plagiarism, 22.
- Stole her Christian Science from the Quimby manuscripts, 22.
- Balabanoff, Dr. Angelica, was loved by Mussolini, 27, 28.
- Balbo, Italo, was "promoted" to governorship of Libya, 29.
- Took no part in Italo-Ethiopian War, 29.
- Executed the murder plot against Matteotti, 29.
- Bankers, have been overlooking several

- opportunities for additional service charges, 4.
- Banks**, why they go easy on publishers, 3.
- Barrett, Dr. E. Boyd**, was he wrong in calling Coughlin sincere, 109.
- Barron's**, reports on American long-term investments abroad, 57.
- Bartow, Professor Edward**, discovers method of extracting explosive from corn, 52.
- Bathtub Ballads**, a new book by Robert W. Service, 64.
- Beard, Chas. A. and Mary**, wrote *Panorama of American History*, 40.
- Beautiful women**, are sometimes a cause of impotence in certain men, 66.
- Beauty parlors**, are fastest growing business in the U.S., 98.
- Berger, Milton M.**, tells of "mental telepathy" he witnessed, 93.
- Bern, Paul**, what were the facts about his suicide, 66.
- His former mistress committed suicide, 66.
- Bernhard, Dr. George**, discusses "Hitler prosperity," 17.
- Bible**, is used as a weapon of exploitation and aggression, 65.
- Can be used to justify any action, 65.
- Billings, Josh**, on prophecy, 89.
- Birkhead, L. M.**, makes investigation of methods of thought, 12.
- Birth Control**, was formerly condemned by all the Churches, 96.
- Black Legion**, is being vigorously prosecuted by the State of Michigan, 32.
- Blair, the Rev. Hugh, Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy** stole from his sermon, 22.
- Blake, Katherine Devereux**, wrote new verses for "The Star Spangled Banner," 53.
- Blind persons**, number of who can read Braille, 68.
- Blum, Leon**, will he inaugurate Socialism in France, 4.
- Declares he has no mandate to establish Socialism, 4.
- An outline of his program, 4.
- His government is based on a bloc of minority parties, 22.
- His foes resort to anti-Semitic propaganda, 23.
- Helped French labor to win a great victory, 46.
- Created a department of scientific research, 62.
- His administration nationalized the Bank of France, 72.
- Boaz, Professor Franz**, discusses the race question, 65, 66.
- Boles, John**, praises Southerners as lovers, 107.
- Casts reflection on European men, 107.
- Bradlaugh, Charles**, was jailed for advocating birth control, 96.
- Braille**, facts about it, 68.
- Brandenburg, W. A.**, permits Kansas State Teachers College publication to libel the Jews, 99, 100.
- Bread**, may be kept fresh longer with new process, 111.
- Briffault, Dr. Robert**, calls present age most truly moral, 60.
- Wrote *Rational Evolution*, 60.
- British cooperatives**, number of persons employed by, 105.
- Membership of, 105.
- Gross business of, 105.
- Britton, Nan**, has she repudiated her story about Harding's daughter, 64.
- Her daughter is the image of Harding, 64.
- Brotherhood**, how it was expressed by great nations of antiquity, 83.
- Brown, the Rev. John**, asserts that the Church never changes, 96.
- Buchanan, James**, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Buckle, Henry Thomas**, quotation from his *The History of Civilization*, 67.
- Buddha**, was he a Rationalist and Atheist, 20.
- Bus companies**, have cut fares to meet slash in railroad rates, 18.
- Business Week**, tells of new development in scientific agriculture, 57, 58.
- Canada**, is taking steps towards a nationalized banking system, 72.
- Capitalism**, sows the seeds of dictatorship, 8.
- Uses militarism to maintain its sway, 9.
- Controls means of communication and propaganda, 9.
- Applied science to production, 60.
- Is based on economic dictatorship, 60.
- Is in conflict with the social order, 61.
- Promotes Fascism in the U.S. in order to destroy the New Deal, 74.
- Is quite dead in the Soviet Union, 89.
- Capitalists**, why they hate President Roosevelt, 33.
- Why they are anxious to defeat Roosevelt, 73.
- Use Catholic priest and Protestant rabble-rouser in holy war against Roosevelt, 73.
- Capper, Senator Arthur**, an estimate of, 87, 88.
- Is an expert politician, 87, 88.
- Gave President Roosevelt support, 88.
- Has opponents but no enemies, 88.
- His technique is subtle and intelligent, 88.
- His manner is timid, 88.
- Is too old to have Presidential ambitions, 88.
- Carus, Paul**, his *The Gospel of Buddha* shows Buddha's Atheism, 20.
- Catholic bishop**, makes fatuous statement regarding crime conditions in the Soviet Union, 37.
- Catholic Fascists**, envision a world federation of tyrants, 82.
- CCC camps**, received overwhelming

- vote of approval in nation-wide poll, 25.
- Central Bank**, is worthless unless supported by a nationalized banking system, 94.
- Chaplin, Charley**, portrays the frustrated hero, 49.
- Chastity**, educated people no longer regard it as woman's supreme virtue, 59.
- Chicago Daily News**, publishes humorous skit on bank service charges, 3.
- Child actors**, an estimate of, 102.
- Christianity**, has lost ground steadily among educated people, 58.
Its spirit is opposed to modern progress, 60.
Under its sway, the world lived in mental darkness, 68.
Has no exclusive claim to the Golden Rule, 83.
- Christian Science Church**, its organization is super-efficient, 67.
- Christian Science lecturers**, what rewards do they receive, 66, 67.
- Christian Scientists**, do they live longer, 11.
- Church**, has changed its position on birth control, 96.
Does it ever change, 96, 97.
Gives many indications of change, 96, 97.
The transitions in its views are extremely gradual, 97.
Was forced to change its attitude towards science, 97.
Has a small minority of genuine pacifists, 97.
- Church enrollment**, is not an accurate indication of the extent of religious belief, 59.
- Churches**, reasons for their new interest in social and economic questions, 62, 63.
Have reversed their position since 1929, 63.
Are militaristic in war-time and pacifistic in peace-time, 63.
Their "radicalism" is superficial, 63.
Have no right to criticize ethics of business, 63.
Indulge in many forms of exploitation and anti-social practices, 63.
Receive dividends from the munitions industry, 63.
Have been effective tools of social injustice, 63, 64.
- Clark, Dr. C. C.**, gives results of his study of pin-ball machines, 50, 51.
- Clark, Grover**, wrote *The Balance Sheets of Imperialism*, 69.
- Cleator, P. F.**, wrote *Rockets Through Space—The Dawn of Interplanetary Travel*, 86.
- Cleveland, Grover**, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
- Colonies**, should they be redistributed, 18.
Their redistribution would strengthen
- Fascist countries, 18.
Are they indispensable to a nation's economy, 38.
- Color-blindness**, facts about it, 52.
- Commonwealth College**, a description of, 24.
- Commonwealth Fund**, reports on value of formal education, 110.
- Communist party**, size of its membership in the U.S., 70.
Could its candidates for President and Vice President serve if they were elected, 97.
- Communists**, describe democracy as a bourgeois myth, 6.
- Conklin, Dr. Edwin Grant**, asserts that Socialism is in accord with biological evolution, 61.
Attacks philosophy of "rugged individualism," 61, 62.
Holds social progress to be a process of collective education, 62.
Attacks Fascism, 62.
- Consumer**, is he a brand buyer, 49.
- Consumer cooperatives**, daily sales of, 43.
- Consumers' cooperative organizations**, principles upon which they are established, 25, 26.
- Coolidge, Calvin**, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
- Cooperative movement**, is growing among professional classes, 21.
Statistics of in colleges, 21.
Has established college to train young men and women, 24.
Will make tremendous strides in the U.S., 24.
Offers a useful, constructive career to youth, 24.
May become the biggest business in the U.S., 25.
Statistics of in the U.S., 43.
Needs the protection of an honest press, 71.
Must be protected against unscrupulous promoters, 70, 71.
- Cooperatives**, how to distinguish the genuine from the spurious, 70, 71.
- Corporation farming**, would be outlawed by Socialism, 7.
- Cosmetic market**, has it reached saturation point in the U.S., 68.
- Cotton**, can it be used in road-building, 98.
- Coughlin, Father Charles E.**, hopes to become a Fascist dictator, 63.
Is the tool of the reactionary interests backing Landon, 73.
Why he turned against Roosevelt, 75.
His actions prove the Catholic Church has joined the conspiracy against Roosevelt, 75.
Called Townsend plan "economic insanity," 77.
Does the dirty work of the Catholic Church, 77.
Continues his anti-Semitic utterances, 77.

- Makes false statement regarding cancellation of war debts, 77, 78.
- Makes ridiculous misstatement concerning judicial branch of the government, 78.
- Has a genius for making misstatements, 78.
- His statements on national debt are garbled and inaccurate, 78.
- Ignores government assets when he speaks of national debt, 78.
- Charges Roosevelt with being "the great betrayer," 81.
- Is adept at the trick of low invective, 81.
- His anti-Semitism grows more aggressive, 82.
- His "challenge" to the Jews, 82, 83.
- Is an apostle of racial hatred, 83.
- Should challenge himself to be honest, 84.
- Uses "radical" phrases and issues to delude his followers, 93.
- If he were sincere, he would demand a nationalized banking system, 94.
- Seeks to destroy the Federal Reserve Banks, 94.
- His criticism of national bank note issue is unsound, 94.
- Is an alien, 95.
- Why he did not run for President himself, 95.
- Coughlin-Smith-Lemke-Townsend combination, is a move in the direction of Fascism, 74.
- Criminals, are the majority of them mentally sick, 48, 49.
- Current History, gives facts about the cooperative movement in the U.S., 43.
- Darrow, Clarence, wrote *Story of My Life*, 36.
- Is one of the most civilized men in the world, 36.
- Darwin, Charles, must share credit with Alfred Wallace for discovery of principles of Evolution, 61.
- De Bono, General, made a glorious mess in Ethiopia, 30.
- "Decalogue of Good Thinking," 12.
- Demagogues, their chief stock in trade is unfounded generalizations, 13.
- Democracy, is beginning to stage a come-back, 15, 16.
- Can it be achieved under Capitalism, 81.
- Has a right to use stern measures against its foes, 82.
- Democratic countries, wage scales of compared to Fascist countries, 101.
- Their wage scales are highest, 101.
- Dennett, Dr., protests against German ruling on exchange students, 43.
- Devaluation, is not synonymous with inflation, 20.
- Dewey, John, outlines his methods of thought, 12.
- Dickinson, Dr. Edward, letter to Joseph McCabe, 58, 59, 60.
- Diesel engines, help railroads to achieve greater speed and economy, 49.
- Dionne quintuplets, are "charming rascals," 92.
- Ditmar, Dr., says snakes of the same species cannot poison each other, 56.
- Divorces, statistics of in the U.S., 112.
- Are increasing in the U.S. faster than marriages, 112.
- Doctors, death rate of in the U.S., 52.
- Double-feature shows, a criticism of, 102.
- Dublin, Dr. Louis I., refutes Upton Sinclair's assertions, 11.
- Du Pont Cellophane Company, makes survey of retail buying habits, 49.
- Durant, Dr. Will, compares children of polygamous and monogamous unions, 58.
- Duranty, Walter, an estimate of, 94, 95.
- His stories established *The New York Times* as the best medium for the truth about the Soviet Union, 95.
- Doesn't care what the editor thinks about his work, 95.
- Approached the Bolsheviks objectively, 95.
- Dwyer, Gerald P., calls attention to facts about Thomas Paine, 102, 103.
- Disagrees with Woodward's estimate of Thomas Paine, 104.
- Early, Stephen, issues denial of story slandering President Roosevelt, 40.
- Earth, extent of its fertile and non-fertile area compared, 29.
- Economic status, has important bearing on length of life, 68.
- "Electrically transcribed," what it means, 58.
- Electricity, who consumes it in the U.S., 57.
- Elliot, Professor W. Y., links Christianity with human rights, 67.
- His statement on Christianity is not backed by evidence, 68.
- Emery, H., reviews *Questions and Answers in The Llano Colonist*, 30, 31.
- Emotionalism, has no place in scientific thinking, 10.
- England, has had no strike deaths for 75 years, 32.
- English Grass, quotation from, 67.
- Envelopes, how long have they been in use, 55.
- Facts about them, 55, 56.
- Environment, its relation to the life-span, 68.
- Ethiopians, should have resorted to guerrilla warfare, 18.
- European governments, might confiscate U.S. securities of their nationals to finance a new war, 98.
- "Expert opinion," was proved to be wrong in the Italo-Ethiopian war, 18.
- "Eye for an eye . . .", was never accepted by Jews as an ethical precept, 83, 84.

- Its implications explained, 84.
 Facts, are the best antidote to emotional thinking, 11.
 Fascism, can it happen here, 75.
 Can be whipped in the U.S. by courageous fighting, 75.
 Fascist countries, wage scales of compared to democratic countries, 101.
 Their wage scales are lowest, 101.
 The effect of their policies on the smaller nations of Europe, 105.
 Fascist dictatorships, seek colonies to provide them with raw materials for war, 19.
 Fascists, seek to overthrow the French Republic, 23.
 Fat-reducing preparations, should be avoided like poison, 95.
 Federal anti-lynching law, would soon wipe out the crime of lynching, 32.
 Federal Reserve System, could be easily transformed into a Central Bank, 94.
 Fillmore, Millard, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
 Finger, Charles J., wrote *Lost Civilizations*, 83.
 Fisher, Dr. Ronald Aylmer, presents a problem with no known solution, 113, 114.
 Floyd, William, proves that Bible advocates aggression and exploitation, 65.
 Won prize offered by the Rev. Holmes, 65.
 Ford Motor Company, its net profit for 33 years, 26.
 Granted Soviet Union right to use its processes and patents, 29.
 Foreign investors, holdings of in the U. S., 56, 57.
 Formal education, is it an essential for intellectual pursuits, 109, 110.
 France, a summary of its political situation, 4.
 Its working class recognizes the menace of Fascism, 23.
 Will it become Communist or Fascist, 23.
 May be facing a violent revolution, 23.
 Its "folded arms" strike was orderly, 32.
 Comment on its "stay-in" strike, 46.
 Free press, is essential in the fight against Fascism, 81.
 Free thought, is gaining ground in sectarian colleges, 58.
 French government, respected every right of the strikers, 46.
 Aide in plans for erection of statue to Thomas Paine, 53, 54.
 French Radical Socialists, hold the balance of power in France, 22, 23.
 French strikers, how their tactics differed from those of Italian Communists, 45, 46.
 Conducted themselves with praiseworthy discipline, 46.
 Were careful to avoid illegal measures, 46.
 Furnas, Dr. C. C., wrote *The Next Hundred Years*, 51.
 Fury, an estimate of, 43, 44.
 "Gaga," meaning of, 21.
 Garden Home Company, offers uncleared land at a high price, 90.
 Garfield, James Abram, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
 Gasoline, U.S. consumption of in 1935, 39.
 Generalizations, a list of commonly accepted ones, 13.
 George Washington—The Image and the Man, depicts Washington as a real human being, 102.
 German Jews, are not "pouring" into the U.S., 106.
 German-Soviet war, can it be avoided, 112.
 Germany, its armament factories are humming, 17.
 Its "prosperity" is an illusion, 17.
 If its rearmament ceases, its economy will collapse, 17.
 Its textile industry is at the point of ruin, 18.
 Its "labor front" is merely a tool to enslave the workers, 26.
 How its policies differ from those of the U.S., 31.
 Insists that its exchange students be Nazis, 43.
 Consists of one of the most mixed stocks in Europe, 65, 66.
 What is the status of its literature since the advent of Hitler, 69.
 Is almost devoid of gold, 104.
 Is unable to get a loan from Great Britain, 105.
 Gilbert, Mort and E. A., wrote *Life Insurance: A Legalized Racket*, 108.
 Gold, statistics of world production, 36, 37.
 Amount of held by various countries, 37.
 Reasons for increase in production of, 37.
 Is always subject to governmental confiscation, 44.
 Its price compared with that of platinum, 101.
 Will be an important factor in a war between Germany and the Soviet Union, 104.
 Goldberg, Dr. Isaac, wrote *Mussolini Exposed*, 27.
 Golden Rule, examples of among different nations of antiquity, 83.
 Good literature, is the flower of journalism, 10.
 Grant, General U. S., ordered Jews expelled from the Department of Tennessee, 28.
 His father was a cotton smuggler, 28.
 Facts about his religious beliefs, 41, 42.
 Great Britain, its national debt is larger

- than that of the U.S., 79.
 Made loan to the Soviet Union, 104.
 Great writers, have also been great journalists, 10.
 Green-Lewis controversy, a discussion of, 106, 107.
 Gunther, John, asserts there is no factual evidence of Hitler's homosexuality, 92.
 Hagan, Dr. W. A., gives facts about laying capacity of hens, 50.
 Haldeman-Julius, E., his opinion of journalism, 10.
 Outlines his methods of thought, 10, 11.
 His attacks on Hitler regime are factual rather than "venomous," 17.
 Advises a voter, 33.
 Was not impressed by The Trail of the Lonesome Pine, 42, 43.
 Issues warning against Socialist "leaders" who are promoting farm cooperative, 77.
 Outlines A History of the World Since 1918, 86, 87.
 Warns against promoters who scheme to exploit cooperative movement, 89.
 Letter to Clarence Senior regarding Ameringer's land-selling scheme, 89, 90, 91.
 Is glad to be known as a "knocker," 91.
 His experience with "mental telepathy" fakers, 93.
 Letter to Governor Landon protesting against libel on Jews, 99, 100.
 Doesn't care much for child actors, 102.
 Places Charles Laughton first among movie actors, 106.
 Refuses to act the part of a family doctor, 109.
 Charges \$1 for personal answers to questions, 112, 113.
 Harbord, General James G., denies U.S. payments to France for rent of trenches, 60.
 Harding, Warren Gamaliel, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
 His marriage was not a happy one, 64.
 Harlow, Jean, her beauty had a peculiar effect on Paul Bern, 66.
 Harrison, Benjamin, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
 Harrison, William Henry, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
 Hartenstein, Arno, letter to E. Haldeman-Julius, 34.
 Hawaii, is being heavily fortified, 4.
 Hayes, Rutherford Birchard, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
 Hayward, P. A., gives data on timber resources of the U.S., 50.
 Hearst-Davies triangle, a discussion of, 44, 45.
 Hearst, William Randolph, has no right to criticize the morals of others, 45.
 Heiden, Konrad, wrote biography of Hitler, 91.
 Hen, its egg-production is increased by domestication, 50.
 Heredity, a discussion of, 65, 66.
 Is it more important than environment from the standpoint of the life-span, 68.
 Higher education, results in religious skepticism, 58.
 High school curricula, facts about, 48.
 High school students, data on their reading habits, 50.
 Hillquit, Morris, his shoes are too big for Waldman, 42.
 History of the World Since 1918, how it should be written, 86, 87.
 Hitler, Adolf, will think twice before he defies Blum, 4.
 His early "prophecies" were as absurd as Pelley's, 38.
 Is he a "pansy," 91.
 May have had sexual relations with women, 91.
 The facts about his sexual life are disputed, 91, 92.
 What are the facts about his sexual life, 91, 92.
 Has attracted thousands of homosexuals to his cause, 92.
 Was an alien before he came to power, 96.
 Hitler and Mussolini, are giving aid to the Spanish Fascists, 82.
 When will they get the gate, 89.
 "Hitler prosperity," what it means, 17.
 HOLC, has been amazingly successful, 5.
 Have its policies been successful, 5.
 Holmes, John Haynes, challenged statement of Archbishop of York, 65.
 Honor graduates, live longer than preachers, 11.
 Hoover administration, had no respect for civil liberties, 46.
 Hoover, Herbert C., did he plan to smuggle gold out of the U.S., 30.
 Facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
 His campaign speech was a tissue of hypocrisy, 46, 47.
 Impotence, is sometimes cured by changing mates, 66.
 Its effect on character, 104.
 Industrial unionism, how it works, 106.
 Why it is opposed by some A.F. of L. officials, 107.
 Inflation, is it possible in the face of a huge gold reserve, 20.
 Is not here yet, 20.
 How it may affect the small investor, 44.
 How can one avoid its disastrous effects, 44.
 Inositol, may be basis of new super-explosive, 52.
 Insanity, chief causes of, 72.
 Insecurity, is a logical result of the workings of Capitalism, 8.
 Interplanetary travel, difficulties of, 86.

- Inventions, table of in the Soviet Union, in 1935, 113.
- "Iodine socks," are a fake, 48.
- Italy, its trade with its colonies was always insignificant, 19.
- Pours Fascist propaganda and agents into the U.S., 110, 111.
- Bring Italian boys from the U.S. to indoctrinate them with Fascism, 111.
- I Write As I Please, the autobiography of Walter Duranty, 95.
- Jackson, Andrew, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Japan, how its scientific research compares with that of the Soviet Union, 4.
- Its birth rate is increasing, 25.
- Its air force is weak, 105.
- Japanese Emperor, correct pronunciation of his name, 5.
- Jefferson, Thomas, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Jenkins, the Rev. Burris A., denied that Buddha was an Atheist, 20.
- Jews, do not control the Soviet Union, 35.
- Are blamed for the drought and dust storms, 79.
- Have always accepted the principle of brotherhood, 83.
- Jews and bicycle riders, are they to blame for all the world's ills, 100, 101.
- Jinsky, Hugo A., gives facts about snakes, 56.
- Johnson Act, forbids loans to foreign governments which have defaulted in debt payments, 98.
- Johnson, Andrew, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Joliot-Curie, Irene, named to French cabinet post by Blum, 62.
- Journalism, defined, 10.
- Journalists, should aspire to be salesmen of the truth, 10.
- Judicial branch, cannot pass on a law until after it has been enforced, 78.
- Kansas City elections, are a national disgrace, 32.
- Kansas City Jewish Chronicle, refutes Father Coughlin's "challenge" to the Jews, 84.
- Kansas City Star, its editorial policy is venomously reactionary, 15.
- Why it supports Landon, 15.
- It suppressed facts about the religious issue in the 1936 campaign, 71.
- Kansas State Hospital, its superintendent expressed anti-Semitism, 72.
- Kansas State Teachers College, issues publication containing a libel on the Jews, 98, 99, 100.
- Kauffman, George S., did a good job on A Night at the Opera, 87.
- Kiplinger Washington Agency, says that Coughlin-Lemke lineup is a pro-Landon maneuver, 108.
- K.K.K. gangsters, were convicted by a Florida court, 32.
- Knights of Columbus "oath," has been exposed as a forgery, 99, 100.
- Knopf, Mrs. Alfred A., describes status of German literature under Hitler, 69.
- Knox, Frank, how he broke a strike, 39.
- Krick, Dr. Jerome J., asks advice on insurance, 108.
- Labor legislation, in 1936 Socialist platform, 7.
- Landon, Alf, M., an estimate of, 13, 14.
- Has long been a loyal supporter of Capitalism, 14.
- Deserves no credit for "balancing the Kansas budget," 14.
- Has supported civil liberties, 14.
- Is supported by the worst reactionaries in the nation, 14.
- Was made governor by the Kansas utilities and oil interests, 15.
- Wears the boots of Wall Street, 15.
- Is the spearhead of the nation's Fascists, 33, 34.
- Would make relief a matter of local charity, 34.
- Seeks to save Capitalism without spending any money, 34.
- Refuses to explain or repudiate anti-Semitic policy of Kansas State Hospital, 71, 72.
- Ignored communications from The Daily Worker, 72.
- His election would mean the triumph of reaction, 76.
- Has all the ear-marks of a Dabbitt, 92.
- Letter to E. Haldeman-Julius promising investigation of The Technelibel, 100.
- Letter to W. A. Brandenburg condemning anti-Semitic libel in The Technelibel, 100.
- Landon, Mrs. Alf M., takes a dig at Mrs. Roosevelt, 35.
- Lang, C. A., comments on Gassaway's cowboy clothes, 44.
- Is praised by E. Haldeman-Julius, 44.
- Comment on efficiency of artificial teeth, 98.
- Comment on The Trail of the Lonesome Pine, 101, 102.
- Praises Joseph McCabe's estimate of E. Haldeman-Julius and his work, 107, 108.
- La Salle Extension Course, an estimate of, 10.
- Laughton, Charles, is he a box-office attraction, 105, 106.
- Gave an excellent performance in Mutiny on the Bounty, 109.
- Law of love, does it apply to the unconverted, 65.
- Lemke, William, is Father Coughlin's catspaw, 73.
- Lenin, was not an opponent of democracy, 81.

- Held a dictatorship of the proletariat to be a temporary expedient, 81.
- Letters, quotes General Grant's order expelling Jews, 28.
- Leuba, Dr., shows that higher education ~~g~~ results in religious skepticism, 11.
- Lewis, John L., it was absurd to call him a Lenin, 86.
- Advocates industrial unionism, 106.
- Is supported by progressive elements in the labor movement, 106.
- Lewis, Joseph, compiles list of eulogies of Thomas Paine, 54.
- Lewis, Sinclair, fears the advent of Fascism in the U.S., 74, 75.
- Comment on Coughlin-Smith-Lemke-Townsend combination, 74, 75.
- Did not have Roosevelt in mind when he created Berzelius Windrip, 97.
- Life Insurance: A Legalized Racket, exposes the insurance business, 108.
- Light-year, definition of, 30.
- Lincoln, President Abraham, rescinded Grant's anti-Semitic order, 28.
- Facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Lippmann, Walter, exposed New York Times' news about the Soviet Union, 94.
- Has become a time-serving hack, 95.
- Living matter, can it be changed from one form to another, 69.
- Local governments, cost of, 36.
- Loeb, Dr. Jacques, was a Materialist and Socialist, 61.
- London Economist, shows that colonies are not essential to a nation's economy, 38.
- Louisiana, makes it difficult for minority party to get on ballot, 80.
- Louis, Joe, was a brave, manly figure in defeat, 23.
- Proved he could take it, 23, 24.
- His defeat does not prove superiority of "Nordics," 24.
- Is made of the real champion stuff, 24.
- Louis-Schmeling fight, comment on, 23, 24.
- Louisville Daily Democrat, criticized Grant for his anti-Semitic action, 28.
- Luce, Henry R., asks E. Haldeman-Julius to comment on "The March of Time," 37.
- Lynchings, are deplored by better class of Southerners, 31.
- Are largely confined to most backward sections of the U.S., 31.
- Madison, James, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Man, how long would his whiskers grow in a lifetime, 52.
- Margrie, William, defines Rationalism, 67.
- Married persons, do they live longer than single persons, 48.
- Marx brothers, an estimate of, 87.
- Masses, are led by shoddy thinkers, 13.
- Maternity cases, death rate in, 56.
- Maternity Center Association, gives statistics on maternal death rate in the U.S., 56.
- McCabe, Joseph, his claim of Buddha's Atheism is substantiated, 20.
- Wrote work on religious beliefs of U.S. Presidents, 40.
- Comment on James Monroe, 88.
- Would he write a detective story, 96.
- Is a trustworthy guide to knowledge, 110.
- McFarland, Spanky, is a talented little actor, 102.
- McKinley, William, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
- Melnichansky, G., tells of progress of invention in the Soviet Union, 113.
- Mencken, Henry L., comment on his support of Landon, 92.
- Built his reputation by castigating the dumb booboisie, 92.
- His support of Landon is based on economic reasons, 92.
- Why he opposes Roosevelt, 92, 93.
- Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, gives facts concerning relative longevity of married and single persons, 48.
- Gives data on death rate from sunstroke, 114.
- Meves, Everett R., is unfamiliar with real facts of science, 62.
- Mickey Mouse, what are the reasons for his popularity, 49.
- Modern women, reject religious restrictions on sex conduct, 59.
- Monroe, James, facts about his religious beliefs, 88.
- Used his influence to free Paine from French prison, 88.
- Morality, is being dissociated from religious sanctions, 59.
- Morgan, C. F. H., wrote "The Old Order Speaks," 3.
- Mortgage Bankers Association, makes study of rents, 69, 70.
- Moscow News, gives figures on Soviet crime conditions, 37.
- Movie fans, voted against double-feature shows, 102.
- Movies, are inferior to the printed word as a means of communication, 21.
- Movie stars, list of those having greatest box-office value, 106.
- Multiple births, statistics of, 21.
- Municipal governments, cost of in the U.S., 52.
- Mussolini, is still a long way from being the master of Ethiopia, 18.
- His claim of Italy's need for colonies is exploded by facts, 19.
- Has spent over \$1,000,000,000 in Ethiopia, 19.
- Does he suffer from syphilis, 27.
- Feared Balbo's growing popularity, 29.
- Exhibited his jealousy of General Badoglio, 29.

- His plan to make himself King was spoiled by Badoglio, 30.
- Was forced to put General Badoglio at the head of the army when his own tools failed, 30.
- Appropriates huge sum to propagandize Fascism in the U.S., 110.
- Mutiny on the Bounty, an outstanding picture, 109.
- National Banks, must back their note issue with government securities, 94.
- Nazi party, gets an enormous graft from German "labor front," 26.
- Negroes, are not accurately portrayed in *The Green Pastures*, 85.
- Suffer more from sunstroke than do white persons, 114.
- News, leading types of, 68, 69.
- New Soviet Constitution, is a tremendously important document, 15.
- Will be a great force for democracy, 15.
- Provides for two national legislative bodies, 16.
- Provides for a secret ballot, 16.
- Outlaws the fomenting of racial and national hatreds, 16.
- Guarantees the right to own personal property, 16.
- Provides important guarantees of civil liberties, 16.
- A summary of its provisions, 16, 17.
- Provides sanctuary for foreign political refugees, 17.
- Its ratification will mean a long forward step for humanity, 17.
- Chiefly sponsored by Stalin, 26, 27.
- How does it compare with the U.S. Constitution, 82.
- Is its trend toward Capitalism, 88, 89.
- Newspapers, how they apportion their space, 22.
- Night baseball, brings out bigger crowds, 102.
- Oberlin College, a brief summary of its religious history, 58, 59.
- Old Guard, made unfounded charges of communistic tendencies against Socialist party, 6.
- Its defection will not seriously injure the Socialist party, 42.
- Osman, F. J., comment on Father Coughlin, 108, 109.
- Paine, Thomas, will be honored in Paris by erection of a statue, 53.
- Eulogies of, 54.
- Was one of the world's greatest liberators, 54.
- Quotations from, 54, 55.
- His partisanship was praiseworthy, 103.
- His writings were born of "dust and grime," 103.
- Was a highly effective revolutionary propagandist, 103.
- Facts about his marriage, 103.
- Had no love affairs, 103.
- Was he impotent, 103.
- Elements of his character, 103.
- Panama Canal, how much business does it do, 100.
- Panorama of American History, quotation from, 40.
- Patents, facts about them, 66.
- Pelley, William Dudley, has a mania for prophecy, 37.
- Claims to have "talked with God," 38.
- An example of his "prophecies," 38.
- Blames Jews for drought and dust storms, 79.
- Will probably blame Jews for California earthquakes, 79.
- Pierce, Franklin, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Pin-ball machines, their payoff is based on chance rather than skill, 50, 51.
- Pay even less than slot-machines, 51.
- Platinum, its price compared with that of gold, 101.
- Political sectarianism, must be put aside in time of crisis, 77.
- Polk, James Knox, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Polygamy, does it result in better offspring, 58.
- Pope Pius XI, does he qualify as a "Pacifist," 47.
- Receives copies of all Coughlin's speeches, 77.
- Preachers, their longevity due to high standard of living and freedom from occupational hazards, 11.
- Printed word, is still the greatest medium of communication, 21.
- Problem, one with no known solution, 113, 114.
- Professionals, reasons for high proportion of childless marriages among, 53.
- Public forums, number of in the U.S., 21.
- Subjects most frequently discussed in, 21, 22.
- Pulitzer, correct pronunciation of, 5.
- Questions and Answers, review of, 30, 31.
- Are "attractive, stimulating, and valuable," 31.
- Race, is largely a matter of environment, 65.
- Radical press, deserves, and needs, support of the working classes, 43.
- Radical Socialists, may be compared to New Dealers, 4.
- Radio, is inferior to the printed word as a means of communication, 21.
- Radios, number of in the U.S., 20, 21.
- Radio time, cost of, 57.
- Railroads, what speed do they make between Chicago and California, 49.
- Rationalism, definition of, 67.
- Reading, is the key to self-education, 110.
- Real estate promotion, how it will be tied in with the cooperative movement by unscrupulous promoters, 71.

- Relief, insurance, jobs, in 1936 Socialist platform, 7.
- Religion, declines as science advances, 58.
- Religious propaganda, must be presented in a serious manner if it is to be effective, 84.
- Rents, are they headed upward, 69, 70.
- Republican Convention, ignored suggestions of American Civil Liberties Union, 47.
- Review of Reviews, tells how newspapers apportion their space, 22.
- Result of its poll on question of German-Soviet war, 111, 112.
- Riffraff, is motivated by a Fascist psychology, 44.
- Robinson, Senator Joseph, defends lawless behavior of Arkansas landlords, 76.
- Rockets, will they be used to explore outer space, 86.
- Their possibilities are being thoroughly investigated, 86.
- Roehm, Captain, was a confessed homosexual, 92.
- Roman Catholic Church, does it advocate Pacifism, 47, 48.
- Why it opposes the New Deal, 75.
- Has always supported the worst forms of Capitalism, 75.
- Seeks revenge on Mexican government, 80.
- Always marches hand in hand with Fascism, 82.
- Has compromised on the question of birth control, 96.
- Roosevelt family, an estimate of, 39.
- Roosevelt, Mrs. Franklin D., takes an intelligent interest in public affairs, 35, 36.
- Roosevelt policies, receive approval in nation-wide poll, 25.
- Roosevelt, Pres. F. D., his present and past attitudes towards armaments compared, 4, 5.
- His position is slightly left of center, 33.
- Does not lean towards Fascism, 33.
- His attitude and policies compared to Landon's, 34.
- Does not interfere with personal lives of his wife and children, 39.
- Was made the victim of a slanderous story, 39, 40.
- Facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
- What would his defeat mean, 45.
- Is he our 31st or 32nd President, 55.
- Has saved millions of victims of Capitalism, 73.
- Has been as radical as the people would permit him to be, 73, 74.
- Is planning a super-cooperative movement, 74.
- Is attacked by the most vicious elements in the nation, 75.
- His administration aided dictatorial regime in Cuba, 76.
- Is a bulwark against the menace of Fascism, 76.
- Could not "sell out" to Communists and international bankers at the same time, 77.
- Did not build up a debt of \$35,000,000,000, 78.
- Has not "betrayed" the American people, 81.
- Offended Mencken by trying to enforce labor laws against newspapers, 92.
- Did he inspire Sinclair Lewis' *Berzelius Windrip*, 97.
- Is opposed by all the forces of reaction and Fascism, 109.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
- Rothschild, Richard, wrote *Three Gods Give an Evening to Politics*, 81.
- Rousseau, was an over-sexed genius, 104.
- Sales tax, is a tremendous burden on the consumer, 80.
- Sanctions, had an amazing effect on Italy's foreign trade, 4.
- San Francisco bridges, accident statistics of, 19.
- Schmeiling, Max, was knocked out by a non-Aryan, 24.
- School Life, lists number of public forums in the U.S., 21.
- Science, is the only means of gaining reliable information, 12.
- Some of the problems it has yet to solve, 51.
- Must be the basis of modern life, 52.
- Can transform the virus of one disease into another, 69.
- Easily duplicates "miracles" of the Bible, 84.
- Finds new way to keep bread fresh, 111.
- Scientific fact, definition of, 12.
- Scientific method, requires imagination, 12.
- Scientific thinking, how it may be achieved, 10, 11, 12, 13.
- Scott, Charley, is now a "liberal," 14.
- Scribner's, Charles Sons, published *Darrow's Story of My Life*, 36.
- Seldes, George, quotation from his *Sawdust Caesar*, 27, 28.
- Service, Robert W., is now living in France, 64.
- An example of his recent poetry, 64.
- His poetry has a wide appeal, 64.
- Was interested in problems of Free-thought, 64.
- Describes his life in France, 64, 65.
- Has had a picturesque career, 65.
- Sex, holds many baffling mysteries, 66.
- Shady promoters, how they will exploit the cooperative movement, 71.
- Shaw, George Bernard, rejects immortality, 67.
- Shaw, Roger, tells how impending German-Soviet war can be avoided, 112.
- Shorter work week, is favored by a large majority of Americans, 29.

- Siamese twins marriage, comment on, 82.
- Sinclair, Upton, is an emotional thinker, 11.
- Made erroneous assertion concerning longevity of preachers, 11.
- His opinions on religion carry no authority, 11.
- Smaller nations of Europe, have increased military budgets to meet Fascist threat, 105.
- Small motor car, cost of on basis of weight and horsepower, 109.
- Smith, the Rev. Gerald L. K., is as menacing as Coughlin, 74.
- Asked his audience to lynch hecklers, 74.
- Is a potential Hitler, 80.
- Plans to organize Fascist bands in the U.S., 80.
- Would use Fascist hoodlums to break up Socialist and Communist meetings, 81.
- Snail, amount of time it would require to travel a mile, 47.
- Snakes, can they poison themselves or each other, 56.
- Socialism, is the only solution of the economic problem, 9.
- Is it at variance with the principles of biology, 60, 61.
- Best preserves freedom of experimentation, 62.
- Has attracted best brains of scientific world, 62.
- Socialist leader, how he victimized his followers, 71.
- Socialist party, comment on its 1936 convention, 5.
- Rejected proposal to pool campaign with Communists, 6.
- Its program is far superior to that of Communists in meeting needs of American people, 6.
- Limits its program of socialization to key industries, 6.
- Its 1936 platform has a strong civil liberties plank, 6.
- Its 1936 platform declares against socialization of small farms, 7.
- Summary of its agricultural program, 7.
- Would curb the usurpations of the Supreme Court, 7.
- Anti-war plank of its 1936 platform, 7, 8.
- Why it does not receive support of the masses, 9.
- What is its attitude toward the Townsend plan, 79.
- Has always advocated old-age pensions, 79.
- Should investigate Ameringer's scheme, 90.
- Socialist party platform, outline of, 6, 7, 8, 9.
- Indicts both the Old Deal and the New Deal, 8, 9.
- Charges New Deal with violation of civil liberties, 8.
- Shows the causes of crises under Capitalism, 8.
- Condemns armed insurrection, 9.
- Warns workers to be on guard against fascist violence, 9, 10.
- Socialists, how they voted on Roosevelt policies, 25.
- Admit that Capitalism was a necessary step in social evolution, 60.
- An outline of their arguments against Capitalism, 60, 61.
- Wish to save the good in Capitalism, 61.
- Are the true exponents of peace, 63.
- Do they favor the idea of a central bank, 72.
- Do they hold that Roosevelt's policies make for a dictatorship, 85.
- Are they fighting Roosevelt and Landon equally, 109.
- Socialization, cannot be achieved without aid of a strong people's party and press, 9.
- Socialized medicine, in 1936 Socialist platform, 7.
- Southern States, do not have highest death rates from sunstroke, 114.
- Soviet Union, how its scientific research compares with that of Japan, 4.
- Its new Constitution sets an example in democracy, 15.
- Now leads the world in wheat production, 18.
- Its dictatorship is voluntarily abdicating, 27.
- Manufactures a replica of the Ford car, 29.
- Protects Jews against anti-Semitism, 35.
- Ranks second in world gold production, 36.
- Has had marked decrease in crime, 37.
- A discussion of its attitude toward dissenters, 45.
- Is justified in sternly suppressing "White Guard," 45.
- Has treated Socialists with great barbarity, 45.
- Is ready to accept the principle of democracy, 45.
- Should use The Green Pastures as part of its anti-religious campaign, 85.
- Its banks pay interest on deposits, 98.
- Obtains huge trade credit from Great Britain, 104.
- Is conserving its gold against German war threat, 104.
- Is rapidly expanding its military forces, 105.
- Has made immense strides in aviation, 105.
- Its fliers established new non-stop record, 105.
- Has a large force of tanks, 105.
- Takes care to avoid even appearance

- of foreign propaganda, 110.
 Would be favored by Americans in a war with Germany, 111, 112.
 Does it encourage inventions, 113.
 Stands fourth in number of applications for patents, 113.
 How it handles applications for patents, 113.
 Respects foreign patent rights, 113.
 Encourages the patenting of inventions, 113.
- Spain**, is in the grip of a death struggle between the forces of reaction and progress, 81, 82.
 Is getting ready to boot out the priests, 81, 82.
 Future of its labor depends on outcome of the present civil war, 101.
 Its labor has been ground down for centuries, 101.
- Spanish Fascists**, have tried to knife the Republic, 82.
 Have massacred thousands of liberals and radicals, 82.
- State gasoline taxes**, amounts collected in 1935, 39.
- State governments**, cost of, 36.
- Stauffer, Oscar**, a Kansas Hearst who works for Landon, 14.
- Steel workers**, are being organized by Lewis and his supporters, 107.
- Steiner, Franklin**, has collected great mass of data on religious beliefs of U.S. Presidents, 40.
 Wrote *The Religious Beliefs of Our Presidents*, 70.
 Comment on *The American Rationalist Annual*, 70.
- Stock Exchange Bulletin**, gives figures on world gold production, 36.
- "Stranger than Fiction"**, makes erroneous statement about Communist candidates, 97, 98.
- Stratosphere**, compared with atmosphere, 57.
- Stratosphere flight**, scientific results of, 57.
- Stream-lined trains**, establish new speed records, 49.
- Students**, number receiving aid from federal government, 69.
- Sunstroke**, facts about its incidence in the U.S., 114.
- Swedish Cooperative Union**, statistics of its sales and membership, 25.
- Taft, William Howard**, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
- Talmadge, Governor Eugene**, condemns social security program, 3.
- Taxation**, in 1936 Socialist platform, 7.
- Taylor, Zachary**, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Teeth**, artificial and natural compared from standpoint of efficiency, 26.
- Telephones**, number of in world, 49.
- Term insurance**, is it to be preferred to other forms, 108.
- The Annalist**, gives data on use of electricity in the U.S., 57.
- The Autobiography of a Madame**, a companion book to *The Autobiography of a Pimp*, 70.
- The Autobiography of a Pimp**, is praised by a reader, 70.
- The Birth Control Review**, gives facts on abortions in the U.S., 52, 53.
- The Camden Courier**, printed letters from Everett R. Meves, 60.
- The Country Doctor**, an estimate of, 92.
- The Daily Worker**, exposed anti-Semitic policy of Kansas State Hospital, 72.
- The Green Pastures**, an estimate of, 84, 85.
 Its movie version was not laugh-provoking, 84.
 A comedy of primitive minds, 84.
 Makes religion appear ridiculous and childish, 84.
 It might have been sponsored by Atheists, 84.
 Gives a false impression of Negroes, 85.
- The Hollywood Reporter**, reports on questionnaire concerning box-office value of movie stars, 105, 106.
- The Journal of the American Medical Association**, gives figures on death rate of U.S. doctors, 52.
- The Kablegram**, gives definition of "electrically transcribed," 58.
- "The March of Time"**, a criticism of, 37.
- The New Republic**, gives facts about Communist party in the U.S., 70.
- The New York Herald Tribune**, comments on Coughlin's anti-Semitism, 77.
- The New York Times**, its reports of the early days of the Soviet Union were grossly inaccurate, 94.
- The Next Hundred Years**, outlines tasks for science, 51.
- "The Old Order Speaks"**, a poem, 3.
- The Religious Beliefs of Our Presidents**, will be issued by Haldeman-Julius Publications, 70.
- "The Star Spangled Banner"**, non-militaristic version of, 53.
- The Survey**, made study of mortality in Cincinnati, 68.
- The Techne**, printed article libeling Jews, 99.
 Gives no hint that its anti-Semitic statements are false, 99.
 Quotes from discredited *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, 100.
- The Trail of the Lonesome Pine**, an estimate of, 42, 43.
 Should have been turned into a burlesque, 43.
- The Truth Seeker**, was first to publish an *American Rationalist Annual*, 70.
- Things to Come**, an estimate of, 85.
 Its appeal is decidedly adult, 85.
- Thinking**, is a comparatively recent development in man's evolution, 13.
- This Week**, quotation from, 56.
- Thomas, Norman**, comment on the Un-

- ion party, 75.
- His attitude towards Roosevelt and Landon, 75, 76.
- Objects to some of Roosevelt's reactionary advisers, 76.
- Chief points in his indictment of the Roosevelt administration, 76.
- Is able to see the good in his opponents, 76.
- Called attention to Coughlin's inconsistent position on Townsend plan, 77.
- Criticized Townsend plan before Cleveland Convention, 79.
- Was booed and hissed by Townsends, 79.
- Objects to sales tax feature of Townsend plan, 80.
- Predicts that Townsend plan would result in inflation, 80.
- Asks the Rev. Smith a pointed question, 80.
- Charges Coughlin's opposition to Roosevelt based on his refusal to interfere in Mexico, 80.
- Thunder, extreme distance at which it can be heard, 29.
- Time, makes inflated claims for its "The March of Time," 21.
- Todd, Lawrence, denied having called Roosevelt a Kerensky, 86.
- Toleration, has been forced upon Christians by the secular-minded, 67.
- Topeka State Journal, prints spurious Communist "oath," 89.
- Dusts off old yarn about Trotsky's having worked in Girard, 112.
- Tornado, average size of, 28.
- Townsendsites, resent criticism of their pipe-dream, 79.
- Townsend Plan, is shot through with bunk and lunacy, 79.
- Is not consistent with Capitalist economy, 80.
- Trotsky, was never West of the Hudson River, 112.
- Trojanovsky, Alexander A., denies that Jews control the Soviet Union, 35.
- Explains racial policies of the Soviet Union, 35.
- Has scrupulously refrained from interfering with internal affairs of the U.S., 86.
- Did not call Roosevelt a Kerensky; Lewis, a Lenin, 86.
- Tyler, John, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Tyranny of the Left, is it the only answer to a tyranny of the Right, 82.
- "Uncertain inference," what it means, 114.
- Union party, is a stooge for Landon and Wall Street, 33.
- A discussion of its origins and aims, 72, 73.
- Was promoted by Hearst and the American Liberty League, 73.
- Is part of a reactionary conspiracy to elect Landon, 73.
- Its chief purpose is "to get Roosevelt," 75.
- Its plank on money illustrates charlatanism of Father Coughlin, 92.
- U.S., makes record-breaking appropriations for armaments, 4.
- Its basic defense problem consists of defending its two coasts, 5.
- Gets its greatest volume of news from the White House, 26.
- Is it in the same class with Hitler's Germany, 31.
- Is one of the few countries which permit terrorization of labor by strike-breakers, 32.
- Has largest stock of gold, 37.
- Farm population of, 39.
- Does it face a timber shortage, 50.
- Its maternal death rate is too high, 56.
- Total monetary circulation of, 69.
- Is menaced by a gang of fascist demagogues, 81.
- Does not compete with Canada in the wheat market, 95.
- Available waterpower of, 114.
- U.S. army, did it pay rent for its trenches in France, 60.
- U.S. aviation, how it compares with foreign aviation, 5.
- U.S. Congress, its power to regulate money is limited by existence of a private banking system, 94.
- U.S. farmers, number engaged in outside part-time employment, 25.
- Net income per family, 111.
- Gross income, 1909-1934, 111.
- U.S. Fascist organizations, source of their revenue, 26.
- U.S. fire losses, for 1935, 29.
- U.S. gold reserve, is double the amount of paper money in circulation, 20.
- Can always be used as an alternative to inflation, 20.
- U.S. government, does not promote lynching and racial hatred, 81.
- Cost of, 36.
- Does its debt threaten the national credit, 38.
- Its debt compared with that of Great Britain, 38.
- Should it establish a super-university, 49, 50.
- How it is helping students, 69.
- Its per capita national debt compared to that of Great Britain, 69.
- Will it lend money to finance a new European war, 98.
- U.S. hospitals, number of patients treated in annually, 72.
- U.S. national anthem, should be revised to eliminate glorification of war, 53.
- U.S. national debt, how it will be paid off, 38, 39.
- Is it the largest in history, 78.
- Could be tripled and still be no larger, proportionately, than that of Great Britain, 79.
- U.S. national parks, list of, 19.

- Are ideal recreation spots, 19.
- U.S. Presidents, what their administrations cost, 5.
- How many were lawyers, 21.
- Professions of, 21.
- Should they have a six-year term, 27.
- Were any of them guilty of anti-Semitism, 28.
- Political affiliations of, 30.
- What were their religious beliefs, 40.
- How many had military rank, 47.
- Number who were college graduates, and colleges of, 48.
- How many were Masons, 57.
- U.S. press, why does it ignore service charges of banks, 8.
- Has always been biased in its treatment of the Soviet Union, 27.
- Is largely unprogressive and capitalistic, 71.
- Ignores propaganda of Fascist governments, 110.
- Constantly harps on Soviet "propaganda," 110.
- U.S. Supreme Court, ages of members of, 100.
- U.S. War Department, its plan for militarizing the country has not been accepted by Congress, 32.
- University degree, is not an infallible sign of an educated person, 110.
- University of Minnesota, offers correspondence course in accounting at low price, 10.
- Van Buren, Martin, facts about his religious beliefs, 41.
- Vegetables, can they be produced without soil, 57.
- Veneral diseases, could be wiped out by spread of knowledge, 53.
- Vierling, Dr. Otto, comments on E. Haldeman-Julius' editorial policy, 17.
- Virginia, why it is called "the Mother of Presidents," 50.
- Voltaire, was not highly sexed, 104.
- Wage scales, of the leading nations of the world, 101.
- Waldman, Louis, is suffering from a Jehovah complex, 42.
- Wallace, Alfred Russel, a great scientist who was an early Socialist, 61.
- Washington, George, facts about his religious beliefs, 40.
- His "Prayer for the United States" is a forgery, 40.
- Left money to found a government university, 50.
- Was no plaster saint, 102.
- Waterpower, amount available in the U.S., 114.
- Weeds, annual loss from in the U.S., 70.
- Wells, H. G., must take a back seat for Joe E. Brown, 85.
- Wesley, Dr. Edgar B., proposes that the government establish a super-university, 50.
- Wheat, which country is the greatest producer of, 18.
- White House, furnishes the U.S. with its greatest volume of news, 26.
- White, William Allen, is a bundle of goo and sentimentality, 14.
- Williams College, refuses to accept German exchange student, 43.
- Wilson, Woodrow, facts about his religious beliefs, 42.
- Winrod, the Rev. Gerald B., charges that Jews dominate the Soviet Union, 35.
- Women, percentage of blondes and redheads, 68.
- Woodsworth, J. S., seeks complete nationalization of the Bank of Canada, 72.
- Woodward, W. E., wrote George Washington—The Image and the Man, 102.
- Comment on Thomas Paine, 103.
- World, political and geographical division of, 69.
- Work relief, statistics on, 40.
- WPA, classification of its employees, 107.
- Number of skilled workers among its employees, 107.
- Wycoff, R. Tyson, wrote "The Semite as the National Socialist Sees Him," 100.
- Ziolkovsky, K. E., made important discovery about rockets, 86.