

**17th Series**

**QUESTIONS & ANSWERS**

**E. Haldeman-Julius**

17TH SERIES

# QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

By E. Haldeman-Julius

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS  
GIRARD      -:-      KANSAS

Copyright, 1939,  
Haldeman-Julius Company

Printed in the United States of America

# Questions and Answers

Please comment on the Ford Sunday Evening Hour.

Henry Ford, who once said the banjo is his favorite musical instrument and complained that Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote a good piece once in a while but was, most of the time, a pup; who financed *The Dearborn Independent* to the extent of millions of dollars in order to arouse prejudice against the Jews and later ordered the paper's suspension with the excuse that he'd never read any of the objectionable things it had printed—this same Ford has, in his old age, learned the important lesson that propaganda, if it's to do his vast industrial empire any good, must be handled by an expert, expounded by a mind that knows the subtle arts of propaganda. The man for this chore is the Rev. William J. Cameron, who, in the old days, wrote Ford's dirty articles about the Jews in *The Dearborn Independent*, or, as its editor, called in hired prostitutes to do the job for him. It's interesting to note that the three worst hate-mongers, the three most conscienceless liars against an innocent, helpless, defenseless race, are all preachers—the Rev. Cameron, Father Coughlin, and the Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, the latter known among his collaborators as the "Jayhawk Nazi." Henry Ford dips into his countless millions for the mere hundreds of thousands of dollars needed yearly to hire able musical talent to supply something like 50 minutes of good or fair music to listening millions. Another six minutes go to the Rev. Cameron, who, in a few hundred words each Sunday, succeeds in injecting Ford propaganda, sometimes doing his job so adroitly that even intelligent, informed people wonder just where the poison-gas was emitted. It's all to a plan, and it works. The Ford philosophy is presented in cryptic, pointed sentences by an expounder who also serves as president of the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America, an organization which

the Rev. Cameron at first denied belonging to, but when he was shown up as a prevaricator he let the subject drop. This anti-Semitic organization has been the training school for hate-mongers, the most notorious one—next to the Rev. Cameron—being Mr. Fritz Kuhn, now head of the German-American (Nazi) Bund, but in his earlier days one of Mr. Ford's technicians in the company's chemical laboratories. The Nazi was given what might be called a leave of absence so he would be free to devote all his time to furthering the propaganda of Ford's favorite foreigner, Adolf Hitler, who, undoubtedly at the behest of Mr. Kuhn, decorated the American motor car magnate with the second-highest order the Brutalitarian is able to grant. In his 6-minute chats each Sunday the Rev. Cameron presents Ford as a homely, kindly, humane philosopher whose one aim in life is to serve humanity and make life brighter for all. The race-monger, the union-buster, the murderer of union pickets, the hirer of armies of spies and provocateurs, the slave-driver, the master of the speed-up—all are ignored by the Rev. Cameron, who prefers, instead, to dwell on the vast good Mr. Ford could do for humanity if only the government would cease meddling in business and go about its ancient chore of running down pickpockets, counterfeiters and drunken drivers. Individualism, in the Ford sense, as expounded by the Rev. Cameron, means freedom to run one's business as one pleases, regardless of social consequences. No government, according to this exploded philosophy, has the right to hamper employers by demands for unemployment insurance, health insurance, social security, the protection of the workers who seek the right to form unions of their own choice, the taxation that business should be compelled to pay in order to enable the government to repair some of the damage that's done to lives and characters by the deadening regime

of mass-production industries. The individualist, who merely asks to be permitted his freedom as he goes about serving the people, is painted by the Rev. Cameron as a member of the "plain folks"—an ordinary man like the Joneses and the Smiths—while the real philosophy is furthered through careful and cunning propaganda so that the Ford family may continue as czars of a mighty industry. To listen to the Rev. Cameron one would imagine that the Ford Motor Company never had in mind the notion of a dollar of profit—all it aches for is the opportunity to pour profits into the laps of others, including tens of thousands of employes. That's where propaganda gets in its deadly work.

\* \* \*

Is it a fact that Julius Streicher, Germany's most infamous Jew-baiter, next to Hitler, has been honored in great universities for his propaganda?

Streicher hasn't been "honored," for that's as impossible as honoring an Al Capone. He has received degrees since Hitler's advent, but the institutions that granted them are no longer great, for Nazism has corrupted every educational establishment in Germany, a country long famous for its magnificent centers of higher learning. Ludwig Lore, for many years a journalist connected with German-language newspapers in the U.S., but now a member of the editorial staff of *The New York Post*, tells about the Streicher incident, as follows:

Proud Friedrich Wilhelm University of Berlin has established a branch on anti-Semitism which bears the name of "Julius Streicher Department." Its sponsor consecrated the "scientific innovation," as he called it in a speech as follows:

"World Jewry has only one goal—to provoke a war in order to destroy forever the German and Italian peoples. The Jewish question will only be solved when it has been solved not only in Germany, but also in other nations, and when the other nations march together with the German and Italian peoples into a new future. . . ."

His audience, which included many prominent German professors and German Government representatives, applauded. Once this

university belonged to the greatest institutions of learning in the world. Schleiermacher, Wagner, Virchow, Delbrueck, Mommsen and Schmoller taught there, enlightening the youth of Germany and other countries with their knowledge and their genius.

Julius Streicher, the fitting representative of science in Nazi Germany!

Streicher, in addition to satisfying his craving for sadistic adventures by leading the war of extermination against the Jews, is also known to be a practicing sadist for purposes of sexual excitement. He frequently visits concentration camps and prisons, where personable young men are compelled to appear before him in the nude. Streicher, who always carries a whip with him, then beats the young men until his aroused emotions cause him to reach a climax. It's such a beast who's considered worthy of being "honored" in today's so-called universities in Hitler's mad-house.

\* \* \*

Do you care for Lawrence Tibbett's singing?

Very much. I've heard him many times, and always with vast satisfaction. In mid-February, 1939, I attended another Tibbett concert, in Joplin, Mo., where it didn't take me long to decide that this fine baritone is greater than ever. His artistry grows steadily. I was especially pleased by his interpretation of Mendelssohn's "I Am a Roamer Bold," from "Son and Stranger," a song I'd never had the pleasure of hearing before. It consists of the immense boasting of a dancing teacher, all put to lively, amusing, snappy music. As I listened it came to me that if I had been listening to Tibbett in Nazi Germany he would have been compelled to omit this piece, because the composer was a Jew. Mendelssohn is contraband in Hitler's Germany. What struck me as particularly amusing in this song is the line, "Heaven be praised for bringing me to you." It came to me (without the assistance of my newsclip filing system or even my tabs) that in one of his speeches Hitler (who had outlawed Mendelssohn) went to great pains to congratulate the Creator on sending him (Hitler) to the German people. Thus, the humorless Hitler

took one of Mendelssohn's funniest lines and used it in all seriousness.

\* \* \*

I, along with millions of other Americans, was interested in the Ickes-Gannett debate on the freedom of the press, which was broadcast from Town Hall of the Air. Gannett, who owns a large chain of newspapers, denied that the press distorts or suppresses the news, etc. It would be interesting to check his own newspapers to see how he handled the dispatches reporting his debate with Secretary Ickes.

That has already been done by members of the Newspaper Guild, the union of newspaper workers, which, by the way, has had endless trouble with Mr. Gannett because of his anti-union policies. According to the Guild, Mr. Gannett owns outright, or has a majority control, of 15 newspapers. The report on the way Mr. Gannett's papers handled the debate appeared in *The Nation*, February 11, 1939, from which I quote:

"They [members of the Guild] found that these papers gave an aggregate of 487 inches of space to Gannett's side, 158 to Ickes. Two of them, while playing up Gannett's address, did not even mention that Ickes had spoken; another rearranged the Associated Press story to emphasize Gannett's 'explanations'; still another published Gannett's text and expressed 'regret' that Ickes's text was 'not available'—although it was."

Nothing amuses me more than to listen to the sputterings of a capitalistic editor when he tries to disprove the thoroughly established fact that his paper can't be relied on for the truth on controversial questions, for news that may injure the standing of a big advertiser, or fair treatment of labor issues. I take a delight in baiting such individuals whenever I meet them. I thought Mr. Ickes' speech (which I read in pamphlet form) was true and convincing. His cases were to the point, but he made a mistake in failing to report to his hearers how the capitalistic newspapers consistently ignore the orders issued by the Federal Trade Commission or the stipulations signed with the FTC by the great advertisers. These cases (which I often cover for my readers) are newsworthy, and yet almost all of them are ignored. Now and then, as I've shown several times,

a squib finds its way into the financial pages, a section usually ignored by the average reader. When, let's say, a heavy advertiser like the Seiberling Rubber Company signs a stipulation agreeing to cease misleading tire users, that ought to be written up for the public, but the big story is ignored because Seiberling has been telling its big lies about its tires in advertisements that cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. The newspapers not only want to protect the advertiser but they don't want their readers to get wise to the fact that the offences against the consumers appeared in the chaste, virtuous columns of the kept press. These facts, as I've explained many times before, don't mean we really haven't the right to a free press. The capitalistic press isn't free, as I've shown to the hilt, but the institution of a free press is still with us, and publishers who want to issue periodicals that are dedicated to the truth have every right, under the Constitution, to give real form to their ideas. All they need do is to line up a body of readers who are willing to pay for the publisher's paper so that its expenses will be met from subscriptions instead of from advertising. The trick is to reach such people and move them to action. That isn't easy, but it can be done. I always make it a point to tell my readers to make sacrifices for progressive, candid, honest, truth-telling editors. That isn't asking anything that's unreasonable. If freedom-loving readers will stand by publishers who try to live up to the ideal of a free press, they will find that before long the American people will have access to literature that isn't a carbon copy of the immense quantities of falsehoods and tripe one finds in the average newspaper. That's why I always say there's no room for pessimism. We have the remedy at hand, if only we'll use it. I never let myself get discouraged, even when I see obvious signs of public indifference, because I know in the end a sufficiently large portion of the literate public will see the light and make the necessary sacrifices in order to build up a press that's free. I'm sure my readers have noticed that when I dwell on this theme I never limit my sug-

gestions to my own publications. I generalize here, because I'm sincerely anxious to see the liberal, progressive readers do their best to support and build up all free-speaking papers and magazines. I'm always grateful for every gesture of support made by my reader-friends, but this doesn't mean I expect the intelligent public to concentrate only on my projects. The issue is too big for that. I hope, in the not distant future, to see a whole string of free-minded, independent publications issued regularly from coast to coast. There are a few worth-while organs of honest opinion in this country, but their influence (like my own) is limited because of too meager circulation. The annoying thing about it is that the readers have the power to correct the situation whenever they decide the time has come for all good men to come to the aid of their press.

\* \* \*

How many savings accounts are there in the U.S.?  
42,000,000.

\* \* \*

How many pounds of food did the American people eat in 1938?  
260,000,000,000.

\* \* \*

An editorial on the Pope who died recently claims he was a friend of science because his Church supports astronomers.

The Roman Catholic Church's conversion to Astronomy is so recent that its apologists must feel a little embarrassed when they boast about the Church's devotion to science. Let's not forget that it's less than a hundred years since the Church formally admitted the world's round. In his famous book, "Conflict Between Religion and Science" (page 157), Draper says:

"Christianity had been in existence 1500 years, and had not produced a single astronomer."

Catholic writers, especially the late Gilbert K. Chesterton, often point to St. Augustine as a rationalistic thinker. To show how ridiculous such a notion is let me quote (from The Catholic Encyclopedia's article on "Antipodes") the following words by St. Augustine: "As to the fable that there are Antipodes, that is to say, men on the opposite side of the earth . . . men who walk with their feet

opposite ours, there is no reason for believing it."

Any schoolboy knows better than that, and yet St. Augustine is pointed to as a source of knowledge and wisdom.

\* \* \*

Can penguins fly?

No.

\* \* \*

I enclose a clipping from Walter Winchell's column, which I found in the Topeka Daily State Journal, Topeka, Kans., February 4, 1939. Please comment.

Mr. Winchell quotes from a letter written to him by Dr. S. Atkinson, of the Catholic Action Group of Nativity Parish, Brooklyn, N.Y., as follows:

"The members of our group wish to thank you for your article in which you pay tribute to the Catholics for the big part they have played in the building of the American dream. In these days of intolerance, it is gratifying to find a writer on the daily press who remembers Maryland and the part the Catholics played in introducing religious liberty in the early days of the colonies. With the present wave of anti-Semitism, it might be interesting for you to know that Pope Innocent the Third, in the 13th Century, issued the following edict which has become a part of the law of the Catholic church: 'That a Jew shall not be constrained to be baptized, neither shall his cemeteries be ravaged nor any harm done to his person.'"

Propagandists for the Catholic Church are never more clumsy than when they try to picture the Church as the friend and defender of tolerance. They work the tolerance angle in the U.S. because our public in general is so bitterly opposed to racial and religious intolerance. Being a minority group in this country, some of the Catholic Church's leaders find it convenient to pass up the regular policy of the Church that prevails in Catholic countries like Poland, Italy, Insurgent Spain, Portugal, and elsewhere, where intolerance is accepted as the proper weapon of both Church and State against religious minorities or Freethinkers. I have exposed the Catholic bunk about the Church's "tolerance" in Maryland, but the lie continues to be spread because it's such a useful one in a country that

gives the Catholics the same constitutional rights that are accorded to all others. I have shown, at least a dozen times (as anyone can see who will examine my 16 volumes of questions and answers) that the Catholics, in the early days of Maryland, were a minority, and it was in order to protect themselves against oppression or discrimination at the hands of the majority that they insisted on tolerance for all religious ideologies. Once the Church gains control of a country it invariably returns to its established, traditional policy of persecution for religious minorities and suppression for Free-thinkers. It's amusing to have the spokesman for Catholic Action refer to the edict of Pope Innocent the Third, in the 13th Century. My readers will recall that in the March, 1939, issue of *The Freeman* (the material appears in full in the 16th volume of my questions and answers) I quoted the above edict, showing that the document from which Dr. Atkinson extracted a single sentence was in reality a terrific demand for the most brutal anti-Jewish measures. It's true that the Pope just referred to forbade compulsory baptism, the destruction of Jewish cemeteries, and bodily harm to Jews, but why ignore the real purpose of the edict? It was to compel Jews to live in ghettos, to wear a badge branding the Jew as such wherever he went, to deny him the right to engage in occupations or business, and in numerous other ways strip him of the ordinary rights that belong to human beings. My article quoted not only from Pope Innocent but from almost a dozen others, and from beginning to end they were all upholders of the most horrible forms of anti-Semitism, horrors just as bad, and in some cases worse, than the savageries of the Nazis. The record shows that the Catholic Church is the world's most powerful and consistent advocate of anti-Semitism, and whenever and wherever it gains control and is able to put its traditional policies into action the results are appallingly to religious minorities, and positively devastating to Jews. The Catholic Church is the world's oldest reactionary and dangerous force. It's the breeding place of ignorance, superstition and persecution. It stands as a

tremendous influence against democracy, liberalism and freedom of thought. It gags teachers, censors writers, and stamps out any truth that impinges on any of the Church's dogmas. It's humanity's most relentless enemy. Its whole history is a record of murder, torture, suppression, distortion, exploitation, parasitism, reaction, destruction, mass murder, and intellectual and cultural blindness. Man will never be able to feel secure in his blood-bought freedom so long as the Catholic Church endures. The black robes of the priests have always concealed daggers intended for the heart of civilization.

\* \* \*

I enclose a page from the *Berliner Morgenpost*, in which the writer exposes American censorship of the movies. Please comment.

The article, which covers an entire page, is by Miss Hilde Lest, and is intended to show that Will Hays's censorship is worse than anything imposed on the Nazi movies by Dr. Goebbels. I have, in numerous articles printed during the past 20 years, expressed my opinions of Elder Hays, sometimes using pretty caustic language. Intelligent Americans who accept liberalism in literature and art as well as in politics and economics, have always insisted that Censor Hays has no place in America, that his activities are a disgrace to our civilization, for he not only strikes at what he considers to be "obscenity" but devotes himself mainly to compelling the movie industry to refrain from coming to grips with real ideas and real life. We Americans who are progressive and liberal hope for the day when Hollywood's studios will be as free as that portion of the American press which refuses to toady to big advertisers. But the Nazi blast isn't intended to help Americans throw out censorship. It seeks to put Nazi censorship in a good light, a task which is monumental in its proportions and will never succeed, for there's nothing that can be said in support of Nazi standards of "art." The article is shot through with ignorance, for the author actually believes that Hays's office is "enthroned in Washington." According to this Nazi writer, Hays

was appointed to his censorship office by "the highest Chief of State," meaning President Roosevelt. This, of course, is laughable. The Hays outfit isn't provided for in our Constitution. The office was created by the top figures in the movie industry itself, who produce the money and submit voluntarily to Hays's misrule and general stupidity, to the injury of an industry that presents many opportunities for genuine artistry. The moguls in movieland could close Hays's office tomorrow, if they were so minded.

\* \* \*

Please let me know how many of each of the five leading cigarettes we consumers smoked in 1938?

Total sales of the five cigarette leaders in 1938 aggregated about 133,000,000,000, as follows: Camel, 43,000,000,000; Lucky Strike, 38,000,000,000; Chesterfield, 35,000,000,000; Philip Morris, 9,000,000,000; Old Gold, 8,000,000,000. The total figure for 1937 was 141,000,000,000.

\* \* \*

Do you believe our unofficial boycott against German goods is having any effect?

The facts show the boycott against Nazi goods is having a marked effect on German trade. I find in my news-clip filing system an official report from Berlin which shows that during 1938 U.S. exports to Germany rose to 404,500,000 marks, an increase of 43.5 percent over 1937. U.S. imports from Germany, during 1938, dropped to 149,300,000 marks, a decrease of 28.5 percent. The same report shows that the U.S. "accounts for the larger part of the whole Great German deficit of 432,400,000 marks." This deficit hurts in a vital place. Because the U.S. refuses to accept Hitler's phony marks, the difference between Germany's purchases from us and our imports from Germany must be paid in cash. No wonder the Nazis and their regimented press continue an orgy of abuse against everything American, including our President. But, judging from various surveys of American opinion, our people are bitterly opposed to everything Germany stands for and properly refuse to let their dollars be used to further Hitler Brutalitarianism. The boycott should be continued. It's a quiet and powerful form of reprisal against

Hitlerism; it certainly has a serious effect on the Reich's financial structure, already in a grave condition. Of course, Germany can refuse to buy from us, but that won't frighten Americans who have some regard for peace, humanity, and decency. Germany would have quit buying from us long ago, if it could dispense with our goods, so the trade we're getting from that source comes to us because the buyer finds it inconvenient or perhaps impossible to make similar purchases elsewhere. Whatever happens, American boycotters will surely continue to reject anything that's labeled "Made in Germany." I have, in numerous previous articles, shown how survey after survey shows the American people to be anti-Nazi. The facts, needless to say, will be found in the indexes of my 16 volumes of questions and answers, the most annihilating and complete case against Nazism now in print, a case which I built up, fact by fact, from the first day that Hitler stole power. Now comes Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, with the report of a new survey (February 3, 1939) in which our people express themselves on Hitler's demand for the return of Germany's former colonies. The question was worded as follows: "Should the colonies taken from Germany after the World War be given back to her?" The results listed below give the answers for 1939 and those obtained in a survey in February, 1938, thus:

	Today	Year Ago
For returning colonies. . . . .	17%	24%
Against . . . . .	83	76

This report shows that our people were overwhelmingly anti-Nazi in 1938, but that 1939 shows an intensification of the feeling of opposition to Hitler's regime of gangsterism and mass murder. Last October a similar survey was made in England, with the following results:

For returning colonies . . . . .	15%
Against . . . . .	85

The above figures show that the British and American publics see almost eye to eye on this question of surrendering additional territory so that Hitlerism may enslave greater portions of the globe. In the British

survey the citizens also were asked if they would fight to prevent Germany from getting a colonial empire, and more than 80 percent said they would. Public opinion is sound on this question of Nazism, and when it expresses itself concretely in the form of a boycott it's really doing a service to humanity.

\* \* \*

**Is Russia a self-supporting country?**

Harold Denny, Moscow correspondent of *The New York Times*, makes the statement in one of his dispatches that the Soviet Union is "practically self-sustaining." Until recently, Russia lacked tin and nickel, but it's now reported that these two metals have been discovered. As for Russia's agriculture, as I explained before, the government is giving serious thought to making bread a free item, as free as air or water. Rates charged by utilities, for electricity and telephone service, are so low as to be almost free. Rents are usually figured on the basis of 10 percent of a person's salary.

\* \* \*

**Father Coughlin, in his broadcasts, refers frequently to the Pope's encyclical in support of labor. What's there to this?**

When the Pope, in 1931, issued how now-famous "Quadragesimo Anna," I discussed this so-called "labor encyclical" and showed it up for the fraud it is. While it said a few pretty words about the place of labor in the social order, the encyclical, when it got down to cases, approved Mussolini's brand of cooperative Fascism. Even Fascists like Hitler kid labor with glowing compliments in order to make palatable the awful oppression the workers must suffer in Fascist States, where free unionism is outlawed. The few pretty generalizations about labor are quoted by Fascists like Father Coughlin for American audiences, but priests in Italy and other Fascist countries quote the same encyclical's support of Fascism. That's an old trick that I've exposed many times, but my weak voice reaches a limited audience—because of the lethargy of so many of my readers when it comes to disseminating progressive ideas—so the Coughlins are able to continue winning labor support for a set of ideas that will enslave them once the Cath-

olic-Fascists get control. Even Franco in Spain quotes the above encyclical approvingly, for he knows he can depend on the Church's endorsement of his program of Fascism. Can Father Coughlin deny that Spanish Fascism gets its most powerful support from the Catholic Church, next to the military arm? I don't think I'm boasting when I say that my 16 volumes of questions and answers treat of every phase of the international problem of Catholic Fascism. I believe I'm being strictly factual when I say that a review of my indexes in these volumes will show that the case against Catholicism's labor record is devastating. So far as Father Coughlin is concerned, I've shown, from the Church's records, that he isn't the least bit out of line when he promotes Fascism and anti-Semitism and prepares the soil for anti-American doctrines. The fact that Coughlin can continue his propaganda in print and over many radio stations is proof of the fact that the hierarchy approves of his dangerous activities. If the Church found Coughlinism unsavory it could silence Coughlin in an hour or compel him to leave the Church. Coughlinism and Catholicism are twins. The Church wasn't hesitant about silencing Father Edward McGlynn, 50 years ago, when he stirred American labor with his sincere and honest preachments in support of the workers. It didn't take the hierarchy long to unfrock him. But when a Father Coughlin works to confuse, mislead and betray the proper interests of the workers the higher-ups in the Church pretend to be deaf. There isn't the slightest doubt in my mind that if Father Coughlin were to change his viewpoint—that, of course, is a wild flight of the imagination—he wouldn't remain a priest very long if he asserted labor ideas in harmony with the democratic principles of the late Father McGlynn. These opinions of mine are in strict accord with the record, but where can one get them enunciated except in a few progressive publications of too limited circulation? The standard press is gagged by the Church in matters of religion and social ideas, and is bulldozed by the big advertisers on issues that concern politics and economics. How

long will the American masses stand for this prostitution of a press that pretends to be free? How long will the masses stand by and see their honest and sincere friends speak to small audiences while the powerful engines of publicity remain in the hands of the avowed enemies of the people. Here we are faced by the appalling fact that we have the right to a free press but, like so many robots, do nothing about making it an effective reality. Will there ever be a change? I for one at least hope for the best. I'm optimistic enough to believe that the day is coming—in the near future—when the masses will turn to candid, truth-telling, fearless, unsubsidized, progressive, democratic, independent editors unafraid of Fascist-minded priests or domineering advertisers.

I enclose a clipping from a liberal weekly which refers to the "Ghetto Benches" of Poland. What does this expression mean?

In 1936, the Polish Fascist Government (into the constitution of which the Catholic Church is written as an official part of the Government) established "Ghetto Benches" in all high schools and universities. Jewish students were ordered to occupy such segregated benches during all classes, but to their eternal glory all Jewish young men and women have refused to occupy them. Instead, they prefer to stand in their classes. This means they take their lessons standing up for from five to six hours each day. This has been going on for more than two years. According to the best figures available, something like 8,000 Jewish young people are participating in this silent protest against brutal discrimination. I wonder if Father Coughlin, who surely knows about this, hopes for the day when such practices will be instituted in the U.S. The Church must look forward to such inhuman treatment of an innocent, helpless minority, for they participate in humiliations and slow tortures of such a nature wherever they are able to assert undisputed power. The capitalistic press, afraid of the power of the priests to boycott it, prefers to keep such news from the eyes of democratic Americans. But, ways will be

found to bring the truth to America, which is still a free country and will remain so if only supporters of democratic principles show a willingness to make sacrifices for their media of communication.

\* \* \*

You frequently write articles supporting Socialism. Can you show your readers, by concrete example, that American Socialists have ever done anything for the people of the U.S. that would entitle them to the right to ask for wider spheres of activity and influence?

It happens that I was in charge of the publicity of the Socialist administration of Milwaukee, Wisc., when it ran a municipal exhibition of its achievements during the time Emil Seidel, Milwaukee's first Socialist mayor, was in office. Later, as a member of the editorial staff of *The Milwaukee Leader*, I was city hall reporter, a job which gave me endless opportunities to watch, study and comment on the way Socialists go about the difficult and complicated business of running a city. What I saw back in those days (1911-12) convinced me that the policies of municipal Socialism are the only ones that can be depended on to put a community on its feet and make it a solvent institution. Since then, Mayor Daniel W. Hoan has spent something like two decades in the city hall, and the record shows that the voters made a splendid investment when they intrusted power to Hoan and his honest, loyal, competent lieutenants. Let's not forget that when the Socialists took control, in 1910, Milwaukee was busted flat. There was hardly a dollar in the treasury, while many departments were running at a deficit. The police force was corrupt. The politicians were indulging in open, brazen graft, with direct dealings with the criminal elements. The fire department was antiquated. The city's supplies were being bought by several dozen department officials, and in the confusion much of the taxpayer's money went into the pockets of the politicians instead of for goods needed by the community. There were no playgrounds for the children, with the result that gangs of tough youngsters roamed the streets, got into trouble, and eventually landed in

court on more or less serious charges. The first thing the Socialists did in Milwaukee was to clean up the city—physically and morally. The problem of tough boys running in gangs was solved, in large measure, by inaugurating a system of public playgrounds, which now number 65. These well-appointed playgrounds—supplied with all facilities for sport and play—took boys off the streets and led them in the direction of law and order. The records show that juvenile delinquency has declined from the very beginning of the first Socialist administration, so that today Milwaukee is the most law-abiding city in the country. This is a literal fact. For example, Milwaukee enjoys the lowest burglary insurance rates in the country—from \$7 to \$40 per \$1,000 less than it was in the days of corrupt politics. The insurance rate on motor cars in Milwaukee is the same as will be found in villages, which indicates that the hard-boiled insurance companies know that their risks are well protected in the city that's ruled by the Socialists. J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, reports that Milwaukee's "crime rate is only 20 percent of the average crime rate of 35 of the largest cities." The Wickersham Crime Commission, in its report to the President, said "no other city can equal this record." What did the Milwaukee Socialists do to be able to make such a record? The facts are available to anyone who is willing to study the situation, and the moral, in my opinion, is for the other cities in the country to follow Milwaukee's lead, if they want good, clean, efficient, progressive, social-minded government. For example, take a look at Milwaukee's finances. As I stated before, the city was broke in 1910. Today, after almost 30 years of Socialist rule, Milwaukee is paying its bills as it goes. Deficits aren't tolerated. The city never has defaulted on one of its bonded debts. It has met every interest payment promptly. At the rate its bonded indebtedness is being reduced, Milwaukee, in 1943, will be absolutely free of debt. Think what this will mean to the people—a city that doesn't spend a dollar for in-

terest. Milwaukee saves money by buying all its supplies through a single purchasing department, thus making sure of getting value for each dollar spent. Milwaukee, under its Socialist officials, was among the first American cities to enter the field of cooperative housing, beginning with what is known as Garden Homes, in 1921, consisting of 105 homes which were built for working people at an average saving of \$1,500 per family. Since then the city has cooperated with the Federal government in several large housing projects. The idea is to develop a system of building houses for the public that will be self-liquidating and at the same time produce taxes for the community. Socialist Milwaukee made the fire department so efficient that the insurance companies now give its property owners the lowest fire insurance rates in the country. Its losses from fire are less than half of the national average. Its traffic deaths are extremely low, comparing with the best in the land. In times of industrial strife, the city government refuses to act as a strike breaking agency. It protects the strikers as well as the employers. It forbids outside strike-breaking gangs to come into the city to foment violence. Milwaukee, many years ago, pioneered in the field of humane working conditions for its own employes, giving them the 8-hour day and minimum wages. Milwaukee's influence resulted in a State law giving its people the country's first workmen's compensation law. It also helped establish unemployment insurance. And, let me add, Milwaukee's influence brought into being the country's best and most liberal system of old-age pensions. Wherever possible, Milwaukee insists on municipal ownership of its utilities. Its objective is a social order in which the people will own their large-scale industries and operate them for the common good. This, of course, is a national problem, so the reform will have to wait until the people generally become as enlightened politically as the people of Milwaukee have been for more than 25 years. Milwaukee's record is being repeated in Reading, Pa., and Bridgeport, Conn.

Municipal Socialism, I insist, is a success. The American people will have to come to it in time. The sooner the better.

\* \* \*

Your articles on our national debt have been helpful, especially in these days when no editorial writer considers his day finished unless he has written at least one stereotyped editorial bewailing our spending. I agree with you that we have much to show for the money spent during these depression years. Let me suggest that you break down the figures and show what we got for our money.

I'm glad to have this opportunity to show my readers what we are able to show for the money spent during Roosevelt's years in the White House. As the President said: "We have not been throwing the taxpayers' money out of the window or into the sea. We have been buying real values with it." Let's examine the record carefully and see if the facts can teach us anything. To give my readers the full picture, I must, in the figures below, include the 1939-40 fiscal year, for these estimates are already in and the money is sure to be spent. Also, for three lines of activity—direct public works, loans and investments, and public roads, I must include two Hoover years—1931 and 1932. As both these Hoover years resulted in heavy deficits—\$684,000,000 in 1931 and \$1,372,000,000 in 1932—they don't serve to brighten the picture. But, by and large, I can use the Hoover shadows and still show that the Roosevelt billions haven't been wasted, in the main. Thus, for 10 years—1931-1940—direct public works cost a total of \$4,005,000,000, and even the bitterest anti-New Dealer will admit that the country is supplied with improvements of a permanent nature that are the result of this spending. Next we come to the government's loans and investment, and we find—again from 1931 to 1940—that we spent \$3,234,000,000—all of it secured and recoverable. Next, public roads—from 1931 to 1940—cost \$2,424,000,000, and again I feel safe in saying the money was well spent. We now leave the 1931 and 1932 years out of the figuring, as we are to touch on Roosevelt's own outlays—CCC, WPA and Public Works Grants. The Civilian

Conservation Corps, from 1933 to 1940, cost \$2,550,000,000, and who can seriously hold the young men in these CCC camps haven't earned the money it cost to keep them there? WPA construction—you see the benefits everywhere, cost a total of \$2,687,000,000. And, finally, Public Works Grants, from 1934 to 1940, cost \$1,523,000,000. The grand total: \$16,423,000,000, every dollar of it representing real values to the people. Accepting the figure for the total deficit—from 1931 to 1940—as \$27,279,000,000 we have what's called a non-recoverable deficit of \$10,856,000, of which about \$3,000,000,000 was incurred in the last years of Hoover's administration. This "loss" includes expenses of the government, relief to the unemployed; help for the farmers, help for business, appropriations for the army, navy and air force, and so on, during 10 years. With our national income last year at \$60,000,000,000—a low year, by the way—we find that our war on depression under the leadership of the President has cost us the net national income of something like 60 days. When I examine such obvious facts I find little reason to grow hysterical. The country hasn't gone to the dogs, and I doubt it will. We have spent money—true, but we haven't bankrupted ourselves. I've shown that to be true in many previous articles.

\* \* \*

Father Coughlin says and writes that the Church is being persecuted in Mexico. Is he telling the truth?

Coughlin lies, as usual. Our ambassador to Mexico, Josephus Daniels, is an honest authority on Mexico, and here's what he says:

"There is no persecution of the church today in Mexico. . . . The churches are open throughout Mexico. . . ."

\* \* \*

Is there any truth in the report that anti-Fascist editors have a copy of the general orders issued by the head of the Crusaders White Shirts? I understand this document tells how the country is to be turned into a Fascist heaven. Can you give us the text of the order?

George W. Christians, commander-in-chief of the Crusader White Shirts, has issued a general order to his organization, a copy of which was obtained by Dr. L. M. Birkhead, of

Kansas City, Mo. Birkhead, as my readers know, is a tireless enemy of Fascism and a brave fighter for democracy. It's through Birkhead's efforts that I'm able to supply my readers with the plan already worked out for turning the country into a vast concentration camp. Here it is, and it's authentic:

### CRUSADER WHITE SHIRTS

#### General Orders:

No unit of the Crusader White Shirts should attempt any positive action until it has been thoroughly drilled and officered and perfect discipline has been obtained, nor should it attempt to move until it is sufficiently strong to accomplish its purpose without any chance of failure.

The first objective should be to take control of the local government in the following manner: March in military formation to and surround the governmental buildings. Then, by sheer numbers and a patriotic appeal, force the officials to accept and act under the direction of an economic adviser appointed by the President of the C.F.E.L. This adviser's first duty will be to repudiate the public debt and utilize the payments assigned thereto for the public welfare.

Dishonest officers should immediately be brought to justice. You should remember that most politicians are unfamiliar with modern business methods, and that their accounts are apt to be badly muddled and may be short ... [sentence illegible.]

When this is accomplished, Crusader White Shirts should assist law enforcement officials in maintaining the kind of order we consider essential.

Preparations should then be made at once for the Crusade to Washington. Crusader White Shirts requisitions will be furnished for the purpose of obtaining funds and other things needed. This work should be assigned to a thoroughly trustworthy and carefully instructed X committee.

Generous donations can be obtained from most people for the Crusade by merely appealing to their patriotism. However, a patriotic appeal will probably not have much effect on the people who have most of the money nowadays. There will be a great temptation to use a few pineapples to loosen up those fat pocketbooks, but this temptation

should be righteously resisted.

As soon as you are fully equipped to go to Washington, report to the Commander-in-Chief of the Crusader White Shirts at Chattanooga, Tennessee, stating the number of men, how equipped and the time required to reach Washington, but do not move until ordered. Nothing must fail.

This is a lawful organization and it can not be stopped by lawful means. If anyone uses unlawful means to start a fight, just be sure that YOU finish it.

Read these orders VERY carefully. Strike hard straight and swiftly. Get what you start out to get.

Signed: Geo. W. Christians  
Commander-in-Chief,  
Crusader White Shirts,

President, Crusaders for Economic Liberty.

Does all this sound fantastic and laughable? Don't laugh too soon. Remember, Hitler's orders that went out to his followers in Germany, before he grabbed power, sounded as ridiculous. In those days shrieks of laughter were heard all over Germany from the republican elements, who felt the whole spectacle was too funny for words. They ridiculed Hitler, called him a nut and a lunatic—and, in due course, either ran away from the country or landed in a concentration camp, where they were tortured and even murdered. I always advise my readers never to laugh at anything a Fascist does. If the above general orders sound screwy, remember it takes a large degree of screwiness to label oneself a Fascist leader—and such nuts frequently end up in seats of power. The lesson we have learned—through bitter experience—is never to laugh at the pretensions of any Fascist leader, however eccentric and fantastic. Take them seriously. And, by all means, prepare to liquidate such propaganda by doing your utmost to build up a dependable, progressive, anti-Fascist press. There's our real salvation, for without mass support the Fascists can't get very far. A free press can be used, in legitimate ways, to keep the masses so well informed regarding conditions that they won't be the easy victims Fascists expect them to be. An informed body of citizens can save the country's democratic institutions, if it can be educated to the

truth of what's going on. A free press isn't everything, by any means, but it's an indispensable beginning. I hope my readers learn the full meaning of that lesson. I've preached this sermon often enough, and here I am going over it again. But I do it unblushingly, for I know how important it is. I feel it's one of my jobs to keep the anti-Fascists reminded of the grave fact that a free press is the foundation on which they are to build the glorious temple of an enduring democracy. We must all be builders. We must back up fine words with strong deeds.

\* \* \*

I see that Japan doesn't want us to make Guam into a base for our navy and air force. But we seem to insist on going ahead with the job, though up to this writing Congress hasn't done anything definite. I see that France and Britain are joining us in protests to Japan about its policies in China. Doesn't this mean we're in some sort of an alliance with these countries against Japan? Let's not forget what George Washington said about "entangling alliances."

The treaty that Japan threw over in order to attack China also contained the proviso against our fortifying Guam. Since Japan, of its own volition, repudiated its agreement, why should we be so upset when it protests against our going ahead and making the island available for military and naval ends? Japan can't have it both ways—kick out a treaty that binds it against aggression and then insist that the part of the rejected treaty dealing with Guam shall be respected. We should go ahead with our plans, if there are good reasons for making the island a part of our defense system. It's true that France and Britain have followed us in protesting firmly against Japan's treatment of foreign interests in China. I hope they are backed up with proper action—not necessarily war, but firm, positive action against the Japanese Fascists, along the lines of a real boycott of Japanese goods, an embargo on munitions to Japan, refusal of any kind of credits, and even withdrawing the privilege of using our Panama Canal. If this means we're in an "entangling alliance" with France and Britain, I hope it sticks, for the democracies

have been too slow and lazy about defending themselves against aggressors like Japan, Germany and Italy. Whenever such a subject comes up we're sure to hear George Washington's warning against "entangling alliances," uttered in his farewell address. Perhaps the people who quote this don't know that after speaking against "entangling alliances," Washington went right on to say that we should make use of "temporary alliances." Here are Washington's exact words:

"Taking care always to keep ourselves suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies."

I think it's no exaggeration to say the rise of the three great Fascist aggressors has presented the democratic world with an extraordinary emergency, one which entitles us to follow Washington's advice and resort to "temporary alliances."

\* \* \*

I enclose a clipping from The Chicago Tribune, which, as you can see, is still pounding away at labor. Please comment on the article headed "C.I.O. STRANGLES SAN FRANCISCO; INDUSTRIES DIE." Note, please, that the point of this piece is that labor troubles have compelled General Motors Corporation to move its San Francisco Chevrolet motor car assembly plant to Los Angeles, thus causing a loss of 3,500 jobs.

The story is false. The Chevrolet assembly plant never was located in San Francisco.

\* \* \*

What's your opinion of Lloyd C. Douglas?

I wrote a piece about his "Green Light" some months ago, in which I described him as a master of the art of dishing up tripe. Bernard Devoto characterizes him as "a streamlined Harold Bell Wright." He can say that again. I don't intend to waste any space reviewing his latest book, "Disputed Passage," even though it has all the marks of a best-seller. It'll still be trash, even though it's moved by the carload.

\* \* \*

Please let us have your comments on the Harry Bridges case. I'm sure your newspaper filing system must be crowded with interesting data.

Harry Bridges, leader of the Pa-

cific Coast longshoremen and West Coast director of the C.I.O., entered this country in 1920, from Australia, where he was born. He became active in trade union affairs, in time becoming leader. Through carelessness, two applications for citizenship were permitted to go into default. A third application is pending. For several years, Secretary of Labor Perkins has been deluged with demands that Mr. Bridges be deported as an alien who believes in Communism, is a member of the Communist party, and aims to overthrow our government by force and violence. As Secretary Perkins said, on January 23, 1939, there is no evidence linking Bridges with Communism. She says this was learned after careful investigations by the Immigration Service, which is a branch of her Department. The facts show, therefore, that Bridges never was a member of the Communist party and never participated in that party's activities. He has been "guilty" of the usual actions of an energetic, conscientious labor leader—organizing workers, leading strikes, and the like. These acts aren't in violation of our immigration laws, nor, as Mrs. Perkins said, "can such actions be regarded as attempts to overthrow the government." There are two reasons for the great to-do over Mr. Bridges. First, he is too honest to sell out, which enrages employers who have long been accustomed to "solving" their labor troubles by slipping some graft to a willing, dishonest union official. Bridges is absolutely relentless when he negotiates for his members, and the record shows numerous concessions to longshoremen, including higher wages, shorter hours, and better conditions generally. He is hated for his unbending loyalty. Another reason for sniping at Bridges is the desire to smear the New Deal. Protests directed to Secretary Perkins are really intended to damage President Roosevelt by giving the public the false impression that he is in cahoots with the Communists, thus, by inference, branding himself as a Communist, or at least as a sympathizer. How strange it is that for about 12 years Mr. Bridges performed his duties as a labor leader and nothing was done by the authorities,

despite the fact that the administrations were in the hands of conservative Republicans of the Coolidge-Hoover stripe. Reactionary politicians and the conservative press are working together to do anything to besmear the President and his administration. The brickbats now being thrown at Mrs. Perkins are intended for the head of F. D. R.

\* \* \*

What has been the effect of Nazi rule on the living standards of the people, especially the workers?

This is a subject I've written about for years, as my old readers know. There are numerous references to this question in the indexes in the back pages of my 16 volumes of questions and answers. Also, despite the fact that I have dipped often into the folder in my newsclip filing system that's devoted to "Nazi Living Standards" I find a few that are still to be used. It's only these items that I want to draw on in this piece. As the late Thomas Masaryk, founder and first president of Czechoslovakia, once said, "The dictators always look good until the last five minutes." It's in the last five minutes that the befuddled victims come to their senses and realize they've been fooled. Take the Nazi propaganda about unemployment. Much is made of the fact that all able-bodied Germans are working, but nothing is said about the appalling fact that most of them are wasting their labor power in the armament industry, where they're getting the Nazi regime ready for another immense war that will cost at least 10,000,000 lives. Unemployment can't be disposed of on such a basis of national waste. If that policy were sound, any country could solve its economic problems by putting all its men in the army, or in the industries that must be kept going in order to supply the army with what it needs. In short, the Nazis have "solved" unemployment by conscripting labor. It's interesting to note, according to one item in my newsclip filing system, that, in the words of Dr. Arthur Feiler, former German economist but now on the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research, N.Y.C., that "unemployment insurance premiums, which were increased during the depression,

are still collected at the emergency rate, and the insurance funds are used as a source for financing the armament bills." In short, this is just another Nazi trick to take a heavy portion of the expense of arming the Third Reich out of the hides of the workers. Dr. Feiler writes that real wages have constantly declined since Hitler came to power, adding:

"There has been a marked deterioration of quality of consumers' goods . . . and the scarcity of many products necessitates the purchase of more expensive substitutes . . . the workers carry a constantly larger share of the mounting tax burden which absorbed 24.6 percent of the national income in 1937. In addition to taxes, there are 'contributions' in endless variety, and nobody is free to refuse to make them—to the Nazi party and to all of its various subdivisions."

This, needless to say, can't continue indefinitely. There's bound to be a limit—a "last five minutes."

\* \* \*

Do you think there's any chance of the G.O.P. nominating Hoover for President in 1940?

Lord 'erbert 'oover seems to have the presidential bee in his chapeau, judging by the way he's cavorting with the boys and slashing away at the New Deal. Or, maybe he's only trying to control the party machinery and thus be able to dictate who the candidate is to be. However, if he thinks he stands a chance he'd better examine the report of *Fortune* magazine's sampling of public opinion on the following:

"Regardless of your own party affiliations, which of the following men would be your choice for President in 1940?"

The replies:

Dewey	12.2%
Vandenberg	11.5
LaGuardia	11.5
Landon	8.2
Hoover	5.1
Lodge	4.6
Nye	4.1
Barton	2.8
Other	2.0
Don't know	38.0

I don't think there's a man in the above list who could stand a chance against Roosevelt if he were to run for a third term. LaGuardia could

do a fair job, but I doubt he'd even consider running against Roosevelt. Dewey—the boy scout of politics—is leading, but not by much of a margin, which would indicate that the Republican party doesn't expect its glorified cop to defeat Roosevelt after the way Lehman whipped Dewey for Governor of New York State.

\* \* \*

I agree with your statement that the President made a good choice when he named Prof. Felix Frankfurter to the Supreme Court of the United States. I wonder if the public was pleased with the appointment?

On January 28, 1939, Dr. George Gallup, director of the Institute of Public Opinion, announced the results of a nation-wide survey of rank and file voters who had been asked:

"Do you think Felix Frankfurter will make a good United States Supreme Court judge?"

The vote of those with opinions: Yes, 82 percent; No, 18 percent.

\* \* \*

Do you recommend Japanese shaving brushes?

No, and for two reasons. First, I believe in boycotting Japanese goods, because of that government's aggression in China. Second, Dr. John L. Rice, Health Commission, N.Y.C., issued a warning to dealers and users, late in January, 1939, that a large number of Japanese shaving brushes distributed from N.Y. to various parts of the U.S. have been found to be infected with anthrax. They are stamped "Japan 332" and "Imperial, Sterilized." Consumers should be warned and on their guard.

\* \* \*

I suppose you hate Hitler's speech to his puppet Reichstag on January 30, 1939. In it he said his regime wasn't opposed to the Christian church. Please comment.

It all depends what Hitler means by the Christian church. We get a fair idea from the words of Hans Kerrl, Reichsminister for Church Affairs:

"There has arisen a new authority as to what Christ and Christianity really are—that is, Adolf Hitler . . . "Adolf Hitler . . . is the true Holy Ghost."

\* \* \*

Which country, in the opinion of the American people, will bring on the war that's getting nearer day by day?

Dr. George Gallup, director of the

American Institute of Public Opinion, reported on January 31, 1939, that his organization had conducted a nation-wide survey of the American people on the question:

"If there is such a war [a World War], which country do you think will be responsible for starting it?"

The answers:

Germany alone .....	62%
Italy alone .....	12
Germany and Italy .....	20
Total—Germany, Italy or both .....	94
All others .....	6

Another question asked was:

"If there is such a war, do you think the United States will be drawn in?"

The answers:

Yes .....	57%
No .....	43

In the middle of 1937 Dr. Gallup asked a cross-section of the American public whether or not they expected a major European war within the next 12 months. This, let me add, was before Hitler's absorption of Austria and the Sudetenland of Czecho-Slovakia. The result, at that time, showed that only 16 persons in every 100 expected such a war. But January, 1939, shows a great change. Sentiments now is divided as follows: Yes, 44 percent; No, 56 percent. This shows a growing feeling among our people that a great war is in sight, to be caused (in the opinion of 94 percent of the persons asked) by Germany, Italy or both. Notice from the above that hardly any part of the American public looks on the Soviet Union as an aggressor, as a government likely to bring on a war. Despite the efforts of the Fascists and other reactionaries to give the impression, through adroit propaganda, that Russia has designs on the world, the public sensibly holds to the opinion that such representations lack validity and that, instead, war should be looked for from the two great gangsters, Hitler and Mussolini. I have quoted the results of the surveys of Dr. Gallup and others, including *Fortune* magazine, because I consider them to be of extreme importance to students of current trends. And, while I'm at it, let me add that of the scores of questions I've reported on I can recall only two in which I felt the majority were

in the wrong. The facts show that in a democracy, where the people have facilities for the dissemination of news and ideas, the masses can be relied on to show sound sense. It's of tremendous value to show, at each step of the way, what the people in a democracy think on great social, economic, political and international questions. Thus far, the surveys have been honest and accurate, if I'm any kind of a judge. Being realists (as shown by numerous surveys of opinion) the American people are moving far away from the stupid isolationism which some politicians seem to think is the accepted policy of the majority of Americans. The people of the U.S. look facts in the face and know we are living in grave times, with democracy slated as the ultimate victim of the Brutalitarian. They know that France and England are facing serious days, and should Fascism succeed in crushing them we'll be compelled to resist the iron fist of Fascism on our own Hemisphere and eventually on our own Continent. For that reason, we Americans who take our democracy seriously must show readiness to help other democracies in their hours of peril. We showed the worst kind of stupidity in declaring an embargo against Loyalist Spain, thus depriving the legitimate government of its legal right to purchase arms, while all along the haters of democracy, Italy and Germany, were pouring almost limitless supplies of munitions into Fascist Spain for the purpose of crushing a smaller and newer democracy before tackling the greater and older ones of France and England. We mustn't make that criminal blunder again, and, judging by the reports of competent writers on the situation in the White House, President Roosevelt realizes the peril and seeks, short of war, to help the democracies while they're getting ready to resist the Fascist aggressors. It's our duty to sell France and England all the airplanes, and other munitions, that we can turn out for their fighting forces. We must do this not only for ideological reasons but for the very sound reason of wanting to save our own hides. As someone well quotes the President, France is our first line of defense. When France

falls, the line will draw closer to our land. Intelligent selfishness should compel us to recognize this fact and act accordingly. Whatever facilities we have at our command should be made available to the democratic powers, especially our genius for turning out airplanes on a mass-production basis. As these countries draw more and more on our facilities we are enabled to expand our airplane industry, thus building a tremendously powerful arm of defense for the day when we ourselves are compelled to face the Fascist militarists. France and England soon may be facing the combined might of Hitler and Mussolini. It would be idiotic if we were to take the position that their quarrel doesn't concern us in any way, that we should "stay at home" and "tend our own knitting"—ideas which Hitler and Mussolini approve *in toto*. The American people are too sensible to be taken in by such rot. They properly suspect that if we were to take a stand for complete indifference to what happens when the Fascists attack democracies we'd be putting our own heads on the block. That's why I say, as a matter of pure selfishness, we should do everything in our power to enable the democratic powers to resist Fascist attacks.

\* \* \*

I agree with you that we should boycott Japanese goods. Please explain how it is that certain Japanese imports carry on them the words: "Made in USA"?

The explanation is that Japan shrewdly renamed one of its cities USA, thus getting the right to use the words my reader objects to. Such a subterfuge—meant to deceive American consumers—shouldn't be allowed by the authorities. Japan also has an island where matches are made, and in order to deceive consumers it changed the island's name to Sweden, thus being able to print on its matchboxes, "Made in Sweden." A Japanese village was named Macclesfield, after the famous silk center, and now marks its output "Macclesfield Silk."

\* \* \*

The other day I heard Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt make a little speech in a news reel, and when she came to "infantile paralysis" she pronounced the first word "in-fan-tile," with the accent

on the first syllable. Is this right?

It's the first choice of Webster's New International Dictionary, which also permits the last syllable to be pronounced "ill."

\* \* \*

In his February 1, 1939, broadcast Herbert Hoover used, at least a dozen times, the word "ideology." He pronounced it "id-e-ol-o-gee," the first syllable as in idiot. Is this correct?

Webster's New International Dictionary prefers the first syllable "eye" and the second "dee," with the accent on "eye." Hoover's pronunciation is permissible, but not preferred. Personally, I wince when I hear the word used Hoover's way. Strange to say, this word was first used in political writings by Karl Marx, who meant it to be satirical. He liked to describe a set of visionary ideas, or collections of intellectual bunk, as "ideology." But the world, in taking over the word, prefers to make it mean any organized scheme or pattern of ideas. The word also has had its place in philosophy for more than a century, having been used by Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836) to describe Condillac's theory of the origin of ideas, which derives them exclusively from sensation. Now, we use the word mainly in the political sphere, such as the ideology of Fascism, or Communism, or democracy, and the like. But Marx's acceptance of the word—as visionary speculation, empty theorizing, or an impractical system of theories—is definitely out. The word "bunk" seems to fit better here, and is never misunderstood.

\* \* \*

Did independence for Ireland give the country a free press, free thought and free discussion?

The Dublin government, under Prime Minister Eamon de Valera, soon after it won home rule, wrote into the Constitution that Ireland is a Roman Catholic country. The same document guarantees freedom of worship to other sects, but it cracks down on anything in print that's not acceptable to the Roman Catholic Church. So far as intellectual liberty is concerned, Ireland is still living in the Dark Ages. Conditions are far worse than they were in the days of British rule, when it was possible for a person to express himself on religion, liberalism, birth con-

trol, and the like, without being threatened with fine and imprisonment. Ireland is a priest-ridden country in which a censorship exists that's every bit as bad as the worst intellectual repression in the most brutal Fascist country. The dogmatism of the Roman Catholic Church are protected by the policeman's club and by a censorship that is merciless and ruthless. Orthodoxy in religion, politics and morals must be maintained in harmony with the bigoted standards of a Torquemada. When Ireland was under British rule I never had any trouble shipping my books into the country, but today I'm always finding the most innocent publications barred, let alone works on Freethought, Rationalism, sexology, and the like. Not only do the censors keep out books that represent the Left but they have banned such works as "Anthony Adverse," Louis Bromfield's "The Strange Case of Miss Annie Spragg," Christopher Morley's "Thunder on the Left," and "Three Comrades," by Erich Maria Remarque. The ban on Morley's book is delicious, for if ever there was a milk-and-water author who never expressed an idea capable of offending the most correct parson such a man is the great Christopher Morley, and yet he has been put on the index. I suppose it's that word "Left" in the title that scared the censors. Even a magazine like the American *Physical Culture* isn't permitted to enter the country because of its "daring" pictures of men in jock-straps and women in form-fitting bathing suits. Today's Ireland is so medieval that censors, acting under the authority of the State, demand that proofs of books be submitted in advance before they may be printed anywhere in the land ruled by Eamon de Valera's government. Newspapers don't have to go through this routine—for mechanical reasons, naturally—but they have to watch their step. They have been warned by the Prime Minister that the same kind of censorship imposed on book publishers will be visited on the daily press if the publishers don't watch out for orthodoxy must be preserved. The government's board of censors can't be questioned even in court, its decision being final. Ireland, as a Catholic country, is

choking out every semblance of free intellectual life. Books which circulate in every free country in the world are banned in Ireland because of the power of the Catholic hierarchy. Writers aren't even permitted to say they favor birth control, let alone impart contraceptive information to the reading public.

\* \* \*

Can you recommend a book that will give me an inside view of convent life?

The best one I know of—because it's so truthful and sincere—is "Forgotten Women," by Mrs. Ellen Price, who for years was a nun under the name of Sister Mary Ethel. The book sells at \$1 per copy. Order your copy direct from Mrs. Ellen Price, Box 65, Middleton, Idaho.

\* \* \*

Hitler says that "never have German soldiers fought on American soil unless it was in the cause of independence and freedom." Please comment.

Apparently Hitler doesn't know history. All American schoolboys know about the Hessian mercenaries who fought against the revolutionary army. They were so bloodthirsty that even the British who were paying them protested against their behavior. The French patriot, Mirabeau, when told of what the Hessians were doing in the American colonies, protested:

"What new madness is this? Alas, miserable men, you burn down not the camp of any enemy, but your own hopes. Germans! What brand do you suffer to be put upon your forehead? You war against a people who have never wronged you, who fight for a righteous cause and set you the noblest pattern. . . . There is no crime like the crime against the freedom of the people."

There were other Germans who fought for the Revolution and for the Union in the Civil War. They were the kind of men who, living in Nazi-land, would be persecuted by Hitler and his Brutalitarianism, for their belief in democracy, liberalism, libertarianism and humanitarianism.

\* \* \*

I am grateful to you for introducing me to your newsclip filing system, which has been a great help to me. I begin to understand how you manage to draw on so much data from newspapers and magazines. However, there is one feature about your work that puzzles me. I notice that you quote from hundreds

of books. As your quotations or references are so apt, it occurs to me that you must have worked out a special system for bringing out material from books just when you need it. Can you explain it to me?

The important thing about my work—you see, I write more than 60,000 words each month—is to get it *organized*. It's like any other job. Plumbers, carpenters, machinists, etc., must be masters of their tools, if they're to get anything done. The same goes for any writer, student, teacher, lecturer, and the like. I have worked out a simple method of identifying the material found in books—material I feel sure I'll want to use at some future time. Let's suppose, just by way of illustration, that I'm reading a book on war and that page 299 contains a comment or quotation by Prof. Einstein. I know I'll want it at one time or another. I immediately reach over and get one of my tabs—I like to call them H-J Mark-a-Tabs, because I know of no one else who uses this simple, never-failing, effective, helpful plan to spot facts, dates, comments, opinions, arguments, etc., in the books one reads. A tab is a strip of gummed paper, 14/16ths of an inch wide and two inches long. The tab is scored in the middle, which enables me to fold it over. I then wet both ends and paste them to the page I want identified for future use. This leaves me a tab that extends from the page for almost an inch, plenty of space on which to write: "PEACE, EINSTEIN." When I want that quotation I reach for the book and, bang! it's facing me, practically yelling at me. This system of mine was worked out to meet my needs as a writer who wants to identify everything important he meets in books or magazines, and tab them in such a way that the desired material may be reached in as little as 10 seconds. These H-J Mark-a-Tabs have a hundred uses. You can use them on books and magazines, as outlined above, or you can use them on the sides or tops of loose-leaf note books, ledgers, filing systems, as price tags, signals, and so on. It's funny how a simple, little trick can save a person endless time and effort.

\* \* \*

Will you accept advertising for a well-

recommended proprietary medicine which is able to produce many convincing testimonials?

No. I don't care to run patent medicine advertising of any kind. The Freeman is a good advertising medium for legitimate announcements. The rate—only \$5.60 per column inch—is extremely low. To save bookkeeping, remittances should accompany order.

\* \* \*

Has Stalin ever expressed himself on the anti-Semitism of Hitler?

Joseph Stalin has, on several occasions, made clear the fact that the U.S.S.R. refuses to permit race-baiting of any kind. His most forceful statement on this subject was issued on January 12, 1931, when he was asked for an expression of opinion by the Jewish Telegraph Agency of America. He said:

"Replying to your enquiry, national and race chauvinism is a survival of the man-hating ethics characteristic of the period of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism, as an extreme form of race chauvinism, is the most dangerous survival of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism benefits the exploiters for it serves as a lightning conductor to divert from capitalism the blows of the toilers. Anti-Semitism is dangerous for the toilers, for it is a false track which diverts them from the proper road and leads them into the jungle. Hence, Communists, as consistent internationalists, cannot but be irreconcilable and bitter enemies of anti-Semitism. In the U.S.S.R. anti-Semitism is strictly prosecuted as a phenomenon profoundly hostile to the Soviet system. According to the laws of the U.S.S.R. active anti-Semites are punished with death."

This position taken by Stalin and the Soviet Union is in sharp contrast to what's happening in Hitler's madhouse and in the Russia of the days of the czars. Anyone who expresses publicly sentiments of hatred for other races is guilty of a crime and is subject to a jail sentence anywhere in the Soviet Union; and anyone who commits an overt act against another race—such as stirring up mob action or attempting to lead or participate in any kind of a pogrom—is subject to the death penalty. In Hitler's Germany today the government itself keeps burning the fires of racism and

actually organizes mobs to destroy and kill. The German people are paying bitterly for their lack of vigilance in the days when Hitler was reaching for power. The Nazis were laughed at by many liberal-minded intellectuals. The Jews refused to believe it possible that the lies and libels of Hitler could be accepted by civilized Germans. Poor, deluded people! They didn't realize that Hitler was aiming his hate-philosophy at an entirely different public—a world below the surface of normal German life, an intellectual underworld inhabited by gangsters, hoodlums, persecutors, and exploiters. The leaders of Republican Germany laughed at the poor grammar Hitler used in his speeches and his book, "Mein Kampf." But the cultural underworld drank in every word Hitler uttered, because it was the only language it could understand. Hitler printed the forged Protocols of the Elders of Zion, and the liberal and progressive newspapers and magazines ignored the document because they knew it was a fabrication of the czar's secret police, but the intellectual hoodlums Hitler appealed to believed it. Hitler spread lies and calumnies right and left, and hardly any attempts were made to expose them. The liberal, democratic world has learned its bitter lesson. In this country, for example, the progressive people who hate all forms of Nazism and racism are on the alert to expose and challenge every lie uttered by any would-be dictator or Fascist agitator. The Rev. Gerald B. Winrod got a sample of this watchfulness during the 1938 senatorial campaign in Kansas, when he was greeted with a flood of printed matter that branded him as a liar, race-baiter, and subtle promoter of Nazism. Father Coughlin is now in the limelight with his support of anti-Semitism, but he has found that the thinking people of this country are watching every word that comes from his mouth or pen. His lies are exposed as fast as they leave his lips. The liberal world is on its toes, watching, challenging, and avoiding no phase of the controversy. This is a sign of health. This attitude must be continued. It means that no race-baiter will be permitted to advance

anti-Semitism and Fascism without having each of his sentences analyzed and answered. We refuse to laugh at silly forgeries. We know how dangerous they can be. We refuse to shut our eyes to such lies as the one that presents Benjamin Franklin as an anti-Semite. My readers know how this hoax has been exposed completely and unanswerably. The educated people refused to hide in an Ivory Tower. They stepped into the arena of public discussion and did their duty. Historians joined hands to expose a dangerous lie. That was another sign of health. Other lies will appear from month to month, but they won't be permitted to pass unchallenged. The American people are going to be kept informed from first to last, and in this work all liberal, progressive editors know they can depend on the anti-Fascist public in the U.S. to render moral and financial support in their educational efforts. The men and women in the rank and file want to do their part in the great war to keep the legions of the Dark Ages from making progress in a country that's dedicated to freedom, progress and toleration. Yes, we've learned our lesson. We know now that silence can be dangerous. Lies must be answered. The white light of publicity must be turned on every Coughlin or Winrod who attempts to inject the poison of Nazi anti-Semitism into the American blood-stream.

\* \* \*  
Are our Negroes improving their rate of literacy?

In 1900 45 percent of all American Negroes were illiterate. By 1930 the rate was reduced to 12 percent. If the more backward parts of certain Southern States would spend as much per capita on Negro children as on the whites this showing would be improved materially during the next few years.

\* \* \*  
Send \$2 for a year of H-J News-Letter.

\* \* \*  
What became of the thousands of Italians moved from Italy to Ethiopia?

According to official reports, Mussolini moved 198,344 Italian workers and farmers to Ethiopia, where they were expected to colonize the newly acquired land and produce wealth in abundance. But it didn't work out

according to schedule. *The New Masses*, January 17, 1939, reprints a statement from *France Monde*, Paris, that 93 percent of these colonists, or 185,888, have gone back to Italy. "The workers," it says, "preferred unemployment at home to the hardships encountered in Il Duce's 'promised land.'"

\* \* \*  
 What percentage of the American people favor a boycott of Nazi goods?

According to a survey conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion, in January, 1939, 61 percent of our people favor boycotting German goods.

\* \* \*  
 Is it true that one of Adolf (Pansy) Hitler's scientists has decided, after considerable research, that he and his fellow Nordics have the most kissable mouths in the world?

Yes, that's true. You'll find this tremendous discovery in "New Bases for Racial Research," by Hermann Gauch, a Nazi professor. Here are his precise words:

The Nordic mouth is superior to any other kind. Inasmuch as red is an attractive color in itself, the clear redness of the Nordic mouth exudes a great power of attraction, and awakens a desire for conquest and for kisses. As a matter of fact the Nordic mouth simply calls for a kiss. The non-Nordic mouth, on the other hand, with its thick open lips manifests sexual desire, and, accompanied by a wild, evil and sarcastic look, makes one think only of lubricious orgies.

Hitler should dissolve that one in his douche-bag.

\* \* \*  
 I heard a short-wave broadcast from Nazi Germany the other day, in which it was asserted that the regime never resorts to torture. Please comment.

That denial will fool no student of affairs. I have, during the past six years, printed hundreds of columns of facts which brand the Nazi Brutalitarianism as mass-murderers. The evidence is convincing. Only a lying propagandist would try to deny the truth. The other day, January 12, 1939, I read a summary of a speech on Nazi savagery delivered by Heinrich Bruening, former chancellor of Germany, and now on the faculty of Harvard, from which I quote:

"I cannot even tell the story of

the secret state police and the fate of many of my dearest friends. It is hard to imagine to what depths human depravity can sink. . . .

"Cells have been lined with electric light bulbs so a prisoner feels as though he were dying of thirst. At the same time he is forced to listen continually to recorded speeches of Goering.

"Very few persons can stand that for more than three or four months. Persons cannot stand this modern system of torture, this continual fright. . . . After three days of it I have seen a man come out looking like a man of 70 with whitened hair."

Naturally, propagandists have to gloss over such appalling situations, and the best thing to do, under the circumstances, is to deny they exist. Or, if one has a mind to, he can use the method adopted by a London religious journal, *Church Times*, which told how that delightful humanitarian, King John, tortured his victims without the slightest feeling of malice or hatred. Here's how the *Church Times* worded it:

"The popular account of King John's financial dealings with Jewry is that he imprisoned wealthy Hebrews and had their teeth extracted in instalments until they yielded to his extortions. In all this, however, there are extenuations for King John. The Government had to be maintained out of the royal patrimony. There was then no comprehensive and well-ordered system of rates and taxes. Nor did he deprive them of the means of livelihood or cause them to be 'beaten up.' His tooth-drawing was not sadistic, but a practical and comparatively mild way of exercising financial pressure. There was nothing malicious or destructive in it."

It must have cheered the prisoners when they were told their teeth were being yanked out in the spirit of love, that it was all done constructively and without malice. It comforts one to know that such acts are done lightly, artistically, and impersonally.

\* \* \*  
 Is it true that our national debt is limited to \$45,000,000,000 by the Constitution?

No. However, it's a fact that we are held to the debt limit you name. In 1917, Congress passed a statute which says our national debt mustn't

go beyond \$45,000,000,000. However, since Congress set the limit it has the power to change it.

\* \* \*

How many workers and establishments do we need to take care of our food industry?

In 1938, the food industry (which employs every third person directly or indirectly, full time or part time) required 48,936 food processors employing 970,000 people; 862,289 retail stores with 1,158,000 workers; thousands of wholesalers, employing 392,000; 1,250,000 restaurant workers. Total pay-roll in these departments of the food industry, \$1,651,498,000.

\* \* \*

List the countries from which immigrants may enter the U.S. free of quota restrictions.

Canada, Mexico, Newfoundland, Haiti, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Republic of Panama, and all Central and South American independent countries.

\* \* \*

Are the questions in the H-J News-Letter just a rehash of subjects treated in your volumes of questions and answers? If not, I would be interested in a subscription.

The material used in the H-J News-Letter is entirely original. Under no circumstances would I consider editing a periodical that isn't devoted to fresh topics. Nothing would kill the H-J News-Letter faster than to turn it out indifferently. This new publication is a serious project and I aim to make it an important medium. As a general thing, the H-J News-Letter will devote itself to consumers' problems, while The Freeman will cover a more general field, including international affairs, race-baiting, Fascism, democracy, Freethought, and the like.

\* \* \*

I agree with you when you say Father Coughlin is a Fascist. But what I'd like to know is whether or not the Fascists themselves recognize him as one of their kind.

I've already shown that the Nazis look on Father Coughlin as an American "hero." His anti-Semitic, anti-Roosevelt speeches are usually quoted generously in Hitler's press. On Sunday, January 16, 1939, Father Coughlin, laying off anti-Semitism for once, turned his guns on Loyalist Spain,

against which he hurled the usual bunk about "Communism" and closed with an appeal to his hearers to pour telegrams into Washington in support of the Fascist side, the form of endorsement being a demand that Congress shall refuse to reconsider its arms embargo against the Loyalists. Since the Spanish Insurgents get all the munitions they need from Hitler and Mussolini, an embargo by the U.S. can mean only one thing, and that's discrimination against the democratic forces and help for the Franco Fascists. The next day something like 100,000 telegrams flooded Washington. This open help for Fascism drew praise for Coughlin from *Il Regime Fascista*, edited by Roberto Farinacci, former secretary of the Fascist Party of Italy. On January 17, this Fascist newspaper characterized Coughlin as a man who "appreciates our line of conduct. Italians cannot fail to express their sympathy to this apostle of Christianity." Yes, Coughlin stands high in Germany and Italy.

\* \* \*

Let me suggest that you reprint that magnificent article about you in the January, 1939, Public Opinion Quarterly.

Princeton University, which publishes the learned magazine, *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, certainly spread itself when it gave 13 solid pages to my life, my opinions, and my work as editor, publisher and writer. It's going to take a long time before my head gets back to normal. As for reprinting it, I've decided the proper place for it is in an early issue of the *H-J News-Letter*. Watch for it there. If you're not a subscriber, take the hint. And do it now, while there's still time to have your subscription begin with Vol. 1., No. 1. The price? A mere \$2 per year. Oh, yes, while I think of it—a year consists of 24 issues.

\* \* \*

Editor: In regard to the letter of Harry C. Ryan, appearing in your March, 1939, issue, I wish to say that I, for one, should like to see you continue giving the same amount of space to readers' letters as you have been, and to put more instead of less stress on Freethought. I feel that, considering how few periodicals approach this subject in the manner of The Freeman, it cannot be dispensed with. I intend to

continue being a regular reader of this paper, but if Rationalism is to be disregarded, it will lose its greatest appeal to me.

H. DONALD WEISENSALE  
McSherrystown, Pa.

\* \* \*  
Is there any emotional difference between brunettes and blondes?

No. Nor red-heads. I hope this is the last time I'm to answer this question.

\* \* \*  
Thanks for facts about the Cliveden set. But you didn't tell us how to pronounce it.

Cleev-den.

\* \* \*  
Do you consider Joe Penner funny?

No. His "humor" is the saddest thing that comes over the radio.

\* \* \*  
How many insurance policies of all types are in effect in this country?  
118,000,000.

\* \* \*  
Editor: In a recent book, "If I Were a Jew," by William Harmon Black, much valuable information is given concerning the plight of the Jews. I would like to quote a passage: "If there is unwarranted prejudice against the Jews, how shall we treat it? What is a fair remedy, a really effective remedy? The writer believes that the only way to fight anti-Jewish propaganda is to first throw the searchlight of truth full flare upon it; to give its history, its motives, its results, the kinds of men responsible for it, its baleful effects on the countries that have been guilty of it, and then to point out that it is a prairie fire which, started only to burn up one man's field, may destroy a whole territory." The Freeman is one of the few papers in this country which fully exposes and brings to light the lies of anti-Jewish propaganda. The above paragraph gives us the reason why The Freeman should be more widely read.

Whitesburg, Tenn. ALTON J. DAY

\* \* \*  
"While I think of it; why has no one thought to ask Father Coughlin, when he vociferously asserts that Nazism and Fascism were only defense-mechanisms against Communism, against what was Communism a defense-mechanism? Clerical and capitalistic exploitation? Our clerical demagogues are careful not to bring that up."—W. Matthews, Del.

\* \* \*  
Editor: I was greatly impressed by the manner in which you treated the Coughlin menace in the March, 1939, issue of The Freeman. I think it is the first time that many of us have had any

real information about the actual attitude of the Catholic hierarchy and clergy towards the Jews. Intolerance to any group should be handled in the same way. Any fair-minded person must inevitably reach the conclusion that a free press is the only possible method by which such scourges of humanity as Coughlin, Winrod, etc., can be successfully exposed in a democratic country.

It is with the painful realization that you, with too few exceptions, have borne the brunt of this fight so long, that I must shake off the feeling of hopelessness and start fighting again. I say again, because at one time I took an active interest in the fight for Social Democracy, tolerance and decency. I was an active stump speaker for the Socialist party since I came to my senses after completing my legal training in 1928. The mental lethargy and stupidity of the workers caused me to become discouraged to the point of cynicism in my dealings with them, both as a Socialist and as a labor counsel. I still retain my membership in the S.P. and L.I.D.

With regard to your request for reader comment on the limitation of space on Freethought and readers' letters in The Freeman, I should not like to see space on Freethought limited. Of course, the only real solution of the problem is a greatly enlarged paper so both may be included. If, as you say, this is not at present feasible, then limit the space given to reader-comment in favor of space devoted to Freethought. I am emphatic about this. I feel that Freethought and free inquiry in all phases of human endeavor and thought is the only ultimate salvation of civilization. Therefore space must not be limited at the expense of those things that count most. Of course, I do not imply by this that I agree with everything you say. I sometimes think that your conclusions are "whacky," yet, I must, in all fairness, say that your facts and conclusions are generally sound. . . . If I may be of service to you in your struggle for a free press, please do not fail to call on me.

BENJAMIN L. GROSSMAN  
Somerville, Mass.

\* \* \*  
"Salaries of government executives are paid by taxation of the American people. A poll by the American Institute of Public Opinion showed that Americans were overwhelmingly in favor of lifting the embargo against democratic Spain. But the government officials who had the power to lift the embargo ignored public opinion and were influenced (according to writers in The Nation and New Republic) by the Catholic clerical group, who, curiously

enough, do not pay one cent of taxes although they own millions of dollars worth of property. Is it any wonder the masses are distrustful of their leaders?"  
—Reader.

\* \* \*

Editor: Do you see anything wrong with the expression "chiroquacker"? It sounded good yesterday when it first occurred to me, and it still sounds good. If you feel about it as I do, I believe you can make use of it in The Freeman.

Minneapolis, Minn. E. W. Jackson  
(Editor's note: It sounds all right to me. I'll try it out in some pieces I write on the bunk of chiropractic.)

\* \* \*

Editor: As most of your readers regard The Freeman as a light in this age of superstition, I suggest that you do not case up on Freethought. If the supernaturally revealed religion cannot withstand the light of scientific and controversial discussion it is then incomplete and deserves to give way to something better. Why must its errors be considered inviolate and its mysticism ever veiled? Civilization in its upward climb must some day shelve this unfit veneration and strive to give reality to its ideals.

On the other point: How can we express our views on these vital questions if the few media through which we can express ourselves be closed? I say encourage the readers' letters.  
Arlington, Wash. F. M. JOHNSON

\* \* \*

I agree with your appeal to the American public to boycott Nazi goods. I suggest that you discuss this subject more fully.

Every American can boycott the goods produced in the lands of Fascist aggression. Under Federal law, all articles must have their source identified, if they're to be imported. Look over each article carefully, and if you see that it was made in Germany, Italy or Japan, refuse to buy it, and be sure to tell the clerk or manager why. If you should make a mistake and buy Fascist merchandise and not discover it until you get home, take the goods back and request an exchange or refund, giving your reason for the action. Never patronize Nazi services of any kind, including ships. You will find that most merchants are happy to cooperate once they understand the issue. If retailers sense large public sentiment favoring a boycott they won't risk losing their customers by insulting them with Nazi goods. Many

great department stores are boycotting Nazi goods, but I'm sorry to say that other large stores and chains refuse to join in this humanitarian campaign to keep trade from a country that is civilization's sworn foe. I refer to such concerns as W. T. Grant, S. S. Kresge Co., S. H. Kress, Marshall Field and Company, Montgomery Ward, and F. W. Woolworth. So far as I know, Sears Roebuck handles no German goods. The work of boycotting Germany is being conducted by the Joint Boycott Council, 151 W. 40th St., N.Y.C., to whom inquiries should be directed for full lists of goods and services that originate in the land of the Brutalitarian. This is a peaceful way to DECLARE WAR ON HITLER. The boycott can be a powerful weapon for peace, decency and justice. The Fascist aggressors must have foreign exchange in order to buy the various raw materials needed in their armaments industry. By refusing to accept their goods you make it impossible for the Fascists to buy in as large quantities as they would if you were to patronize dealers who sell their goods. That's why I urge readers to refuse to buy anything made in Nazi Germany or any other Fascist country. Don't give Hitler and his brand of mass-murderers the money that will help them plunge the world into war and destruction. There isn't an article imported from Nazi Germany that can't be had from American or other democratic sources. For the sake of civilization and justice—BOYCOTT NAZI GERMANY. The Joint Boycott Council has issued a ringing statement on this subject, from which I quote:

#### AMERICANS ON THE ALERT!

Hitler's agents are disseminating the poisonous virus of race-hatred and religious oppression in our country. Recently at its fifth annual convention, the German-American Bund, official Nazi organization in the United States, issued a statement declaring that "our battle is the battle of all the hundred million Aryan (white gentile) citizens of these United States," and that this battle "will be won." Lovers of American democratic traditions must see to it that this will never happen here.

LOVERS OF PEACE! Do you wish to stop Hitler aggression, the cancerous growth which menaces world peace?

Do you wish to stem the onward march of Nazi militarism which has crushed Austria, overwhelmed the democracy of Czechoslovakia and is bringing us nearer and nearer to the brink of world disaster?

**FREE MEN!** Do you want to become the victims of Nazi propaganda? Shall Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, because of their religious faith, be persecuted as they are in Germany? Shall our religious leaders be imprisoned as were Niemoeller and numerous other priests in Germany because they refuse to give up their faith and to subordinate religion to the State?

**WORKERS!** Do you want to be slaves of a system of forced labor at coolie wages? Do you want a government which forbids wage-increase and persecutes employers who raise wages?

Do you know that because of these inhuman long hours, low wages, high prices, and lack of proper food (because guns are more important than butter in the Nazi Paradise) sickness has increased 30 to 40 percent among workers and their families as compared with the worst depression years? That under Hitler's war prosperity the death-rate is higher than it was in 1932, when there were millions of unemployed?

**CONSUMERS!** Do you know that under Hitler's "recovery" the consumption of meat, eggs, and fats, per capita, was lower in 1937 than in 1932—during the worst unemployment and depression period?

Do you want such Nazi "achievements" for your families and children? Do you want food-substitutes and breadlines?

**WOMEN!** Do you know that women in Germany today have no voice in the community, and that "woman is man's servant," according to the Nazi Slogan? German women who under the Republic occupied prominent positions in public life and in business have been degraded to subordinate work and are getting only about half the wages which their male colleagues receive. The hard-working, humiliated, undernourished female workers are also compelled to bring more and more children into the world as cannon-fodder for Hitler's war program.

**MOTHER!** Do you want your young boys and girls to be educated for war in our schools, as they are in Germany?

Do you know that boys and girls of 10 years of age are compelled to join the military camps of Hitler's youth army?

**TAXPAYERS!** Do you want your government to tax away 42 percent of the national income as Hitler does?

**AMERICANS!** We all want our workers to have a decent standard of living and good food; we want our women to participate as equal citizens in promoting the welfare of our nation.

We do not want war, we want peace! We therefore fight Nazism and all its un-American and militaristic activities.

In order to further this humanitarian **BOYCOTT MOVEMENT** among readers of this publication I request you to sign and mail to my office the following pledge:

E. Haldeman-Julius, Box 168,  
Girard, Kansas.

I pledge myself to **BOYCOTT** all goods imported from Nazi Germany, Italy and Japan.

Name .....

Address .....

City .....

State .....

\* \* \*

I approve of your constant efforts to defend and preserve civil rights, the foundations of our democratic institutions. As you know, conditions regarding civil rights vary in the large and small cities. Have you any data showing the extent to which civil rights are observed or violated?

This question has been studied by the American Civil Liberties Union, one of my pet organizations. From its headquarters at 31 Union Square West, N.Y.C., questionnaires were sent to the mayor, chief of police, superintendent of schools and city counselor, as well as to correspondents of the Union, in 959 places. Three hundred and thirty-two replied, representing a population of over 36,000,000, which is more than half of the urban population in the U.S.

As we can well imagine, conditions differ widely in various sections and communities. We have civil rights presumably guaranteed to us by our Constitution, but this nation-wide survey shows no city in the U.S. achieves more than a 50 percent observance. A special study of 332 cities of over 10,000 population showed that not even those ranked as "very good"—Cleveland, New York, St. Louis and 39 smaller communities—make a

score of over 50 percent, according to the A.C.L.U. Revealing a wide variance in the condition of civil liberties, the report shows that "nothing in geography, economics or politics yields a yardstick. Regardless of constitutions, charters, legislatures, courts, laws and decisions both federal and State, civil rights in a community stand just about as local forces themselves maintain them."

"The right of free speech apparently suffers less assault than any other, and, as seems always to have been the case, the closely related right of public assembly is the most universally disregarded." Three out of five cities in the United States make no more than a "creditable showing" in observing all the requirements of complete freedom of speech, press and assembly, on a rating scale devised by the survey for purposes of comparison, the A.C.L.U. reports. In addition to the 42 cities classed as "very good," 152 rank "good" and the remainder are "fair" to "very bad." Little Rock, Ark., New Orleans, La., Tampa, Fla., and Jersey City received the worst rating. In order of general excellence, the 13 largest cities rate as follows: "Very good": Cleveland, New York, St. Louis. "Good": San Francisco, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh. "Fair": Buffalo, Philadelphia, Baltimore. "Poor": Chicago, Boston. "Very poor": Detroit, Los Angeles. Generally, the survey shows "conditions are probably better in the Northwest than in other sections of the country—but not much better. A greater respect for the Bill of Rights, by and large, exists in the largest cities of the country as well as the smallest, but it is worse in the middle-size cities." Replies to questionnaires indicated that "the right of public assembly is less satisfactorily observed than any of the others." Moreover, the Union pointed out, "the almost certain fact is that the situation is worse than the survey shows. Cleveland is the only city rated as 'very good' in its handling of public assemblage, yet even here Nazis are denied permits for meetings in public schools." As to free speech, the survey inquired as to whether there were local ordinances or regulations prohibiting the expression of specified doctrines and wheth-

er speakers had been interfered with by police or private groups taking the law into their own hands. All 13 of the biggest cities and almost all of the others of from 10,000 to 500,000 population are rated "good." On the freedom of the press issue, which covered official control of leaflet distribution and matter sold at newsstands, authorities revealed that "almost everywhere distribution of leaflets can be barred on the ground that they litter the streets." As to censorship of radio, theater and movies, New York City alone is rated "very good." Only Los Angeles, St. Louis and San Francisco, among the large cities, report that they have no form of censorship, state or local. All 13 of the biggest cities claim to give adequate freedom for picketing "despite the record to the contrary in certain cities such as Chicago and Los Angeles." In cities of the smaller population groups, picketing conditions are worse on the whole.

The facts certainly prove that even with our constitutional guarantees, we lovers of civil freedom must keep constantly on guard against the encroachments of those who have sinister reasons for wanting to interfere with our precious rights. The discouraging condition about this question of civil rights is the way so many people accept without protest the unconstitutional acts of tin-pot, cockroach-sized Mussolinis. The truth, of course, is that only a minority cares a hoot what happens to the Bill of Rights. After all, what do millions of ignoramuses care about the right to free speech when they haven't anything to say? What do these same yokels care about the building of a free, independent, progressive, liberal press when they have available the printed glories of the Macfadden, Hearst and McCormick presses? But the minority that believes in the Bill of Rights is highly vocal and stands ready to fight for its preservation. These civil rights—which have been our most prized possession for a century and a half—are still far from becoming living realities, as the above survey shows. But at least we're on our way, marching in the direction of freedom. Civil rights can't be given a people; they have to be demanded, and even

then they come in small doses. However, we have little to complain about, for we have the power to enforce our demand for 100 percent civil liberties. If we don't ask for more than 50 percent, under the best conditions, we have nobody to blame but ourselves. We need, above all, a powerful, fearless, independent press to help defend our civil liberties. Those cities which have some good newspapers—such as New York, Cleveland and St. Louis—enjoy greater civil rights than those cities which are cursed with nothing but reactionary, liberty-hating, labor-baiting sheets. The lesson here is to give support to even more liberal forms of journalism, for, as the survey quoted above proves, our civil liberties are still to be achieved on a scale that approaches sincere and full acceptance of our constitutional guarantees. Even liberal papers like the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* can't hide their indebtedness to the advertising interests, most leaders of which being reactionaries who look with suspicion on any suggestion that the people be given greater civil rights. The fight must be carried to its logical conclusion—the creation of a free press that's absolutely above and beyond the influence of the men who release heavy advertising schedules. I know I've preached this sermon a hundred times, but that doesn't change the fact that the point is important. A free press is needed to serve as a loyal guardian over our Bill of Rights.

\* \* \*

How many firms in the U.S. are engaged in motion picture production?

More than 200.

\* \* \*

Editor: In his message to Congress, January 4, 1939, President Roosevelt said:

"Storms from abroad directly challenge three institutions indispensable to Americans, now as always. The first is religion. It is the source of the other two—democracy and international good faith. Religion, by teaching man his relationship to God, gives the individual a sense of his own dignity and teaches him to respect himself by respecting his neighbors."

Is it necessary to bring up again how little dignity and self-respect the individual was permitted to have in the

Age of Faith, and to point out that if religion in itself bred democracy, why was there no vestige of democracy during the Dark and Middle Ages; not until the Freethinkers and skeptics began to appear?

President Roosevelt continued:

"Where freedom of religion has been attacked, the attack has come from sources opposed to democracy. Where democracy has been overthrown, the spirit of free worship has disappeared. And where religion and democracy have vanished, good faith and reason in international affairs have given way to strident ambition and brute force. An ordering of society which relegates religion, democracy and good faith among nations to the background can find no place within it for the Ideals of the Prince of Peace. The U.S. rejects such an ordering and retains its ancient faith.

"There comes a time in the affairs of men when they must prepare to defend not their homes alone but the tenets of faith and humanity on which their churches, their governments and their very civilization are founded. The defense of religion, of democracy and of good faith among nations are all the same fight. To save one we must now make up our minds to save all."

A great many of us are curious to know exactly what all this means. If the President means that every American is entitled to worship as he sees fit, well and good; no sane person will quarrel with that. But if he means that there can be no democracy where there is no religion, can he blame us for saying "balderdash"? The most superficial scrutiny of history proves the contrary, particularly as to the Roman Catholic religion. Name any country in the grip of the Catholic Church, and do you find democracy there? Did religion take the side of democracy in the Spanish struggle?

I am also curious to know just what is our ancient faith. Another President, John Adams, said, "This would be the best of all possible worlds, if there were no religion in it;" and Thomas Jefferson referred to Christianity as "superstition," calling the clergy "cannibal priests." This should confound those who claim there can be no democracy without religion! This from the Father of Democracy himself! Can you fancy a President of our time making such statements? But of course those were the days of real American freedom, when Americans had not learned to quake under the menacing eye of Rome. Wilmington, Del. W. MATTHEWS

Is it true that Father Coughlin's magazine, "Social Justice," is printed in a scab shop?

Yes. Coughlin's anti-Semitic, anti-labor publication has been put on the unfair list by the Michigan Federation of Labor. Father Coughlin, until recently semi-Fascist, is now completely pro-Fascist. I want to take this opportunity to discuss another point brought up by several readers. As I've stated before, Father Coughlin isn't an American citizen. Pro-Coughlinites have challenged this statement. I want to assure them the statement is true. Coughlin was born in Canada of American parentage. Under our laws, Coughlin could have been made an American citizen had his father registered the fact at any American consulate in Canada, but such a declaration was never made, which means Coughlin (having reached his majority in Canada) automatically became a Canadian citizen. He has never taken out U.S. citizenship papers in the U.S., insisting he's a citizen of our country, but the facts clearly show him to be an alien—an enemy alien, in fact, because he hates our democracy, progressiveness and liberalism.

\* \* \*

Recently, a woman apologist for Mussolini, in a radio address, said Il Duce's tremendous popularity with the masses is proved almost daily by the immense turnouts whenever the chief Fascist shows up anywhere. What do you say about this?

The demonstrations are pumped up affairs, as can be shown from an official paper reprinted in *Giustizia e Libertà*, the Italian anti-Fascist journal published in Paris. The people are ordered to form gigantic demonstrations, and the expense—always a big item—must be borne by the common people, who already have been compelled to accept a lower standard of living. These "wild" demonstrations are built on threats and blackmail. If any readers have any doubts on this point let them read a circular sent out to various bodies in a city about to be visited by Mussolini. Here it is:

No. 3669/36

Trieste

Object: Visit of the Duce

The news of the impending visit of the Duce has filled the hearts of all—city and country folk alike—

with deep joy and legitimate pride; preparations are already under way to demonstrate with timely manifestations the gratitude and jubilation of the citizens of Trieste for the privilege and high honor bestowed upon them.

The members of the Federation, cognizant of the fact that they owe their all to the inspired and impassioned work of the Duce, do not wish to be outdone by others in the manifestation of their feelings upon the arrival of the Head of the Government. Therefore they have planned a program in which, we feel certain, every one without distinction, will feel the need of taking part.

The realization of this program, which will be announced later, requires certain funds which will be collected as follows: a Union official will be sent to the collector's office in order to enable members, when they pay their dues, to subscribe whatever amount they may deem fit. The official will suggest the approximate sum to be given by each member.

The unions reserve for themselves the right to report to their superiors in rank the names of those members who have generously answered this appeal as well as the names of those who, whether totally or only partially, have failed.

Long live the Duce!

The President, Paolo Marcozzi

Just how enthusiastic and spontaneous—pardon the word!—would this demonstration have been if the organized Fascists hadn't bull-dozed and blackmailed the people into putting up the money and showing up to cheer themselves hoarse? Mussolini's popularity is maintained by swinging clubs and dark threats.

\* \* \*

I think you are right in demanding public regulation of the great corporations that are monopolies. I suggest that you show the extent of their economic, industrial and financial influence.

Before giving my reader the data he asks for let me correct one misstatement. I never said I was in favor of the regulation of the big-scale industries, systems of transportation, communication, exchange, etc. Instead, I've shown that regulation is a big blunder. It doesn't work. They're too big to be regulated. The solution—well, I'll get to that a little later in this article. First, let me show to what extent the great corporations

rule the United States. The data below are taken from a survey made by the Federal Trade Commission, having been summarized by Irving B. Altman, editor of *Dynamic America*:

In banking, 1 percent of the banks control 89 percent of the banking resources of the country.

In matches, two companies dominate the field.

In moving pictures, three companies dominate the field.

In electric power, four groups dominate the field.

In bread, four companies have 25 percent of production.

In meat-packing, two companies have 50 percent of production.

In steel, nine companies have 80 percent of mill capacity, of which the U.S. Steel Corporation has 40 percent.

In glass, four companies dominate the field.

In sulphur, two companies control all the production.

In rubber, four companies dominate the field.

In anthracite coal, eight companies produce 80 percent of the total tonnage.

In farm implements, International Harvester has 50 percent of the U.S. production.

The Ford and General Motors Companies have 75 percent of the U.S. auto production.

The International Nickel Company owns 90 percent of the world reserves.

The American Telephone and Telegraph Company owns 80 percent of the U.S. telephone service.

The Western Union Telegraph Company owns 75 percent of the U.S. telegraph service.

The U.S. Steel Corporation owns 75 percent of the iron-ore reserves in the U.S.

Five percent of the water-power companies control 75 percent of the developed waterpower.

Five percent of the anthracite companies own 78 percent of all recoverable tonnage.

Five percent of iron and steel companies own 95 percent of the iron-ore reserves in the country.

Five percent of the petroleum companies own 50 percent of the petroleum reserves.

Five percent of manufacturing companies produce 65 percent of the value of manufactures.

Five percent of the wholesale establishments do 45 percent of all wholesale business.

Five percent of the retail estab-

lishments do 45 percent of all retail business.

**FIVE PERCENT OF ALL CORPORATIONS RECEIVE 86 PERCENT OF ALL CORPORATE INCOME.**

**FIVE PERCENT OF ALL CORPORATIONS OWN 77 PERCENT OF ALL CORPORATE ASSETS.**

Ever since the days of Teddy Roosevelt attempts have been made to regulate these vast economic organizations, and instead of controlling them, the mighty corporations bossed the regulators. Instead of treating the problem superficially, we should get down to cases. All corporations—whether in production, distribution, or exchange—should be socialized (owned by the people, through their government) whenever they assume near-monopoly proportions. In short, let the nation own the big-scale industries. Notice, please, that I always qualify the demand with the reservation that socialization shall be applied only to the big-scale industries. That's because I believe they're the only forms of economic organization that the people as a whole should own and run democratically. All small businesses should be left where they are—in the hands of their private owners. Let's not make the vast mistake of the Soviet Union and socialize everything from a vast power plant down to the gale of a pair of shoe-laces. I've said again and again, during the last two decades, that the Soviet Union was making a mistake in outlawing all forms of private enterprise. First, it isn't economical for the government to try to run everything. There are thousands of businesses that simply must be run by individuals if they're not to go into the red. In the case of the Soviet Union (a social order to which I have always been friendly despite points of disagreement), I estimate there are something like 40,000,000 people in that country who are simply unable to fit into the government's socialized economy. They would be far more useful to the country if they were put on their own. Many of them would go into private business, where they would be happily engaged, would make it easier for consumers to get the goods that are difficult to obtain now, and would throw additional revenue to the gov-

ernment through common, income and inheritance taxes. I believe the reason Stalin doesn't permit small enterprise is purely political. He's afraid large commercial strata will, in time, demand political representation. The answer here, of course, is that large blocs engaged in useful projects have a perfect right to political representation, provided they don't misuse their privileges of citizenship and don't conspire to corrupt or destroy the majority which prefers socialization. In our own country, we can let the little fellows alone, concentrating on the big companies, which should be compelled to sell their holdings to the people—with the water squeezed out, of course. Each industry, socialized, could issue bonds against its holdings and thereby compensate the owners, paying for the bonds from year to year out of the revenue of the industry, thus making it possible, in time, to own all large-scale industries free of debt. We must avoid the Teddy Roosevelt brand of trust-busting and the Franklin D. Roosevelt brand of trust-regulating. Both are wrong. Of the two, the former is the more dangerous, for nothing could do the country greater harm than to compel our great economic organizations to go out of business entirely or to submit to being cut into numerous small units. Big business is desirable because it's scientific, economical, progressive—especially if big business is the property of a democratic people. The trouble with big business today is that it's owned by the wrong people. My readers needn't be told that in addition to lending my modest ability as a journalist to the task of educating the public to the acceptance of the policy of socially-owned big-scale business I have, with complete consistency, urged that the cooperative movement be given every possible support. The reason here is very simple. If the people are to own the large-scale instruments of production, then it follows that facilities will have to be provided for the fair distribution of what our industries produce. Here the cooperative movement can step in and do a good job, especially after it makes greater headway than it has during the past

few years, proves its managerial skill, and develops enough new personnel to be able to take over new jobs of distributing consumers' goods under the principles outlined for true cooperatives. There's no doubt in my mind that before very long, after the big industries are socialized, the cooperatives could take over all the chain stores and run them for the good of the consumers and not for private gain. Think what it would mean to consumers if cooperatives pledged to distributing goods on a non-profit basis were to gain control of such vast organizations as the A and P food stores, the Woolworth, Kresge, Kress, and other chains, and, of course, the vast mail order houses. If we Americans will face our problems realistically we won't have to go on fools' chases. We can avoid the stupidity of following quack politicians like Dr. Townsend and the other gentlemen who propose hurry-up, visionary schemes for saving humanity overnight. Monopoly is all right, as I've said before, if only the people own it. Any scheme that aims to leave the monopolies in private hands and diverts public attention by proposing utopian pension schemes and new ways of printing money, and the like, are really keeping our people from achieving economic emancipation.

\* \* \*

Editor: De Valera is soon to visit the U.S.A. What for? A Chamberlain tool—to win Irish-American sympathy for the "peace dove"—the old umbrella rascal—"Nev" Chamberlain—whose father sold war material to the Boers and then made war on them; the old rascal (Nev) who is deeply interested financially in the British armament "business"; the old fox who has, for instance, 12,000 shares in the German Dye Trust; the old snake-blooded scoundrel who sold every principle for which we fought (I served three years in first-line trenches during the Great War) during the 1914-18 butchery. British Imperialism is playing a double-game: (a) if the Cliveden set plot is successful, then the U.S.A. will be the next victim (after Russia is defeated and plundered); (b) British Imperialism is playing "friend" of the U.S.A. in case of a German double-cross.

READER

\* \* \*

Editor: De Valera, Ireland's Prime Minister, and the Vatican boys in Ire-

land, hate the Irish Republicans as much as Father Coughlin hates the C.I.O., the Communists, and the Jewish people. And all this hate has the same basis—the hatred of social progress.

The Irish Republican Party is out to establish an Irish Workers' and peasants' republic. The leaders of this party know Ireland's enemies—Vaticanism, British Imperialism, Irish Capitalism, and Protestantism. Lord Craignavon is a tool of British Imperialism and Irish Protestantism. De Valera is a tool of the Vatican and Irish Capitalism.

John Bull needs Ireland as a food depot in case of war; that suits the Irish capitalists and the Irish priests. They will get lots of "blood money" from England (in case of war) for Irish farm products. But the Irish Republicans are opposed to helping British Imperialism in any way, particularly when said ism is in a tight corner.

De Valera recognized the conquest of Ethiopia by Mussolini; he recognized the Franco regime in Spain; he stood four-square behind the Munich plotters; he ordered a Te Deum to be celebrated in Dublin thanking God for the fall of Barcelona. Just think of it! Ireland (700 years under the heel of British Imperialism) now praises God for the massacre of the Coptic Christians of Ethiopia, the Catholic people of Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia, by Italian-German-Mohammedan bandits. How Vaticanism can pollute the minds (blurred with superstition) of the "emancipators" of Ireland!

De Valera is the most dangerous political stooge Ireland has had in 700 years; he is a Fascist, a grafter, a religious nincompoop, a coward and a traitor.

Toronto, Can. PAT O. SULLIVAN

I was pleased over the nice compliment you paid the movie star, Melvyn Douglas, for his interest in democratic processes. Do you believe his attitude is merely one of generalizations or is it a deep interest in the practical aspects of the problems of modern social life?

Just how deep Mr. Douglas is able to go, I don't know, having never had occasion to study him first-hand, but a report from California gives me reason to believe this splendid supporter of our democratic, progressive policies understands that one's ideals, to have any tangible value, must be translated into living realities. I have already shown how he acted as a leader in support of Loyalist Spain. Early in February, 1939, Governor Olson—a forward-looking, honest, fearless liberal—appointed Mr. Doug-

las a member of the California State Relief Administration and the State Welfare Board, where he will be given opportunities to perform concrete tasks in support of the campaign to protect democracy by making it work for the poorest members of the community. After naming him, Governor Olson said:

"Mr. Douglas' activities among the unemployed have shown an understanding of their problems and an appreciation of their needs. He has made a thorough study with Congressman Jerry Voorhis, John Steinbeck and others, of the needs of agricultural workers. He is fully committed to work for the rehabilitation of human beings."

Progressives everywhere hope Mr. Douglas will buckle down and get a lot of good work done. He's already shown that it isn't necessary to be an intellectual non-entity in order to be a top-flight movie star.

\* \* \*

Editor: Anthony Eden visited the U.S. to win the sympathy of the American people in case Chamberlain's buddy—Hitler—double-crosses the Cliveden set. If this double-cross takes place, Chamberlain will step down and Eden will step up; and the American people may say: "Good! A real 'democrat' is now Prime Minister of England." Poppycock! Eden, when foreign minister, was used as a decoy-duck by the Cliveden set; it was this gentleman who was responsible more than any other person for the embargo ("non-intervention") on food and paraphernalia of war for Loyalist Spain; while, on the other hand, all democratic nations poured war material into rebel Spain. The heroic Loyalists of Spain were defeated in the greater part of Spain by the combined forces of world Capitalism (including, of course, Fascism). But Capitalism will yet pay dearly for the betrayal of democratic Spain; this betrayal will be the future driving force of Soviet Russia and the workers of the world in the great class struggle now looming larger and larger on the horizon.

CANADIAN READER

\* \* \*

As you say, everytime Hitler makes a speech he pays lip-service to peace. I suggest that you compile brief sentences from all his main speeches, showing that each nod at peace was nothing more than window-dressing.

Hitler's technique is to disarm world opinion by assurances he has nothing in mind but peace and harmony. Here's the proof, taken from

official versions of Hitler's speeches:

MAY 13, 1933—"Germany will tread no other path than that laid down by the treaties. . . . The German people have no thought of invading any country."

JANUARY 30, 1934—"After the Saar question has been settled the German Government is ready to accept not only the letter but the spirit of the Locarno Pact."

MAY 21, 1935—"The German Government will scrupulously observe every treaty voluntarily concluded. . . . Germany neither intends to interfere in the internal affairs of Austria, to annex Austria, or to conclude an Anschluss."

MARCH 7, 1936—(announcing denunciation of Locarno and the re-occupation of the Rhineland): "After three years I can regard the struggle for German equality as concluded today. We have no territorial demands to make in Europe."

JANUARY 30, 1937—"The Period of so-called surprises is now over."

APRIL 10, 1938—(after the seizure of Austria): "The bases of my program are blood, fire and personality."

SEPTEMBER 26, 1938—(on Germany's Sudetenland claim): "It is the last territorial claim which I have to make in Europe."

NOVEMBER 9, 1938—"Beyond the colonial question, Germany has no demands to make on France and Great Britain."

With enormous cynicism, Hitler's propagandists everywhere use the Brutalitarian's latest verbal soothing syrups, and rest comfortably on the assumption that their hearers won't remember the previous ones that were soon broken. But surveys of public opinion in free countries show that the immense majority refuses to be hoodwinked.

\* \* \*

Editor: The readers' letters serve a larger purpose than merely to provide egotists a chance to exhibit themselves: they can be genuinely helpful and educative and they can often be the means of reassuring poorly informed readers who really want to advance, but who are, as yet, a little doubtful about the intellectual paths into which they are venturing. These are often uncertain about your motives—yea, they may sometimes be even uncertain about their own—and they may be encouraged when they see that there are dozens of others who see things about as "Hell-Demon" Julius himself sees them. As for FreeThought, that **MUST** be given

a chance to sell itself. There is a point in practically every field of thought beyond which further progress simply ceases, until the question of whether or not we have the right to use our reasons in religious matters, as in other things, has been settled. Given the chance to present its case, FreeThought will do right well by itself. Once FreeThought has done its job, by any individual, it is done for good and all, which is more than the churches can say for their work. No one expects the churches to relinquish their right to shriek or insinuate their dogmas. They are never quite sure of themselves so far as dependence on their adherents is concerned; indeed, they are less and less sure as time goes on.

Maplewood, Mo. C. A. LANG

\* \* \*

"In your answer to the question about the basic essentials of democracy you sum up with the remark that 'the nose knows . . . the bad smell of Fascism.' That may be quite true—if you've got a discriminating nose. But for smells of this sort even the nose must be educated, for you have yourself said that you agreed with the late Huey Long when he said that Fascism could very easily be established here; all one had to do was to pretend, while bringing it about, that one was strenuously fighting Fascism. I infer that that would necessarily involve a pretense of great effort at saving democracy. Obviously, then, one cannot trust one's nose too far. I'd say that here, if anywhere, all the faculties of a clear, informed head are needed."—C. A. Lang, Mo.

\* \* \*

I am writing a paper on anti-Semitism in the U.S. and have found your articles on the revolutionary patriots most helpful, especially the ones you wrote on Benjamin Franklin. I want to include, if possible, an expression from George Washington. Can you supply one?

When George Washington was president of the Constitutional Congress he opposed every proposition that aimed to establish a religious test for American citizenship. When he visited Newport, R.I., in 1790, he received an address of welcome from the Jews there, to which he replied:

"All persons alike possess liberty of conscience and the immunities of citizenship. Happily, the government of the United States gives no sanction to bigotry; to persecution, no assistance; requires only that they who live under its protection, should demean themselves as good citizens."

The same attitude was expressed to

the Jewish communities of Philadelphia, Savannah, Richmond, and Charleston, as follows:

"The liberality of sentiment towards each other, which marks every political and religious denomination in this country, stands unparalleled in the history of nations."

Those who would inject the virus of racism into our national life are spitting on the glorious humanitarianism of the founding fathers.

\* \* \*

Editor: Why is Canada now arming at a terrific speed? To suppress the Canadian workers? A Canadian army will not be needed in Europe in case of a world war. Is it a physical impossibility for any foreign country (not including the U.S.) to invade Canada? Yes. Such an invasion would presuppose the collapse of the U.S.A. Mussolini had to send an army of 400,000 to defeat the comparatively unarmed semi-savages of Ethiopia. Can an Italian army of 400,000 defeat the hardy, intelligent, well-armed Canadians? Of course not. Can a German-Italian army land in Canada? Impossible. Why then is Canada arming at top speed? Is this country to be used as a jumping off ground against the U.S. in case the Cliveden set's plot succeeds? Why were German experts (naval, military and air) so busy around Montreal and other Canadian seaports last year?

British Imperialism has been the cock-of-the-walk for many centuries; and the loss of this supremacy is a hard nut for this ism now to swallow. Britain's nightmares are (a) triumph of Socialism in Russia and its essential internationalism; (b) social and class opposition; (c) the rise of the more virile American Imperialism; (d) her undefended rear in the Far East.

British Imperialism would enter into a pact with the "devil" to put to flight the above nightmares, particularly (a) and (c). If the Cliveden set plot succeeds, the next great battle will be Britain, Japan and Fascist Europe against the U.S.A. Canada will be used as a jumping off ground by the U.S.A.'s enemies if the Americans do not very soon question very closely British Imperialism's moves in this country.

CANADIAN READER

\* \* \*

In his January 30, 1939, speech, Hitler charged the Jews with conspiring to start a world war. Please comment.

The aim Hitler had in making this insulting charge was to divert attention from his own efforts as a war-monger. It isn't the Jews who want

war but Hitler himself, as can be seen on almost any page of his book, "Mein Kampf," in which he outlines policies that can be realized only through force. If war comes—and, as I write, it seems just around the corner—the world won't have to be told who started it. The three Fascist aggressors—Germany, Japan, and Italy—are the ones who are driving the world to new wars. Hitler's crude lies won't deceive fair-minded people who have access to the truth of what's going on.

\* \* \*

A radio speech by a big industrialist includes the argument that taxes on corporations should be reduced. His main reason for this is the fact that 58 percent of all corporations failed to make any net profits in 1936. Please discuss this.

Just because 58 percent of all corporations—most of them small ones—made no net profits shouldn't be advanced as an argument for cutting the taxes of the large ones that make immense profits. Farm Research, Inc., from its headquarters in Washington, D.C., released interesting figures that bear on this discussion. The table shows that 200 of the largest non-financial corporations, numbering less than seven-hundredths of 1 percent of the total, "control more than half of the corporate wealth in the U.S.":

#### Growth of 200 Largest Non-Financial Corporations

Year	Gross Assets
1909	\$26,063,000,000
1919	43,718,000,000
1929	81,074,000,000
1937	122,000,000,000

Imagine the impudence of an industrialist who actually goes to the extreme of telling the American people that 200 corporations, with gross assets in excess of 120 billion dollars should be treated lightly in matters of taxes. The same argument in favor of the corporations was used in the January, 1939, bulletin of the National City Bank of New York.

\* \* \*

Editor: I disagree with your statement regarding the League of Nations' accomplishments. It is true that of late the political accomplishments have been nil, but in all fairness it must be admitted that in the past many small international disputes were quietly settled by the League. This organization

also conducts other activities, such as statistics, health, commerce, agriculture, etc. Much has been done in these lines, as League records will show. It is weak, but your humorous statement that "its accomplishments could be written on a postcard with a broom," is a bit extreme. J. LAWRENCE RUSSELL Madison, Wisc.

\* \* \*  
 "That little piece you wrote about Quakers and Mennonites, in which you meandered into several absurdly delightful bypaths, is another which must be woven into that autobiography you're going to write."—Reader.

\* \* \*  
 Professor Albert Einstein refers to himself as "an active pacifist." What does he mean?

"An active pacifist" is a person who is for peace, but advocates using force to protect democracy and oppose Fascism.

\* \* \*  
 Do you think Astrology is scientific?

I'm getting tired of having this Astrology bunk put before me month after month, especially since I've written scores of pieces exposing it as rank fraud. People who want my opinions about this survival of the ages of ignorance should study my numerous articles in my volumes of questions and answers. I don't want to waste any more time on this theme.

\* \* \*  
 Does Graphology give us an insight into character?

For the hundredth time, No. It's idiotic bunk. All persons who advertise themselves as Graphologists are bunk-shooters.

\* \* \*  
 One can hardly look at a press picture from Germany without seeing thousands of marching young men. What effect is this having on them?

Erika Mann, who studied conditions in Nazi Germany, reports that 37 percent of Nazi youths in Germany today are flatfooted. This condition, it is asserted, is caused by excessive marching.

\* \* \*  
 Editor: Your article on "Faith Cures" (Vol. 1, No. 1, H-J News-Letter) shows suspicion about this matter, but to dispel your distrust I send you the following story, which you may caption "Believe It or Not." Many years ago, in the old country, a man was limping because one of his legs was an inch shorter than the other. His family went to a faith healer for help. He examined the

leg and promised to have it in the right length by praying six months. They agreed on the price, paid him, and he began to pray. Now, the diagnosis might have been incorrect or the prayers were too strong, anyhow after three months the legs were of equal length. The family wanted to notify the faith healer, but unfortunately they had lost his address and could not locate him. Consequently, he prayed the full six months as his contract demanded and after this time the formerly short leg was one inch longer than the other one. New York City MORRIS SCHIAYE

(Editor's Note: This is a very pretty story, which Mr. Schaye may believe, if he chooses. I don't.)

\* \* \*  
 There is a ball twelve feet in diameter on top of a pole sixty feet high. On the ball stands a man whose eye is six feet above the ball. How much ground beneath the ball is invisible to him?

6371.1498932 square feet. This answer is by Dr. Benjamin Franklin Finkel, of Drury College, Springfield, Mo., where he edits the *American Mathematical Monthly*.

\* \* \*  
 An Oxford divinity student writes, in support of William Paley's "Evidences of Christianity," that the workings of divine providence can be shown by a simple illustration from nature. He continues: "The mouth and nose of the bulldog should convince the most skeptical. The nose is set so far back that the dog can get his breath while still hanging on to the bull." Please comment.

If the Lord went to all that trouble to help the bulldog He showed lamentable disregard for the legitimate interests of the bull.

\* \* \*  
 In what ways do the following games differ: bingo, beano, tango, keno, screeno, lotto and the corn game?

They don't differ at all. They all add up to the same thing—gyppo.

\* \* \*  
 Editor: In Washington, D.C., the authorities make it a practice to close the public comfort stations on Sundays, depriving the public when the spirit moves them to let the events flow or pass in an orderly and respectable manner, especially those who have imbibed in nurgatives that rile up the spirit, causing violent rumblings from the inner regions as a warning that it shall come to pass that what is inside shall come outside regardless of all dignities. It would be a great relief if the authorities would put signs outside the com-

fort stations proclaiming that the public shall act like dogs, using lamp posts, sidewalks, stoops, alley-ways, etc. Wash., D.C. J. DUFFY

\* \* \*

Editor: I have some news to tell you from Milwaukee. In June, 1938, our Socialist paper, The Milwaukee Leader, changed hands. Before it did so, I could always get a Freethought article into its columns. After the change, I submitted one to my friend, the editor-in-chief, John M. Work, who read it and said: "Well, I will get it in, if I can." I replied: "Do you not still have the say as to what shall appear in The Leader?" He said: "No, I must submit all things to men higher up." The article was rejected. In mid-January, 1939, The Leader changed its name. It is now called The Post. In its announcement it stated that while it would uphold the cause of labor, it would not take part in political party concerns. The scheme, I think, is to make of it a commercial and money-making affair, and to kill it as a radical, reform sheet. I believe there is a conspiracy to put the reform press out of business.

FRANKLIN STEINER

Wauwatosa, Wisc.

\* \* \*

Our little girl will be two years old next month. She uses only a few words. Does this mean she will be backward?

No. It frequently happens that a two-year-old child is almost wordless, but this shouldn't cause any fears. Dr. Melvin G. Rigg, of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, discussed this problem at a meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, at Stillwater, Okla., saying parents needn't be scared if their baby doesn't take to words early. He added that such youthful failure at talking doesn't even mean the child will be deficient in use of words later. Dr. Rigg told of how he had studied a little girl of two who used only 13 words, four of which were names in the family. Her vocabulary was limited to "bread," "butter," "milk," "here," "there," "is," "it," "wow-wow," and "bye." Dr. Rigg commented:

By contrast, the two-year-olds whose words have been counted and the totals given scientific publication averaged 520 words apiece. It is true that these youngsters were all from homes with an intellectual atmosphere—but so was Carolyn.

Carolyn made rapid progress in her third year, but was still way be-

hind the average at the age of four.

But little Carolyn, despite her vocabulary handicap, managed to achieve a very superior score in intelligence. At three she earned an IQ of 133, a rating that entitled her to be called "gifted."

And before she was nine years old she had a vocabulary as extensive as that of the average adult. She then scored 147 in IQ.

\* \* \*

Editor: I think you are doing well by your Canadian readers when you call attention to the way we are being censored, denied the right to read literature of our own choice, and in other ways treated like subjects in a Fascist country. Your readers, I'm convinced, will be interested in an incident reported in The Nation, January 14, 1939, as follows:

"Some weeks ago Mr. M. S. Reynolds, a resident of Vancouver, wrote a letter to Neville Chamberlain criticizing British foreign policy. Shortly afterward—on Nov. 23—Mr. Reynolds was visited by two plain-clothes members of the Royal Canadian Northwest Mounted Police. Producing a copy of the letter he had sent to Chamberlain and of another he had sent to Lord Lloyd, they warned him not to write such letters again. Mr. Reynolds reported these facts to the editors of the London Tribune, and added that he told his inquisitors he would keep on writing 'just so long as postage stamps are available.'"

Mr. Reynolds is to be congratulated on his courage in telling the would-be censors where to get off. But how many Canadians are willing to take a similar stand? Not many, I'm afraid. Most are standing by while the authorities gradually lead us in the direction of Fascist suppression and censorship.

CANADIAN READER

\* \* \*

Could you tell me if the practice of ventriloquism has any detrimental effect?

There's no evidence to show that ventriloquism has any bad effect on the speaking or singing voice, or on the throat itself, in a physical sense.

\* \* \*

Editor: Did you ever notice that when our Fascists are faced with the current persecutions that are laid at the door of "pagan" Hitler—why, he's doing it to save "Christianity"! Yes, right over in New York, January 22, 1939, Heywood Brown was picketed by Father Coughlin's followers, and reports that one of the men in charge declared, "After all, Hitler saved Christianity!"

It seems as if there should be better cooperation between the hierarchy and the lay Catholics. We see the Cardinals and whatnot protesting against the "paganism" of Hitler and his Nazis, while the masses of Catholics are humbly thanking Hitler for saving Christianity!

By the way, on this occasion of the picketing of Broun, he observed the Coughlin influence in certain of the placards carried by pickets: "Two chickens in every pot. No Frankfurters." Cars were covered with stickers reading, "Buy Christian." One placard urged, "Buy Christian and employ Christian." Finally the marchers chanted, "Send Broun back where he came from!" Ho, hum! Isn't it odd these violent reactionaries never think it may be they who should go back where they came from?

## READER

\* \* \*  
A magazine devoted to Spiritualism sells a pamphlet which quotes Beatrice Houdini as saying that a certain medium had read her mind. Please comment. I enclose the quotation.

Beatrice Houdini, the widow of Harry Houdini, the great magician and mystifier, is supposed to have signed some sort of a statement on January 9, 1929, to the effect that a medium known as Arthur Ford had given her the words of a message which she and Harry Houdini had pre-arranged. It seems doubtful she wrote the statement, especially in view of the fact that the Associated Press, on October 11, 1938, sent the following message from Raleigh, N.C. The report appeared in many newspapers. It reads:

Oct. 11, 1938, (AP). Mrs. Harry Houdini, widow of the magician, said today that after 10 years of trying to contact the spirit of her husband she felt that she had proved there was nothing to spiritualism. The magician and his wife agreed to try to contact the spirit of the other when one died. "I tried to contact Harry for 10 years after his death and nothing happened," she said. "After the last seance almost two years ago I stopped trying."

Later, when asked about the alleged statement in the pamphlet mentioned above, her answer, through her manager, Mr. Saint, was that "Mrs. Houdini believes that ALL mediums are fakes or self-delusioned." Of course, I don't know how to find

out what Mrs. Houdini really said 10 years ago. And I don't care a lot what she said. However, when she wrote, through her manager, that she believes all mediums are fakes or self-delusioned, she said enough to satisfy my mind. The notion of Spiritualism is so completely discredited that it's almost a waste of time to check up on every charlatan who comes along with a new line of nonsense. The intelligent world agrees it's all bunk. That's one subject I don't bother much about. The folder on Spiritualism in my news-clip filing system doesn't hold more than a half dozen clippings, which indicates how little attention I pay to this hokum. I don't even take the trouble to clip even 1 percent of the reports I glance at on Spiritualism. Life's too short to waste effort on such idiotic flapdoodle.

\* \* \*  
Editor: Says Samuel Romer: "The White House has been the main force in inspiring and continuing the embargo. . . . When an aroused America demanded the lifting of the embargo in May of 1938, the entire campaign was smashed by Secretary Hull's letter to Senator Pittman demanding that the embargo be continued. . . . From those strange friends of Spain who have their axes to grind comes the hysterical cry, 'We must not embarrass the President! The President will life the embargo; let us not embarrass him!' Let us be honest enough to recognize that a 'Lift the Embargo' campaign . . . will embarrass the President only if he does not intend to lift the embargo."

It is hardly necessary to point out that the Catholic pressure groups don't seem to mind "embarrassing" the President—or doesn't such pressure embarrass him? If he is sincere about not wishing to run for a third term, how can his loss of popularity among the pro-Franco Catholics disturb him? Does the good will of ill-informed fanatics mean more to him than the saving of a sister democracy, whose rescue might strengthen our own?

## READER

\* \* \*  
If at all possible please keep sending The Freeman after my subscription runs out. I can't afford a renewal just now, but I'll send the cash as soon as I get it. I couldn't live without The Freeman.

Don't you think you're being just a little bit unreasonable? I'm advancing your subscription a year by putting out a dollar of my own money,

which you may refund to me personally when you have it, but let me tell you frankly that the paper couldn't get very far if many readers took the same position. When I send for a supply of paper in order to get out a few issues I can't tell the paper company to just send the paper along and that payment will follow at some indefinite time in the future. The publication wouldn't last long, let me tell you frankly, if I tried to get away with that method more than once or twice. The paper houses would get wise to me and I'd find myself on a C.O.D. basis, and with justice, too. I'm reminded of a bit of conversation I overheard years ago in a beer joint. The man said, "We can't get anywhere because you won't do it my way." To which the other replied, "How do you know I won't do it your way? What do you mean?" "I mean," the man replied. "I want you to do it for nothing."

\* \* \*

Editor: On January 3, 1939, Eddie Cantor made a speech before Welcome Chapter of the Order of the Eastern Star, in Philadelphia. Said *The Record*, January 4, 1939: "It was to have been broadcast over a national hook-up, but Eddie objected and the broadcast was cancelled. 'The radio censorship has become so bad we can't take a chance,' said Eddie. 'Even the presence here of Chief Justice John W. Kephart of the State Supreme Court might not protect us. I'd rather just sit down in the parlor and talk.'"

What the public would like to know is, who is responsible for a censorship that prevents a broadcast by Eddie Cantor? He has shown himself a humanitarian, a defender of democracy, but certainly no dangerous radical whose speeches would be likely to drive an audience to violence!

Perhaps you heard the speeches of Harold Ickes and Frank Gannett in N.Y.'s Town Meeting of the Air, January 12, 1939, on "Do We Have a Free Press?" Although Mr. Ickes got in some telling thrusts at his opponent, I was amused at the way in which the point of the whole thing was solemnly avoided. The assumption seemed to be (on the part of Mr. Gannett) that the Government does its best to control the press; while Mr. Ickes indignantly denied, and appeared to prove, that the press is quite free so far as the Government is concerned. Not a word was said about the pressure brought to bear upon the press—and most successfully

—by the Roman Catholic Church. Every intelligent person knows it to be a fact, but is much too polite to mention it.

Mr. Ickes included the *Stern* papers among the few which he considered honest and frank with the public. But I should like to ask how you can call a paper "free" when its publisher (as related in December *Scribner's*, 1936) had to humble himself before Cardinal Daugherty for saying a few words in favor of the Loyalist democratic government of Spain, and has not dared since that time to say anything in behalf of that government? I realize what petty persecution such a publisher would have to undergo (you remember Philadelphia priests ordering a boycott of *The Record*), and that he yields rather than go bankrupt; but as for saying our big dailies are free from clerical pressure—what nonsense! A censorship so terrifying that it may not even be mentioned—except in a few papers like your own, *The Nation* and *The New Republic*—is a censorship indeed!

*The New Republic*, January 25, 1939, states, "There are many well attested cases where advertisers have sought, individually and collectively, to control the policies of a paper. (Sometimes these advertisers are in turn pressed by their own customers, as when Philadelphia Catholics forced local department stores into reprisals against a newspaper friendly to Loyalist Spain.) A newspaper which persists in printing truths disagreeable to advertisers will soon find itself under boycott."

Wilmington, Del. W. MATTHEWS

\* \* \*

What do you think of E. A. Wiggam?

He's doing much better work since he gave up the dogmatic position that heredity alone counts. Numerous scientists sailed into him, showing that environment also is an important factor. Most authorities now take a middle position between heredity and environment, which strikes me as the sensible thing to do. Wiggam's column, "Exploring Your Mind," contains valuable material from time to time. My readers know I'm given to quoting him on occasion.

\* \* \*

How does today's labor compare with ancient labor when on a massive job?

The best comparison I can think of is the Grand Coulee Dam in Washington State and the Great Pyramid. The dam, as I've shown in other articles (in which I drew on "Our Promised Land," by Richard L. Neuberger), will weigh 23,000,000 tons,

as against the Great Pyramid's 7,000,000 tons. When the Great Pyramid was built 6,000 years ago in Egypt 50,000 men were employed for 20 years. This modern job, which is more than three times as heavy, is being done by 5,000 men in six years. And that isn't all. The Great Pyramid, after all, was just a matter of shaping stones and putting them into place. The Grand Coulee, needless to say, is much more complicated. As Stuart Chase so well puts it. "Pyramids were houses for the dead. Dams are centers of energy for the living. It is better, I think, to live in the age of Great Dams than in the age of Great Pyramids."

\* \* \*

Please tell us a few things about yourself. How old and tall are you? How much do you weigh? I'm sure most readers would like to be better acquainted with the man who has more genuine guts than all other publishers put together.

Well, you asked for it. I'm 50 years old, five feet six inches tall, and weigh about 170 pounds.

\* \* \*

Editor: The Nation for January 7, 1939, mentions something that very few Catholics appear to realize:—"Separation of Church and State [is] a blessing in disguise for the Church as well as for the State. It is no accident that the Church is secure in Protestant countries today, but fighting for existence in Catholic lands where in the past there has been no check on its power; Mexico, Spain, Austria, Italy . . . illustrate the anti-clericalism bred where the Church has dominated the State and dominated it invariably in behalf of the great and powerful."

READER

\* \* \*

Is Fritz Kuhn the chief Nazi propagandist in this country?

Kuhn is the leader of the Bund, but he has little to do with Hitler's propaganda in this country. That work is done by George Sylvester Viereck, one of the most unscrupulous pen-prostitutes ever to smear paper with the symbols of hatred, intolerance, Fascism, bigotry and anti-Americanism. He's the same Viereck who did the kaiser's dirty propaganda work from August, 1914, until the U.S. entered the war. Viereck looks like a rat and acts like one, though I fail to see why I should bring the rat out of his sewer and compare him to

something that's unspeakably lower. After all, a real sewer-rat goes about the job of living in a simple, honest, dignified way. A human rat like Viereck isn't satisfied with being a rodent—he aims to turn millions of decent people into his kind of a Ratz. Of course, Viereck does all this filthy work for money. If you took away the money he'd quit being a rat. But so long as the Ratzis are able to produce about \$2,000 per month Viereck will be there to do his dirtiest. Many of Viereck's rottenest jobs of writing—which often find their way into Macfadden's *Liberty*—are done under pen-names, because it would be a give-away if he put his real name on his vicious propaganda. But you can smell the same old rat even when he tries to hide under no end of false names. The veteran master exudes an odor peculiar to himself. It's an odor that accumulates only after many years of devoted, tireless, talented, cunning lying. Of course, if Viereck were living in Hitler's Germany he'd been in a fix, for it happens his wife is part Jewish. The rat would be outlawed in Germany but manages to hold on as a part of the dirty outfit in the U.S.A. If he were to succeed in putting over his propaganda and make this country a totalitarian State Viereck would be the first thing to get the boot. But he's useful to the Ratzis because he knows the game of word-poisoning. There's no person in the country able to do a better job for Hitler, so the great pansy pays Viereck the money he craves, shutting his eyes to the fact that he's married to a Jewess. At that, Hitler might do with Viereck as he has done with other human rats—declare his wife an "honorary Aryan."

\* \* \*

Editor: The fall of Barcelona moves me to quote for Freeman readers Bruce Bliven's statements in The New Republic, January 11, 1939:

"He, [President Roosevelt], professes to abhor Fascist dictatorships, yet in the two wars they are carrying on, he has thus far done much more to aid them than their victims. For 18 months he has permitted a vast trade in vital war material sent from this country to Japan. Nothing has been done to hinder it except Secretary Hull's

warning about airplanes, which did not come until Japan had bought about all she could afford. The Neutrality Act, invoked at the beginning of the conflict, would have hurt China little and Japan a great deal. As it is, we have been Japan's secret ally during all this time.

"In Spain, the President's record is even worse. He has continued to sell arms and ammunition freely to one side—the Fascist aggressors, Germany and Italy—but he has withheld them from the Spaniards who are fighting the very battle for democracy to which he has paid such distinguished lip service. For various reasons, including the desire to go along with the Chamberlain government, plus pressure from some domestic groups such as the Catholics, he caused special changes in the law in order to give the color of legality to cutting off supplies to the Loyalists. He has done much to help the Fascists win in Spain, in spite of the fact that such a victory would mean a death blow to his own cherished plans for 'hemispherical solidarity' in the New World."

Says *The Nation*, January 21:

"It is no secret that the only real obstacle to repeal of the embargo is Catholic pressure. The leadership of the Church is deliberately attempting to nullify the expressed pro-Loyalist sentiment of a majority of the American people. . . . Many Catholic papers are devoting their entire issues almost exclusively to the Spanish question, and despite the plain fact, revealed by the Gallup and other polls, that most Americans favor the republic, the Catholic press has the effrontery to declare that the movement against the embargo is Communist-inspired and to attempt to stigmatize all the leaders of the pro-Loyalist movement as 'red.'"

"In this hysteria Catholic leadership has overplayed its hand. For when the one group in America which is pro-Franco stands alone in advocating the continued application of the Neutrality Act in Spain, it is evident that the act is far from 'neutral.'"

So here we have a sample of that religion which Mr. Roosevelt says leads to a love of democracy—a small religious group arrogantly demanding that the wishes of the majority be ignored; that a presumably free Congress, overwhelmed by their hysterical wires and letters, maintain the embargo against democratic Spain. We know this is a test, and I for one shall watch

with interest to see whether the Roman Catholic Church controls the Government of the United States or not.

Incidentally, wouldn't you say that this arrogant conviction that our Government should be swayed by the telegraphed orders of a minority group shows up what a pretense is this group's protestations of love for democratic processes?

READER

\* \* \*  
What's Hollywood's annual payroll?

Approximately \$100,000,000.

\* \* \*  
I have been invited to join the Daughters of the American Revolution. Do you think that body serves a useful purpose?

I don't know what this reader means by a "useful purpose." To me, it means helping to spread enlightenment, removing barriers of race and class, striving to increase social security, encouraging progressiveness, defending liberalism, educating the people to throw over ideas of racial prejudice and supernaturalism, and the like. A person who holds to such ideals certainly doesn't belong in the D.A.R., one of the most reactionary, narrow-minded and intolerant organizations in the country. I need only point to the way this organization treated Miss Marian Anderson, the great Negro singer, who was denied the right to rent Constitution Hall (of all names!) in Washington, D.C., solely because of her color. Such people don't represent the traditions and ideals of the great Founding Fathers. Instead of joining the D.A.R. I'd suggest becoming a member of the Descendants of the American Revolution (headquarters: Historic Arts Galleries, Murray Hill Hotel, 112 Park Avenue, N.Y.C.), a society that, in the words of *The Social Frontier*, is more interested in the spiritual heritage of the Declaration of Independence than in genealogical lineage." This new D.A.R. aims to carry on in this generation "a leadership more in accord with that which Jefferson, Samuel Adams, Franklin, Paine and Washington contributed in their day." Recently my wife, whose mother was a member of the D.A.R., was invited to join the D.A.R., but she refused on the grounds of the organization's reactionary attitudes. I liked that response. Individuals

shouldn't miss opportunities to express their conscientious scruples on subjects of great social importance. I don't see how a true American, after the way the D.A.R. treated Miss Marian Anderson, could permit herself to become affiliated with this unworthy group. I glory in the spunk and moral grandeur shown by Mrs. Roosevelt, when she resigned from the D.A.R. because of the brutal snub accorded a great Negro artist. What a woman! I lift my topper to her. And that, by the way, is the difference between racial prejudice in our democracy and that which prevails in Fascist countries like Germany and Italy. Over there race persecution is a fixed policy of the government, encouraged and supported by the heads of the regime. Over here race persecution remains a problem of sections and groups, without support from our government, our Constitution, and our traditions. Instead of furthering ideas of racism Mrs. Roosevelt, from her home in the White House, struck a blow for decency, justice and fair play. Splendid things like that inspire one with hope for the future.

\* \* \*

If all the lipstick used in a year by the women in this country were to be smeared on barns, how many would be covered?

40,000, according to an estimate in *Home Safety*.

\* \* \*

Speaking as a Negro, let me commend you for your article on the need for being careful not to use insulting names for people of different nationalities and races. Nothing offends me more than to hear the word "nigger." I notice that intelligent, fair-minded whites never use it.

I've always been careful to speak against words like nigger, chink, kike, yid, hunk, dago, and the like. Civilized people are always given to avoiding such offensive expressions. However, in the matter of the word "nigger," I was interested in what Lucius Harper, editor of the *Chicago Defender*, a widely circulated Negro paper, said on this theme, based as it is on many years of first-hand study of the problems of inter-racial dealings. He writes:

"The word 'nigger' is offensive to Negroes when used by whites, but contrary to all belief, it is a com-

mon expression among the ordinary Negroes and is used frequently, almost daily, in conversations between them. It carries no odium or sting when used by themselves, but they object keenly to whites using it in reference to them because it conveys the spirit of hate, discrimination and prejudice."

I've noticed that Jews are the same way when the word "yid" is used. If it's said by a Gentile, the Jew gets rip-snorling mad, but they think nothing of using it among themselves. Here I'm speaking of ordinary Jews, in the same way that Mr. Harper speaks of ordinary Negroes. No educated Jew would dream of using the offensive word "yid" even when he's among his own people. The matter of pronouncing the word "Negro" frequently comes up for discussion. The other night, when I appeared at a Negro church to make a talk on the problems facing our Negro brothers, I heard at least a dozen colored men and woman make the word sound like "Nigra." During my talk I went to some pains to call attention to the fact that our greatest authority, Webster's New International Dictionary, allows only "Nee-gro," with the accent on the first syllable. I now learn, from Mr. Harper, that he has noticed frequently that the most liberal-minded white persons often make the word sound like "Nigra," or, still oftener, "Nee-gro," which, says Mr. Harper, "is a little too much emphasis and shows an effort on the part of the white speaker to strictly classify." Of course, I don't agree with Mr. Harper. The whites who say "Nee-gro," with the first syllable stressed, are absolutely right, according to our best authority. Mr. Harper discusses other words that rile Negroes, as follows:

"The word 'darky' (or 'darkey' or 'darkie') is an offensive term written or spoken. It is the belief of many white people that it is not offensive. They believe it is a term of endearment when used in referring to an aged Negro of the ex-slave type, such as 'he was a faithful old southern darkey.' Many white speakers who are very liberal on the race question have made fatal errors in saying before colored audiences, 'That reminds me of the joke at the expense of an old darkey.' I have often sensed a spirit

of revolt that immediately sweeps through the audience."

Some Negroes themselves have been trying, especially in their press, to rid themselves of even the word "Negro," trying out substitutes like Afro-Americans and Aframericans. Neither word has had wide acceptance. In fact, the former, which was pushed hard 25 years ago, is hardly ever seen any more, while Aframericans is one word I haven't seen in print more than a dozen times in all my life, and have never heard it even once in conversation. I believe there won't ever be any substitutes for plain "Negro" or "colored people." The editor of the *Chicago Defender* goes to the extreme of using only the word "Race" to designate black Americans, according to an article on this subject in *Ken*, March 9, 1939. The *Ken* writer quotes a typical headline which strikes me as being pretty bad: "RACE LIEUTENANT GIVEN HIGH RATINGS," etc. I doubt that will ever go very far.

\* \* \*

Can you tell me why Eskimos never get lost even when they are on ice packs off shore?

Master Sergeant Stanley R. Morgan explains Eskimos don't get lost even when storms arise and even though there are no landmarks. The reason, he says, is:

"The prevailing winds in this area are Northeast and Southwest at all times of the year. Hence the Eskimo merely looks at the drift of the snow on the ice, or tosses some in the air and learns the direction."

\* \* \*

How do our dear Catholic brethren get around the Bible's admonition that a bishop should have a wife?

They don't try. Usually they prefer to ignore it. This reminds me of a bright and amusing anecdote told by L. H. Lehmann, in his excellent book, "Ex-Priest and the Riddle of Religion":

An Irish priest, a native of County Waterford, known to the author, is fond of relating an anecdote at the expense of his own father to illustrate the super-physical conception which Irish people have of their priests. His father, Mr. Kelly, a prominent storekeeper of the town, was brave above his fellows

to engage at times in discussion with the resident Protestant minister. The conversation turned one day on the question of the marriage of priests. "Sure an' that could never be," objected his father, "for 'tis agin all law of God and man."

"But, my deah Mister Kelly, in the Holy Bible, Paul says to Timothy that a bishop, should be a man of one wife!"

"Faith an' bigorra," retorted Kelly, "that may be in your Bible, but 'tis sure not in mine!"

On the minister enquiring if he had a Bible at home Kelly indignantly replied:

"Sure an' I have! We Catholics can have a Bible as well as you!"

They agreed to go to Kelly's house and see whether the passage in question was in his Bible. Arrived there, Mr. Kelly proudly took down the family Bible from a shelf, carefully dusted it and handed it to the minister, confident that he would be disappointed in his search. The minister quickly turned to Tim. III.2 and read: "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, etc." and then handed the book to Kelly who carefully adjusted his spectacles, and read the passage. Suspicious of some trick on the part of the Protestant minister, he turned to the fly-leaf, to convince himself it was really his own Bible, by the record of all the Kelly baptisms written thereon. He then removed his spectacles and carefully wiped them, and again read the passage aloud for himself. Finally he closed the book with a snap, threw it on the table, and convinced, but undefeated, exclaimed:

"Faith an' 'tis St. Paul ought to be ashamed of himself!"

Dr. Lehmann, who was a priest in Ireland for years, says he knows that many devout rustics even go so far as to hold that once a man becomes a priest God steps in and does something to his front and rear bumpers so that he never even feels what other men have to go through when in the presence of a beautiful woman. Some even go so far as to refuse to believe priests perform the kind of bodily functions that Jonathan Swift, in one of his inspired moments, described as being offensive to the person concerned, an appalling fact that applies only the humans—the only living creatures who are offensive to themselves at certain times. Of

course, such empty-headedness was observed in the more remote parts of Ireland. The communicants he met up with in the U.S. usually showed a more realistic appreciation of the facts of life.

\* \* \*

Please tell how to test crooked dice that have off-center weighting.

This can be done by dropping the die gently into a tumbler of water. The straight die will sink without turning over, while a dishonest die will turn over. This proves it's been loaded off-center.

\* \* \*

What do you think of Walter Winchell's recent blurbs on the Catholic Church? How do you account for his praising an institution that stands against everything he fights for? Do you believe he is sincere but misinformed, or is he trying to boost a circulation which is perhaps dwindling?

It's pure ignorance. Winchell knows absolutely nothing about history, and probably never will. That explains why he's able to say the most ridiculous things in praise of the Catholic Church. I praise Winchell for his anti-Fascist stand, but can't overlook the fact that while his heart's in the right place his head is full of wrong notions. At that, Winchell is doing excellent propaganda work for democracy. He is doing more than his share of the task of picturing the Nazis for the Ratzis they are, if I may be permitted to steal Winchell's excellent word. But that doesn't alter the fact that he's ignorant about history.

\* \* \*

Would you consider the Chicago Daily News the best paper published in Chicago? Personally I have no respect for the Chicago Tribune. The Chicago Times is primarily a picture paper, and the two Hearst papers are out so far as I am concerned.

Chicago has powerful, influential newspapers, but none of them can be said to be truly great. The best, by far, is the *Chicago Daily News*, mainly because of its foreign correspondence. Even this isn't as good as it used to be, but it's still the best in Chicago and the second-best in the country, the leader being the *New York Times*. I hope some day to build up a sufficient following to be able to finance a daily newspaper that will be completely in-

dependent of the advertisers. The job can be done, but it will take time—and plenty of financial support from the people who really believe in the truth.

\* \* \*

I enclose a propaganda tract of the Catholic Church, which says the church never changes. It gives Absolution as one illustration. Is this true?

The choice of Absolution—the power to free the sinner from his sins—is an unfortunate one, as I'll show from history. The dogma is based on John xx, 23, "Whose sin ye remit, they are remitted." The word "remit" fits perfectly. The formula was worked out at the Council of Trent and worded "*Ego te absolvo*," meaning "I absolve thee." By the use of these words the priest absolves the penitent "from guilt and eternal punishment." The record shows that this was turned into a business. Leo X, according to an article in the *Encyclopedia Sexualis*, "ordered the taxes on all crimes to be fixed, as if they were articles of merchandise. Under the auspices of this Pope appeared the first edition of Taxes of the Holy and Apostolic Chancery and Penitentiary (Rome, 1514). The work made it clear that absolution was distinctly a rich man's game." To prove this the writer calls attention to this passage (Paris edition, 1520, p. 23):

"And carefully observe, that these kinds of graces and dispensations are not granted to the poor, because, not having wherewith, they cannot be consoled."

Needless to say, when that position couldn't be maintained, the Church gracefully changed to fit the needs of the occasion. The papal catalogue price (it was all as efficient and matter-of-fact as the quotations on the Kansas City Board of Trade) offered absolution on a sliding scale for the following: abortion, pure adultery, adultery with incest, bestiality, carnal knowledge of mother and god-mother, deflowering a virgin, and fornication with a nun in the cloister or out of the cloister. The authority just mentioned calls attention to the fact that "as an indication of changing morality it should be noted that the price for 'absolution for one who has killed his father, his mother, his brother, his sister, his wife, or any

of his kindred,' was less than for various sexual sins." Joseph McCabe, in one of his books, tells how he saw, in Spain, before the Republic, tickets of Absolution on sale in many popular places, such as tobacco stores and the like. If a penitent, as a devout follower of the Church, had done something to trouble his soul he could drop in at the nearest store and buy a slip of paper which granted him the comforts and noble urgings of his one and only religion. Out of this fee the tobacconist kept his commission, the net being turned over to the priest. By this logic, McCabe assumed, anyone who intended to commit a crime could buy his ticket of Absolution in advance and go ahead with his job undeterred by fears of an eternity of punishment. All that was changed during the Republic. And this is the institution that defends itself on the grounds that man would fall into an endless orgy of viciousness if it weren't for the ministrations of a heaven-sent, unworldly, virtuous, saintly priesthood.

\* \* \*

Editor: The Nation (February 4, 1939) has an article "The Baltimore Sun Goes Down," from which I quote: "It must be a dreadful jackass indeed who believes that . . . the gang of Communists, anarchists, and other such vermin now operating in government Spain is democratic." These words are taken from The Baltimore Sun. (I'd like to remark that it must be a dreadful jackass who believes that the Mussolini-Hitler-clerical gang operating on Franco's side is out to "save Christianity," democracy, or the rights of the mass of Spaniards.)

It seems that a paragraph in The Sun "compared Hitler's fanaticism to Ignatius Loyola's. . . . The Archbishop (Curley) burst into a thousand blazing little pieces. He demanded an immediate and utter apology, and when every formula that The Sun put forward failed to satisfy him, he had the journal denounced from all the parish pulpits . . . and initiated a Catholic advertisers' boycott. . . . The incident allowed the Sunpapers to feel painfully the weight of the church's hand. . . . Since 1934 The Sun has dealt tenderly with the Catholic Church. . . . It is reasonable to assume that the Curley attacks of 1934 may have affected Sun policy on the Spanish civil war. Shortly after the revolt started, a Sun man wrote an article in which he assessed the opposing forces greatly to the moral detriment of the rebels. . . . A few days lat-

er the editorial staff received from the hand of John Owens a note signed by Paul Patterson stating that henceforth articles on Spain must be read by Mr. Owens before going into print. . . . Sun columns since that time have displayed pro-rebel sympathies, and Mr. Henry L. Mencken has outdone Father Coughlin himself in excoriating the "Barcelona convent-burners," the scoundrels "imported from Moscow" by "Red Spain."

#### BALTIMORE READER

\* \* \*

Please comment on Father Coughlin's basic thesis that Nazism is a defense mechanism against Communism.

I have discussed this point many times in the past, as my volumes of questions and answers show. The very first time Hitler made the point that Coughlin is now emphasizing, I showed by actual figures that he was talking bunk. Communism never was a menace in republican Germany. When Hitler took power the Communist vote in Germany was only 15 percent of the total ballots cast. Such a small minority can't be considered a menace to any democratic State. In a speech before the Progressive Education Association, in Detroit, Mich., February 25, 1939, L. M. Birkhead, of Kansas City, Mo., who is well known to my readers, charged that the Coughlin "basic thesis" mentioned above is a distortion of the truth. Mr. Birkhead said:

"Actually Nazism is a defense mechanism against liberalism, decency and progress; and, as such, it is characterized by all means of barbaric practices, including the persecution of defenseless minorities. Not even the majorities are exempt."

It's interesting to note that Father Coughlin is using all the tricks of propaganda employed so successfully by Hitler. His magazine, *Social Justice*, sounds as though its words had first been uttered in Hitler's Germany.

\* \* \*

Editor: Secretary Ickes declared, February 10, 1939, that among other newspapers The Philadelphia Record comes "well within the limits of what a fair newspaper ought to be." That depends on what you mean by "fair." I admire The Record in many respects, but I maintain that a paper is unfair to the public if it dares not print truths which are disagreeable to the Catholic clergy. The story of the priestly boycott of The

Record and its subsequent humble attitude toward the Church has been told in too many magazines and journals don't need repeating here. Amusing at first, this tempest in a teapot over fancied "government" censorship has become tiresome. Intelligent people know quite well that the danger of censorship does not come from the government; but only a few—yourself, The Nation, The New Republic—dare speak out and tell us who the real censor is. We know who threatens boycotts right and left (in their gentle, tolerant, Christian way) and sends pressure groups to browbeat publishers who print the smallest item exposing nefarious activities on the part of the Church.

An item in Washington Merry-Go-Round column (Pearson and Allen) of February 5—"The American Association of University Professors has appointed a committee to investigate the dismissal of Dr. Moyer Springer Fleisher from the medical faculty of St. Louis university because of his pro-Spanish Loyalist views." A strange circumstance was that this item appeared in the column as published in the Wilmington Sunday Star. Out of curiosity I read the same column in The Philadelphia Record of February 5. The item was omitted entirely.

Wilmington, Del. W. MATTHEWS

\* \* \*

What is your reaction to the enclosed clipping, which tells of the complaint of a scientist from Fascist Italy, who claims he wasn't permitted to enter certain laboratories at Harvard.

Let's get the facts straight. Dr. P. W. Bridgman, world-famous physicist, decided to bar Fascists from the laboratories in his department, at Harvard, because of the danger that such men might misuse the scientific knowledge available there. His department is one of the great research centers in the field of physics, where he created tremendous pressures which have given us new information about the earth's interior and the nature of matter. One of the numerous results of Dr. Bridgman's work is hot ice. When a Fascist scientist tries to enter, Dr. Bridgman hands him a statement which reads, in part:

"A citizen of such a State (totalitarian) is no longer a free individual, but he may be compelled to engage in any activity whatever to advance the purposes of that State. The purposes of totalitarian States have shown themselves to be in irreconcilable conflict with the purposes of free States.

Cessation of scientific intercourse

with the totalitarian States serves the double purpose of making more difficult the misuse of scientific information by these States, and of giving the individual opportunity to express his abhorrence of their practices."

Scientists in free establishments don't have to be told how men of science are enslaved to Fascist ideology in totalitarian States. They have seen Germany's great educational centers ruined, so that only those "scientists" remain who are willing to prostitute themselves in the service of the military machine, their researches being aimed almost entirely at finding new ways of destroying free people in democratic countries. Dr. Bridgman's position is well taken. All laboratories of the free part of the world should withhold from the aggressors the knowledge that might, if misused, make them more destructive.

\* \* \*

I have kept a money order for more than a year. Now I'm told by the postmaster that he can't redeem it because it's more than a year old. Have I lost my money?

No. While it's true the local postmaster isn't permitted to cash money orders more than a year old, you don't have to lose your money. The Treasury Department will accept it and issue a warrant from the treasury.

\* \* \*

Is Canada the world's greatest producer of nickel?

Yes. The mines of Sudbury, Ont., supply 85 percent of the world's nickel.

\* \* \*

Editor: You might print at The Freeman's masthead the text of the Bill of Rights and allow it to remain there as the rallying point for a movement to dress up the poor old thing with a good, sharp set of usable teeth and a virile set of masculine accessories all ready for business. The Constitution doesn't seem to do much more than guarantee that "We the Peepul" shall be exploited in the same old way by the same old gang of governing gyms working in two shifts and so faithful and eager to serve us that they actually quarrel for the honor. Two instances within six months I have personally seen. Near Oceanside, California, I saw a driver dragged from his car and beaten by emigration officers searching all cars. He was pushed back into his

car with kicks and allowed to drive on. There was no arrest. On U.S. Highway 99, at Indio, I saw a State Highway patrolman reach through the window and slug an unresisting man sitting in the car with his family. Again no arrest. These attacks were both of the spirit of Nazism and Fascism. It is time to give the civil liberties people something they can use to fight with.  
 Ramona, Calif.

L. L. FENN

\* \* \*

Is it a fact that one of our Presidents announced he was in favor of a war because he got a "flash from God in a dream?"

It's true, even though it sounds fantastic. William McKinley said he had been thinking about the "oppressed colonies of Spain" when later, in a dream, God appeared and told him it was the destiny of the U.S. to free them. The Spanish-American war followed.

\* \* \*

Do you believe Poe was drunk when he wrote his greatest stories, as so many writers claim?

I don't. John Macy, who saw some of Poe's manuscripts, said they were written exquisitely, that they were so neat and workmanlike they couldn't have been done by a shaky hand. I'm always suspicious of anyone who says a certain masterpiece was written while the author was drunk. A genius can (and does) get drunk between Brobdingnagian masterpieces, but not while he's on one.

\* \* \*

What do you think about the exchange of students between countries? Also, what do you think of the growing system of correspondence between high-school students of various countries?

Usually, the system of exchanging students is excellent, especially among democratic, free countries. But the evidence I've collected on the system of student exchange between our country and Fascist countries, especially Germany, shows it's bad, according to numerous clippings in a folder devoted to this subject in my newsclip filing system. The Nazis are careful to send us nothing but propagandists who are taught how to spread Nazism among our students. However, in at least three cases Nazi students in our colleges rejected the teachings imposed on them in Germany and sincerely embraced our democratic, liberal, humanitarian ideals. They're over here for good

and will become American citizens of the best kind. When we come to the student correspondence clubs we meet a situation that's one-sided propaganda. I have collected excerpts from letters written by Nazi youths to American pupils and all indicate the crudest kind of Brutalitarian propaganda. The highschool at Jackson, O., offers some precious examples of what Nazi pupils will resort to when they participate in "international correspondence." Let me quote a few:

I shall join the Arbeitsdienst for a half a year and the army for two years voluntary. It is the greatest pleasure and honour for me to march for my fatherland and my godlike Fuhrer.

I like music very much, especially military music.

I only can tell you that I am hating the Jews more than devil and hell. I have lived to see how my German fatherland was exhausted and sponged by this diabolical people. I know how many girls have been ravished by Jewish scoundrels. But now the Jews have lost power in Germany. No real, true German would shake hands with a Jew today. I would be glad when the last Jew would be vanished from the earth. I only hope that the brave Arabs will kill many Jews in the revolts of today.

I am very glad to join the Arbeitsdienst. We must help the peasants in the harvest time. I am not accustomed to that work, but I shall try to love it. It must be an elevating feeling to march within the grey columns through our German country, side by side with the sons of laborers, ministers, artisans and noblemen, all with shouldered spade and with one creed: Whatever our Fuhrer Adolf Hitler does, he is right.

Germany is the most powerful state of the world with the best army, the best leader, the best government, the best idea. No country in the world will be able to defeat us. The will of Adolf Hitler is stronger than the will of the sum of all other statesmen. He is sent by God to free our country, and to free the world from the despotism of the Jews and the capitalists, who wish to send the nations into bloody wars in order to earn themselves much money.

Perhaps you may imagine how we love our Fuhrer. If he appears in a town or village, there is an im-

mense rejoicing. Men, women and children salute our god-like Fuhrer with raised arms and "Heil Hitler."

You may imagine that we cannot like war when seeing the widows, orphans, and cripples. But our whole nation is ready for war, if anyone should try to attack our honor or rights. There will be no boy who will not at once shoulder the arms voluntarily whether we all have heard about the terror of war from our fathers. (My father was during the whole war in the hell of Verdun. Perhaps you have read about Verdun.)

You have a fine opinion of our government and Hitler. But you said that you believe in freedom of the press and speeches to your own advantage. But such a freedom in Germany would mean a free hand for the few enemies of our government, for the traitors, war-profiteers, and cowards. They could unrestrained poison the opinion of the foreign countries. That is nowadays impossible in Germany. Our press says the opinion of our government and of the ninety-nine percent National-Socialists is of Germans.

Usamerica is the only state in America led by the white race (I think and I hope that she soon will free herself from the influence of Negroes, Jews, and Japanese or Chinese people). All other American states are led by conglomerate of white men, Negroes, Red Indians, mestizos, mulattos, A.S.P. In the hands of your nation lie the destiny of American culture and political strength.

The last one quoted above must have puzzled the American youths who had taken Geography. One wonders where this Nazi pupil got the information about our 49th State, "Usamerica." Some Nazi teacher must have put it into his mind. Think of an "educational" system that prostitutes a noble institution to such barbarous purposes!

\* \* \*

Why are Jews also called Hebrews and Israelites?

An authority on Jewish history, Solomon B. Freehof, asks the question, "Are we Hebrews, Israelites or Jews?" and answers:

All three terms were at one time a correct description. Hebrew comes from the Hebrew word meaning to cross and referred to the descendants of Abraham who crossed the river Euphrates from the East to settle in Palestine. Israelite comes

from the name Israel, which was the by-name of Abraham's grandson, Jacob. All of the 12 tribes were descendants of Israel (Jacob) and therefore called Israelites as well as Hebrews. These 12 tribes formed one kingdom under Saul, then David, and then Solomon. After the death of King Solomon, the kingdom divided into two. The Southern Kingdom included the Tribes of Judah and Benjamin and because Judah was the dominant tribe, it was called the Kingdom of Judah. The Northern Kingdom included the 10 other Tribes and was called the Kingdom of Israel, although the name Israel could have applied to both Kingdoms. The Northern Kingdom was conquered by the Assyrians and its scattered remnants are called the Ten Lost Tribes. The Southern Kingdom endured and we are the descendants of its people. When the Northern Kingdom was destroyed, the remnants of this Southern Kingdom were called Judeans, from which is derived the German word "Jude" and our English word "Jew."

We are all Judeans, or Jews, descendants of the Tribe of Judah. Being also descendants of Jacob (Israel), Judah's father, we can be properly described as Israelites and also as Hebrews (i.e., descendants of Abraham who crossed the Euphrates).

\* \* \*

I am interested in getting authentic data regarding civil rights in Hawaii, Guam, the Philippines, Virgin Islands, etc. I find it difficult to get access to the real facts. I'm sure many of your readers want to know the truth about the relations of the U.S. government with its Caribbean and Pacific possessions.

The best source of information I can find is a 32-page pamphlet issued by the American Civil Liberties Union, entitled "Civil Liberties in American Colonies," an invaluable mine of material on this important subject. The survey shows that the Philippines and Virgin Islands are enjoying some civil rights, but that conditions in the other islands aren't what they should be. However, in Hawaii, "although numerous violations of civil liberties in industrial strife have been reported, no special condition in Hawaii different from that in the U.S. marks American control." Samoa and Guam, whose people still aren't permitted to become

American citizens, "remain under dictatorial rule by the Navy Department without even a status defined by Congress." As I stated a few sentences back, the people in the Philippines receive more civil liberties than in most of our other colonies, but this shouldn't permit us to jump to the conclusion that all is well. In those islands, according to the A.C.L.U., "the lack of democracy and the denial of constitutional civil rights that characterize the Commonwealth government are ominous." The whole record of our 40 years of American administration of colonies isn't anything to boast about. Puerto Rico presents the most "acute problem" in its relation to the U.S., the nationalist movement there being the object of "constant repression." But when we turn to the Virgin Islands we discover that "the conflict between American officials and the natives, acute for years under naval rule and even later, has largely disappeared under the new form of government and a liberal administration." The pamphlet says:

"Maintenance of civil liberties in the colonies is essential to political or economic reforms of any sort. Only by organization and agitation can natives express their desires and needs. Achievement of this depends not only on freedom of speech, press and assemblage but also on the forms of American control, which limit political participation."

The A.C.L.U. urges seven steps as "remedies obviously needed," as follows:

1. To permit Puerto Ricans to vote on genuine independence or on statehood.
2. To change the present administration in Puerto Rico by appointing officials who will permit the free exercise of civil rights, and extend self-government.
3. To adopt forms of civil government for Samoa and Guam to replace naval rule, with citizenship for the natives.
4. To substitute as rapidly as practicable school instruction in native languages for instruction in English—in Guam, Samoa and Puerto Rico.
5. To retain the terms of independence for the Philippines, and assure its realization by 1946. To secure for the Philippine Commonwealth American advisers of progressive mind.
6. To extend native participation and responsibility

in the government of the Virgin Islands. 7. To permit Hawaii to vote on changing its territorial status to statehood.

Readers who care to study the report in full may obtain a copy by sending a dime to the American Civil Liberties Union, 31 Union Square West, N.Y.C.

\* \* \*

Do you consider the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People a legitimate organization for Negroes? I have an opportunity to join, but won't until I learn more about it.

Don't be afraid to join the N.A.A.C.P. It's a legitimate, honest, sincere association. I happen to be a member of this inter-racial organization, which was founded in 1909 by white and black Americans to support the struggle to gain the Negroes full enjoyment of the Bill of Rights. This body's leadership is able, energetic, uncompromising, intelligent and strictly honest. The money taken in for dues and from contributions is used constructively to the last penny. Here are the main purposes of the N.A.A.C.P., all of which I endorse completely:

1. The ending of lynching;
2. the ending of peonage and the debt slavery of southern sharecroppers and tenant farmers;
3. the ending of disfranchisement;
4. the abolition of injustices in legal procedure, particularly criminal procedure, based solely on race and color;
5. equitable distribution of funds for public education;
6. abolition of segregation, discrimination, insult and humiliation based on race or color;
7. equality of opportunity to work in all fields with equal pay for equal work;
8. abolition of discrimination against Negroes in the right of collective bargaining through membership in organized labor unions.

The other night I spoke at a meeting in a colored Methodist Church, where a movement was afoot to organize a branch of the N.A.A.C.P. I spoke for about 50 minutes, outlining the principles and splendid record of this organization, and urged all persons present—white and colored—to join. I'm glad to be able to report that before the meeting adjourned a branch was organized. Our own Kansas Senator, Arthur Capper, has long been an officer of this society and has always shown

himself to be a true friend of the colored people. When I mentioned his name the audience applauded. In my talk I called particular attention to the fact that persecution of Negroes isn't a problem only of colored people—it's a problem that concerns the entire human race. At the same time I brought home the important fact that the N.A.A.C.P., and other organizations fighting for oppressed minorities, are fortunate to be able to carry on in a democracy, imperfect though that democracy may be. They have the right to organize, to meet, to publish papers and magazines, to speak freely, to vote (in all States except certain sections in the South), and can, in numerous other ways, advance their cause. This led me to my favorite subject—a severe attack on Fascism as the enemy of all civilized elements, and, needless to say, all racial minorities. My anti-Fascism was received favorably, showing that the Negroes recognize the appalling persecutions and discriminations that will face them should Brutalitarianism spread its poison into our country. I then paid tribute to the Supreme Court of the United States, declaring that that body has, since the Dred Scott decision, shown a desire to help preserve the Negro's rights. I felt safe in saying that no matter how many defeats the Negroes might suffer in the local courts of unfair sections, they could rely on fair decisions when their complaints went before the Supreme Court, a body which has, of recent decades, shown itself, time after time, determined to stand by the Constitution every time Negroes appealed for their constitutional rights. Then I enumerated a number of victories won by the N.A.A.C.P. in the educational world (several times with the direct help of the Supreme Court), especially in the case of the University of Maryland, which was compelled to open the doors of its law school to Negro students. Similar suits have been fought against the University of Tennessee and the University of Missouri. Intelligent Negroes feel keenly the fact that so many of our universities still discriminate against Negro students, but it's clear that they will fight such unfair treatment, especial-

ly through the N.A.A.C.P. Readers who want to join the N.A.A.C.P. should write to its headquarters, 69 Fifth Ave., N.Y.C.

\* \* \*

Do you believe that money can buy the finer things of life?

On this point I'm inclined a little to agree with that great philosopher and humanist, Jimmy Durante, who, in one of his profoundest moments, discoursed:

"What good is money? Can money get you friendship? No. Can money get you loyalty? No. Can money get you happiness? No. . . . I'm speaking, of course, of Confederate money."

\* \* \*

Do people fail to cash many postoffice money orders?

The postoffice department reports that Americans fail to cash from \$500,000 to \$700,000 worth of money orders each year. Most of these orders are received by persons who forget to cash them or lay them aside. In my plant we have handled many thousands of money orders and I'm still to fail to cash one. In fact, the usual procedure is to turn them into money twice daily, within a few minutes after each mail is opened.

\* \* \*

As a Newtonian I'm puzzled by those astronomers who speak about the "curvature of space." What does it mean?

It means nothing very much, even though it came from the great mathematician, Professor Albert Einstein. I say "came" deliberately, for he later announced he had revised his ideas on this confusing subject. Sir James Jeans, the mathematical astronomer, in his book, "The Universe Around Us," page 72 of which I had talbbed a long time ago in order to get his ideas when needed, discusses the matter this way:

"This curved space is not, it is true, the ordinary space of the astronomer. It is a purely mathematical and probably wholly fictitious space—[ a space which, when linked with time] is nothing but a convenient fiction of the mathematician. . . . Real space and real time undoubtedly are distinct."

Expressions like "space bending back upon itself" shouldn't bother those who always looked on the world as having three dimensions—length, lepth and breadth. Here our eyes

don't deceive us. Sometimes certain scientists like to bewilder ordinary people with their orgies of verbiage. And this includes the fellow who talks about "curved space" or who gets drunk on Bishop Berkeley and argues endlessly on the silly point that matter doesn't exist, that it's all in our minds—as though the brain (which, when in action, constitutes what we call mind) weren't in itself a hunk of matter. The typewriters on which they write their long-winded essays are just as real as a hot-dog sandwich. This is a very real universe. I always advise my readers to shy away from any kind of mysticism, whether it comes from a preacher or a gabby scientist who thinks it's smart to get people all muddled by empty phrase-mongering. You never hear an intelligent, informed, realistic Materialist talk such moonshine. I'm reminded of the visit a young engineer once made to my office. He is connected with one of the great corporations in the electrical field. On his way to install some new kind of engines in a distant city, he dropped in for a chat. When talking about the subject he was an expert in—electrical engineering—he was entrancing, but, like so many others, he likes to stray into fields about which he knows nothing, especially mysticism. After describing real engines and all that sort of thing for perhaps 30 minutes, he stopped, sighed, and then said, rather wistfully, "After I get these things finished I always stand back and wonder if they're really real or just figments of my imagination?" I looked at him in amazement, then said I was sure the municipality that had contracted for the engines was quite convinced they were real and that real money would be forthcoming in due time. He shook his head again, as though he questioned even this obvious statement. As I've said, it all goes to show how some people who deal in realities like to wander into the jungles of mysticism, which gets them nowhere. Such people make perfect members of the Christian Science Church. But, those notions can't get very far, for most people have their feet on solid ground and know that engines that produce elec-

tricity are real things, not manifestations of the spiritual, whatever that piffle means. At this point I want to repeat a good sentence to be found on page 140 of John Dewey's book, "Reconstruction in Philosophy," because the kind of people I've been describing above need to take the words to heart: "The first distinguishing characteristic of thinking is facing the facts—inquiry, minute and extensive scrutinizing, observation."

\* \* \*

I need a quotation from a conservative source regarding the claim of Fundamentalists that Genesis doesn't conflict with science. Can you give me one?

There are many to choose from. *The Encyclopedia Britannica* enjoys the reputation of being conservative, a point which even a Fundamentalist may be willing to grant. Well, you'll find in its article on "Genesis," by Stanley Arthur Cook, the following:

"That the records of the pre-historic ages in Genesis 1-XI are at complete variance with modern science and archaeological research is unquestionable."

\* \* \*

Where do we get cloves?

The bulk of the world's cloves comes from Zanzibar.

\* \* \*

I'm glad to read the numerous funny stories you say the people in Nazi Germany are passing around. Give us some more.

These stories are a form of political expression, in humorous style, and for that reason help give one an insight into how the German people really feel about Hitlerism. Here are a few more that are going the rounds:

A lad named Fritz, of Hamburg, was eating a meager supper with his father.

"Papa," asked Fritz, munching his potato peeling, "what does National Socialism mean?"

Papa remained gloomily silent.

"Papa," insisted Fritz, "I asked you what does National Socialism mean?"

"Eat your potato peelings and shut up!" cried the father.

"Ja, ja," said Fritz sadly, "that's what I thought it meant."

A high Nazi functionary visited a Frankfort factory.

"I have come," boomed the high

official to the factory owner, "to get statistics on the political beliefs of your employes. I want exact figures, you understand."

"To be sure," said the honest factory owner. "I have known my workers for many years and I know exactly their political beliefs. I would say that 60 percent of them are trade unionists."

"What!"

"Yes. And 30 percent are Social Democrats."

"The devil you say!"

"And the other 10 percent are scattered, but most of them are Communists."

"Du lieber Gott! Do you mean to say there are no Nazis at all?"

"But, my dear sir," protested the factory owner quickly. "Of course. They are ALL Nazis."

A valuable ape in the Berlin zoo died. The head zoo keeper summoned one of the caretakers, named Hans, and said:

"Hans, run quickly to the zoo staff doctor and tell him the ape is dead. Ask him to come immediately, for the disease may be epidemic and more animals may die."

"Ja ja," said Hans, putting on his cap and running off.

Hours passed. No Hans. The head zoo keeper, cursing, decided to run the errand himself. He walked to the office of the zoo staff doctor, and there found both Hans and the doctor quite drunk, with a bottle of brandy on the table between them.

"This is unheard of," screamed the head zoo keeper. "Hans, this shall be reported!"

Hans wavered to his feet and saluted.

"It was not my fault, mein lieber Herr," mumbled Hans. "This is God's truth. I came immediately to Herr Doktor's office. When I entered he arose and cried: 'Heil Hitler!' And I said: 'Herr Doktor, the ape is dead!' 'Aha!' cried Herr Doktor. 'So he's dead! Well, that calls for a celebration.' And he opened a bottle of his best brandy."

\* \* \*

Not that it's of world-shattering importance, but can you tell me what caused Mencken and Nathan to break up their friendship?

Mencken and Nathan, as is generally known, collaborated as editors and authors for something like a decade, during which they turned out an immense quantity of stuff, much of it good and some of it callow. They were hardboiled with the world,

and (so the world thought) with each other. But there came a day when Mencken exploded into a round grease spot. Nathan, the snappy, smart, stylish cosmopolitan, let Mencken, the corny product of Baltimore, know that his clothes were in bad taste, especially his collars. And that's how Mencken quit working with the dapper Nathan. It sounds fantastic the way I write it here, but it happens I'm being careful to tell the literal truth.

\* \* \*

Is poker more popular than contract bridge?

The Association of American Playing Card Manufacturers announced, on February 14, 1939, that a survey of 2,600 clubs and organizations showed contract bridge is the most popular card game, while poker ranks second, followed by auction bridge, rummy, pinochle, hearts, 500, whist and solitaire.

\* \* \*

What do you think about Rousseau's theory that man is "naturally good"?

While there's much in Rousseau that I admire, I can't see much truth in his theory that man is naturally good, that civilization corrupted us, that man in his primitive state was a worthy creature, and that civilized man should, to save himself, return to the happy, blessed habits of the people who lived in simpler times. If Rousseau is right, why is it that primitive man made so few contributions to civilization? His life was short, filled with superstitions, ignorance, preventable disease, fears and cruelties. Children of even civilized people are rarely "good." If anything, children usually are downright bad, anti-social, cruel, destructive, savage. They have to be educated into the ways of civilized living. There are many people who claim to be civilized but who are even worse than the worst savage—meaning, of course, men of the ilk of a Hitler or a Mussolini. But such creatures aren't civilized, in the real sense. They're throw-backs. Education only succeeded in bringing out the primitiveness we're all born with, extending it beyond the usual years of youthful savagery, and then growing more ruthless and cruel with the passing of time. Every impulse of

civilized people is to breed such specimens out of the race. The job may seem hopeless, but there are many good reasons to hold that, with time, it's possible to raise a people to loftier standards, to humanitarianism, to friendliness, to kindness, to justice, to fair play. A medicine, if taken in ignorance, may kill; if taken properly, it may save lives. Education is civilization's medicine to remove the curse of the primitive. Too often it happens that education is used, or rather misused, so that the purposes of civilized living are frustrated. But that doesn't change the truth that education, properly used, can be made to elevate humanity to higher planes of existence. Just because certain people misuse science for the ends of destruction, of mass murder, and terror, is no reason to dismiss science from our lives, for it's clear that, properly used, science can help make life truly worth living—a thing of beauty, security, health, wisdom, and progress. The mentality that works over the problem of supplying aggressors with new kinds of poison gas can have his energies diverted to finding a cure for cancer. The test of any civilization is the determination it shows in ridding its people of the impulses of primitive ignorance. But we must be patient. Civilization is hardly more than a child. In the calendar of events, it appeared only yesterday. It wavers, it stumbles, but it manages to survive. Its future is bright, because it holds the key to better living.

\* \* \*

Someone told me your name was changed to E. Haldeman-Julius from E. Julius Haldeman to escape creditors. Was he mistaken?

This is a new one. I hear no end of fantastic stories about myself, but this is the first time I've heard this amusing one. Your mistaken friend, incidentally, has discovered a simple way of getting rid of creditors—just turn your name inside out. But what is poor John Jones to do? Change it around to Jones John? And how's Mrs. Astorhorses to turn the trick?

\* \* \*

Can you mention some of the government's domestic projects that are making for progress?

You can answer that question for

yourself by just looking around your city of Philadelphia, where two progressive phenomena were born—the Declaration of Independence and myself. But seriously, this subject of whether the people have received value for the money spent by the Federal government during the past five or six years must be getting tiresome to informed people. I have shown—and I point to my volumes of questions and answers for the proof of this assertion—that the vast and varied public works program of the administration has been progressive, useful and constructive in every sense. Billions have been spent, but look at the gigantic power sites, dams, bridges, public buildings, schools, roads, CCC camps, soil conservation, reforestation, flood control, athletic centers, airports, libraries, housing, and so on almost without end. The country is richer because of this mighty program. It's a better place to live in. Don't be taken in by the false propaganda of the reactionary interests that want the public to get the impression that the government has squandered the people's money, that the men who have been put on the pay-roll were, and are, lazy, inefficient and expert shovel-leaners. The silly little jokes shouldn't deceive anyone. The millions of men and women who have been paid to deliver work have met their part of the bargain. They have given value for the money.

\* \* \*

Editor: I agree with you in your analysis of world affairs at present. The democracies, or so-called democracies, which comprise chiefly England and France are the direct cause of the present terrible conditions existing in the world. I love freedom. I was educated in your country (in Pennsylvania) and I am now completing work for my doctor's degree in law at our National Law Faculty here.

We have formed in this city the Nicaraguan Democratic Union, which chiefly fights Fascism and Nazism. We hold weekly meetings and call in the masses and explain to them the grave danger that is upon us if the free peoples of the world do not rally and lend their support in every way to stamp out this new form of medieval savagery that has come upon us.

Just recently I met Dr. Ben Cherrington, Director of the Division of Cultur-

al Relations at Washington. He passed through here from the Lima Conference. I had a long chat with him on matters of great importance to the American Government. The U.S. has slept and allowed Fascism to creep into Latin America. You are going to have a great struggle to clean up these countries. Franco's puppet government in Spain is working here to renew the old Spanish Empire that existed before we declared our independence in 1821. In these Republics, Franco has the Catholic Church with him. You better continue a strong propaganda for your Government to keep an eye on these little countries. I am a friend of the U.S., but you have been careless with the liberty your forefathers gave you. Remember, "Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom."

R. M. HOOKER

Managua, Nicaragua, C.A.

Which feature of the New York world's Fair, in your opinion, will impress mid-westerners most?

15-cent hamburgers.

Do you think human nature can ever change?

In only my lifetime I remember when every young feller with a car never thought of driving without first opening the muffler.

Please write occasionally on the progressive foreign governments that have or are making contributions which the U.S. might adopt.

I have done this consistently, and intend to continue telling readers how Scandinavia, New Zealand, etc., have gone ahead with programs that we can adapt to our needs. During the past 15 or 20 years I've extolled New Zealand for its social-minded measures along the lines of security for the masses and its efficient, workable system of nationalized utilities. As for the Scandinavian countries, I've written reams of copy about their wonderful cooperatives. Here, of course, I've told about the same projects in countries like Belgium, France, England, etc. The idea of consumers' cooperatives is taking hold, even though it was first tried out in a foreign country. We're usually suspicious of izzums, but consumers cooperatives are so sane and sensible that even the most provincial yokel has to confess there's something in the cooperative movement.

that we can use for our own good. And the facts show we're traveling in the direction of a prodigious cooperative movement. The next decade or two will see immense forward strides in this field. If you want more of the facts, let me refer you to my volumes of questions and answers, which are crammed with data of all kinds.

We Western Canadians who believe in democracy are deeply concerned over the threats of the Catholic-Fascists in Eastern Canada. What would be the attitude of these Fascists if Italy were to join Germany and Japan in a war on the Western democracies?

Mayor House, of Montreal, announced early in February, 1939, that the French-Canadians are "Fascist by blood." He added they would sympathize with Italy "in the event of an Anglo-Italian war." Canadian Fascism is a serious problem. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (C.C.F.), Canada's Socialist party, takes a firm stand in support of democracy, at the same time insisting that the Government shall decide for itself whenever it's to go to war.

Editor: You are such a Rooseveltophile that you have definitely sabotaged criticism of F. D. R. in your writings. Perhaps you have done it unconsciously, not wishing to put yourself in the category of the opposition. But, after all, criticism from the Left should always be kept up, the Communist party notwithstanding. Furthermore, don't forget one thing—capitalistic democracy is still capitalistic democracy. That's not being narrow-minded; it's being realistic. Look at England and France as beautiful examples of capitalistic democracy—just out and out hypocrisy. It boils down to class interests before national interests. Certainly no real democracies would have continued this appeasement and also let Franco win in Spain. What a sweet set-up for France with an additional border to defend. By criticism of F. D. R. I mean in regard to: 1. The administration blocking passage of the Ludlow amendment which would have allowed the people to vote on war participation for offense and not defense. It's a perfectly good democratic bill and all talk about giving the Fascists a better hand is ridiculous. 2. The administration (through Hull) not declaring that there existed a state of war in

China. To say that restriction of war shipments to China would have helped Japan is also ridiculous since 45 percent of Japanese war material has come from the democracy of the U.S.A. After all, if the shipments of war material directly to a Chinese port had amounted to anything Japan could and would have easily blockaded China. China would be better off today if the neutrality act had been invoked, for the U.S.S.R. and Indo-China would have shipped in arms to China and Japan's source would have decreased. 3. The administration's rotten and damnable policy toward Spain is a terrible blight upon the U.S.A. and it was at F. D. R.'s instigation that Congress put through the embargo originally. Don't forget that! And every attempt to lift it since has been sabotaged by the White House crowd. It's just rotten hypocrisy, all these words by the little father in the White House. If you want to stop aggressors in South America, then you must stop them on the soil of Spain and not let them win there. Even now they won't change their policy, saying it would change the European policy. The fact is we don't have a European policy; we're just tied to the apron-strings of Great Britain, and you know it.

E. HERBERT SEXTON, D.D.S.  
Hollis, Ll., N.Y.

Is it true that it's much easier to make a girl by getting her to smoke cigarettes, which are supposed to make her passionate?

I'm afraid, no matter what I tell you, you're going to waste a lot of cigarettes.

What's the difference between an old-time jazz band and one of these new-fangled swing bands?

There are many points of difference, but the only one that strikes me at the moment is that the men in jazz bands used to be apologetic about their work while members of swing bands tell you frankly their stuff's 'way better than Bach, Beethoven, or Brahms.

Did Abraham Lincoln own a German-language newspaper?

Yes.

#### ADVERTISE IN THE FREEMAN

The American Freeman, with its intelligent readers scattered all over the U.S., is an excellent mail order advertising medium. Advertisements are accepted subject to the publisher's approval. GENERAL ADVERTISING: per

column inch, \$5.60. Minimum space, 1/2 inch, \$2.90. CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING: per word, 6c. Minimum order for classified, \$1. (Count each initial, abbreviation, number or group of numbers as one word.) Cash must accompany all orders. The American Freeman, Adv. Dept., Girard, Kansas.

A friend did me a favor and I immediately did him one in return, with the result that he seemed displeased. Can you explain this?

La Rochefoucauld noticed this when he wrote: "Too great haste in repaying an obligation is a species of ingratitude."

How many American policemen did criminals kill in 1938?  
40.

What do you say when you hear it argued that religion and science must go forward hand in hand?

That's ridiculous. As Joseph McCabe once said: "The Theist and the scientist are rival interpreters of nature. The one retreats as the other advances."

How many symphony orchestras are there in the U.S. today? How many a generation ago?

In 1939, 2,000; in 1910, 22.

"The recent suggestion of certain congressmen that the C.C.C. become a military unit does not meet with my approval. I believe the organization is doing very well with its present program and that making it a junior army would lower its value."—J. P. McStracat, Alaska.

Editor: I believe your "card jackets" will fit right in with my present system of filing clippings and material. If it does, I'll be coming back shortly for 200 more jackets.

While the system I use, based on that of Henry Albert Phillips, a playwright, is nowhere near as simple as yours, I think it more nearly suits my needs for fiction. The system is divided into 10 main divisions: Man's Nature (races, customs, position in society, etc.), His Heart (his relations of friendship, love, marriage, etc.), His Ambition (dealing with his struggle for achievement), His Might (dealing with forms of combat, war, peace, discord, history, etc.), His Character (dealing with character, crime, its detection and punishment, the law, etc.), His Flesh (health, remedy, disease, death, etc.), His Mind (super-

stitutions, science, literature, derangement, etc.), His Soul (or his relations with his gods, and the effect of those relations on society—which includes filings of much of yours and Joseph McCabe's works), His Emotions (pleasure, pathos, etc.), and Personification of Man (under which comes nature, the air and sea, animals, etc.)

This system, with its many subdivisions, covers all of the aspects of man's life. If I'm working on a detective story, I'll find all the items on crime detection in the several envelopes under Detection in the main division "His Character," instead of scattered all over under various letters of the alphabet, as "lie-detector" under "L" and "finger prints" under "F." Locating a subject isn't complicated, though; for a catalog is used, each numbered page representing an envelope with each subdivision on it lettered. At the very beginning, it requires 200 envelopes.

CLARENCE S. CAMPBELL

Philadelphia, Pa.

[Editor's note: Reader Campbell's filing system looks good from where I sit. But I don't see why he can't use it in my newsclip folders. They're right down his alley.]

\* \* \*

Editor: Father Coughlin is an Irish name, I am sorry to say; but I doubt if there is a drop of Irish blood in the "good" father's heart. He should change his name to Cackling. Let no man dare call himself Irish if he persecutes or attempts to persecute the Jewish people—whose blood has been shed in torrents all through the ages by barbarians sailing in the good ships—Christianity, Civilization, Respectability. Fascist murderers! They will get what they have given to the poor Jewish people. The Czars of Russia and their ilk persecuted the Jews; we know how they ended. And if I could lay my hands on Hitler I would show him how a real Irishman disposes of a scabby, Fascist rat.

PATRICK O'SULLIVAN

Toronto, Canada

\* \* \*

Editor: Says The Philadelphia Record, March 2, 1939: "It is becoming increasingly impossible to comment coherently on totalitarian Europe. The closest we can come is Lord Acton's 'Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely.' Even that doesn't seem to go far enough for Germany and Russia." Nor for Italy and Roman Catholicism, why doesn't The Record add? Doesn't absolute power corrupt the Roman Church as absolutely as any other dictator? One wonders whether the Church will be shrewd enough not to kill the goose

that lays the golden egg here, now that it has killed its Spanish, Russian and Mexican geese? It is common knowledge that the United States provides most of the Vatican wealth. Will the hierarchy have sense enough to let well enough alone?

More from the Philadelphia Record, February 16, 1939: "It is perhaps the clearest indication of Hitler's megalomania that he would have the sacred election of a new Pope of the almost 400,000,000 Roman Catholics of the world revolve around his political wishes. Fascism never ceases extending its tentacles. It has destroyed democracy at home, just as it has destroyed Church schools. . . . We think the Fascists will be disappointed. The Church, based on the brotherhood of man, will not tolerate racism under any Pope. The Vicar on Earth of the Prince of Peace will not condone the wanton making of war. (Mr. E. H.-J., here's your chance to give us a new definition of 'wanton'—the war against the peaceful Ethiopians evidently not being wanton!) The successor to St. Peter will not shut his eyes to paganism. The war of the Church against racism and violence of Fascism will be as unrelenting as its war against the crass materialism of Communism. How small are these who shake their fists at the ancient Church of Rome!" Like Voltaire, perhaps? He was not so small but that the French clergy realized the harm he could do them. (By the way, perhaps some of your readers would like to refresh their minds as to the affaire Calas.) No; Voltaire with his cry, 'Crush the infamous thing!' was not much like the Mr. Sterns of our day, whose reasoning appears to be, "There is no use trying to stand in the way of the tremendously powerful R. C. Church. It will get whatever it wants anyway, so let us hasten the day by lying down and permitting it to walk all over us."

Wilmington, Del.

W. MATTHEWS

\* \* \*

How many pianos and radios do the American people own?

10,983,000 pianos; 30,500,000 radio sets.

\* \* \*

How many parts does the average watch contain?

150.

\* \* \*

At which speed does a vacuum cleaner do its best work?

Two State experiment stations studied this question and reached the same conclusion—a vacuum cleaner works best when moved at a speed

between one and two feet a second, according to a memo in my newsclip filing system.

\* \* \*  
 "I wish you would slip the slogan, 'Join a Consumers' Cooperative Today,' into *The Freeman*."—E. Herbert Sexton, D.D.S., N.J.

\* \* \*  
 "Your articles on freethought are as necessary as air."—C. Borst, Ill.

\* \* \*  
 Editor: You have probably read that Rt. Reverend Joseph Corrigan of the Catholic University of America announces a crusade for "God in Government." We thought it would come to that sooner or later—an excuse to put an end to separation of Church and State; to have God (meaning the Catholic Church?), not man, running the country. We've seen how it worked in Spain, Mexico, Russia, and other Catholic countries, and I think most of us will agree with Alexander Hamilton, whom *The New Republic* quotes as saying, in reply to the suggestion that the Constitutional Convention open each meeting with prayers to God, that they "could get along without the help of any foreign power."

#### READER

\* \* \*  
 What is your reaction to the bill introduced by Representative Dickstein, which would deny citizenship "to persons who believe in any form of government for the U.S. contrary to that now existing in the U.S.?"

This is on a par with the bill introduced by Representative Dempsey, providing for deportation of aliens who advocate changes in the American form of government. I have expressed my opinion on the Dempsey bill. The Dickstein measure, if passed, can be used to strike a serious blow at civil liberties. It would leave the question in the hands of naturalization examiners and judges, which would mean that personal prejudice would have a lot to do with deciding whether or not a person may become a U.S. citizen. Mr. Dickstein, who is chairman of the House Immigration Committee, speaks of the "form of government of the United States," but does he know exactly what this means? And does anyone know the precise answer? One person might say that members of the Supreme Court should be elected by direct vote of the people, while another might insist that the present system of appointing judges should prevail. Would

one be American and the other un-American? A prejudiced official could even decide that an alien belonging to a labor union (such as the C.I.O.) is acting in an un-American way, and refuse to let him become a citizen. Some judges could easily construe membership in one of the minority political parties as a reason for assuming the applicant isn't entitled to citizenship. The whole thing is open to many misinterpretations and abuses. I agree with the American Civil Liberties Union when it held, recently, that the present law is wholly sufficient.

\* \* \*  
 Give the figures showing how Germany has grown in area and population since the beginning of the World War.

The following table gives variations in area and population of Germany:

	Sq. Miles	Population
1914	208,780	67,800,000
1919	181,500	60,000,000
1938 (March)	214,000	68,000,000
1938 (Sept.)	225,000	78,700,000
1939 (March)	258,000	88,000,000

\* \* \*  
 The Congressional Record (February 1, 1939) contains a statement by Senator Reynolds, of N. Car., in which he quotes from an interview by Erika Mann, daughter of the famous novelist, Thomas Mann. Miss Mann is alleged to have said: "I have no hesitancy in calling for the blood of the sons of American mothers just so I can get even with that government which I despise." Please comment.

Miss Erika Mann represents the finest type of woman. She is an intelligent, honest student of affairs, and her anti-Nazism is the result of true humanitarianism. Senator Reynolds, on the other hand, is growing more pro-Nazi every day. He puts the Hitler regime in his gallery of admirations, which is his privilege, but he shouldn't expect the American public to swallow his gross lies without protest. He deliberately lied about Miss Mann. The interview, which appeared in the *New York World-Telegram*, January 27, 1939, didn't contain the words Senator Reynolds credited to her. He showed his Hitleristic appreciation of the power of falsehoods by inventing a stupid remark which a woman of Miss Mann's intellectual attainments wouldn't dream of uttering. In his book, Hitler advised against little lies

but defended great lies. Senator Reynolds has taken this lesson to heart. The voters of North Carolina, who sent this Fascist to the U.S. Senate, should blush for shame.

\* \* \*

I was impressed by the numerous facts you gave about the Socialist administration in Milwaukee. As an insurance man I was especially interested in how Milwaukee has succeeded in getting the lowest car theft and burglary rates among the country's larger cities. I think it would be valuable if you were to show us exactly what Milwaukee's crime record is, compared with cities of similar size or situation.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has issued its report for 1938, according to an item in my newspaper filing system. This report gives figures on robberies, burglaries and car thefts in Milwaukee and a number of other cities more or less comparable to that city. Here's the table:

	Robbery	Burglary	Car Theft
Kansas City .....	558	1,316	1,147
Cincinnati .....	534	2,159	713
Buffalo .....	102	650	661
Indianapolis .....	519	2,222	1,267
Dallas .....	162	1,754	634
Louisville .....	443	2,604	878
St. Louis .....	534	1,340	1,226
Minneapolis .....	276	1,446	1,363
Milwaukee .....	51	577	551

Milwaukee's Socialist administration has produced excellent results. In my previous article I described the measures that brought about these splendid improvements. The only point I care to make here is that Milwaukee's low crime rate isn't the result of a happy set of accidents; it's the outcome of intelligent, competent, honest administration.

\* \* \*

Editor: Interesting comment on the recent Nazi demonstration. Frank R. Kent says, March 1, 1939: "Infinitely more insidious, and therefore, more dangerous, are the Communist tactics of loudly calling themselves 'liberals,' falsely asserting their devotion to the American system, worming themselves into key positions not only in pressure organizations and labor unions but actually in the government itself. . . ." They would not be a real danger, says Kent, if they were not permitted, "disguised as patriots and with their tongue in their cheeks saying, 'Why, we're not Communists, we're just Americans.'" Most of their activities are "pretty well hidden, but now and then they break out in a new place." "So far as the

bund is concerned, it provides its own antidote. By putting on a show thatangers and disgusts the country, it frustrates its efforts."

On March 1, 1939, the Philadelphia Record contained a letter, said to be typical of others received from Philadelphia students: "I have been a student of the South Philadelphia High School for Girls for two years and I wish to protest against the statement in The Record accusing our instructors of teaching Communism. I can truthfully say, having studied history since I entered the school, that this statement is not only false, but also an insult to our school. Our teachers are careful not to express their personal opinions in matters of politics. About two years ago the same charge was brought against us; our school was visited, our books examined and not one piece of evidence was found which could make this statement true. . . . Pauline Marchini."

Why do tory commentators, forever yelling about mysterious Communists (whom no one else can see) boring from within by claiming "We are good Americans," remain strangely blind to Roman clerics who do that very thing? "We are as good Americans as you can find," they protest; "we love your George Washington, your Thomas Jefferson (which one finds it hard to believe, considering what Jefferson thought of them.) We are always found in the vanguard fighting for human rights, for the right of the people to govern themselves." Yes, the priests say this, and any child knows they never back their words up by their actions. But somehow our brilliant tory writers can't see it. They are too busy calling attention to non-existent Communists to see an evil that faces them.

READER

\* \* \*

Please comment on the claim that Hitler has raised the German people's standard of living.

Of all the outrageous statements made by Hitler's propagandists, this is the most brazen. I heard the same remark made by a Pittsburg, Kans., Methodist preacher, a Rev. Alpha Kenna. The records—official and unofficial, and the reports of independent correspondents working for free newspapers—all agree that the Nazis have lowered the standard of living of the German masses to its lowest point in a century. I have presented no end of facts (all of them to be found in my volumes of questions and answers) showing that Fascism in

Germany and Italy has played havoc with the people's purchasing power. Junius B. Wood, veteran newspaper correspondent, who spent nine months in Germany, in which he visited many sections of Hitlerland, wrote, on April 1, 1939, that Hitler has made Germany into one vast concentration camp, writing of the average man, Mr. Wood said:

"Instead of complaining—he'd be thrown into a concentration camp if he did—he now works 60 hours a week, instead of 48. It is a virtue and a patriotic duty to his great Germany—so says Goebbels—to go without coffee and tobacco and to eat adulterated butter, greenish potato flour bread and other 'ersatz' foods. Butter and fats and coffee are rationed by cards, while all other foods—meats, vegetables and fruits—are just as effectively rationed by limiting the quantities put on sale in the stores."

That gives one a pretty good hint of what's happened to Germany's standard of living under the great "savior." Mr. Wood takes up another point frequently touched on in Nazi propaganda. I refer to the Hitler-Goebbels slogan, "People without space," which is used effectively to give the world the impression that Germany must have additional space because the country is overpopulated. But, says Mr. Wood, "they cannot explain why Italians are brought by the thousands to work on farms and new construction. The explanation is simple—all available money and man power are used for new public buildings, fortifications, munitions, roads and other non-productive development. The German is not expected to bother his head about that. The Fuehrer will decide and tell him what to think." Mr. Wood also found that Germans everywhere took special pains to explain to him "there are no poor or unemployed in the country." But they make no attempt to explain away the fact that "four separate collections are needed each month, in addition to the special taxes, all amounting to millions, on the pretext of caring for these non-existent poor and unemployed." They obey Hitler's propaganda and shut their eyes to the fact that while millions of men have been forced into the army and labor camps, and other millions have been put into the gigantic projects connected with building

up the war machine, Germany has many unemployed and immense poverty, with the standard of living practically reduced to an "ersatz" level—a standard based on substitutes for many important articles of diet. As Mr. Wood remarks, "One may wonder whether the famed German mentality has not become as 'ersatz' as the country's bread."

\* \* \*

Editor: As an earnest seeker after truth, Mr. E. H.-J., I do hope you will tell me why presumably intelligent people (including Eleanor Roosevelt, Drew Pearson and Robert Allen) have labeled Pius XI the "Pope of Peace." His own apologists have been unable to deny that he, his priests, bishops and cardinals, blessed the banners of Mussolini's Fascist troops when they set forth on their rape of Ethiopia, a peaceful, Christian country; or that Italian Fascists, with his blessing and approval, bombed defenseless women and children in Spain. If those writers had been Catholics, it would be quite understandable; it is what they honestly believe of their Pope. But the articles were written by Protestants, so-called liberals, and the very fact that they have written such things makes one feel hopeless for the future. Our Founding Fathers knew a man of peace, a lover of democracy, when they saw one. Their descendants seem to have lost that faculty. All one need do is to say he loves peace, believes in democracy; the superficial do not look to see if his actions bear him out. As you and Joseph McCabe have implied, Hitler and Mussolini believe in peace, in a sense; they would much rather get what they want peacefully—without the ravaging, the destruction, the expense of war. But if they can't get their own way peacefully, well, there will have to be a "just" war—and it will be the enemy's fault that there is no peace. He could have handed over whatever the big shots wanted, and there would have been no war!

Which reminds me—in a broadcast of March 2, 1939, Rev. Robert I. Gannon of Fordham declared that the new Pope, Pius XII, wants "peace with justice." College students who are pacifists are poor deluded creatures, according to Rev. Gannon; not that the Church wants war—bless you, no! It wants peace, but "peace with justice." Now I am very curious to know what that phrase means. Does it mean that bloodshed, slaughter, bombing of women and babies, is highly moral so long as it is done with the blessing of the Church—that is, of course, in a Holy Crusade—and a hideous "pagan" outrage so long

as it's committed by any group or groups who refuse to give up their right to self-government, the right to their own souls, at the order of Catholic Fascists? You tell me! Pacifism, said Rev. Gannon, was not a virtue, but "the image of the virtue distorted by heresy." Fordham students love peace, but "peace with justice." Inasmuch as the new Pope, Pius XII, has declared himself for "peace with justice," it would be gratifying to know just what that means—it might mean so many things.

It seems to me pacifism is stupid, but not in the sense in which Rev. Gannon means it. It is stupid to sit back and permit Fascist and Nazi propagandists to do their worst; to be so—well, let's call it "polite"—that we dare not even answer back, or fight with pen or typewriter, when they try to put over audacious and atrocious lies which even those Americans who should know better seem to swallow. What if Washington, Henry, Paine, Jefferson, the Adamases had been pacifists? The British would have had as easy a time as the Catholic hierarchy appears to be having today.

Wilmington, Del. W. MATTHEWS

\* \* \*

Have you any evidence showing how Father Coughlin uses Nazi and other Fascist propaganda material?

The evidence has been piling up for several years, until it's become a sizable mass. You'll find a tremendous amount of data about Father Coughlin in all my volumes of questions and answers, for I've watched this scoundrel and liar ever since he began using the radio in order to line up the ignorant masses behind his Fascist ideology. I've taken this dishonest rabble-rouser seriously from the beginning, and I believe I'm not guilty of the slightest exaggeration when I say I have written 10 times more about Father Coughlin than any other writer in the country. I have analyzed all his speeches and writings, answering his vicious lies and distortions one by one, until it's impossible for any sincere reader to reject the assertion that I have demonstrated, from a thousand sources, that the Detroit priest is one of the most dangerous misleaders in the country. His paper, *Social Justice*, months ago threw off its disguises and came out for Nazism and anti-Semitism. The April 5, 1939, issue of *The New Republic* contains an editorial paragraph which I'm sure my

readers will find interesting. It is entitled "Father Coughlin Repeats a Lie," and asks if Coughlin's paper is using verbatim the anti-Semitic falsehoods put out by Nazi propaganda agencies. The answer is, Yes, says this responsible, reliable commentator, and refers to an inquiry conducted by the American Jewish Congress, which found that an article in *Social Justice*, March 6, 1939, "is identical with material contained in *Sigilla Veri*, a publication of the Nazi propaganda house of Ulrich Fleischhauer. The article in question purports to tell how Moses Montefiore, addressing an assembly of Jewish rabbis in Cracow, in 1840, advised them to get control of the press throughout the world in order to advance Jewish power. The whole story of course is a lie. No such assembly of Jewish rabbis ever took place in Cracow; Montefiore never visited that city; Simon Wolf, a Jewish writer supposed to have told of the meeting, never did so. Finally, the Jews don't control the press, in any country in the World. We doubt very much, however, whether the falsity of the story will stop *Social Justice* or, if they ever find out about it, its readers. Anti-Semites move in a strange half-world of their own, below the level of even intellectual curiosity." One has the right to expect anything from a man of Father Coughlin's low caliber. A man capable of giving moral support to a mess of forgeries like the so-called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" can be expected to commit any sort of a crime against truth and culture.

\* \* \*

Editor: I have more news about the Milwaukee Leader-Post. You will recall that the headquarters of the Socialist party was in Brisbane Hall. The other day, the Milwaukee Journal had an illustrated article announcing that the headquarters had been changed to the Turner Hall, on 4th Street. This indicates to me that the present proprietors of The Post do not want to be identified with Socialism even to the extent of having its headquarters in the same building. This adds to my comment that there is a move to kill or cripple the radical press.

In addition to this take the fact that when the present crowd took possession of the paper they demoted Leo Wolfsohn from managing editor to merely a member of the staff. Then John M. Work could not publish anything by

me without submitting it to people "higher up."

FRANKLIN STEINER

Wauwatosa, Wisc.

\* \* \*

Editor: Our nation has the sort of protection that is given by distance and by encircling seas. We are tempted to believe that we can be frugal in preparing our defenses because we have oceans about us. For 500 years English statesmen thought they could practice that sort of frugality. But Englishmen have begun to wish that their statesmen had never learned to put so much faith in the protection given by large bodies of water.

Today many Englishmen are inclined to think that their rulers have forgotten too often that it is the duty of English statesmen to make sure, so far as human prudence can make sure, that Englishmen shall not be ruined by any enemy using any new invention. That duty has been tragically neglected.

I think I am not guilty of exaggeration when I say that most of us Americans believe that the United States should be so equipped with army and navy and flying machines as to be able to resist any combination of enemies; not any probable combination, but any combination.

Are any of us content to have the fate of our grandchildren left to probabilities?

America needs a navy that can meet the four corners of the world in arms. It needs such a navy in the Atlantic and such a navy in the Pacific. The man who denies this may be wiser than you or I and he may be right. He may be advising a wise economy. But he must remember that what we risk, in the next war, is the ruin of our descendants. He proposes to stake their future on the safety of a single delicate and remote piece of machinery, our Panama Canal.

What limitations should we put on our expenditures for defense? We can put that question in another way. What will happen if our defenses fail? That is a question easy to answer.

A fate worse than extinction threatens the race. There is no precedent for flying and there is no precedent for the new perils of this hour.

The governments of Germany, Japan and Italy have joined in far-sighted plans for unscrupulous conquest.

They begin by disabling, one by one, possible allies of any power that might be tempted, in the future, to resist these robber governments.

Many accurate volumes have been written about the benevolence, wisdom and charm of the people of Germany, who used to stand at the head of civil-

ization; and about the benevolence, wisdom and charm of Italians and Japanese. But these three peoples have fallen into the hands of ruffians.

The alliance of the Three Powers is a sinister portent. Sometimes they are called the Totalitarian Powers; and not without reason, for in astronomy, "totality" is defined as "the time of total obscuration."

Consider the possibility of a great war in which on one side will stand the three totalitarian nations, with England, France, Russia and our United States against them. Or, rather, imagine, as more probable, a war in which only two of the civilized governments have the courage or the prudence to fight against the three totalitarian powers. I can imagine our States and Russia uniting against three totalitarians; and I can imagine France and England afraid to join in such a war. They might remember General Boulanger. He has been quoted as saying that one may calculate the profits of war against a small nation but that no man can predict the incidents and results of a great war.

Let us suppose that the three totalitarian powers win in a war against us. It is not inconceivable that they might win, in such a war; and it concerns us to consider the results of such a victory. What nations after such a victory could stand against the victorious and unscrupulous three? What then would the three decree, in their peace terms? Let us consider only one point.

The victors would announce that in the future all flying would be reserved to trusted soldiers of the three. Nobody of any other nation would ever be allowed to fly, in war or trade or for pleasure. This would give to three groups of tyrants control of all the world's war, commerce, food, work, play and education. This would mark a division of the human race into Air Men nations and Ground Men nations. The people of nations forbidden to fly would undergo degradation and enslavement. Their women would be used to breed slaves and robots.

The low-minded chiefs of the Totalitarian Three would regard such a result as a desirable war prize. But Russians, French, Americans and English do not need to create any such unequal conditions for their own benefit.

You and I believe that all wisdom and all invention and all progress should be used, in the long run, for the good of the whole race. You and I believe that it is the duty of the human race, no matter how much hatred and cruelty prevail, to see to it that all men have a chance to advance in happiness, wisdom and power. But three maleficent

governments ardently desire the ruin and enslavement of such nations as they have marked down to be their victims.

Huntington, N.Y. NEWELL MARTIN

\* \* \*

I agree with your position regarding the Bill of Rights. We must be on our guard to defend our civil rights. But I don't agree with you when you write that you favor free speech for Nazis, Fascists and Communists. You know that all upholders of these ideologies believe in using democratic rights in order to destroy democracy.

This question has bothered me for years. It's so easy to say that a democracy shouldn't permit anyone to speak, print and organize with a view to destroying free speech, free press and free assembly. But is it good public policy? As my readers know, I have, since the advent of Nazism, written several times advocating a Federal law outlawing paramilitary (private) forces, meaning, of course, the practice of drilling with arms, wearing military uniforms, policing public meetings, etc. A democracy has a perfect right to protect itself, and should, as a simple measure of self-preservation, insist that military forces and uniformed bodies shall always be under the control of Congress. If Nazis or other anti-democrats want to hold a meeting, let them, by all means, if it's orderly, but don't permit the Nazis to send military forces to those meetings to terrorize elements that may want to express themselves, in an orderly way, against the ideas expounded. If there's any policing to be done it should be turned over to the police, who are capable of maintaining order without the help of private military forces. But this still leaves open the question of whether we should suppress all meetings, periodicals, etc., which frankly use the Bill of Rights in order to destroy that great document. Here I agree with a statement issued by the American Civil Liberties Union, one of my pet organizations. This Union, finding itself criticized by many of its own members and citizens in general because of its defense of Nazis' rights, was compelled to issue a statement, on April 3, 1939, in which it outlined its policy with regard to this difficult problem. Says the Union:

"To those who would suppress meetings where race or religious

prejudice is likely to be stirred up, the answer is that there is no general agreement on what constitutes race or religious prejudice. Once the bars are let down, the field is open for all-comers to charge such prejudice against any group—Catholics, Atheists, even against Jews attacking the Nazis."

No consistent line can be drawn, according to the Union, if propaganda is to be suppressed. The only clear distinction is between words on the one hand and acts, attempted acts or incitement to specific unlawful acts on the other. Libel laws are adequate remedies for scurrilous statements against individuals or organizations which do not amount to incitement. The statement continues:

"An organization to defend civil liberties naturally stands in direct opposition to any movement which rejects the principles contained in the Bill of Rights. But this opposition is expressed at the point of action contrary to the Bill of Rights, not in relation to theories. It is the task of other organizations to engage in political controversy in defense of democracy. It is our task to preserve democracy by opposing all violations of the Bill of Rights from any source whatever.

"It is in this spirit that we defend even the rights of those who might, if they came to power, suppress civil liberty. We certainly cannot abandon the principles of the Bill of Rights, which requires defense of everybody's rights without distinction, just because of the fear that thus some anti-democratic force will triumph. Such a fear implies distrust of democracy."

Declaring that the defenders of civil liberty cannot tolerate the suppression of any propaganda, the Union takes a stand in support of "only the suppression of acts in violation of civil liberty, or actual preparation for the use of force. Beyond that we cannot go and remain faithful to our purposes." No laws can be written to outlaw Nazi propaganda without striking at freedom of speech in general, according to the Union. The best way to combat propaganda directed against principles of the Bill of Rights is in the open "where it can be fought by counter-propaganda and all the devices of attack which do not involve denying the right to meet and speak." Defenders of civil liberty "cannot

yield to government the right to discriminate between those who may enjoy the protection of the Bill of Rights and those who may not." Interference by one group with the rights of any other group, however, will be fought by the Union, the statement declares. Enactment of the Fish bill now before Congress and other laws to prohibit military drill or arms in the hands of private organizations are being vigorously supported by the Union.

The Union's position is sound to the core. It's the only stand we supporters of democratic liberty can take and still remain democrats. I was shocked when I read in the press how the German-American Bund had held a mass meeting in Madison Square Garden, N.Y.C., at which 19,000 persons heard our President booed and Hitler cheered, and at which attempts were made to arouse race hatred by referring to the President as Mr. Rosenfeld. But, I would have been shocked immeasurably more if these unspeakable Nazis hadn't been permitted to express themselves. Our democracy is strong enough to withstand the impacts of undemocratic elements, especially if we remain vigilant and resort to honest, candid, forthright counter-propaganda. Freedom is the test of democracy. Once a democracy uses undemocratic tactics against its minorities there's no telling where the acts of discrimination may lead. It may end, eventually, in the suppression of all oppositions, a condition that would put us in the same class with the Brutalitarianism. I don't think our democracy suffered any real threat to its existence when 19,000 Fascists screamed their hatred at our President and cheered Hitler. That was a splendid lesson to all believers in democracy, and the reaction was favorable to democracy, because it showed what sort of people these Bundists really are and what their objectives are. A democracy shouldn't deny any portion of the population the right to demonstrate what damned fools they are. Fools have a way of showing wiser heads the things that should be avoided. The Bundists gave the American people a useful lesson in common sense—they taught our people (unintentionally, of course) what a blessed thing it is to

be able to live in a free country like ours. If such a meeting had been held in Berlin and a speaker had praised Roosevelt and ridiculed Hitler—well, you know what his punishment would have been. We have learned a better way. We prefer to treat unpopular minorities in a civilized manner, watching, however, against open acts of violence against our institutions.

Pro-Nazi meetings aren't shivering the foundations of democracy. They merely test them—and thus far we've met the tests successfully. We can let them spout their lies—the whole rotten crew—but we can hold our own meetings to answer their slanders and print papers, pamphlets and books to expose their printed lies. Yes, by all means let the anti-democratic elements have their say. It's better to have such meetings out in the open than in secret cellars. Democracy is strong enough to defend itself, and strong enough to be unafraid of those who think they have a political philosophy that's superior to democracy. Democracy is the best way of life ever conceived by man. It will endure because it's the best way ever invented to permit its citizens to live like decent, upright, honorable, justice-loving human beings.

\* \* \*

Editor: According to your "Answers to Unasked Questions" (the new department which is so seductively empyrean and so bewitchingly Arcadian), a shave plus a symphony equals an exalted mood. Now the minds of thousands of your disciples are reassured. Atheism comes into its own in this puzzling matter of exaltation.

Like peace, morals, and true love, exaltation has always been claimed by the religious as an exclusive adjunct. Psychology pricked this sacred bubble long ago. But many of us have forgotten

Exaltation is just simple and homely enough, it seems to me, to warrant renewed anti-clerical attention. Many people believe that only prayer induces it. Many other people believe this, too—so they shrug and mutter: "Well, this exalted stuff ain't in my line anyhow."

While the following is an incomplete list of exaltation agents, it's a fair start:

Logan Pearsall Smith finds solace and elevation in language, its similes, metaphors, and fine phrases.

Jack London ("Martin Eden") in beauty and thought,

W. Somerset Maugham in the fasci-

nating vistas of literature.

John Langdon-Davies in biology . . . and Spain (with reservation).

Carl Sandburg in his magic eye which focused on ordinary or sordid city-scenes and transformed them into flowers and jewels (sometimes).

John Erskine in the whimsical, forth-right play on sex ideas.

Offhand, here are some general sources (not in entirety, of course, but in angles and aspects): springtime, moonlight, sunshine, dancing, food, alcohol, invention, success, poetry, color and form, laughter, a smile, a nod.

The point I'm trying to make is this: to become exalted it's not altogether necessary to put on the slippers of angels and slip and slide in heaven. Amen.

Chicago, Ill. **THOMAS BAILEY**

\* \* \*  
It's my ambition to become a radio writer. Am I crazy?

I don't know, but if you are it'll help a lot.

\* \* \*  
The enclosed press picture shows IT CAN HAPPEN HERE. The German-American Bund now has its private military force—uniformed, drilled, armed Nazis in our Republic. What can we Americans do about this?

I can point to numerous articles, during the past six years, in which I warned my readers against the danger of private armies. Readers are invited to check this statement by referring to my numerous volumes of questions and answers. Para-military (private) forces needn't be tolerated in free America. Fortunately, the present Congress is going to be given an opportunity to pass on this important matter. Liberty-loving Americans should give their fullest support to federal legislation prohibiting the formation of private military forces in the U.S. Representative Hamilton Fish has introduced such a bill in the House, while a companion bill has been introduced by Senator Gerald P. Nye. According to a bulletin issued by the American Civil Liberties Union, the measure (H.R. 2654) bans private military forces "in order that there may be no interference with the control by Congress of the armed forces of the United States or tendency to interfere with or impair the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitution." I urge readers to write strong letters of support to their Congressmen and Senators. Show them you

believe it should be unlawful, under the terms of this bill, for five or more persons to organize as a club, camp, society, etc. "for the purpose of drill or parade with firearms . . . or for the purpose of giving or acquiring military training." Violation may incur penalties of \$500 fine, six months imprisonment, or both. Authorized government units and recognized veterans' organizations are among those to whom the law would not apply. My readers can do much good work in this fight to eliminate private military forces by not only writing to their Congressmen and Senators but taking the points in this article and turning them into letters to newspapers. Hundreds of such letters, appearing over the senders' names, can be of great help in furthering this movement. The American Civil Liberties Union, which sponsored this bill, submits the following memorandum:

"The increase in this country of uniformed military groups connected with political movements constitutes a menace to democracy, for they are plainly preparations for the use of force. The experience of foreign countries clearly indicates the danger of allowing such groups to assume the function of maintaining order even on private property, for the extension of that function to public places is only too easy. Already German-American organizations of Nazi sympathies have established semi-military companies, drilling and organizing, and, in some places, allegedly with arms. Certain native American organizations of political character also engage in military drill and training. While these organizations are not yet large or numerous they represent a tendency which should be outlawed by federal statute.

"Federal law at present does not prohibit private military drill nor drilling with arms by political organizations. The law only prohibits the wearing of uniforms similar to those of the United States armed forces. Certain States prohibit private military organizations unless authorized by State officials.

"The only objection raised to the proposed law is that it might violate the constitutional right to bear arms. The constitutional guarantee of the 'right of the people to keep and bear arms' does not apply to private military groups. The Second Amendment establishes the right to bear arms only for the

purpose of 'a well regulated militia' as 'necessary to the security of a free state.'

"Congress alone, under Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution, has exclusive powers 'to provide for the organizing, arming and disciplining of the militia.' Congress can and should exercise its power to regulate or prohibit private military groups."

Let me repeat what I've said many times before: *Democracy has a right to defend itself.* It doesn't have to stand by and let Fascists organize private military forces that are intended to destroy democracy and enslave our people. The bill described above is constitutional and if passed will do much to strengthen democratic rights in this country. I again urge readers to join in this crusade. Write letters to the newspapers, by all means, and send copies to your Congressmen and Senators. Be sure to submit your statements in your own words. Don't hesitate to use any of the data printed above.

\* \* \*

Is it true that a Pope once formally denounced and condemned a comet?

Yes. I recall having tabbed a page in John W. Draper's "History of the Intellectual Development of Europe," page 253, vol. 11, wherein I now find that when Halley's comet appeared in 1456, "it struck terror into all people. From his seat, invisible to it, in Italy, the sovereign pontiff, Calixtus III, issued his ecclesiastical fulminations; . . . in vain were all the bells in Europe ordered to be rung to scare it away; in vain was it anathematized; in vain were prayers put up in all directions to stop it." I'm glad I tabbed that page at the time I read Draper's interesting statement, for it enabled me to answer the above question in a few minutes. The system works.

\* \* \*

#### WAS IT A GOOD CHOICE?

[Anthony Arico is a journalism student at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. When asked to turn in an original theme, he submitted the brief article below, for which he received the worst mark the instructor could bestow. I've studied the paper carefully and find it reasonably well written, its "slant" intelligent and informed, its viewpoint fresh and honest, and its criticisms fair and sound. And yet young Arico got an "F" for his

pains. I believe my readers will agree with me when I say this treatment was accorded student Arico because he preferred to express an unpopular set of ideas. Our great schools of journalism prefer to toady to the publishers of the capitalistic press. I happen to know that the main building of the School of Journalism, University of Missouri, was paid for by one of the most reactionary publishers the country ever produced. Some years ago, I delivered some lectures at this university, because of the independent spirit of one of its leaders (now deceased), and I heard from his own lips that he had to do a lot of explaining because of his decision to have me spend a week with his students. At the very same time lectures were being delivered in another hall by the editor of The Wall Street Journal, but not a word of protest was expressed over the reactionary ideology he presented with all the aplomb of one speaking by direct authority of Jehovah. Mr. Arico is one of the busboys I wrote about last year, after meeting him (and his twin brother) in the dining room of the Chase Hotel, St. Louis, Mo. I encouraged them to save money and go to an educational institution, for they're still very young, hardly more than 20 years of age. I'm glad they took my advice. I wish them every success. I think I ought to let my readers know that one twin is working eight hours each day in order to earn the money to keep Anthony Arico in school. Later, he will quit his job and go to some university, while Anthony does the earning for a change. That shows a splendid, independent, praise-worthy attitude towards life, especially in these hard times. Such youngsters deserve any success they achieve. I know I don't have to tell Anthony to keep up his courage and refuse to be worried over his instructor's unfriendly attitude. He's made of too solid stuff to be bowled over by every puff of wind that comes from some teacher who thinks it's part of his duty to keep the world safe for Capitalism. Anthony will learn much at the University of Missouri, because he will master the technical studies offered by the school, but at the same time he'll protect himself against being tainted by fly-specked, moth-eaten, sun-bleached conservatism. Young Anthony ought, in time, to be able to become a useful worker in labor journalism, a field which is in need of conscientious, talented, competent practitioners. His "bad" theme, which I place before this jury of readers, follows:]

According to the item in The New Republic, which was read in class, Mr. Robert R. McCormick, publisher and

editor of The Chicago Tribune, was invited to an Eastern university to speak as a representative of successful journalism. In my opinion, the institution which bestowed this honor upon the Colonel, made a bad selection. Why McCormick was selected instead of Hearst, Gannett, or any other newspaperman who represents the same sort of gutter journalism, the article did not state.

In the United States there are several other men who are eligible and should have been selected to represent successful journalism. True, the men I am about to mention haven't acquired an enormous amount of wealth, as has McCormick. Good, successful journalism shouldn't be measured by the amount of wealth accumulated but by the honest and sincere character of the editor or owner. McCormick dishes out daily, to millions of readers, an enormous amount of poison—his prejudiced views on economics, politics, religion and bunk place him in the category of gutter journalism.

On the other hand, carefully scrutinize the paper owned and edited by E. Haldeman-Julius and the paper edited by William T. Evjue, just to mention a few. These two editors are not concerned with profits but with truth and progress. Since they carry no advertising, no pressure is exerted upon their editorial policies. Their opinions are, for the most part, free from bias and not dependent on a policy advocated by the advertisers. Their actions or ideas are not motivated to please the "haves," who control many of our newspapers. Their support comes from readers who realize and understand the usefulness of a free, enlightened, and independent press. These two editors publish the facts, not as they are found in the sheet put out by the Colonel, but as they should be published—free from distortion, prejudice, and caprice. McCormick's editorial columns in The Chicago Daily Tribune are filled with distorted, ambiguous statements, contemptible lies, and unsound reasoning, while the editorials of E. Haldeman-Julius and W. T. Evjue are written to enlighten and liberate thousands of minds from the shackles of the supernatural, from the bunk of the press and radio, and from all political and religious charlatans.

McCormick's paper has been and still is a vigorous foe of President Roosevelt and all his policies. On the other hand, E. Haldeman-Julius and W. T. Evjue have, from time to time, praised and supported Mr. Roosevelt because they realize that his policies go a step forward—mainly a step to bigger and better things. They, however, recognize the fact that Mr. Roosevelt merely in-

tends to patch up an old outworn system, but they also recognize the President's sincerity when he attempts to better the lot of the workingman. On the contrary, the Colonel brands the President's progressive acts as Communist-inspired and invariably shouts the oft-repeated cry of "dictator."

In reviewing the characteristics of McCormick and comparing them with the characteristics of the other two editors mentioned, I find myself in a dilemma, for I am unable to discover WHY McCormick was selected as a representative of successful journalism instead of another individual possessing qualities similar to those of E. H. J. and W. T. E. Could it be possible that the institution selected him with the hope of thus acquiring a part of his ill-gotten gains? Who knows?

The economic status of the two last mentioned editors cannot be compared with that of the Colonel; nor are their economic, political, and religious theories very popular. For these reasons these two worthy gentlemen of the press were completely ignored by the institution, but it was the Institution's loss, not theirs. These two editors, and others like them, will continue to fight consistently to make this world a better place to live in. Riches and honors may not be for them, but perhaps after they are gone from our midst, posterity will erect a sacred memorial in their honor.

In conclusion, let me state that these seemingly insignificant publications, The American Freeman, of Girard, Kans., and The Progressive, of Madison, Wisc., will some day, in one form or another, become the indispensable and priceless heritage of society. If their present policies are continued, the road to lasting success is certain. Institutions will be clamoring for a hearing, while the gutter journalism of McCormick and his kin will fade into oblivion.

These two publications, with the assistance of The Nation, The New Republic, and several other liberal periodicals, may in the future cause a complete transformation in these United States—where at the present time there remains that awful paradox—want in the midst of plenty.

\* \* \*

"In answering the question about the practice of circumcision in Germany, you forgot to mention that after throwing away the Jew, the government saves the pieces, out of which it hopes some day to make a man out of Hitler."—Eli Appelbaum, Washington, D.C.

\* \* \*

Floyd Gibbons, newspaper correspondent, once cabled a story to The Chicago Tribune in which he claimed "that lock-jaw was prevalent on the field of bat-

tle because of the vast number of rusty nails lying around." Do you accept this?

No. It's nonsense. Lockjaw isn't caused by rust. A new, shiny nail can cause lockjaw, if it has on it the bacteria that cause lockjaw, while a rusty nail that is devoid of bacteria won't cause that condition.

\* \* \*

What have the Nazis contributed to German philosophy?

The non-Nazi professors of philosophy who have been driven out of the universities answer: "Field Marshal Goering has evolved the combination of simple ostentation, Dr. Goebbels has contributed the theory of suggestive truth, and Hitler has established the principle of voluntary compulsion."

\* \* \*

I enclose a clipping which says flies don't grow up, that a fly emerges from the pupal state full grown. Is this true?

Yes. It's as big at birth as it'll ever be.

\* \* \*

Is there any factual basis to the common belief that all babies are born with blue eyes?

No. Johns Hopkins Hospital reports that physicians "examined the eyes of almost 500 newly born infants and found that many of the babies had brown eyes and that others had gray, violet, green and lavender eyes." Of all these babies only 48 were found to be blue-eyed. Thus does another popular piece of bunk get swatted good and hard, and thus does my newsclip filing system help me keep the record straight.

\* \* \*

If you went to heaven and St. Peter told you you couldn't stay without first identifying the angels Adam and Eve, how would you go about it?

That's an old one. I'd hunt around for two angels that didn't have navels.

\* \* \*

Are camel's hair brushes made of camel's hair?

No. They're made of the hair on squirrels' tails.

\* \* \*

#### ANTI-NEWS NEWSPAPERS

The Standard newspapers, as I've shown many times, are wary of most of the news coming out of the Federal Trade Commission, Federal Food and Drug Administration, and other government agents that are participating in

the fight to protect consumers against false advertising and crooked business methods. Recently, I noticed another interesting incident, this time concerning 20 metropolitan newspapers which subscribe to the reports issued by the sponsors of the Gallup poll, a fact-gathering organization often mentioned in these columns. On March 24, 1939, Dr. Gallup released a story which showed that President Roosevelt is still popular with the American masses. The poll showed F.D.R. was preferred by 58.2 percent of the citizens interviewed. It was 58 percent in the previous month, and 54.4 percent in November, 1938. That's news, by anybody's standards, and yet only one among the 20 newspapers examined (The Baltimore Sun) carried the report. Even the sacred, divinely inspired, pure, thrice-blessed New York Times omitted mention of this unpleasant fact. These papers, let me add, all paid the usual fee for the Gallup material, even though they preferred to throw the material out. Three weeks before, Dr. Gallup released another set of figures dealing with one of his surveys, this time showing that more than 50 percent of the American voters don't favor a third term for F. D. R. All 20 newspapers printed this story. There's a moral here. America is waiting for a press that will tell all the news. There are lots of important developments which the capitalistic press won't touch with a 10-foot pole. Last month I examined carefully the Associated Press dispatches in a number of large newspapers, including the pious and virginal Kansas City Star, and found that only one unfriendly report dealing with a great advertiser—the one showing that the FDA had cracked down on the Baltimore corporation which feeds doses of dangerous Bromo-Seltzer to consumers—got into print. This story simply couldn't be ignored, because the order to confiscate and destroy thousands of bottles of Bromo-Seltzer was issued by a Federal Judge. Even then the AP report simply called the patent medicine "bromo-seltzer," when, as shown in previous articles, the proper name is "Bromo-Seltzer." Using lower-case type helped take the curse off a great advertiser's temporary bad luck. During the same month this happened I compiled more than 100 news releases of the FTC and the FDA giving appalling instances of misleading representations, dishonest devices, and all the other tricks and crimes used so often to skin the consumers—and not a single item appeared in the average newspaper, including the chaste Kansas City Star. How long are the consumers going to tolerate such tactics? They have a right to the news. The press has no right to sup-

press scores of news releases telling unpleasant facts about big and small advertisers. In one case, which I'm reporting fully in another place, I found the FTC had cracked down on a great patent medicine company which was making immense profits from the amazing practice of shipping empty bottles and labels to druggists and letting them put what they thought best into those bottles. The company merely bought bottles from a factory and millions of labels from a printer—that was its complete inventory—oh, yes, I forgot to mention circulars and booklets advertising the trade name—and the druggists did the rest, after paying the medicine company a handsome royalty for the empty bottles and the labels. Why, a druggist could fill those bottles with colored water and sugar and still get by. Who could check the fellow? And, don't let me forget to mention that the circulars shipped to the druggists contained dozens of "testimonials" from "cured and satisfied buyers." When the FTC cracked down on that concern—I give all the facts elsewhere—the newspapers should have printed the news, because it was of great interest to readers everywhere, but not a single paper, so far as I know, gave an inch of space to it. Why? Because the respondent company was a profitable source of advertising revenue. And, oh, how these capitalistic editors get mad when one even hints that their columns are controlled by the heavy advertisers.

\* \* \*

I am 36 years old and have been here in Alaska a year, working as master-mechanic for a coal mine—salary \$300 a month, plus free rent, light and heat. My wife is with me. However, I don't like Alaska, the isolation, or the superintendent, although I don't mind the work. Now, I have my heart set on returning to my home town, Seattle, and going into the chicken business. I could use a 2-acre farm on the outskirts of the city. It has housing capacity for 3,500 chickens, brooder house, electric incubators, etc. I have in mind to raise my own hatching eggs, sell baby chicks, raise broilers, capons, etc. Also, grind my own feed. Should I quit my steady job? Please answer by personal letter.

My advice is for you to stick where you are. The chances of getting as good a job in the States are pretty slim. As for the idea of going into the business of running a chicken farm, let me urge you not to do this until conditions get much better. Today, we are facing overproduction in poultry and eggs, a condition that promises to be with us for a long time to come. It's exceptional for one to

make real money in the chicken business, the main reason being its overcrowded condition. I'm willing to lay a bet you'll never make anywhere near the money you're getting on your Alaska job. I don't doubt Alaska has its shortcomings, but the country is treating you fairly well, so don't give up a good thing for something that is highly speculative.

\* \* \*

What does the movie industry pay in taxes?

Over \$100,000,000 annually to the Federal Government; more than \$250,000,000 annually to State governments.

\* \* \*

I was interested in your editorial comment favoring the nationalization of the insurance business. Is it your idea to have the government buy out the stockholders and bondholders of the great companies? Wouldn't this take an immense amount of money?

Ferdinand Lundberg, an authority on insurance and financial questions, in the April 1, 1939, issue of *The Nation*, shows how easy and simple it would be for the Federal government to take over the management of most of our insurance companies, as follows:

It may be of some value to continue by pointing out that it would be relatively easy for the government to take over the insurance companies, as they would have no stock- or bond-holders to buy out. The insurance companies are mutualized; they are owned by their policy-holders. The policy-holders could place any management in power that they voted for, including a management recommended by and answerable to the government. Legislation might be sought creating a Department of Insurance, which might appeal to policy-holders for proxies to be used in electing a public-spirited management. If the policy-holders decided to vote for the government-sponsored management that would be all that was necessary. A new management would be installed.

One of the quick reforms such a change could make possible is the current practice of paying officers of the life insurance companies immense salaries and bonuses. Legislation could put the salaries of executives on a sane, reasonable basis. Also, nationalization would make it possible for the policyholders, through

their government-controlled insurance department, to see to it that their money isn't used by executives to finance projects and establishments in which present executives are interested in, directly or indirectly. Of course, such a reform would require great caution and intelligence, for the problems are numerous and intricate, but they can be controlled and directed in the public's interest, if the policyholders were to become aware of their rights and duties. Mr. Lundberg's suggestion is workable. Policyholders—who are, after all, nothing more than consumers of insurance—have it within their power to put their money to work not only to protect them and their dependents but to serve the community in constructive and social-minded ways. This field is ripe for enlightenment.

\* \* \*

I think you ought to take a shot at the enclosed advertisement.

The advertisement reads:

"Fictionize yourself! Novelist will mail original unpublished short story in which you are the heroine or hero. \$1. Send photograph or description, hobby, profession. Box 109C."

That's such a harmless form of idiocy that I hesitate to waste any of my shots on it. Besides, the man who writes "The Talk of the Town," in *The New Yorker*, did a neat job of debunking this piece of tripe, which I'll use in place of anything I might cook up. His gentle spoofing:

This is probably the literature of escape in its perfect form. We can think of no lovelier experience than to read a short story in which we are the hero, free from debt and the crowding infirmities of middle age, untroubled by the state of the world, certain only that we are going to get the girl in the end. We are about five feet ten, Box 109C, a blond bankrupt with an old saber wound on his right cheek. The girl had better look like Christina Rossetti; the time should be about 1870; the locale, Graustark.

Some busted poet may take a hint here and advertise sonnets to frustrated souls in need of the kind of talk Romeo passed up to Juliet in the balcony scene. There's a public that'll always pay money for flattery if there's none to be had free of charge. How we hunger for praise! How we ache to break the bonds of

anonymity! I'm reminded of a poor boob who wrote one of the worst books ever printed, printed it at his own expense, and mailed a copy to the Smithsonian Institution. He spent the rest of his time telling everyone in sight he was "in" that repository of wisdom, which automatically put him in a class with Darwin, Huxley, Pasteur, Edison, Steinmetz, and Wassermann. The damned human race is incorrigibly cockeyed.

\* \* \*

I have a brother who's a hopeless Fundamentalist. Right now he's being worked on by a Methodist and a Latter Day Saint, each begging him to join up. What can I tell him? He keeps asking my advice, even though he knows I'm a skeptic.

Tell him to be extremely cautious, for if he makes a slip he'll have to spend a long time in a place I refuse to mention lest I offend the refined ears of my esthetic readers. Tell your brother to be careful to pick out the line that will land him into heaven when he kicks off. He mustn't waste his time and money (and his immortal soul) on some religious outfit that can't deliver the goods. I'm reminded of the colored congregation that was being asked to step forward and be washed in the Blood of the Lamb. The parson got a good response, except that one fellow held back. "Brudder," cried the preacher, "doan hol' back. Doan be askeered fo' yo' sins. Doan yo' want t'be washed?" "Pahsson," the reluctant one replied, "I'se bin washed—las' night, over to the Reverend Weems' mission at Chanute." To which the parson replied: "Oh, no you wasn't, not in de Blood of de Lamb. Yo' was only dry cleaned *there!* Come fo'ward."

\* \* \*

I notice that you print numerous reports on polls of public opinion. Have you any figures on religious beliefs?

Many surveys on theistic ideology have been discussed here, as my volumes of questions and answers show. The latest inquiry of this kind is reported in the April, 1939, issue of the *Survey Graphic*, in which Dr. James H. Leuba, professor emeritus of psychology, Bryn Mawr College, says he found that 64 percent of America's prominent bankers believe in God whereas only half as many writers do. Dr. Leuba, who made a similar study in 1933 covering scien-

tists (which I covered thoroughly in an early volume of my questions and answers) reached this conclusion when he received the returns to a questionnaire sent to bankers, business people, lawyers, and writers appearing in "Who's Who." He states, in part:

"Half of the business and professional people announce a belief in God, and 58 percent in immortality. To the rank and file of the church-going people that will appear distressingly small proportions, and yet the corresponding proportions among men of science in the inquiry of 1933 was considerably less: 30 percent for God and 33 percent for immortality. Worthy of observation are the consistently higher figures for belief in immortality than for belief in God. One should note also the large proportion of those who have not made up their minds as to immortality: 25 percent; while those doubtful of the existence of God number only 7 percent. The proportion of doubters in immortality is especially large for the writers: 32 percent. The larger number of doubters in a future life goes with a very much smaller proportion of downright disbelievers than is the case with regard to belief in God: 18 percent against 43 percent. That difference is most marked for the bankers: 11 percent to 29 percent. Among men of science the proportions of doubters in immortality was also much greater than that of doubters in the existence of God."

Space won't permit me to review previous articles on this interesting subject, but I don't want to close without calling attention to the demonstrated fact that the higher the rate of intelligence the smaller the support for religious ideas. The survey for 1933, which is referred to above, shows that leaders in the more important branches of science show hardly any support for the ideas of God and immortality. This interesting subject may be pursued profitably by referring to the index at the close of my volumes of questions and answers. Freethought's hold grows stronger each year. The future of religion isn't bright—from the viewpoint of the parsons. But this is all to the good, in the opinion of the supporters of truth-seeking and the opponents of supernaturalism.

\* \* \*

Editor: A clipping from The American

Freeman [April, 1939] has just been brought to my attention. There is a column on page two in which reference is made to The New York Times, to George Seldes's article in The New Republic, and to a sheet which calls itself The New Times, claiming to be published by a Communist cell in The New York Times.

You quote at length from this latter publication, and reprint a story told in it of a conversation between me and Harold Laski regarding Professor Frankfurter. Please note that this story is false in its entirety—not only did the incident never take place, but the alleged conversation does not represent my views.

I agree with you that "constructive, intelligent, informed criticism" is desirable. It is impossible for a publisher to have personal knowledge of all that appears in a newspaper, and criticism of the type referred to helps him check upon his own organization. On the other hand, it is necessary in order to keep this record straight to advise you that I cannot recall ever having seen a word of truth in The New Times, and that I am quite convinced that the misinformation it prints is prompted by deliberate malice.

Permit me to give you one instance of this. The New Times published the fact that an employe of our Auditing Department was ill, yet was forced to work and in consequence of his weakened condition, was obliged to do "routine and mental tasks." The correct facts are that the employe was in the Auditing Department and was ill. From there on, however, the story differs. Without cost to him or to any other employe, this man received twenty-six weeks full pay followed by twenty-six weeks half pay. Toward the end of that period, at his doctor's request, we permitted him to work two or three hours a day, in an effort to again adjust himself to his occupation. That effort failed. He was consequently pensioned for life, and the office assisted him in securing an advance payment on the life insurance policy which the office had purchased for his benefit. Please draw your own conclusions.

ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER  
 Publisher, The New York Times, New York City.

Dear Mr. Sulzberger: I'll be glad to print your letter in an early issue of The American Freeman, because it has always been my policy to give space to anyone I've criticized. As I wrote, only one copy of The New Times came into my hands, the rest of the data coming by way of the Seldes article in The New Republic. I'm puzzled why you didn't write to The New Republic im-

mediately after it printed the piece telling about your alleged conversation with Dr. Laski. Also, since Dr. Laski is now lecturing in this country, why don't you telegraph him for a statement on this supposed conversation regarding the appointment of Professor Frankfurter? I don't believe you said it, since you make the denial over your own signature, but from your own viewpoint you ought to ask Dr. Laski to back you up with a letter covering the situation. He could dispose of this business in 10 words.

As I just said, I don't know much about The New Times, but I know a little about the Communist press in the U.S., and agree that it's often moved by malice. A few years ago, papers like The Daily Worker were about 90 percent malicious. Today, after amazing improvement, I can detect hardly more than 80 percent malice. Reform is in the air. But, of much greater importance is the reference in my piece to the way your paper rejected the advertising of Consumers' Union. You ignored this. Also, I'm curious to know why you use hardly more than 5 percent of the releases of the Federal Trade Commission, which you invariably stick away in the dark jungles of the financial section, where they'll be seen mostly by businessmen. If such reports are to serve the public—the great mass of consumers—they should be printed in the news columns. I don't mean to suggest that you should print all of the press releases of the FTC—even I (who specialize in FTC and FDA news) select pretty carefully what I can find space for—but a great paper like the Times ought to use many more stories covering the orders and stipulations of the FTC. At that, you do much more in this line than any other paper in the country. Great papers like the Kansas City Star never print even a line about these important developments—important, of course, to the consumers. You're better than any other paper, but, I must add, not better enough.

E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS

\* \* \*

Editor: Well, I see that we've now recognized Franco's "government." And why not? We recognize Hitler's and Mussolini's, too, whose stooge Franco is. Also, we've now cancelled the embargo on arms shipments to unhappy Spain. That, I suppose, is intended to allay the resentment of those of us who pleaded for it long ago when it would have meant something. What hypocrisy! Verily, even though I know that it's probably not all his doing, I grow more and more disgusted at the President's stupidity, opportunism, or whatever it is. Maybe, like you say of Walter Winchell, he's merely ignorant but he's

certainly great on fine-sounding talk and then always a little short when it comes to translating it into effective action. I agree, too, that Mrs. Roosevelt would be a better president.

READER

\* \* \*

The Rev. Alpha Kenna, of Pittsburg, Kans., is making numerous speeches in which he says no end of flattering things about Hitler's regime. In all his talks he stresses the fact that Hitler has "solved" Germany's unemployment problem. Please comment.

I've heard this man's line and I agree that all his inferences are in support of Nazism, though he lends lip-service to democracy, a favorite trick of Fascist spokesmen. This preacher puts up a swell front and knows how to orate. In the speech I heard him make (before a luncheon club of Girard businessmen) he made such effective use of the tricks of orators that he had many of his hearers hypnotized. In fact, it took them hours before they came out of their spell, so clever is the man as a demagogic speaker. He puts up an impressive front, and the fact that he was a chaplain in the U.S. army during the World War seems to be accepted as "proof" that he is competent to discuss anything of public concern. Also, the fact that he visited Nazi Germany—according to the inferences he handed out—qualifies him as an "expert" on economic, industrial, social and political conditions in Hitlerland. I was amazed at the brazen way this minister repeated almost every angle of Nazi propaganda as worked out by Hitler and Goebbels. All the old Nazi bunk was repeated—how Hitler saved Germany from Communism, how Hitler solved the problem of unemployment, how the advent of Hitlerism was caused by the Versailles treaty, and how Hitler raised the living standards of the German people—lies, all of them. Let's take the hoary lie about Hitler and unemployment. I have shown, in numerous articles—all of which are reprinted in my volumes of questions and answers—that Hitler's handling of German unemployment is a fake. First of all, as even schoolboys know, Hitler put millions of men into the army, navy, air force, and the munitions industry. All this labor, needless to say, is unproductive. Millions of men have been put to work at jobs that have to do with future military

strategy, not at tasks that represent productive enterprises. Also, the jobs of many Jews, Social Democrats, Liberals, etc., were taken from them, given to good Nazis—and, presto, another miracle was performed, though the men and women ousted from employment weren't counted as belonging to the unemployed. This subject of employment in Germany is handled informatively by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, in their syndicated newspaper column, "The Daily Washington Merry-Go-Round," (Mar. 30, 1939), from which I want to quote. These reporters show, by drawing on a study made by Hugh S. Hanna, expert statistician connected with the U.S. Department of Labor, that Hitler "is a long way from abolishing unemployment in Germany." Mr. Hanna's report is based only on official figures issued by the Nazi government, and shows:

(1) Productive employment—that is, non-military employment—proportionately is much higher in the U.S.A. than in Germany.

(2) Hitler has blown up his employment figures by including relief, public works and concentration camp labor—a type labeled as unemployed in the U.S.A.

(3) There are several million unemployed in Germany who remain unclassified. These are high grade workers who have refused to register as unemployed lest they be put to work at a pittance doing military labor.

As the Hanna report shows, less than 60 percent of the employed in Germany are engaged in productive activities, or on jobs which produce food, clothing and other necessities for the people. Non-productive military work takes up more than 40 percent of the employed, which includes a vast army of military police, secret service agents and other government employes, as well as workers in munitions plants. Pearson and Allen add the following resume of other data prepared by Hanna:

In the United States, however, non-productive employment is almost negligible. Another highlight is that German taxation to support its war machine amounts to 40 percent of the total national income, whereas United States military preparedness costs about 15 percent; in Great Britain, about 20 percent.

Maintenance of non-productive military employment has imposed a

tremendous burden on the living standards of the German people. This helps explain the serious economic shape of the country and why an unpopular war is so risky.

Another point stressed by the Rev. Kenna—and many other speakers and writers who deliberately or ignorantly repeat Nazi propaganda—has to do with the much-maligned Versailles Treaty. They keep saying that this iniquitous treaty—the Brest-Litovsk Treaty imposed on Russia by Germany was filled with the milk of human kindness, of course—made Hitler inevitable, that the German people, prior to Hitler, were held in slavery to the great powers, and all that sort of rot. One would imagine that when Germany was disarmed it was prostrate and helpless. The facts show this picture to be false. Disarmed Germany, under the Republic, won concession after concession from the Allies who imposed the Versailles Treaty. The record shows that the German Republic—despite its disarmed condition—just about killed off the Versailles Treaty during the first 10 years of its existence. These concessions were won by friendly discussions and negotiations, not by threats and terrorism. It was the disarmed German Republic that pulled the teeth of the Versailles Treaty, not Hitler. Let me show what the German Republic did in 10 years—without the help of guns or poison-gas—and then let's watch propagandists of the type of Rev. Kenna explain away the facts:

1. After the treaty imposed reparations amount to 132,000,000,000 gold-marks on Germany, the Republic's statesmen negotiated its reduction to 3,000,000,000 gold-marks, and long before the advent of Hitler stopped paying reparations entirely.

2. Germany was treated as an equal, especially since the League of Nations admitted the Republic as a full-fledged member.

3. Because the German Republic had numerous friends throughout the world, it was able to build its export trade to 13,000,000,000 gold-marks a year, the top figure in all Germany history, including the years since Hitler took power.

4. The German Republic had such warm friends that it was able to get foreign loans amounting to billions of gold-marks, which helped reestablish Germany's industries and

enabled it to reenter international trade as a full equal.

5. The German Republic got its Western frontiers guaranteed by the Locarno Treaty.

6. Germany's sovereignty was fully accepted during the Republic, except the right to rearm and remilitarize the Rhineland, a condition that certainly did no harm to peace-minded Germany.

7. Long before the dates set, armies of reoccupation were withdrawn from German soil. Such concessions were won by negotiations, not by threats.

8. France was won over to the view that it should remove its army from the Ruhr.

The record, as outlined above, shows clearly that Republican Germany wasn't chained to the victorious Allies. The evils of the Versailles Treaty were being remedied one by one, with the worst features disposed of long before Hitler stole power. To blame Germany's Fascism on the Versailles Treaty shows a desire to deceive the public or surrender to the opinions of the uninformed. If the Treaty of Versailles is to get the blame, then how is one to explain the fact that about a dozen other countries besides Germany are living under Fascism, none of them subject to the terms of the Versailles Treaty, and many of them, by the way, having been members of the victorious Allies who dictated the Versailles Treaty? Need I point out that Fascist countries like Italy, Rumania and Yugoslavia were once among the victorious Allies? At this point let's listen to the informed words of Wilhelm Sollmann, former Reichminister of the Interior, who is now lecturing in this country. Mr. Sollmann explains the conditions that make for Fascism, as follows:

Post-war Germany represents classically the domestic causes for Fascism: resentment of the nobility and Big Business against democracy, lack of understanding of democratic methods in the rank and file of middle class and farmers; and the fight between truly democratic Socialists and fanatically dictatorial Communists. There could have been no peace treaty whatsoever. No democracy will survive if a large majority of the nation is opposed to democracy either from group interest or from fundamentally wrong perspectives.

Fascism can't be beaten by ser-

mons of atonement about Versailles. A firm aggressive stand of all followers of democracy against every type of dictatorship is the challenge to us all.

Near-Fascists of the type of the Rev. Kenna, referred to above, meet facts like these by merely ignoring them and continuing to mouth their old slogans and discredited interpretations of history. Nazi propaganda rests on repeating its claims endlessly, assured that if a lie is told often enough it'll finally stick with enough people to make it count for something. That trick has worked, but this doesn't mean it'll always be swallowed without question. Wherever there's free speech and a free press we should make it a point to answer every argument advanced by the Fascists. The truth—if backed up by positive, constructive action—can be made to prevail.

\* \* \*  
What about this press paragraph which says anyone can get a pound of coffee free in Nazi Germany?

You missed the joke. Let me explain it carefully. The reports that there is a serious shortage of coffee, butter, eggs, etc., in Hitlerland are true. Some stores, which are run by men with a sense of humor, carry this sign: "You can get a pound of coffee free if you can tell us where to buy a crate of eggs." Ketch on?

\* \* \*  
If F. D. R. refuses to run for a third term, whose name would you suggest in his place as a good candidate for President of the United States?

Mrs. Roosevelt.

\* \* \*  
Editor: In your discussion of Listerine you quote Dr. Torald Sollman who refers—with sarcasm, I gather—to the comparative "odor and taste" of thymol (Listerine), 5 percent phenol, and 1 percent corrosive sublimate. His idea, of course, was to emphasize the fact that the antiseptic quality of a substance had no relation whatsoever to its taste. As for 5 percent phenol: perhaps no one, unless suicidally inclined, could do himself much harm with it; its taste is too obnoxious. But concerning 1 percent corrosive sublimate (bichloride of mercury): really, he should have warned his readers not to try tasting that! Even at that concentration a very small amount could be fatal. I have no idea, myself, how it might taste; I'd be afraid to make such a test. It is my unprofessional opin-

ion that the silver-salts hair dyes against which you constantly warn your readers—and which, of course, are dangerous, especially if used over a period of time—are, by comparison to such a test for corrosive sublimate, mild as milk.

While on the subject of taste—and tastes—I want to register my amusement at your diatribes against baker's bread. As well as being outrageously over-priced, the stuff is, of course, atrociously de-nutted, to use one of your own terms, and the cause of that and de-crusting as well is at least partly traceable to contemporary snobberies which, if diligently pursued, would just about emasculate life of all its lusty pleasures. But, mainly, its lifelessness and lack of character by comparison with your favorite pumpernickel is due to the fact that it's made with highly refined, white flour, a food-stuff in which, some years ago, you could see nothing particularly objectionable. I'm wondering if, perhaps, you're not getting old; you know, in more ways than merely the usual one, our capacity for keenly enjoying pleasurable acts becomes blunted with the passage of time. May not the taste of bread be one of these? If so, then, truly, the adage, "Man does not live by bread alone," takes on new, and hitherto unsuspected, meanings. Imperious meanings, that are very disquieting, I might add. I smile, too, at your apparently unreasoning, hard-headed prejudice against strange mixtures in salads, etc.—cottage cheese and pineapple, for instance. What's wrong with that, now? To an inveterate experimentalist, innovator and varietist, such as you undoubtedly are in many other particulars, that ought to be quite appealing; more appealing, I should think, than canned rattlesnake. No, I'm not prejudiced against the snake at all; as a matter of fact, if I can ever overcome my Swiss frugality to a sufficient extent to part with \$1 for the 3-ounce tin of the stuff handled by our swanky local grocer I'll try it too.

Maplewood, Mo. C. A. LANG

Can you give me the famous passage by Abraham Lincoln which deals with his views on the labor question?

Here's a Lincoln paragraph that's quoted frequently:

Inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened, in all ages of the world, that some have labored, and others have without labor enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong

and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor as nearly as possible, is a worthy subject of any good government.

Every word of it continues to have meaning. Lincoln had a genius for for being right most of the time, which is something in a world that usually sees opinions outdated soon after they're spoken. "It is better only sometimes to be right than at all times to be wrong," said Lincoln.

\* \* \*

Is it good history to say that the Fundamentalists once believed it was sinful for a baby to be born on the Sabbath?

Yes. Up to about a century ago strict church people held to the quaint belief that a baby born on Sunday was evidence that the parents had conceived the child on a Sunday, which Fundamentalists considered a naughty way to believe on the Lord's day. The more one looks into the religious mentality the more amusing and astonishing things one's sure to find.

\* \* \*

"I'm glad to see that you gave space to Anthony Arico's theme. I imagine that there were few others that were more deserving of the publicity you gave it even had you been able to inspect them all. Doubtless Tony will survive that "F". It may come to pass in the end that that teacher will learn more from Tony than Tony will from him."—C. A. Lang, Mo.

\* \* \*

Editor: I don't think Father Coughlin is an able speaker, as do some of your correspondents. I have never heard a more repulsive voice, nor observed a more blatant, exasperating attitude. I think he is an all-time low in American public life. He may have been a menace at one time, but not now. You dignify him by your long articles. A single sentence, here and there, with plenty of sarcasm would be much more effective. For many years I have read every word of each Freeman, but hereafter I shall skip the articles about Silo Charlie. I don't want to think of him.

Brentwood, Md. ELMER C. HELM

\* \* \*

An old anti-Ingersoll tract charges the great Agnostic with seeking to return man to the jungle. The writer of it says Ingersoll's ideal of happiness meant animal satisfaction, to the neglect of man's higher aspirations.

It's hard to keep up with the propaganda of the church-minded. In the present instance, it seems to me our

Fundamentalist doesn't know what Ingersoll meant by happiness. He certainly went to great pains to show that man's happiness doesn't rest on the stomach alone. But let Ingersoll speak for himself:

Happiness is the true aim in life. It is the task of intelligence to ascertain the conditions of happiness, and when found, the truly wise will live in accordance with them. By happiness is meant not simply the joy of eating and drinking, the gratification of the appetite, but good, well-being, in the highest and noblest form. The joy that springs from obligations discharged, from duty done, from generous acts, from being true to the ideal, from a perception of the beautiful in nature, art and conduct. The happiness that is born and gives birth to poetry and music, that follows the gratification of the highest wants: Happiness is the result of all that is really right and sane.

Does that expression suggest a man who wants to push man back into the jungle? Freethinkers are accustomed to being lied about, misrepresented and ridiculed, but their philosophy moves forward from year to year, mainly because many people are ready for it, and, above all, because what they tell the world is true. And lest my readers get the impression that truth to a Freethinker can mean just another form of dogmatism let me again draw on the words of Ingersoll, in which he outlines what the Freethinker aims at:

I do not pretend to tell what all the truth is. I do not pretend to have fathomed the abyss, nor to have floated with outstretched wings level with the dim heights of thought. I simply plead for freedom. I denounce the cruelties and horrors of slavery. I ask for light and air for the souls of men. I say, take off those chains, break those manacles, free those limbs, release that brain! I plead for the right to think, to reason, to investigate. I ask that the future may be enriched with the honest thoughts of men.

When writers of religious tracts express thoughts like the above intelligent men and women will begin to pay more attention to them. It was at this type of mentality that Ingersoll once aimed one of his most powerful paragraphs. Since I'm off on an Ingersoll orgy (blame the Ingersoll folder in my newspaper filing system),

I want to pass it on to my readers:

I will not invade the rights of others. You have no right to erect your tollgate upon the highways of thought. You have no right to leap from the hedges of superstition, and strike down the pioneers of the human race. You have no right to sacrifice the liberties of man upon the altars of ghosts. Believe what you may; preach what you desire; have all the forms and ceremonies you please; exercise your liberty in your own way, but extend to all others the same right.

\* \* \*  
 "You wonder if the Philadelphia Academy of Music is still there. Yes—still is the right word. There has been no change of any kind, in appearance or anything else. And it is operating exactly the same as it did 40 years ago."  
 —W. Norton, Ambler, Pa.

\* \* \*  
 "I hope some one (preferably yourself) will write a review of the history of red-baiting in America, which we might reprint in a pamphlet for the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. The purpose is to apprise the public with the conniving methods used by the Fascist and Nazi forces in America throughout our history to thwart liberal thought, etc."—Jay Gorney, Beverly Hills, Calif.  
 [Editor's Note: This is an excellent idea. Red-baiting (under various names) goes back to colonial times, when the Founding Fathers were called everything from traitors to Atheists. I believe I have the data on this subject in various folders in my newspaper filing system, but it's a question if I can find the time to do the job. If students of American history find the theme interesting I suggest they work on it. Here's a chance for a good, useful pamphlet.]

\* \* \*  
 "I notice that Coughlinism is in a more virulent form at present; that undisguised Nazis have a foothold in America; that Republicanism, with its reactionary objectives like the annulment of the New Deal, makes headway, and so forth. I believe that these negative developments are more than overbalanced by the positive gains democracy has made in the U.S. during the same period of time."—Antonio Del Riego, Mexico.

\* \* \*  
 Kindly comment on the bill before Congress providing for deportation of aliens who advocate changes in the American form of government.

Representative Dempsey, of New Mexico, originally introduced the bill which stipulated deportation for advocacy of "fundamental changes" in

the American government. But when the American Civil Liberties Union charged that "no agreement is possible as to what are 'fundamental changes' in a form of government," the measure was amended to make it worse, prohibiting "any changes." In this form the bill was approved by the House Immigration Committee. In a letter to Chairman Samuel Dickstein, of the Immigration Committee, the American Civil Liberties Union pointed out that the President's proposal to reorganize the Supreme Court might be considered a "fundamental change" in the form of government. "Expression of approval by an alien would subject him to deportation." The letter continues:

"The effect of the bill, if enacted and seriously enforced, would be to suppress all expressions of opinion on essential political issues by aliens. Any utterances on political theories could be readily construed as coming within the prohibited advocacy. All aliens would be placed at the mercy of informers and personal enemies ready to report as violations of law any remarks on American politics.

"All laws aimed at opinions and beliefs are notoriously difficult of enforcement, and, wherever the attempt is made to enforce them, grossly unfair. Prejudice inevitably plays a large part in all such proceedings. The history of the present provisions of the immigration law relating to opinions and beliefs bears convincing testimony as to the difficulty and unfairness of their administration."

There's no real and fair reason why an alien should be denied the right to an opinion about any form of government, including our own. The Constitution doesn't say the right of free speech belongs only to citizens. This right belongs to anyone in the U.S.A. Readers should let their Congressmen and Senators know they are opposed to this attack on free speech.

\* \* \*

Editor: When an individual expresses ideas that disturb the conventional mind, he is called an agitator. He is despised for his efforts at free expression, and he is denied the right of fair judgment. He is regarded as intolerant when he speaks his mind with the force of conviction. He is radical when he insists on holding to his convictions in the face of conventional thought. It is the very act of his thinking that so

antagonizes the blissful, ignorant, conventional mind.  
Spokane, Wash.

ROBERT SLOCUM

\* \* \*

Editor: I have just read that Bible quotation in the letter department of your issue of May 15, about over-industriousness leading to stupidity. Now you go ahead and be as industrious as you wish because there positively is no such statement made in the Bible, anywhere. New Orleans, La.

JOE FAGER

\* \* \*

"Just had a lady 'air warden' at the door of my home offering me a gas-mask. I am ashamed of England, and if it comes to the bestiality of having poison poured upon London by Mr. Chamberlain's friends I go under. Of course, the whole series of capitalist-aristocratic blunders here was inspired by the idea that Hitler and Mussolini would destroy Socialism in Europe and then shake hands with England and France. English statesmanship is on the level of a women's club at Podunk Corners."—Joseph McCabe, England.

\* \* \*

In one of your volumes of questions and answers you write of Thomas Jefferson as an upholder of intellectual freedom. Can you give me a quotation showing his position?

There are many passages in the letters and addresses of Thomas Jefferson which uphold freedom of opinion. Here's a piece that answers the purpose quite well:

"Opinion is something with which the government has no business to meddle; it is quite beyond its legitimate province. Millions of innocent men, women and children since the introduction of Christianity, have been tortured, fined, burnt, imprisoned; yet we have not advanced one inch toward uniformity. Let us reflect that the earth is inhabited by thousands of millions of people; that these profess probably a thousand different systems of religion; that ours is but one of that thousand; that if there be but one right, and ours that one, we should wish to see the nine hundred and ninety-nine wandering sects gathered into the fold of truth. But against such we can not effect this by force. Reason and persuasion are the only practicable instruments. For these, free inquiry must be indulged; and how can we wish others to indulge it, while we refuse it our-selves?"

Jefferson, always a Freethinker, fought for religious freedom, for he never wanted America to be the battleground of warring religious ideologies. He didn't want the hor-

rors of the Inquisition repeated in this land of freemen. "What has been the effect of coercion?" Jefferson asked; "to make one half of the world fools and the other half hypocrites." I've quoted Jefferson's attitude toward the church and its priests, but I feel justified in reprinting them here, for they carry an important lesson to this generation:

"In every country and in every age the priest has been hostile to liberty, he is always in alliance with the despot, abetting his abuses in return for protection to his own. It is error alone that needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself."

Jefferson, more than any other revolutionist, in the words of Joseph Lewis, "thwarted the efforts of Hamilton and others to establish a state church." Jefferson's Rationalism was clear and honest. Study these Jeffersonian sentences carefully, for they mean much to candid Freethinkers:

"Fix reason firmly in her seat, and call to her tribunal every fact, every opinion. Question with boldness even the existence of God; because, if there be one, he must approve the homage of reason rather than of blindfolded fear. Do not be frightened from this inquiry by any fear of its consequences. If it end in a belief that there is no God, you will find incitements to virtue in the comfort and pleasantness you feel in its exercise and in the love of others it will procure for you."

\* \* \*

"You probably read that 'Click', issue for April, 1939, was banned in certain towns for showing pictures of Hitler's 'Breed, damn you, breed' policy. Is it not true that the Roman Church instructs its communicants to breed—without the profanity, of course?"—Reader.

\* \* \*

#### THE CASE AGAINST THE PACIFIST

Editor: Even some of the most obsessed pacifists are frank enough to admit that the intense nationalism of the post-war period is responsible, to a great degree, for the collapse of the efforts to secure the basis for a wide collaboration in bringing universal disarmament. Some of the responsible leaders of the pacifist movement do not deny that it is this feeling of intense nationalism that the Fascist and Nazi regimes, for reasons of their own, have transformed into strong forces of fanatical chauvinism, which in turn has

created world-wide conditions leading all nations to unprecedented programs of rearmament.

The war-mania of the regimes that constitute the so-called Rome-Berlin-Tokio axis is not a theory or an illusion. It is a grim reality which has and continues to make of the family of nations an inferno of aggressions and insecurity.

Yet, despite all this, one is shocked to observe the seeming irresponsibility with which pacifists generally attack all proposals for collective security—that is, for a binding together of all governments that honestly believe Fascism and Nazism are a great danger to democracy and peace. Collective security the pacifists condemn and reject as something provocative, that would make war unavoidable because, they argue, such a move would enrage the Fascist regimes. The Totalitarian governments are achieving their goals by simply resorting to threats of war and the use of blackmail. Therefore, according to the pacifists, these regimes will never tolerate the existence of an organized effort that is capable of putting an end to their lawlessness in the international field, and would start war rather than be deprived of their freedom to terrorize the world.

War is a hideous crime. Nobody could maintain the contrary without degrading himself. War has to be abolished. Still, the way the pacifists act when the enemies of humanity have gathered in their hands enormous war materials with which to intimidate other governments is not a good way of seeking to remove the evil but the surest way to strengthen the roots of it by supplying them with the psychological elements issuing from an increase in the vanity of easy conquests and personal prestige.

Also, like those who openly or covertly want to help Fascism establish itself in the United States, the pacifists parrot their stale arguments: "let's mind our own business"; "let's build democracy at home"; "let's never again try to make the world safe for democracy." But actually, what is it that the pacifists are accomplishing? First, spreading doubts and confusion, and, secondly, contributing toward making the world safe for Fascism, since by their weakening of the morale of the democratic peoples they are paving the road for the monsters of Fascism to march arrogantly forward.

The greatest proof of the folly of the pacifists' line of action and argument is found in the fact it fails to arrest the preparations for war or the conditions which to some nations make those preparations necessary. Defeatism lies at the bottom of the heart of every

pacifist. No wonder the Fascists, sensing this and having successfully tested it more than once, feel confident of their conquest of the world. They know that pacifist and isolationist propagandas are turning the peoples of the democratic countries into something resembling frightened chickens.

N.Y.C.

A. GARCIA DIAZ

\* \* \*

"Representative Noah Mason, of Illinois, broadcasting March 24, 1939, urged all teachers to have their pupils learn Edgar Guest's 'America's Creed.' I've heard it read only once, and caught a reference to 'the Communists sowing seeds of discontent' but no references to the Nazis and Fascists and their sowing of discontent. Why urge this special one on the teachers? Is it because it specifically mentions the Communists? One would think there were enough 'creeds' from the pens of first-rate authors, without resorting to Guest's."—W. Matthews, Del.

\* \* \*

When submitting a musical manuscript to a publisher for examination is it necessary to have the composition copyrighted before sending it away? I have written quite a number of compositions on the semi-classical order (both vocal and instrumental) but have never done anything about putting them before the public, and should like to do so now—that is, if conditions are favorable. I hope to hear from you by personal letter.

If you send your manuscripts to a reputable publisher you have nothing to fear about copyright. If you prefer to copyright the work in your own name all you need do is to write on it the following: "Copyright, 1939, by—" followed by your name. Then, when the work is published, you send to the Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., for the regular application blank, which you will fill out and return, accompanied by two copies of the printed work. Any of the large New York and Philadelphia music publishers are reputable concerns. You can always spot the other kind by the way they approach writers of music with various propositions that are intended to get money from them in exchange for the magic key to fame and fortune. Be careful not to pay out a penny of your own money, regardless of promises. A reputable publisher, if he accepts your work, will pay you a small advance on your royalties when he signs his contract

with you. This is a difficult field. I wish you luck. But don't be disappointed if you fail to make the grade.

\* \* \*

Which farm animal is the most valuable?

The good, old mule takes first place, by a wide margin. Statisticians connected with the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture report (according to a clipping in my newsclip filing system) that the average mule is worth \$118, as against \$84 for the horse and \$56 for the cow. They say a good work horse can be bought for as little as \$50, but just try to buy a good mule for that figure. A good Missouri mule will bring \$150, while a matched pair will cost \$500, and even more. These specialists report that the U.S., in 1938, had 4,382,000 mules, more than 80 percent being owned in the South. The report also says there were, in 1938, 10,000,000 work horses in the U.S., with almost 60 percent in the North Central States. This is about 50 percent less than the horse population of 20 years ago.

\* \* \*

Editor: Your remarks in reply to the fellow who thought he saw evidence of Divine guidance in the structure of the bulldog's face were apropos. To demonstrate His all-encompassing intelligence so that a perfect cycle of useful acts and functions might be efficiently completed, Diety should certainly have also provided the bull with a nerveless posterior to which the dog might cling indefinitely. Jestng aside, however, you might have told him, too, that "in Nature" there never was such a thing as a bulldog: all the marvelously diverse types of dogs were undoubtedly, since very remote times, selectively bred from a few wild, and probably not very dissimilar, species of the genus canis. The bulldog, in this development, must have been evolved rather late for cattle began to be domesticated much later than dogs. In addition to all this, the bulldog's specialization away from a "natural" type has been carried to such an extreme that he is really a physiological monstrosity; only listen to his labored, catarrhal breathing, poor beast! Any anatomist would agree that he has a "bad" nose.

Maplewood, Mo.

C. A. LANG

\* \* \*

"The British Government gave Czechoslovakia a \$50,000,000 credit after the Munich betrayal. \$20,000,000, at least, of this amount was used to 'grease' the Czech politicians who betrayed their people. John Bull, the world's master

double-crosser, has jockeyed himself and France into a position slippery enough to upset a cat. John Bull has billions of dollars to 'grease' every Fascist nation in the world, but he has no 'dough' when it comes to paying his Great War debt to the U.S.A."—Pat O. Sullivan, Canada.

\* \* \*

I join you in your admiration for Mark Twain. Keep up your interesting, instructive, and amusing quotations from his writings. Can you give us a quotation showing how he felt about the Jews? Was he friendly to that race?

Mark Twain wasn't prejudiced against any race. As for the Jews, he often wrote about them. Here's an excellent passage from his "Literary Essays," Vol. 22, page 253:

The Jew is not a disturber of the peace of any country. Even his enemies concede that. He is not a loafer, he is not a sot, he is not a noisy, he is not a brawler nor a rioter, he is not quarrelsome. In the statistics of crime his presence is conspicuously rare—in all countries. With murder and other crimes of violence he has but little to do; he is a stranger to the hangman.

In the police court's daily long roll of "assaults" and "drunk and disorderlies" his name seldom appears. That the Jewish home is a home in the truest sense is a fact which no one will dispute. The family is knitted together by the strongest affections; its members show each other every due respect; and reverence for the elders is an inviolate law of the house.

The Jew is not a burden on the charities of the state nor of the city; these could cease from their functions without affecting him. When he is well enough, he works; when he is incapacitated, his own people take care of him. And not in a poor and stingy way, but with a fine and large benevolence. His race is entitled to be called the most benevolent of all the races of men.

It's too bad Mark Twain isn't alive during these days of Fascist and Nazi terrorism and race-baiting. His heaviest artillery of sarcasm and irony would be turned on Hitler and Mussolini, to their everlasting embarrassment. If ever the world needed a Mark Twain it's now. There isn't even a candidate for his magnificent pen. He had a genius for the right word. As Mark Twain put it himself, "The difference between the

right word and the not quite right word is the difference between lightning—and the lightning bug!"

\* \* \*

There are some college women in our town of Kalispell, Mont., who have formed a pan-Hellenic Association. I have been wondering how much Greek they know and would appreciate your opinion in print.

I don't know a thing about the organizers of the Kalispell, Mont., society, nor have I the slightest knowledge regarding their grasp of Greek culture. I give space to this question in order to show my readers some of the questions that are being hurled at me daily. I get letters telling me to be sure to answer that "particularly silly editorial" at the top of the third column on the editorial page of last Thursday's local newspaper. Some correspondents actually believe I have a file of every newspaper in the country. Other correspondents ask for personal replies but insist they should get that service free instead of paying me the usual fee. I don't bother to argue with them, of course. What's the use? I'm obliged to deliver a stated number of papers in payment for their subscription, and that's all. Other readers want me to reprint articles because they happened to mislay a certain issue. That's impossible, I explain with magnificent patience, because all my Freeman articles are collected in book form, three times each year, with 16 volumes in print and more to come. I take the position that readers who want my articles should put the set in their library. I can't keep repeating myself, especially since every line written in the past seven years of questions and answers can be spotted quickly by referring to the index in the back of each volume. Many others ask me questions that aren't of general interest and then get mad because I prefer to give space to topics I take to be closer to the wishes of the subscribers. And, while I'm telling about my numerous headaches, let me add that I employ no stenographer or secretary, doing my letter-writing by pounding them out on my machine. Naturally, I can't permit myself to be loaded with too much personal correspondence, for that will interfere with my editorial work. But

many readers hold to the opinion that they have a right to a personal letter on any theme they decide to pass up to my desk. And, boy, they get mad if I don't jump through the hoop. Most readers, of course, are considerate, many even writing the blessed words, "No answer requested" at the bottom of the sheet. That's what I call friendly. They're the kind of friends who understand there's a limit to the time and energy I can give to personal letter-writing. They also understand that I can't satisfy every reader who asks a question. I receive more than 500 questions intended for an issue of *The Freeman* alone and about half that many for the *H-J News-Letter*. An issue of *The Freeman* usually contains a little more than 100 questions and answers, which means that something like 400 questions have to be passed up. Many understand this and don't raise a squawk, but others know how to fume and threaten, some of them even ordering their subscriptions cancelled. That's another source of editorial headache—readers who show their anger by telling me to shove the paper up the most convenient spout. Well, it's all in the day's work.

\* \* \*

If one man can build a house in 12 days, can 12 men build it in one?

That was a favorite in my boyhood days. The answer is, of course, that 288 will build it in one hour, 17,280 in one minute, and 1,036,800 in one second. All of which is nonsense.

\* \* \*

Aren't pillows awkward and unnecessary?

They may be awkward and unnecessary, but I'm so used to them I can't sleep without one.

\* \* \*

What causes a fish to die when it's out of water?

Albert Edward Wiggam, in his "Exploring Your Mind," quotes Prof. A. J. Huntsman, of Toronto University, as saying they die from exhaustion because they struggle so violently, instead of suffocation as has heretofore been supposed. Mr. Wiggam continues:

"He finds that oxygen from the atmosphere probably will not pass through fish's gills as it does from the water and, in addition, when

they are brought into the air they have very little reserve muscle sugar in their blood to give them energy. Therefore, a few minutes of struggling brings death."

\* \* \*

Did Lenin want Stalin to succeed him as the most powerful figure in the Soviet State?

No. In 1924, Lenin warned his associates against Stalin, as follows:

"Comrade Stalin is too rude. . . . I propose to the comrades to find a way of removing him from that position [secretary-general of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union] and appointing another man who in all respects differs from Stalin only in superiority—namely, more patient, more loyal, more polite, and more attentive to comrades, less capricious. . . ."

When Lenin died Stalin stepped into his place as leader—or dictator—because he had built up an immense organization through his key position as secretary of the party, an office which gave him the power to appoint most of the important executives in the government, industry, communications, the press, and so on. The man who has the power to hand out the best jobs is usually able to boss the whole show, if he can put enough of his men in the places that count. Trotsky, who was the No. 2 Bolshevik during Lenin's years of leadership, was a great orator and leader, but he neglected the spade work of building a solid, powerful machine. Stalin—the quiet, subtle, secretive plodder—put the machine together piece by piece, and when the leader died he let the machine carry him into what has made him, in the words of John Gunther, "the most powerful single human being in the world." In another place, Mr. Gunther says Stalin rules because he has plenty of guts, durability, physique, patience, tenacity, concentration, perseverance, shrewdness, cunning and craft. "Stalin," he writes, "is about as emotional as a slab of basalt. If he has nerves, they are veins in rock." Stalin is afflicted with a dilated heart, but that doesn't stop him from getting a lot of work done and showing enormous physical strength.

\* \* \*

A Coughlinitic claims Father Coughlin is just as much a citizen of the U.S. as you are. Please explain yourself.

He isn't an American citizen like

myself because it happens I'm native born, having popped into the world down near the Delaware River, in Philadelphia, Pa., July 30, 1889. As I've explained before (see my volumes of questions and answers) Father Coughlin was born in Canada of American parents. Under our laws, Father Coughlin's parents could have retained U.S. citizenship for him had they filed the proper declaration at any American consulate in Canada. This they failed to do, according to the records of the State Department. As a result, Father Coughlin is a Canadian citizen, despite anything he writes to the contrary. He claims he's a U.S. citizen and may even vote, but that doesn't alter the fact that if some U.S. citizen were to challenge him he'd have to do a lot of explaining.

\* \* \*

Can you explain why the Jew gets picked on everywhere?

The answer is very easy. He makes an ideal scapegoat because he's a minority in every country. This point is well made in Robert Gessner's book, "Some of My Best Friends Are Jews," as follows:

The Jew has been an approved scapegoat. For centuries he has been the whipping boy accepted by the best people. Therefore, any new impulse to hate him is legitimate; it is not crude or vulgar; it is hate authorized by tradition and custom, according to our "finest" instincts. Hate has been accumulating on his back through the epochs. To Christians, he willed Christ. To impoverished victims of lords, princes, bishops, he was the exploiter. To the sufferers of plagues, he was the germ spreader. To baffled populaces, he was the unpunished murderer or the uncaught devil. To discontented peoples, he was the one who deposed their king or exiled their duke. To a defeated nation, he was the traitor. He is the creator of capitalism and the instigator of communism, the inventor of birth control and the plotter of overpopulation. However, the secret of the game is never to call him a scapegoat. He must always be conceived as a powerful and dangerous enemy.

\* \* \*

Which quality, more than any other, in your opinion, helps an individual to achieve happiness?

One of my favorite philosophers, Schopenhauer, discussed this question several times. Only recently I

wrote a paragraph in which I quoted one of his sentences on the nature of happiness. Dipping into my never-failing newspaper filing system, I find a piece in which Schopenhauer points to cheerfulness as the thing that has most to do with whether or not one is to be happy or dour. Here it is:

Nothing conduces so directly to happiness as cheerfulness. It is a quality which is its own immediate reward. He who is gay has always reason for being so, namely, the fact that he is gay. Cheerfulness alone can make up for the loss of every other possession, while nothing can take its place. We may be young, handsome, rich, and high in station; still, estimating our happiness, the question will be asked: Are we cheerful with it all? But if we see a person who is cheerful, no matter whether he be young, or old, straight of limb or deformed, poor or rich, he is happy. Therefore let us open wide the door to cheerfulness whenever it knocks. It can never come amiss. Instead of thinking thus, however, we often hesitate whether to admit it at all, and begin to reflect whether we really have every cause for contentment, or fear that gaiety will disturb our serious thoughts and anxious problems. But what good these will do is very uncertain, while cheerfulness is a direct gain.

My readers may recall that I have gone out of my way many times to tell them how much I dislike goopy people, the kind of creatures who gripe endlessly, indulge in self-pity, bellyache until they drive one to thoughts of despair, and in other ways show themselves to be strangers to the mood of cheerfulness. Yes, the world's full of trying problems, it's loaded with things that are saddening, but that shouldn't be a good reason for continually pulling a long face. Down with old droopy-drawers, I say. We can all be sincere about life without being too serious. This brings to mind another thought on the subject of happiness which turned up when I went thumbing through a folder in my newspaper filing system. I find it credited to a Hilty, and for the life of me I can't recall who the man was, nor do I even recall where I found the passage that struck me as being important enough to warrant my typing it off and slipping it into

my filing system for future use. I rescue his buried thought and pass it on because he touches sensibly on one of the essential elements of happiness:

One of the most essential elements of such happiness as we can reach on earth lies in not having too much time. The vastly greater proportion of human happiness consists in continuous and progressive work, with the blessing which is given to work and which in the end makes work itself a pleasure. The spirit of man is never more cheerful than when it has discovered its proper work. Make this discovery, first of all, if you wish to be happy. Most of the wrecks of human life are caused by having either no work, or too little work, or uncongenial work; and the human heart, which is so easily agitated, never beats more peacefully than in the natural activity of vigorous, yet satisfying work.

His point, needless to say, has been used in many of my paragraphs, for I've long looked on work as one of the doors to happiness. The great Goethe enters my discussion at this point with his own contribution to the problem of happiness, his advice being that we turn away from gloomy thoughts and barren speculations, as follows:

To turn away from useless and barren speculations; to persistently withdraw our thoughts from the unknowable, the inevitable, and the irreparable; to concentrate them on the immediate present and on the nearest duty; to waste no moral energy on excessive introspection or self-abasement or self-reproach, but to make the cultivation and the wise use of all our powers the supreme ideal and end of our lives; to oppose labor and study to affliction and regret; to keep at a distance gloomy thoughts and exaggerated anxieties; to see the individual in connection and cooperation with the whole, and to look upon effort and action as the main elements both of duty and happiness.

Goethe's words, in my opinion, are worth reading many times and taking them to heart. If I were to become a preacher I'd deliver a sermon on the above paragraph at least once a year. Some people need proper guidance if they are to achieve at least a semblance of happiness. We

don't hang around this world very long, so the least we can do is to try to work out a program that will enable us to make our stay as pleasant, genuinely profitable, and happy as humanly possible. I hope my sermonizing hasn't bored too many readers.

I save the best for the last. My ancient friend and voluminous contributor, Joseph McCabe, has packed more common and uncommon sense into a single paragraph than I can find in all the clippings I put away on this topic of the happy and full life. He tells the whole story. Study his words. Put Joseph McCabe's advice into your life and you're bound to get more happiness every day of your existence. Speaking from a rich mind, a full heart, and a long life, Joseph McCabe says:

Let your life be as happy and sunshiny as you can make it. Have the good sense to find a joy in work as well as in play. Hurt no man—especially no girl or child. Be sober. Do not invite headaches on the morrow. Resent injustice and lying for the good of all. Smite humbugs and sordid and selfish people joyfully, until the brood is extinct. Be honourable, truthful, and kind; for honour, truth, and kindness are basic conditions of a healthy and happy time for the human family. Cultivate refinement, for it doubles one's capacity for happiness. Cherish wisdom and dread illusion, for the paths of life are slippery with the blood and tears of the unwise. Beware of verbiage. Keep a strong and self-conscious personality, for there are too many people ready to exploit it. Fear neither God nor devil nor priest, but help to make your fellows such that you can walk cheerfully and helpfully with them to the end of the road. Do unto others as you would that they would do unto you.

\* \* \*

Just what can you hope to gain by continually harping on aspects of controversies which you know from long experience are unpopular? Don't you think it's shrewder and better to try to avoid offending people? Why say things—even if they're true—when you know them to be far ahead of their time? I don't think most readers are ready for the hard-boiled thinking you pass out.

I've heard that said before, many times, especially by other publishers and editors. They tell me—what I've known all along—that if I had only

played along with the crowd and avoided offending people's political, economic, social and religious opinions—I could have erected a publishing establishment bigger than *The Saturday Evening Post*. As it is, they tell me, I have to get along without the support of the people who have it in their power to pass out tremendous favors, including, of course, the fellows who buy lots of space. I can't argue with such people because they don't understand my temperament, and if I ever tried to explain it to them I'm sure they'd put me down as a fanatic, which I know I'm not. I hate to tell a money-mad acquaintance that I don't care to do nothing but pile up a lot of money. This doesn't mean I hate money. In fact, I like it, but there are other things I consider more important—and the top thing is love of truth. If I make enough money to live decently I'm satisfied. I have no desire to compete with the presses of Hearst, Macfadden, McCormick, Gannett, and the rest of the publishers who prefer to be important wheels in the great machine that goes by the name of Capitalism. Here I prefer to repeat approvingly the words of Herbert Spencer, a scholar who preferred to spend his life seeking for the truth instead of building a fortune. Study his words carefully. They contain a lesson. They tell us not to let our thought die. I quote:

Whoever hesitates to utter that which he thinks the highest truth, lest it should be too much in advance of the time, may reassure himself by looking at his acts from an impersonal point of view. Let him duly realize the fact that opinion is the agency through which character adapts external arrangements to itself—that his opinion rightly forms part of this agency—is a unit of force, constituting, with other such units, the general power which works out social changes; and he will perceive that he may properly give full utterance to his innermost conviction: leaving it to produce what effect it may. It is not for nothing that he has in him these sympathies with some principles and repugnance to others. He, with all his capacities, and aspirations, and beliefs, is not an accident, but a product of the time. He must remember that while he is

a descendant of the past, he is a parent of the future; and that his thoughts are as children born to him, which he may not carelessly let die. . . . Not as adventitious therefore will the wise man regard the faith which is in him. The highest truth he sees he will fearlessly utter; knowing that, let what may come of it, he is thus playing his right part in the world—knowing that if he can effect the change he aims at, well: if not—well also; though not so well.

Another important Englishman (according to a memo I typed years ago and slipped into its proper place in my filing system), W. K. Clifford, put the case in different words. His point is that it's a sin against mankind when one withholds the best that's in him from reaching the world. He then turns on those who object to unpalatable truths with this excellent piece of advice:

It is wrong, always, everywhere, and for any one, to believe anything upon insufficient evidence. If a man, holding a belief which he was taught in childhood or persuaded of afterwards, keeps down and pushes away any doubts which arise about it in his mind, purposely avoids the reading of books and the company of men that call in question or discuss it, and regards as impious those questions which cannot easily be asked without disturbing it—the life of that man is one long sin against mankind.

I accept those words in their entirety. And, let me add, my own humble efforts haven't been entirely wasted, even though I have never made the slightest effort to join the company of those masters of the business office who place dividends above truth. I haven't been able thus far to win the attention of the great masses, but during all these long, hard years I've never been without my audience—now somewhat hefty, other times rather insignificant. I'd rather talk candidly and honestly to an audience of 50,000 than smear lies before 25,000,000 morons. Let me close this little sermon with a constructive thought from the writings of George A. Dorsey, in which he discusses man's goal on earth. There's guts in what he says:

There is enough for all if love is the motive power; and human nature is now so well understood that

that power can be put to work for more human ends. Civilization is no goal; humanity, peace on earth, is. That goal has been dreamed of—and called a “dream,” and its apostles have been vilified or crucified by the pillars of society who find in human nature what they put into it and cry: “Human nature cannot be changed—it is God’s will!” That cry led to human slavery, human sacrifice, human warfare, and all Man’s inhumanity to Man; it should be known for what it is; the retort of the bully and the coward and the armor of the ignorant, the destroyer of humanity and of human happiness. Nothing is known of “God’s will”; enough is known of Nature to point the way Man must travel if he is to survive and the goal he must desire if he is to make the most of his nature.

\* \* \*

I’ve just heard over the radio that Materialists must be unhappy because their philosophy is so cold. Please discuss.

George Santayana wrote a book, many years ago, entitled “Reason in Science,” and when I read it I attached one of my handy, simple tabs to page 89, for I knew the time would come when I’d need his words. The time has arrived. I was able to dig up his quotation in less than a minute, with the help of a pretty good memory. Here’s the excerpt:

“If you are in the habit of believing in special providences, or of expecting to continue your romantic adventures in a second life, materialism will dash your hopes most unpleasantly, and you may think for a year or two that you have nothing to live for. But a thorough materialist, one born to the faith and not half plunged into it by an unexpected christening in cold water, will be like the superb Democritus, a laughing philosopher.”

\* \* \*

Is it a fact that it’s possible for a player to beat a crooked roulette?

There’s one trick that can be made to work sometimes. Let’s suppose the suckers are putting heavy money on the odd numbers. If the game’s crooked—which it’s pretty sure to be, except at Monte Carlo and some other first-class joints—the house arranges to control the ball so that it’ll fall into one of the even numbers. The man who controls the dishonest equipment lets the small bets on the even

side win in order to trim the suckers who bet big money on the odd side. At best, it’s small-time chiseling. But don’t think the house isn’t wise to you. It knows what you’re up to and sometimes will let you win, if you don’t get hoggish. While on this point let me say that the crooked equipment is rarely operated by the croupier. He’s too busy handling the bets. The crooked twisting is usually done by a shill who poses as one of the players. He keeps one hand over a hidden switch somewhere on the side of the table. Never try to beat a gambler. It’s his business to fleece you. If he didn’t he’d lose his roll—and his prestige among other gamblers. That’s unthinkable. If you like to play and don’t mind losing a few dollars even when you know the house isn’t giving you an honest gamble, that’s your business. But if you need the money and can’t afford to lose even a part of it—stay out.

\* \* \*

I’ve heard it said that man wouldn’t find life worth living if he didn’t believe in Immortality. What’s your notion?

The great Ernst Haeckel, in his famous book, “The Wonders of Life,” (p. 108, where I spotted what I wanted through the help of a well-placed tab) pays his respect to that argument about needing faith in an after life in order to endure this life, this way:

“Convinced that there is no eternal life awaiting him, he [man] will strive all the more to brighten his life on earth and rationally improve his condition in harmony with that of his fellows.”

Expressions like the above can’t be found in the average book of quotations because the editors who compile such works usually try to avoid controversial subjects. They lean in the direction of conventional thinking, and many times they are openly biased in favor of outright orthodoxy. For that reason I find it necessary to use my system of “tabbing” quotations as I read books, in order to have opinions of a more or less unpopular nature to draw on when I need them in my editorial work. I’m glad to pass the idea on for others to use, for I know it enables one to read to a purpose and to identify important utterances so they may be

called back to life when needed, as in the case above. This system, naturally, is not to be confused with my newsclip filing system, which I use mainly for clippings from the daily press. Many of my readers wonder how I go about the mechanical chore of systematizing things so that the treasures of the world's great thinkers may be drawn on quickly when required. I'd be lost without those tabs.

\* \* \*

I've often wanted to ask you whether you have ever thought about, or made any provision for, the perpetuation, after you are gone, of the work you have started—for a while at least.

A man can only do his job as well as he knows how, and then hope for the best. My son and daughter are quite as bright as their old man, and certainly better educated for their age, considering one has graduated from a good university and the other (my son) is in the throes of pouring formal learning into his excellent set of brains. They already let me know, in ways subtle and devious, that I've long passed my prime and that my ideas are beginning to show alarming signs of being dated. But I don't take that to heart, for I'm conceited enough to consider myself able to hold my own against even a pair of university jitterbugs. I listen to their raves about the genius of Benny Goodman and tell them, without the trace of a blush, that Brahms, Beethoven, Bach, and a couple of other "has-beens" still sound tops to my ancient ears. But this doesn't shut my eyes—which have just taken to reading glasses after almost 50 years of reliance on the equipment given to me by nature—to the fact that when I'm gone (which, given the breaks, may not be for another 30 or 35 years) they and the progeny, if any, they bring forth, will undoubtedly streamline what the old man wrought in crude, broad outlines. Youth, as Ibsen showed in his great drama, *The Master Builder*, ever knocks at the door, but the aged ones inside try to resist answering as long as they dare. My hands may be getting ready to tremble, but the spirit in me says they're still able to hold their tools, and, if necessary, their weapons. At that, it's my job to serve my own generation. Tomorrow's genera-

tions will serve themselves in their own good ways. If I'll be able to pass on a few hints I'll know nothing about it as my cremated ashes shake around in some forgotten cigar-box.

\* \* \*

Can you give me the various rates of postage charged in the U.S. 100 years ago?

My reliable, never-failing newsclip filing system, under the folder marked "POSTAGE RATES," contains exactly what this reader wants, and as it is a subject of general interest I'm sure many other readers will be attracted by this unusual piece of information. A hundred years ago letters were charged according to the distance they were to be carried, which made the use of the mails an expensive practice. The section which mentions "double letters," "treble letters," etc., refers, of course, to letters weighing more than ordinary letters. Here's the century-old schedule of the U.S. Postoffice Department:

"On Letters—6¼ cents for any distance not exceeding 30 miles; 10 cents, if over 30 and not exceeding 80 miles; 12¼ cents, if over 80 and not exceeding 150 miles; 18¾ cents, if over 150 and not exceeding 400 miles; 25 cents, if over 400 miles. Double letters are charged double, treble letters, treble, and quadruple letters, quadruple these rates. Postage on heavier packages in proportion.

"On Newspapers—Not carried over 100 miles, or for any distance within the state where they are printed, one cent each. If carried over 100 miles, and out of the state where they are printed, one and a half cents each.

"Periodicals, Pamphlets and Magazines—Carried not over 100 miles, one cent a sheet; carried over 100 miles, two cents a sheet. Those not periodicals, 100 miles or less, 4 cents a sheet; over 100 miles, 6 cents a sheet.

"No deduction will be made on postage on letters charged double, treble, or quadruple, unless they are opened in the presence of the postmaster, his assistant, or some one belonging to the office."

Needless to say, the mail order business couldn't get very far if it had to operate under conditions like those listed above.

\* \* \*

I belong to the Roman Catholic Church. I have just been invited by a priest to

invest my savings in bonds issued by the parish. I have talked to other Catholics and they tell me they prefer to give outright donations to the Church rather than invest in the Church's bonds. The reason, they say, is that Catholics are put in a difficult situation if the parish is compelled to repudiate its bonds or if they have to go into default. Please advise.

I advise you to hold on to your savings. Put your money in the nearest Postal Savings Bank. Many Catholics are reluctant to buy the bonds of the Catholic Church, as you've already noticed. The reason is that no Catholic is permitted to sue the Church without the permission of the ecclesiastical authorities. If the bonds aren't paid, and you and other creditors sue, you can be excommunicated, which means you will roast in Hell for all time without any priest ever putting in a good word for you with Jehovah, who, needless to say, never takes a soul out of his misery unless requested by some authorized agent. The Lord has worked out this policy after many trials and errors, and from what I can gather He intends to stick to it from now on. Let me tell you what happened to some Catholic investors in Montreal, that center of Catholicism and Fascism. I find in my newsclip filing system a clipping from a Montreal newspaper, dated February 2, 1939, in which it's stated that "court action by five creditors of the parish of St. Etienne against the parish and Roman Catholic Church authorities was adjourned until March 27 because the petitioners feared complications arising from a vatican excommunication decree." The same report goes on to say that the creditors are suing the parish, the archbishop-coadjutor of Montreal and the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Montreal for \$261,939, the balance of a loan they contend was negotiated in the name of the parish. I quote:

"The excommunication decree, announced from Vatican City recently, was made because the petitioners took court action without the expressed permission of Roman Catholic authorities here."

The situation is serious for the creditors, for if they push their suit for the money owing them, the Church will excommunicate them. These five dupes, when they appeared in court,

actually heard their attorney announce in open court that the case should be adjourned on the ground "his clients had been placed in a delicate position as professing Roman Catholics by the decree." The lawyer then read a letter from an unidentified expert on canon law "who said he was unable to appear as a witness without receiving permission from church authorities of the diocese of Montreal." That's the policy of the Church, which means that investors who lend their money to the Church can't collect if the authorities don't see fit to pay, and if they sue they can be excommunicated.

\* \* \*

Is it a fact that thunder accompanies all lightning except heat lightning?

Dr. Karl B. McEachron, high-voltage expert connected with the General Electric Company, Schenectady, N.Y., in a lecture delivered at the Franklin Institute, Philadelphia, Pa., denied there's validity to the popular notion that all lightning flashes, except heat lightning, are accompanied by claps of thunder. According to an item in my newsclip filing system, Dr. McEachron said, "the absence of thunder with heat lightning is well known, but it is generally thought that a distinct lightning stroke from the skies to the earth always has a peal of thunder with it. This is true in most cases, but studies now show that for 'slow' lightning there often is no accompanying thunder." He explained that "slow" lightning is a discharge "which takes one or two tenths of a second to build up, whereas the lightning producing thunder takes only a few millionths of a second to do its work."

\* \* \*

What's the difference between a bigamist and a digamist?

Bigamy, I'm sure, you understand. A digamist, instead of having more than one wife or husband at a given time, is legally married a second time.

\* \* \*

What did the Federal Government collect in taxes during 1938 on cigarettes, cigars, and other forms of tobacco?

During 1938, the U.S. Government collected \$491,301,164 in cigarette taxes, an increase of nearly \$4,000,000 over 1937, during which receipts were \$487,903,701. Chewing and smoking

tobacco and snuff brought in \$61,789,570, as against \$60,816,320 in 1937. Federal revenue from cigars declined in 1938, according to a treasury report in my newspaper filing system. The collections in 1938 amounted to \$12,689,834; in 1937, \$13,328,025.

\* \* \*  
I read, in one of your articles, the statement that The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam expresses the philosophy of Skepticism or Agnosticism. Can you quote a few lines bringing out this slant?

There are many to choose from. Here's one that's as good as any: And that inverted Bowl we call the Sky, Where under crawling coop'd we live and die,

Lift not your hands to It for help—  
for It  
As impotently moves as you or I.

\* \* \*  
I've heard it said that the late Charles P. Steinmetz, the electrical wizard, was a Freethinker. Is this true?

Yes. I've often quoted from Steinmetz's papers, letters and addresses to prove his Agnosticism. The following words, from John Winthrop Hammond's biography, "Charles P. Steinmetz," leaves no doubt about the great inventor's place among the Freethinkers:

"... No evidence or proof of the existence of a God has been found in the phenomena of nature, based on experience."

\* \* \*  
If the earth were level, the water in the world would cover all of it, naturally. What I want to know is, how deep would that body of water be?

Two miles.

\* \* \*  
What do the American people pay to be fed?

In 1938, \$11,000,000,000.

\* \* \*  
What is the value of the foodstuff raised on U.S. farms in 1938?

About \$9,000,000,000.

\* \* \*  
We often read how stars collide. Have astronomers ever figured out what the chances are for such a collision?

Sir James Jeans tells, on page 88, "The Universe Around Us," that "calculations show that any one star may expect to move for something of the order of a million million million years before colliding with a second star." In the face of that estimate, let's go ahead with our jobs without worrying about the possibility of our

getting blown into a gaseous state through collision with some heavenly wanderer. Sir Arthur S. Eddington, in "The Nature of the Physical World," (page 176), says our earth was formed as the result of our sun being approached by a star, as follows:

"A star journeying through space casually overtook the sun, not indeed colliding with it, but approaching so close as to raise a great tidal wave. By this disturbance jets of matter spurted out of the sun; being carried round by their angular momentum they did not fall back again but condensed into small globes—the planets."

To return to Jeans's book, let me quote another passage on this interesting point (page 87):

"The universe consists in the main not of stars but of desolate emptiness—inconceivably vast stretches of desert space in which the presence of a star is a rare and exceptional event. . . . The stars move blindly through space, and the players in the stellar blind-man's-buff are so few and far between that the chance of encountering another star is almost negligible."

While I'm at it let me turn to another reader's question, which has to do with a parson's positive assurance to his pious hearers that they are warmed by the sun because God willed it so, for He knew man couldn't be comfortable on this little globe if He didn't supply some sort of a furnace to take away the chill. Astronomers show that almost all of the sun's radiation is wasted, so the Lord must be a poor plumber. Any good journeyman in the plumbing trade seeks to conserve as much heat as possible so that it'll be used for the purpose intended. If the Great Plumber in the skies really wanted to warm our hides He could have done it much more economically. Sir Robert S. Ball, in his "Nebular Theory," Encyclopedia Britannica, says, on this point, "the amount of the sun's heat has been estimated, but we receive on the earth less than one two-thousand-millionth part of the whole radiation." Another astronomer, Richard A. Proctor, in his "Our Place Among Infinities," says "all the planets together receive less than 230 millionth part; the rest is seem-

ingly scattered uselessly through interstellar depth." That's bad engineering, if you ask me. I suggest He remodel the works and keep our pippiks warm by piping just the right quantity of heat to this planet and save the rest from going to waste. But, I doubt He'll pay any attention to "Hell-Demon" Julius. (To close on a constructive note, let me say that the first two quotations used above were rescued from hiding by the use of my nifty little tabs. I use these tabs, as explained before, in order to conserve the gems I discover while meandering through the many books I've read in an active lifetime spent with the world's best literature. If I were as careless about such gems as Jehovah is about his system of radiation I'd read a million million facts and opinions but have only one for use when actually needed. A simple thing like a tab saves such awful waste. Why can't the Supreme Plumber do as well?)

\* \* \*  
**How much do American women spend on lipsticks annually?**

About \$15,000,000, not including Joan Crawford.

\* \* \*  
**How many pianos did the American people buy in 1938?**

About 100,000.

\* \* \*  
**How much will the human skin stretch?**  
 About 43 percent.

\* \* \*  
**Please give us more remarks on books and authors, radio and the movies.**

I try to cover these fields as well as space permits. Now that I'm editing a twice-monthly news-letter, I find more space available for the kind of reviews my readers prefer.

\* \* \*  
**What is a Michigan Bank Roll?**

It's a term, used in some gamblers' circles, to describe a fat roll that consists only of \$1 bills.

\* \* \*  
**The Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, in his magazine, The Defender, says Lenin died of syphilis. Is this true?**

The Jayhawk Nazi" lies again. Dr. George Klemperer, former professor of medicine, University of Berlin, was called from Berlin to collaborate with other physicians in treating Lenin during his last illness.

According to a report in my newsclip filing system, Dr. Klemperer was joined by Dr. Foerster, the famous German neurologist, and several Russian medical men, when Lenin was examined in Moscow, in February, 1922. "The possibility of venereal disease was excluded," writes Dr. Klemperer. Lenin, according to this doctor, "had had trouble in speaking (aphasia) and paralysis of half of his body (hemiplegia) which had disappeared quickly, but there was no doubt at all that he had a hemorrhage of the brain and that this obviously was caused by a hardening of the arteries." Many weeks later, after further examinations, Dr. Klemperer said he "could definitely predict that the hemorrhages would return and might cause his death at any time." He was asked to make an official statement to the Soviet of the State Commissaries, to which he wrote that he diagnosed Lenin's ailment as "arteriasclerotic hemorrhage of the brain" and added the prediction "that the disease would probably cause his death in a year and a half. It was a sad satisfaction for me that this prognosis was correct. Considering the course of this disease, there can be no doubt that Lenin's death was caused by arteriosclerosis of the brain, partly hereditary, partly in consequence of his gigantic overstraining. . . ."

\* \* \*  
**ANSWERS TO UNASKED QUESTIONS**

George Jacob Holyoake said a man can give excellent advice even though he prefers not to follow his own suggestions, as a finger-post may point the right way though it never moves in that direction. But, he adds, "he who is seen to do himself what he counsels will always have more influence over men than those who say one thing and do another." At that, most men prefer to point the way rather than lead the way.

The world always looks with suspicion on anyone who prefers to go through life without being labeled. People everywhere insist on slogans and signs. Men are judged like merchandise —by the label. If a conservative sees a label that mentions "liberal," he draws back, flushes and announces his intention to take his trade elsewhere.

Recently I had the rare experience of being mistaken for a government. A man next to my place at the bar got into a conversation and asked me where

I came from. When I told him I was from Girard, he commented: "Oh, that's the place where that guy Haldeman-Julius comes from. He's the geezer who originated the Five Year Plan." I expressed astonishment, at the same time refraining from revealing my identity. "His Five Year Plan," the stranger continued, "says you can live with your wife only five years, after which there has to be a divorce. Do you happen to know how many wives he's had?" I replied it was my impression he was still living with the first woman he married, some 25 years ago. He then started more talk about the H-J Five Year Plan. "Aren't you confusing him with Soviet Russia?" I asked. "Oh, no. The Rooshians invented the Second and Third Five Year Plans."

Don't waste time on bad books, especially when so many good ones are available.

Don't expect even good books to think for you. You must think for yourself. Use good books as instruments to stimulate thought. That's all one has a right to expect from good books. Don't treat your brain like a sponge and have it do nothing but absorb the riches from other minds. Draw on good books, but do it creatively, doing your own thinking as you go along.

The other day I heard a Methodist preacher, from nearby Pittsburg, Kans., deliver a luncheon club speech that was crammed with Fascism. When it was over everyone I heard comment on the speech agreed the man was a "wonderful orator." No one took the trouble to analyze the horrible things he had said, and the awful lies he had repeated. The fact that he could orate splendidly seemed sufficient. I can't get enthusiastic about oratorical cleverness when I see it used to spread falsehoods and sow the seeds of Fascism. Tell the truth in simple speech and you're nobody in particular, but tell lies magnificently and you become an orator.

One of the biggest lies ever spread is the one that speaks of man's "fighting instinct." It's a myth. Look at the peoples of the world today—not a single one of them hopes for the chance to go to war. Even the German and Italian peoples, after years of war propaganda, insist they prefer peace. But the people haven't much to say about whether they're to live in peace or die in new wars. The dictators will decide for them, and when they do they'll say they can't hold the people back any longer, that the people can't overcome their natural instincts.

The other day I pointed out a serious inconsistency in Hitler's ideology, and an intellectual cockroach dismissed it with the remark, which he credited to

Emerson, that consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds. I don't mind the man's idiocy, for that's his misfortune, but he shouldn't misquote. Emerson put the thought this way: "A FOOLISH consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds."

While eating in a restaurant and thinking how I ought to be a little more inspirational in my writings (dispelling gloom and pessimism, and all that) I heard one waitress complain to another: "If I had another toe I'd have another corn, and if I had another foot I'd have another bunion."

Jonathan Swift noticed that when the world gets a really great genius you can recognize him by this sign, that the dunces are all in confederacy against him.

I prefer not to shun bad company merely because it's bad. I've learned many valuable things—including vigorous ideas, humor and wit—from bad people.

An empty purse can be filled, but an empty mind is an everlasting calamity.

"I believe," began the fool. Who cares a damn what he believes? He has spent his adult life expressing opinions on subjects he knows nothing about, without ever trying to gain the knowledge that entitles one to an opinion. That's what makes him the fool he is. I'm reminded of Henry Thomas Buckle's passage: "Knowledge is not an inert and passive principle which comes to us whether we will or not; but it must be sought before it can be won; it is the product of great labour, and therefore of great sacrifice. And it is absurd to suppose people will incur the labour and make the sacrifice for subjects respecting which they are already perfectly content. They who do not feel the darkness will never look for the light. The doubt must intervene before the investigation can begin."

In the country of the blind the one-eyed man is king, says the old saw. There's much truth to that observation. The ignorant feel comfortable in their ignorance because they see their errors accepted as the truth by so many other ignoramuses. Arthur Schopenhauer put the thought this way: "He who can see truly in the midst of general infatuation is like a man whose watch keeps good time, when all the clocks in the town in which he lives are wrong. He alone knows the right time: but what use is that to him? For every one goes by the clocks which speak false, not even excepting those who know that his watch is the only one that is right."

It's been well said that the liar's punishment is in his inability to believe himself. I recall an oilman who started

a rumor in a hotel occupied by scores of wild-catters. He got word to them, just to fool the outfit, that oil's being found in a certain section of Arkansas. Within the hour half the men were gone. Within the next day or two all were gone except the liar who had started the yarn. When he saw he was alone he thought the situation over and decided he'd better join his fellow oilmen in Arkansas lest he miss out on a chance to strike oil. So he went there.

Don't waste time worrying about women's cockeyed hats when the whole world's screwy.

Look carefully at any writer who indulges in the vice of obscurity and you'll always find him as shallow as toilet-paper.

Tell a man he's perfect and he doesn't even demur, because it always sounds so obvious. Praise his alleged sense of humor and his heart pounds faster. But tell him he's a good man and he wants to start an argument.

When a bore utters a profound truth he finds himself punished for his bore-someness by getting no attention from his hearers or being misunderstood.

I don't mind seeing a man load himself with useless attainments, but it burns me up to see him try to make them appear useful.

People afflicted with the vice of "good taste" always insist that the truth should be used with the greatest caution.

It's true money can't buy true love, but it often lands a pretty good imitation.

When a woman subtracts a number of years from her age she never wastes them. She tacks them onto the age of some other woman.

No woman deliberately tries to make a fool out of a man. She uses her skill to make him do the job for himself.

When a woman says she's "broad-minded" about another woman it usually means she's getting ready to do what the other woman did.

My paragraph on the fatuousness of deliberately setting out to serve posterity when one should be serving his own generation has brought me several letters from readers who think this an unidealistic sentiment. Maybe it is. Maybe I didn't word it just right. Abraham Lincoln discussed the same idea, as follows: "Few can be induced to labor exclusively for posterity; and none will do it enthusiastically. Posterity has done nothing for us; and theorize on it as we may, practically we shall do very little for it, unless we are made to think that we are at

the same time doing something for ourselves." Lincoln sounds hardboiled in this opinion, but we know better, for he never failed to remain true to his ideals of democracy, freedom and justice. By serving his own generation he served posterity, which, after all, is the ideal way to further the interests of generations unborn. On another occasion Lincoln showed his love for freedom and opposition to racial and religious persecution, in these vigorous, lively words: "Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it 'All men are created equal, except negroes.' When the Know-Nothings get control it will read 'All men are created equal, except negroes, and foreigners and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty, to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy." The Know-Nothing Party, to which Lincoln was referring, was the K.K.K. of his day. It's appeal was based on racial and religious prejudices.

Ingersoll got off a good one when he said: "Religion has not civilized man, man has civilized religion. God improves as man advances."

Freethinkers don't claim they've solved the problems of life, "creation," and the like. There are many gaps in their knowledge. But they refuse to accept explanations from orthodox religionists just because such opinions have become "sacred" after centuries of echoing the same dogmas. They don't want to force Freethought on anyone. All they ask is that the world of ideas be free, that thought be permitted to flow. Ingersoll commented on this thought in such a way that he threw light on the subject, thus: "When a fact can be demonstrated, force is unnecessary; when it cannot be demonstrated, an appeal to force is infamous. In the presence of the unknown, all have an equal right to think."

Most of us live our lives in fear. We dread the light—even the truth. Let's listen to Ingersoll on this theme: "Fear paralyzes the brain. Progress is born of courage. Fear believes, courage doubts. Fear falls upon the earth and prays, courage stands erect, and thinks. Fear retreats, courage advances. Fear is barbarism, courage is civilization. Fear believes in witchcraft, in devils and in ghosts. Fear is religion, courage is science."

So many people I meet seem to take for granted that there's something wrong about being a doubter. The skeptic is looked on as something of an outcast—

not by the really intelligent, of course, but by those who are still in the mental chains of orthodoxy. Henry Thomas Buckle, the great author of "The History of Civilization in England," wrote as follows in support of doubt: "Until doubt began, progress was impossible, for the advance of civilization solely depends upon the acquisitions made by the human intellect, and on the extent of their diffusion. But people who are satisfied with their own knowledge will never attempt to increase it. People who are convinced of the accuracy of their opinions will never take the pains of examining the basis on which they are built. They look with wonder, and often with horror, on views contrary to those they have inherited; and while they are in this state of mind it is impossible that they should receive any new truth which interferes with their foregone conclusions."

If we're to have a good world, says Bertrand Russell, we must have knowledge, kindness, and courage. We must cut the ropes of the past and we must free the mind of its fetters. The world has been terrorized too long by so-called sacred words spoken long ago by ignorant men. Yes, there must be "a fearless outlook and a free intelligence."

For decades, until only a few years ago, we men and women who live in civilized countries took for granted that our rather recent victory over the State was to be a lasting one. We seemed convinced that the principle had been established that the State is made for the individual, not the individual for the State. But Fascism denies this, and now the fight has to be won all over again. We insist that the State is to be a tool, not a club with which to beat down freemen. Hitler and Mussolini—their dark shadows reach far. But lovers of freedom won't give up the fight. They have too much to lose.

There are mental cancers that can be cured without knife, x-ray or radium. All one needs is the will to banish them. Most ailments of the mind can be cured, if only we can learn the simple lesson that we have it within ourselves to will our way to mental health. Not always, of course, but almost always.

The body can't be well if it's ruled by a sick mind. The mind can't be well if it's tied down to a sick body. Health of mind and body—both pulling together—make for a full and happy life.

Man did a wonderful thing when he invented work. He did a horrible thing when he introduced toil.

Don't try to run away from reality. Face the facts. They may be bitter and discouraging, but knowledge, in the end, can overcome one's ordinary difficulties.

Stand up to your problems at least half way. And, above all, never shut your eyes to the truth. Of all deceptions, beware most of self-deception. You can fight back when someone tries to deceive you, but you're at a terrible disadvantage when you kid yourself.

\* \* \*

I enclose a clipping which tells how Goebbels cracked down on stage comedians because of their jokes about the Nazi regime. What does such humor consist of?

Nazidom can't even take a little joke. Comedians in cabarets and vaudeville who make wisecracks about Nazism are either sent to concentration camps or expelled from the Reich's Culture Chamber, which means the actors won't be able to follow their profession in Germany any longer. That means they're cut off from their bread and butter. It all goes to show the Nazis can't take it. They're experts at giving it. The most famous comedian to be expelled is Werner Finck, popular for many years in Berlin, where crowds would jam any cabaret or theater he was announced to appear in. Prior to his expulsion on February 3, 1939, he served time in a concentration camp for smart sayings. Propaganda Minister Goebbels says Nazidom "will not be derided." Here are a few of Finck's quips:

He looks at his wrist watch, is about to say something, halts suddenly, remains silent a few seconds and then remarks: "Well, I really was going to discuss out time—but I guess I had better not." (That, believe it or not, is what got him a stiff term in a concentration camp.)

He suddenly raises his right hand in what appears to be a Nazi salute, but the salute changes into a few moves to adjust a picture on the wall, with the arm still up in the air in the manner approved by Hitler. (This is what got him fired from the chamber, which, as I said a while ago, cuts him away from employment anywhere in the Reich.)

After his return from the concentration camp he was greeted by greater crowds than ever before, because many Berliners admire the man's talent for light comedy and enjoy his quips about the bigwigs of Nazidom. One reason for Goebbels' action against Finck was because it

soon became apparent that this actor's appearances brought out hordes of anti-Nazis, who took this mild means of expressing their silent protest against Hitlerism and applauded a wisecracker who managed to put in a neat lick now and then, though none of them were the least bit serious. The first evening he appeared after his release from a concentration camp he said:

"You know, it's funny. After I was released I walked around the camp and saw the walls, guards with their guns and the heavy gates. Everybody told me how hard it was to get in. But shucks, all I did was to speak one sentence."

The United Press story from Berlin contains a few other best-known jokes which annoyed the Nazi leaders. Weiss Ferdl, a comedian, according to this UP story, approached an empty table and began disgorging watches and jewelry from his pockets. He turned to the audience with a leering remark: "Ach, you were asleep that night," referring to the anti-Jewish disorders.

Another joke was based on the four-power meeting at Munich, in September, 1938. The comedian, representing Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, of Great Britain, looked appealingly at Hitler and said: "Can't I have something to take back home with me to London?" To this, Hitler replied: "All right, I'll give you your umbrella back."

It was comments like the above that caused sell-outs wherever he was billed. Now this comedian will develop blisters while he toils with a gang of "free workers" pouring concrete for some new fortifications or helps grade a right of way for a new military road in the direction of the Ukraine, a land that Hitler frankly covets. But Hitler's troubles aren't over. He can suppress Germany's minor comedians, but the greatest of all—Charlie Chaplin—seems to have ceased being allergic to work, for my old, devout and saintly friend, Rob Wagner, reports in his sprightly magazine, *Script*, that the one and only Chaplin is really at work on his new picture, "The Dictator." Here's what Mr. Wagner

writes about Hitler's newest headache:

"Yes, we have heard the story of 'The Dictator,' and you may rest assured that while the satire on all dictatorships is utterly devastating, there isn't a bitter note in it. Its comedy, however, is so hilarious that it will test the sense of humor of all those living under dictatorships. And don't think they won't see it; the temptation to bootleg the film will be too overwhelming to resist. We are sure Benjamin Mussolini will get a great laugh (perhaps secretly) out of it. And maybe Joe Stalin. We're not so sure of Adolf. For while Charlie is not staging his play in veritable Germany and he is not saying his little character is indeed Herr Hitler, there is, of course, a certain physical resemblance, which we must repeat again is Adolf's cross. Obviously it is not Charlie's fault if he is mistaken for Der Fuehrer. Anyway, it looks to us as though Herr Hitler is on the spot marked X. Yes, the situation has all the factors of superb Shakespearean comedy.

\* \* \*

What is the financial position of our largest tobacco companies?

I have the data in my newsclip filing system but space permits me to cover only the main points, as follows:

The American Tobacco Company, in its latest financial report, showed \$21,000,000 cash, \$137,000,000 in inventories and only \$32,000,000 current debt; Liggett & Myers, \$23,000,000 cash items, \$134,000,000 inventories, \$17,000,000 current debt; R. J. Reynolds, \$3,500,000 cash, \$138,000,000 inventories, \$35,000,000 current debt; P. Lorillard, \$11,000,000 cash, \$35,000,000 inventories, \$2,000,000 current debt; Philip Morris, \$2,600,000 cash, \$21,000,000 inventories, \$13,000,000 current debt.

Wages, in the tobacco industry, especially in the manufacture of cigarettes, are notoriously low, while salaries and bonuses to executives are amazingly high. Dividends to stockholders are also fat and promising.

\* \* \*

Are parents one's closest relatives?

That's a common belief, but it isn't always true. Your parents are your nearest relatives only if you have no brothers or sisters. You are more closely related to your brothers and sisters than to your father or mother

because a child and its father or mother share only one-half common blood, while brothers and sisters have the same blood entirely.

\* \* \*

How many adult smokers are there in this country?

39,000,000, according to an estimate made by the tobacco industry.

\* \* \*

What causes dynamite to explode—ignition or percussion?

Percussion.

\* \* \*

Do the American people favor a set limit on incomes?

*Fortune* magazine conducted a survey on this question, asking representative citizens the following:

"Should incomes be limited?"

The replies:

Yes .....	29.9%
No .....	61.1
Don't know .....	9.0

Factory labor, according to this survey, was divided exactly 50-50, which was the heaviest approval for limits on income. It would be valuable to ask these same people if they favor heavy income taxes on large incomes. I'm pretty sure the replies would indicate overwhelming sentiment for having the government take a large share of swollen incomes. This would seem to mean that the average person, while disapproving of laws against large incomes, is in favor of "sharing" in those immense incomes through his government's income and inheritance taxes. This shows the masses aren't given to apostolic worship of the fortunate few who enjoy prodigious incomes. And this brings to mind an old story, one that has absolutely nothing to do with what I've just been writing. But as I happened to think of it just as I closed my argument, maybe my readers will let me tell it. Those who don't care for such levity can skip the rest of this piece and go on to more sober reflections. As I recall the tale, Maud (there's a Maud in every fancy house) told the Madam she was ready to quit. "Why should you want to quit, Maud?" the Madam asked. "You're doing well, Maud, and you're one of the best girls I've ever had. Only the other night I saw you go upstairs with 26 different men." To which Maud replied: "You can

say that again. I can't go on like this. My feet hurt."

\* \* \*

Is it accurate to say that all of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were of English stock?

The statement isn't true. Eighteen of the 56 men who signed the Declaration of Independence were of non-English stock. In short, the Republic started as a racial admixture and has continued that way down to the present. The history of our country gives proof that people of all races can cooperate for the good of all. America's greatness can't be credited to one racial group. The glory belongs to all who have fused their creative, industrial, artistic, intellectual, inventive, financial, commercial, professional, scientific and cultural talents and gifts. America is a garden that sports the beauty of many flowers. It refuses to crush out various flowers in order to establish uniformity. Beauty is achieved by the display of many flowers. Social tolerance, progress, harmony and humanism bring beauty, culture, wisdom and humanitarianism to our people. All races can make great contributions to civilization, if given sympathy, friendliness and equal opportunity. Racialism is social bigotry on a vast scale. Americanism has grown great through its many races. If America were to adopt the ideology of racism our decline would begin immediately and the future would be dark and menacing. This is the proper time to quote the true Americanism expressed by a Jewish woman, Emma Lazarus. Her lines are inscribed in bronze on the Statue of Liberty:

Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,  
With conquering limbs astride from  
land to land;  
Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates  
shall stand  
A mighty woman with a torch, whose  
flame  
Is the imprisoned lightning, and her  
name  
Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand  
Glow world-wide welcome; her mild  
eyes command  
The air-bridged harbor that twin cities  
frame.  
"Keep, ancient lands, your storied  
pomp!" cries she  
With silent lips. "Give me your tired,  
your poor,

Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,  
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.  
Send those, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,  
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

President Roosevelt, in his speech delivered to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty, caught the precise meaning of those lines when he said:

"I like to think of the men and women who, with the break of dawn off Sandy Hook, have strained their eyes to the West for the first glimpse of the New World.

"They came to us speaking many tongues—but a single language, the universal language of human aspiration.

"How well their hopes were justified is proved by the record of what they achieved. They not only found freedom in the New World, but by their effort and devotion, they made the New World's freedom safer, richer, more far-reaching, more capable of growth."

Let me close with the words of Professor G. A. Borgese, the great Italian scholar, who, when granted the blessing of American citizenship after being driven from his native land by the Fascist gangsters, exclaimed:

"This country has given me the remarkable privilege of creating a new life. It is a gift for which I shall always feel gratitude."

\* \* \*

Is there any way of finding out how many big game animals we have in the U.S.?

The U.S. Bureau of Biological Survey, which made a survey in cooperation with the National Park Service, Forest Service, State game and conservation commissions, and other informed sources, says there are more than 5,000,000 big game animals loose in this country. This census, the first of its kind in our history, was reported in a bulletin issued on January 28, 1939, according to a piece in my newspaper filing system. Deer come first with more than 4,500,000. The others follow in this order:

Elk, 165,000; antelope, 130,000; black bear, 81,000; peccaries, 43,000; bighorn sheep, 17,000; moose, 13,000; buffalo, 4,100; grizzly bear, 1,100, and European wild boars, 700.

Strange as it may sound, much of

the big game animals in the U.S. are in Pennsylvania and Michigan, instead of the Far West. The two States just mentioned have a total of about 800,000 white-tailed deer, which makes them the country's leaders, so far as this animal is concerned. There are 450,000 black-tailed and mule deer in California. The report adds that deer, elk, antelope and buffalo have been helped by protection. Antelope increased 500 percent from 1924 to 1937. Once we believed they were facing extinction. Bighorn sheep are losing out, dropping from an estimated 22,000 22 years ago to 17,000 in 1938.

\* \* \*

How many words do we say in a three-minute telephone conversation?

A slow talker, 450 words; a medium talker, about 550; a fast talker, about 700. About 200 words a minute, on the average.

\* \* \*

You take effective slams at phrenology and graphology. I agree with you when you brand both "systems" as bunk. But what about Physiognomy, the science of reading character from the face?

Physiognomy is as bunky as Phrenology. People who pretend to read character from the face either kid themselves or kid others. I can't improve on what August A. Thomen said about Physiognomy, in his book, "Don't Believe It," as follows:

"In 1924 G. U. Cleeton and F. B. Knight conducted a series of detailed experiments to ascertain the validity of this notion (Journal Applied Psychology, June, 1924). They had uniform photographs made of 10 college students whose mental capacities and abilities were definitely known. These photographs were given to 376 persons who were requested to arrange them in accordance with their estimates of the subject's intelligence. The conclusions arrived at by Cleeton and Knight were as follows: (1) The persons making the selections could have done just as well with their eyes closed as open. (2) Any successful selections were merely a matter of luck because those who did well on one set of 10 did poorly on the next. (3) Women were no more efficient than men. (4) Older persons were no more efficient than the young. (5) The more intelligent showed no more ability than the less intelligent. (6) There was a slight tendency for both men and women

to overestimate the intelligence of women from their photographs. (7) When the pictures are not uniform one's ability in such estimates is lessened. (8) In judging two pictures, as in judging 10, one might as well close the eyes. (9) A group of judges working together did no better than a single judge. (10) One professional 'character reader and vocational expert' did no better than the average of the 376 persons who arranged the pictures.'

In short, there are beautiful, ugly, homely, attractive, bright, dull, pleasing, disgusting faces. That's about all. You can't tell from the way a face is put together whether its owner is honest or crooked, cruel or kind, and so on.

\* \* \*

How much money do we spend on greeting cards, and what per cent of this money goes for Christmas cards?

Statistics issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce show that Americans spend approximately \$66,000,000 for greeting cards annually, of which 45 percent goes for Christmas cards.

\* \* \*

Can you verify the claim that a committee of the Founding Fathers wanted the great seal of the United States to include emblems of foreign countries?

Yes, that's true. The sketch, as drawn by the committee, placed the emblems of six European countries in the center of the great seal, sur-



First Sketch of the Great Seal of the United States

rounded by the 13 original States. I had my attention first called to this (according to a memo in my newspaper

file system) by Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter, then a professor of law at Harvard, as follows:

"It deserves to be recalled that, when the Continental Congress chose John Adams, Franklin, and Jefferson as a committee to devise the national emblem, they recommended a seal (see above) containing the national emblems of England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany, and Holland as representing 'the countries from which these States have been peopled'. . . . The very Constitution of the United States was made, in the classic language of the Supreme Court; 'for an undefined and expanding future, and for a people gathered and to be gathered from many nations and of many tongues.'

"If one faith can be said to unite a great people, surely the ideal that holds us together beyond any other is our belief in the moral worth of the common man, whatever his race or religion. In this faith America was founded, to this faith have her poets and seers and statesmen and the unknown millions, generation after generation, devoted their lives."

The occasion of the above utterance was when Mr. Justice Frankfurter accepted, in May, 1938, the award of the National Institute of Immigrant Welfare, at which time he expressed "passionate devotion to this land that possesses millions of people born like myself under other skies."

\* \* \*

Can owls see in broad daylight?

The Smithsonian Institution has issued a bulletin by Arthur Cleveland Bent, of Taunton, Mass., in which the statement is made that "the owl has developed the ability to see in the dark through ages of night-hunting for food, but in some instances owls have shown themselves to have quite keen vision in bright sunshine." The same writer says owls aren't as wise as popular belief holds them to be, and that they are often stupid.

\* \* \*

What's your opinion of "The American Way," the new Broadway success by George S. Kaufman and a collaborator?

I haven't seen the production so I can't discuss it from direct observation. Walter Winchell praises it extravagantly, but Heywood Brown says:

"I was shocked to face a scene in

'The American Way' in which a young boy is told by his grandfather and a benevolent banker not to go to a meeting in his home town, because it is sponsored by 'outsiders'. . . . At this point I marched up the aisle in a dudgeon. . . . 'The American Way' is a play which uses the voice of Franklin Roosevelt for comic relief and takes Lindbergh as the highest potential symbol of American patriotism."

\* \* \*

I live in a town where we have to filter the water, then boil it, and then put chemicals in it. What would you do in a case like that?

I'd drink beer.

\* \* \*

Some of the anti-Semitic literature I read makes much of the alleged argument that President Roosevelt's advisers consist mainly of Jews. Please comment.

The charge is often repeated by professional anti-Semites like Father (of what?) Coughlin and the Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, but the facts prove them to be disseminators of falsehoods. As Paul Mallon, in his syndicated column, says, American Jews, like other religious sects, are divided between conservatism and liberalism, Republicans and Democrats, and so on. "Apparently," he writes, "it is a thoughtless revival of the stupid absurdity that people of any certain religion are of the same goodness or rascality—and the same politics." In order to find out who the President's ever-changing list of advisers now are, and their religious affiliations, a survey has been made with the following results:

There are 19 men now nearest the presidential ear: Corcoran, Cohen, Ickes, Hopkins, Bullitt, Eccles, Welles, Jesse Jones, McNinch, Steve Early, Judge Rosenman, Bill Douglas, Morgenthau, Hanes, Frederick Delano, young Tom Edison, Admiral Leahy, Louis Johnson and Marvin MacIntyre.

Among them are: One Catholic, three Jews, seven Protestants (subdivided as two Episcopalians, two Methodists, two Presbyterians, one Baptist), one Mormon and seven whose denominations are not sufficiently distinct to appear in Who's Who.

\* \* \*

It's obvious that Father Coughlin is spending immense sums of money in order to carry on his pro-Fascist and anti-Semitic propaganda. His radio broadcasts alone must cost thousands of dollars weekly. His magazine, which

I understand has a circulation of more than 1,000,000 copies weekly, costs additional thousands of dollars. He also distributes carloads of free books and pamphlets. Where does all the money come from? Who's putting up the cash?

## HENRY FORD.

\* \* \*

Can you explain why millet is such a popular grain with roving peoples?

Because it matures quickly.

\* \* \*

Is there anything to the squawk one hears regularly from businessmen and bankers to the effect that the government should get out of business? Is our government making it hard for executives to run their establishments?

During recent months I've given considerable space to the various complaints of business against the New Deal, as an examination of the indexes of my volumes of questions and answers will show. I've demonstrated that the yells about taxes are insincere, because the official figures show that we pay far less money in taxes than do the business interests of France and England, with still higher levies in the Brutalitarian countries. As for the national debt, I proved by actual figures that in proportion to population we could increase our debt from about \$40,000,000,000 to \$100,000,000,000 and still have a smaller national debt than England or France. The third argument is met everywhere, especially in newspapers and the radio. Business leaders or their spokesmen bewail governmental interference with business. The fact of the matter is that our government hardly touches business. Outside of a few blanks, which can be filled in a few minutes, the average business establishment doesn't know that the government exists. These howlers should take a look at the lot of a businessman in Germany before they start shedding tears about their sad condition in free America. The various industries in Hitlerland have been literally flooded with hundreds of thousands of decrees regulating every conceivable aspect of business. Business executives are even instructed when they have the right to whip apprentices. A single copy of a German magazine devoted to textile affairs carried a list of new decrees which the businessmen must obey. Let American businessmen look them over carefully—just a section

of them—and then have the gall to squawk about the U.S. The official ordinances announced by the Nazis must be obeyed or one is open to heavy fines, jail sentences, or having one's establishment closed. One of Hitler's hoodlums has the final say about these matters. Such cases are never taken into court. Here are just a few of the regulations announced in a single issue of the magazine referred to above:

"Hat stores and department stores attention: Felt hats of any kind are not allowed for display earlier than June 5. In exceptional cases two or three felt hats may be displayed with a greater number of straw hats. In the same way, promotion of felt hats by advertising, etc., is not allowed before that date.

"No Brown Shirt uniforms are allowed to be fitted with zippers of any kind. Even if a customer orders a zipper on a custom-made uniform it must be refused by the tailor or merchant.

"Apparel stores are not allowed to offer to press, free of charge, a suit bought in the store.

"The leather gloves industry in the Sudetenland is not allowed to produce more than 2,750,000 pairs of gloves in the year 1939.

"The manufacturers of laundry bags, collar bags, tie boxes, etc., are forbidden to use leather of any kind for the production of these goods. Fish skin may be used.

"The following six firms (the firms are listed) are entitled to manufacture the sheath knives used by the uniformed party units. Retailers holding permission for the retail sale of such knives must buy them from one of these state-licensed firms.

"A retailer who is a master approved by the guild is entitled to beat his apprentices if this is a purely educational measure and not a punishment. The apprentice is not entitled in such case to leave his job.

"It is forbidden to install, to open or to enlarge mail order houses or mills producing cravat fabrics.

"Price-fixing laws for the Ostmark (Austria): Retailers trading in textile goods are ordered to respect the following mark-ups and maximum prices. (There follows a list of more than 350 articles.)

"These mark-ups are allowed only if the retailer buys directly from the manufacturer. If he buys from jobbers the mark-up must be one-fifth less.

"The jobbers' mark-ups are valid only for such jobbers holding the merchandise in stock. Other jobbers, acting merely as agents, must sell the goods at purchase price."

How'd you like to run a business in Germany instead of the U.S.? What a question! And don't forget that the regulations printed above are only a fraction of the immense number of decrees issued for the textile industry alone. If you think these decrees don't mean anything then you should look at some of the penalties imposed on those who break them. The Stoehr Kammgarn Spinnerei, one of the most important worsted mills in Naziland, was fined almost 2,000,000 marks for violating the regulation dealing with prices. Our businessmen are lucky to be able to run their places in a country like the U.S. If they had any real gratitude they'd cut out their eternal bellyaching.

\* \* \*

What is your opinion of Alfred Lawson and his theory of economics?

No realistic-minded person gives serious attention to Alfred Lawson and his Direct Credit Society. Lawson is just another crackpot who has the knack of reeling off \$4 words. High-sounding lingo serves in lieu of sound thinking. I certainly don't intend to waste time and space refuting Lawson's economic notions, any more than I'd dream of taking time to tell my readers the reasons for rejecting the belief—still held by millions of people—that the earth's flat. Lawson's followers look on him as God-sent, a Moses who is to teach the people true economics and lead them into Utopia. He's greater and wiser than Darwin, Aristotle, Newton, Einstein, Bacon, Huxley and Donald Duck rolled into one. Think of a "leader" who has the monumental impudence to talk about himself as did Lawson in the following:

"I never make forecasts that do not come true. In comparison to Lawson's Law of Penetrability and Zig-zag-and-swirl movement, Newton's Law of Gravity or Einstein's theory of relativity are but primer lessons, and the lessons of Copernicus and Galileo are but infinitesimal grains of knowledge. My thirst for Truth and to know the Cause of Everything has developed an intellect capable of solving any human problem. A Pledge: I promise you before God, whom I must soon face

and make an accounting to, that I will never betray you. My duty is to God and not to the financiers."

Pardon me, but I prefer to remain lost in the mire of skepticism.

\* \* \*

How much money is Hitler spending on foreign propaganda?

One estimate puts the sum at \$80,000,000 per year.

\* \* \*

Is it a fact that a disproportionate number of Jews are criminals?

Oswald Garrison Villard, in *The Nation*, April 22, 1939, calls attention to the fact that "during the years from 1920 to 1929 Jews furnished only a little over half of their numerical quota to the population of our State and Federal prisons." Mr. Villard then goes on to tell a pleasant story about what happened when a Jewish boy was convicted in Albuquerque, New Mexico, in October, 1937, on a charge of forgery. "The judge, a Gentile," says Mr. Villard, "suspended the sentence because 'there is not a Jew in New Mexico prisons and I dislike to spoil that record of a law-abiding element of our citizens.'" Mr. Villard then takes up another point which several readers have asked about in recent months. He shows how unfair it is to accuse the Jews of being devoid of patriotic impulses. Mr. Villard, after examining the records, found that "40,000 of the 225,000 Jews who were in the army during the World War were volunteers; that 225,000 Jews formed 5 percent of the army, although Jews constituted at that time only 3 percent of the population."

\* \* \*

What do you think about Boake Carter's idea, and also Father Coughlin's, that President Roosevelt is deliberately fomenting war in order to get a third term, and that all the war hysteria is in the U.S., and little of it in Europe? I cannot see Roosevelt in that role, as it seems to me he is doing more than any other statesman to prevent, rather than foment war. Can you throw any light?

I read the Boake Carter piece and it made me boil. He went even stronger than my reader says above, for he actually had the rottenness to suggest that Roosevelt is even provoking trouble in Europe in order to have a nice new World War send him to the White House for a third term. In short, our President would deliberately create a situation in which

something like 10,000,000 men would be killed, 20,000,000 wounded, and hundreds of billions of dollars worth of property destroyed—all in order to get another four years of the presidency. That, I insist, is a new low in journalism, a profession that can go pretty low when it has a mind to. This same pen prostitute and intellectual pimp rarely misses a chance to say a good word for Japanese militarism and Hitleristic imperialism. He's the most contemptible sewer-rat ever to make his home in the "sacred" temple of journalism.

\* \* \*

Please let me know if the National Protective Insurance Co., of Kansas City, Mo., is any good. I hold one of its health policies.

I made personal inquiries about this company when I last visited George M. Husser, manager, Kansas City Better Business Bureau, and he told me he had investigated the concern and had found it reliable.

\* \* \*

How does one prepare a "Hitler her-ring"?

According to a sign in a delicatessen store, you take a Bismarck her-ring, cut out the brains, remove the backbone and open the mouth.

\* \* \*

How about a cumulative index for your 16 volumes of questions and answers?

I've been thinking of such a project and believe it would be better to wait until I issue my 20th volume. I figure it'll take about 128 pages to cover such a cumulative index. Meanwhile, readers will have to thumb through each volume's individual index.

\* \* \*

Can you give me the ancestry, occupation and religion of each State governor?

"We Americans," a handbook on the varied origins of our democracy, contains a table which answers the above questions. The information was compiled from answers to a questionnaire, five of the governors (Iowa, Montana, New Hampshire, Oklahoma and Tennessee) failing to reply. The compilation shows that Protestant lawyers of British, Scottish and Irish ancestry have a nearly three to one chance to become governors. There are two Jews, two Catholics, and (Kans.) a half-Jew. Two governors (N.D. and Wis.) are immigrants. The survey also shows that there are 11 ethnic strains,

either mixed or unmixed, in the 43 governors who replied, as follows: English, Scots, Irish, Welsh, German, French, Jewish, Scandinavian, Dutch, Czech and Spanish. British Isles blood strains dominate. Religious connections show: Protestants, 29; Catholics, 2; Jews, 2; Unitarian, 1; Latter Day Saint, 1, and two persons without any religious connections. Their occupations: lawyers, 23; farmers, 4; millers, 3; manufacturers, publishers and engineers, 2 each; and one each of the following: pharmacist, banker, rancher and orchardist-nurseryman. The table:

Governor	State	Ancestry	Occupation	Faith
Frank M. Dixon	Ala.	Eng.-Ger.	Lawyer	Bapt.
Robert T. Jones	Ariz.	Eng.-Fr.	Engineer	Pres.
Carl E. Bailey	Ark.	Eng.-Sco.	Lawyer	Chr.
Culbert L. Olson	Calif.	Danish	Lawyer	No data
Ralph L. Carr	Colo.	Sco.-Eng.-Ir.	Lawyer	Chr. Sci.
Raymond E. Baldwin	Conn.	English	Lawyer	Epis.
Richard C. McMullen	Del.	Ir.-Eng.	Mfg.	Meth. Epl
Frederick P. Cone	Fla.	Sco.-Eng.	No data	Bapt.
Eurith D. Rivers	Ga.	Eng.-Fr.	Lawyer	Bapt.
C. A. Bottolfsen	Id.	Norwegian	Edit.-Pub.	No affil.
Henry Horner	Ill.	Bavarian	Lawyer	Jew
Maurice C. Townsend	Ind.	Eng.-Ger.	Farmer	Meth.
Payne H. Ratner	Kan.	Ir.-Jew	Lawyer	Chr.
Albert B. Chandler	Ky.	English	Lawyer	Epis.
Richard W. Leche	La.	Fr.-Sp.-Ger.	Lawyer	No affil.
Lewis O. Barrows	Me.	English	Pharmacist	Cong.
Herbert R. O'Connor	Md.	Irish	Lawyer	Cath.
Leverett Saltonstall	Mass.	English	Lawyer	Unit.
Frank D. Fitzgerald	Mich.	Sco.-Ir.	Farmer	Cong.
Harold E. Stassen	Minn.	Ger.-Scan.-Cz	Lawyer	Bapt.
Hugh L. White	Miss.	Irish	Lumberman	Pres.
Lloyd C. Stark	Mo.	Sco.-Ir.	Nurseryman-Or.	Epis.
Robert L. Cochran	Neb.	Scots	Civil Engineer	Epis.
Edward P. Carville	Nev.	Ir.-Eng.	Lawyer	Cath.
Arthur H. Moore	N.J.	Sco.-Ir.	Lawyer	Dut. Ref.
John E. Miles	N.M.	Ir.-Sco.-Wel.	Farmer	No data
Herbert H. Lehman	N.Y.	German	Banker	Jew
Clyde R. Hoey	N.C.	Irish	Lawyer	Meth.
John Moses	N.D.	Norwegian	Lawyer	Luth.
John W. Bricker	Ohio	Ger.-Sco.-Eng.	Lawyer	Chr.
Charles A. Sprague	Ore.	Eng.-Sco.-Ir.	Editor	Pres.
Arthur H. James	Pa.	Welsh	Lawyer	No data
William H. Vanderbilt	R.I.	Dutch	No data	Prot.Epis.
Burnet R. Maybank	S.C.	Eng.-Sco.-Ir.	No data	Epis.
Harland J. Bushfield	S.D.	Scots Prior	Lawyer	Pres.
Wilber L. O'Daniel	Tex.	Irish	Miller	Chr.
Henry H. Blood	Utah	English	Miller	Lat. Day
George D. Aiken	Vt.	Scots	Farmer	Prot.
James H. Price	Va.	Scots-Ir.	Lawyer	Pres.
Clarence D. Martin	Wash.	Scots.	Miller	Meth.
Homer A. Holt	W. Va.	Eng.-Sco.-Ir.	Lawyer	Pres.
Julius P. Heil	Wis.	German	Mfg.	Prot.
Nels H. Smith	Wyo.	Scandinavian	Rancher	Luth.

\* \* \*

I have read in several places the charge that the Soviet Union must take its share of blame for the sell-out that ruined Czechoslovakia because "it failed to make clear that it would go the limit in halting Hitler." Munich's betrayal of

the sturdy, little Republic was "the direct result of the uncertainty of the Soviet Union's intentions in the crisis." Please comment.

I've seen and heard the same charge. It's completely false. The USSR was ready, and anxious, to go the limit. Eduard Benes, former president of Czechoslovakia, ought to know the truth, and it's from Dr. Benes that Erika Mann got the facts, which were printed in *The Chicago Daily News*, April 18, 1939. Because the subject is of such great importance I feel justified in reprinting the

interview with Dr. Benes in full, as follows:

Virtually everyone in my American audiences has been asking me whether or not Russia would be a

possible ally for the democracies, both from a military standpoint and from the standpoint of her internal solidity.

People are asking whether Russian reluctance to join the British stop-Hitler bloc means Russia is not interested in European developments or is unwilling or unable to participate. They recognize that the situation of France and England will be affected by what Russia does.

Reports that Colonel Lindbergh had belittled the Russian air power have made a forcible impression. No other witness has been heard who was, like Lindbergh, in a position to know.

Therefore I asked Dr. Eduard Benes, who among all European statesmen was in closest contact with Russia during the European crisis of last September. I learned that Dr. Benes had ascertained, through a Czechoslovakian military commission, that Russia was excellently prepared. I learned also that Russia was willing to come to Czechoslovakia's aid whether France did so or not.

I asked Dr. Benes what Russia's position was last September.

Dr. Benes said: "Russia was faithful to the very last moment; I knew that. Shortly before the Munich conference I sent a military commission to Russia; it came back with the best reports as to all aspects of Russia's morale and military preparedness. The reports as to air, sea, and land forces were completely satisfactory."

Dr. Benes said he was assured by Russia that it would have sent military assistance even though France and England failed to do so.

This statement at this moment, coming from this source seems to me of the highest importance, since it contains news which is not only significant for the past, but at least equally significant for the present and future.

As for the past, it is more than understandable that Dr. Benes doesn't want to discuss today the reasons for his attitude during the crisis. It is generally known, however, that the ambassadors of England and France not only declined to promise help in case of hostilities, but even indicated, in the name of their governments, that these governments, as in the case of Spain, might actually help the aggressor in the guise of "non-intervention." In fact, I was told in Praha a few days after Munich, by persons belonging to the government, that they feared that Czechoslovakia, had she

offered resistance with Russia's aid alone, might have become a second Spain.

Russia's foreign policy has been consistent in two respects: first, it has always stood for peace; secondly, it has always stood ready to help block the aggressors. No amount of Fascist lying can erase these obvious truths. I call particular attention to Dr. Benes' sentence in which he says—and he certainly was in a position to get the truth—that Russia assured him it would send "military assistance even though France and England failed to do so." The facts indicate beyond debate that the blame for Munich rests with France and England. The Soviet Union's record is clean.

\* \* \*

Is there anything to the rumor that Heywood Broun has joined the Catholic Church?

It looks as though the report is straight stuff. Two of my paid spies—one in N.Y.C. and the other near Broun's home in Connecticut—say it's so, and they've never failed me yet. They agree that Broun has been going to mass and getting the right dope about heaven direct from God's own agents. Once he took a batch of his political articles to confession and asked the priest if they were strictly kosher. The priest said he'd read them in the newspapers and couldn't see anything in them that was at variance with the One and Only Church. Broun—America's greatest intellectual jitterbug—ought to last about two years in the Catholic Church. That's about his record. He was in the Socialist Party that long. He was a fellow-traveler with the Communists for about that much time. And now he's ripe for two years of the Catholic hokum. I predict he'll leave the Roman outfit early in 1941, when he'll join up with the Christian Scientists, though I'm surprised he didn't sandwich the Eddy outfit into his schedule before becoming a Catholic convert. After he leaves the Eddyites he'll join a society devoted to "psychical research." Then he'll become an out-and-out Atheist. After that he'll head for the last round-up and become a Spiritualist. He'll die in the faith that when he reaches the other shore he'll send messages (at space rates) back to the syndicate that's been selling his daily pieces.

Only the Spiritualists can guarantee him the power to continue pounding out daily articles for the folks back home.

\* \* \*

In his speech answering Roosevelt's peace telegram, Hitler said (April 28, 1939) that "at Versailles the German delegates were stoned, they were dragged to the conference room and forced to sign at the pistol's point." Please comment.

This is pure bunk. No violence was used against the German delegates to the conference. They weren't dragged to the meeting. They rode there in perfectly good motor cars. They certainly weren't stoned. When Hitler said these things he was making up his own history, a common device of the demagogue.

\* \* \*

Do you believe professional baseball is honest?

Absolutely. It's clean right down the line. Of course, 20 years ago, baseball suffered a black eye when the Chicago Sox pulled their dirty stuff, but that mess was mopped up promptly and everything's been on the square ever since. One short-lived scandal in a century of baseball—that isn't at all bad. Today, baseball's reputation is spotless. Baseball is one of our greatest institutions. It would be unspeakably tragic if this fine sport were to fall to the levels of wrestling, prize fighting and horse racing. I recall an argument with a fellow who insisted that dog racing was honest because you couldn't tell the dogs what to do. Poor, naive sucker. Dog races are crooked from beginning to end. Once I attended a list of greyhound races near Joplin, Mo., and was given a chance to see one phase of the rotten racket right out in the open. I was chatting with the owner of a dozen or more dogs, out where the dogs were kept. A caretaker approached the owner (who was his boss) and quietly announced: "So-and-So, the black dog, is to run in the next race. Which of the black dogs will it be this time?" The owner pointed to a certain black individual and ordered him to be entered as a much-advertised (and heavily betted on) dog. With five black dogs to choose from, the owner was able to put one out that would fit into the betting that had been planned. Who but insiders could pick out So-and-So

among five black dogs? But to return to baseball, another thing I like about this sport is the way it adjusts itself to the purses of the masses. Compared to horse racing and prize fighting, baseball is a big bargain. A fight, with its \$10 and \$20 tickets, is a clip racket if ever there was one. And look what kind of fights they've been putting Joe Louis in the past couple of years—pushovers. Wrestling has ceased being a sport and has become a brazenly open fake. But the public can see great teams play our National sport at 50c or \$1—a real bargain. And the show is always clean, honest sport. However, let me confess my admiration and respect for baseball is purely platonic and vicarious. I rarely see a game, I never read about one, hate to hear the scores announced on the radio, and consider play-by-play broadcasts the stupidest of all dumb programs, of which there are many. It never bothers me in the least when I'm compelled to confess I don't know which team is in the lead at some critical moment in a world series. But I know if I were to permit myself to become a fan I'd pick out baseball as the best in the country.

\* \* \*

I have heard it said, and I've seen the statement in print, that we should shut our doors to all refugees from Europe because of our own bad economic situation. Please comment.

Some months ago I showed by actual statistics that a body of German refugees, admitted into England only a few years ago, soon rehabilitated themselves, became self-supporting and then, to the astonishment of bystanders, actually established factories and other enterprises that gave profitable employment to 25,000 Englishmen. Thus, they helped the government by taking 25,000 men and women off the dole, helped the public treasury by turning in large sums in income and other taxes, hiked England's volume of domestic and foreign trade, and in other ways demonstrated their ingenuity, productiveness and all-round usefulness. I could cite similar cases in the U.S., for I have the data in my newsclip filing system, which, like calomel, hasn't failed me yet. Let me quote the opinion of Dorothy Canfield, novelist and distinguished citizen of

New England, who discusses refugees as possible assets to our country, as follows:

"If we show the most ordinary good sense, we can reap a rich harvest which Europe has sown and cultivated. Refugees are not taking jobs away from our own people. I can cite factual information about the kind of people the great majority of the refugees are, and what—already—they are doing for our industrialized country, by their highly trained specialized skill and knowledge of advanced processes of manufacturing and business and opening up of new possibilities in the use of our vast national resources."

Miss Canfield then gives an illustration to show how a single refugee helped put new life into an Indiana community. The German, a certain Mr. Busch, had been operating his factory in Germany. Let's call it a box factory. He was doing well, but after the Nazis came into power it was discovered by the authorities that two of his grandparents had been Jewish by blood. As this was a crime against humanity, he was stripped of his possessions, his factory was confiscated, until finally he was compelled to leave with his family, their possessions only a little clothing and a few dollars. The penniless family settled down in New York City for a few months, depending on a few dollars each week from the hard-pressed refugee committee organized to help such exiles. Soon the mother was scrubbing floors. A daughter was earning a little money in some sort of a business, while the father got employment on the night shift of a printing establishment. But Mr. Busch's sister, in a small city in Indiana, was on the look-out for her brother and his family. She knew that even though he was penniless, he had in his head ideas that could be useful to our country. He had been decorated with medals because of inventions he had made in the box factory he had developed and built up in Germany. She made inquiries and discovered an abandoned factory, in the neighborhood of which were scores of unemployed, discouraged workers. With the help of the Chamber of Commerce she got her brother and his family to join her. She took

care of them while he went about the slow, arduous task of transforming the abandoned plant into a box factory capable of turning out goods up to his superior specifications. Before long, the business was going full tilt, the factory was alive with activity, the neighboring unemployed were now drawing good wages, the county was getting taxes, the Federal Government was receiving income taxes, and in a hundred other ways the dispossessed Mr. Busch was back in action again. That's what a single German refugee did for an Indiana community. That could be multiplied thousands of times if we were to take advantage of the Nazi mania for persecuting gifted, creative, constructive, useful people. There's a lesson here. We should reach out and rescue these embers, for they can be used to light the fires of American industry.

\* \* \*

"I have the announcement of your newsclip filing system and think I have a better and more elastic one. Anyway, yours is a dandy for amateurs. I file my clippings in regular letter-sized folders, numbered 1 to 50. I use a vowel index to index my clippings. I put a red or blue number on my clippings to correspond to my folder number, and file once a month."—G. Fred Orphal, N.Y.

\* \* \*

Editor: I have a bone to pick with you.

Have you or have you not read "Life Insurance: Investing in Disaster," by Mort and E. A. Gilbert? Judging from the neglect of this important subject in *The Freeman*, it seems that you have not. Anyway, you owe it to your readers to expose this gigantic racket, and for two reasons—to save them substantial sums of monies, and to warn them against supporting "investment institutions engaged primarily in banking operations." It is common knowledge that the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. is the largest financial institution in the world. And it got that way by milking the public, who, in their blind faith believe that life insurance as handed out by such private companies is the best protection against death and the soundest depository for savings. But progressive-minded individuals, when they learn the cold facts, will think hard before risking their money and aiding in the concentration of wealth and vast power in the hands of a few.

In the columns of *The Freeman* you have served your readers well with reports on such items as coffee, razor

blades, combination pens and pencils, etc. But not on life insurance—though various reports have contained splendid articles on the subject.

Why not? Is not the truth about life insurance as important as the truth about laxative bromo quinine tablets, dated coffee, or about fish being a brain food? Surely that cannot be. Not a matter involving \$110,000,000,000.

I have been reading *The Freeman* for more than a year now and remember nothing of significance therein on life insurance. I've looked through your volumes of "Questions and Answers" but have been poorly rewarded. In one place, if I remember correctly, you straddled the issue by expressing your personal notion that you had nothing much against the ordinary type of insurance policies but that the U.S. Postal Savings Bank is the best place of all for one's savings. Of course. But had you followed up that suggestion as to savings with the advice to try to get renewable term insurance, you would have completed a perfect answer—the most perfect answer yet possible.

In the 13th volume of "Questions and Answers" you wrote: "It is well to remember that there's no such thing as a cheap policy, even against death alone." Of course I don't know what you meant by "cheap"—but the International Workers Order has been issuing low-cost insurance for the past nine years, with rates based on the Fraternal Congress Table, calling for a lower and truer mortality cost. This organization is licensed to do business in California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Then there is the Knights of Columbus—unfortunately limiting its membership to Catholics. And the Eureka-Maryland Assurance Corporation—the Bankers National Life Insurance Company—and other companies, listed by the Gilberts, offering renewable-term contracts under varying conditions. In this same article you said that insurance will become cheaper when the government assumes this work, and suggested that "meanwhile" the reader buy his policy from one of the old-line companies, even though he pays too much. Why not "meanwhile" be better informed—while waiting for the government to step in? It seems to me that to admit one's lack of knowledge is one thing, but that to act in the role of adviser under that handicap is quite another. And one who did not know better might reasonably suspect you of working for these "old-line companies."

To go back to the 8th volume of your "Questions and Answers" I find the case of a reader, speaking for a "small group of professional men" seeking your advice toward a solution of their "vital"

insurance problems. And you told him: "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. . . . It's going to cost you more . . . but my sincere advice is to let a bad bargain stand." Of course that was back in 1936 and the Gilberts had not written their book mentioned above. Then too, you were three years younger and not as wise as you are, or should be, in this respect today. I recall your statement in a recent issue of *The Freeman* that you judge the value of a belief "by the support the believer can bring up in its defense." Your "feeling" about life insurance contracts, unsupported by reason and facts, is, by this judgment of yours, valueless, to say the least. Why see a contract through that is bad to begin with and keeps getting worse right along? Why let a "bad bargain" stand if a better bargain is to be had?

I sympathize with those "professional men" if they abided by your advice, as their spokesman said they would—and wonder what your other "quite a number of pieces about insurance" contained.

The insurance problem is vital to the majority—if not to the minority whose economic status seems secure enough to allow them to shrug their shoulders at the whole business. "Sure, it's a gamble," say the minority, "and we can afford it." But what about the little fry—the millions of low-wage workers who can't afford it? For them—it should be plain enough—renewable term insurance is the only answer. . . . I, for one (with a salary of \$30 a week and facing the loss of my job) appreciate the fact that, as a member of the International Workers Order, I pay \$21 for the first year for \$3,000 of protection, rather than a net "level premium" of \$48.66 (quoted by the Travelers Ins. Co.) for the same amount of protection.

It's plain that an insured with one of these beneficent companies says a so-called level premium for a decreasing amount of insurance, or, in other words, that the insured is creating his own insurance with his increasing "savings," which money the company appropriates in paying his beneficiary if or when he passes out of the non-too-lovely picture. This "savings" is not savings at all, unless he cancels his policy or should happen to live through the life of the policy to collect on it. In that event he has done well in improving his money at 3 percent, but aside from that he has no insurance on his life whatsoever. What a gamble—considering that during the life of the policy the "savings" belong to the company and that any temporary withdrawals are

confronted with dismaying 6 percent interest charges! (Gilberts' book contains this quotation from "Fortune" of May, 1931: "Of every one-hundred persons now insured, 17 will die and 83 will give up their policies in a period of less than 20 years." Say the Gilberts: "Experience has taught the companies, if not the policyholders, that reserve-building policies rarely end by death or maturity. Most policies are lapsed or surrendered in the early years—in the period during which much of the reserve is confiscated. . . . It should be a warning to policyholders that the companies assume that most investment policies will continue to end in lapse or surrender. Otherwise the companies would gain nothing by increasing the surrender charge.") . . . How much better for the insured to have renewable term insurance and to keep his nest-egg, if he has one, with the Government. His savings are then truly his own—and his beneficiary's in the event of his death.

My attitude is this: We live today—not ten, twenty five or forty years from now, when we may no longer have dependents to protect; and as long as we need to carry protection the cheapest form is obviously that which necessitates the least outlay of hard-earned cash. If we lose our jobs and are hard-pressed for money, how much easier it will be to pay low step-rate term premiums rather than exorbitant insurance-savings premiums. And there's this realistic viewpoint: We cannot escape the fact that we live in a mad, chaotic world—a world, as one writer put it, "resembling a hospital for mental cases with the patients in control." A world war in which the United States may become involved—a Fascist uprising in this country (certainly not hard to imagine after reading about the German-American Bund meeting at Madison Square Garden in New York)—these things are far from unthinkable. Nor is it pleasant to contemplate a demoralized capitalistic economy, with its unemployment and relief needs and the workers' place becoming less and less hopeful. Under such conditions why sink one's precious income into the hazardous long-term venture of an investment-insurance contract? Why compromise the present for the sake of a future so uncertain?

Chicago, Ill.

BEN NELSON

[Editor's Note: Reader Ben Nelson should realize that it's hard to find space for many subjects, even though they are important. However, now that I'm publishing the H-J News-Letter I feel confident that problems of life insurance will receive the space they deserve.]

\* \* \*

Editor: If I believed in verbal inspir-

ation I would say that you were infused with divine afflatus when you wrote "Answers to Unasked Questions" in the June, 1939, number of The Freeman. It has more stimulating thought and sound advice packed into it than any other article of its length I've read in years. Atoka, Okla. JOHN MASON

\* \* \*

You say, in one of your articles about Il Duce that he has worked out a theory of propaganda in order to keep a firm hold on the minds of the masses. Can you give me an outline of what this method embraces?

The technique of Mussolini's system of propaganda is, according to a clipping in my newsclip filing system, well analyzed by John T. Whitaker, foreign correspondent, who has studied propaganda methods at first hand in Germany and Italy. In his comparison of dictators, Mr. Whitaker writes that Mussolini "is the most articulate intellectual among modern tyrants." He continues:

"Mussolini has discovered that the masses are quick to enthusiasm and easily persuaded. But their enthusiasm is dissipated and they do not remain persuaded. He has perfected a technique, therefore, of rousing public opinion only on vague and emotional issues. On vital controversial matters he deliberately bewilders and confuses the masses to prevent the crystallization of opinion.

"Thus the emphasis upon the dictator as 'leader,' thus the rodomontade instead of the discussion of issues. Mussolini not only discharges or transfers any lieutenant who catches the public imagination—'changing the guard,' it is called in Italy—but he always deliberately resists any crystallization of majority opinion. If Mussolini finds that Italian opinion yearns after a policy he himself desires he will even attack that policy and discipline its champions, only to bring it forward himself later. Thus he prevents the Italian public from becoming aware of the force which resides in public opinion."

Mussolini is a shrewd master of the subtle art of propaganda, but even he won't be able to survive certain combinations of circumstances, once they take form. His policies are leading in one direction—aggression. Now it's Ethiopia; now it's Spain. But these victims were practically unarmed, so his "victories" were almost certain. Now, as I write, the

newspaper headlines tell about Mussolini's threats at France, his demands for slices of French colonies. If he goes too far in his baiting, war may break out any day, in which case Mussolini would be faced by a power that's better armed and supplied, and a country that commands far greater resources, much more money, and surer access to the world's markets. No dictator—even when he's the most adroit propagandist—can long survive a series of military defeats. Mussolini will find himself no exception to this rule. He'll be able to fool his millions of dupes so long as he wins easy victories against poorly armed opponents; there'll be wild cheering from the crowds, even though they have to tighten their belts another notch in order to produce the money to pay the costs of such campaigns of aggression, but those same elements will become open rebels, once he fails to win. A dictator must always be a superman. No dictator dare make a mistake or lose prestige. He must always be right, in a pragmatic sense. Well, the answer is that no dictator can always be right. He's bound to bet on the wrong side some time or other, and when he does that his fancy theories of mass psychology will pass into thin air and the world will see the end of another tyrant.

\* \* \*

You have told us a great deal, during recent years, about Hitler's Drang nach Osten (drive to the East), which means he wants to dominate the Ukraine. But I don't recall your ever having written a word about the Ukraine itself—what the country amounts to, its resources, its activities, its culture, and so forth. Let me suggest that you dip into your famous newsclip filing system and pull out the data I'm sure many of your readers want.

It's important to know something about the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (which Hitler says is his objective) because this area commands world attention and promises to become even more newsworthy after Hitler moves nearer to his professed goal. Yes, it happens that my newsclip folder contains many interesting facts about this important and rich part of the Soviet Union, and when I get through telling my readers what's contained in that section of

Russia they'll understand why Hitler isn't going to have an easy time taking the country. The Ukraine, which is one of the four original republics which joined to form the U.S.S.R. in 1923, is one of the richest places in Russia. As some of my readers undoubtedly know, it begins down at the Northern shore of the Black Sea and spreads North far enough to abutt both Poland and Rumania, its two Western neighbors. It's much larger than either of these neighbors, while its population is 32,000,000, of which 80 percent are Ukrainians, the remainder being Russian, Jewish, German and other nationalities. There are about 400,000 Germans in the Ukraine. In the days of the Czar, the Ukraine was an oppressed territory, in which the Ukrainian language was forbidden by law, and in which the Jews frequently were murdered in pogroms that horrified the civilized world. Today all this is changed. The U.S.S.R. not only tolerates the Ukrainian language; it actually made it the official language of the Ukrainian Republic, while acts of violent anti-Semitism are punishable by imprisonment and even death. The Republic's schools, following the usual policy of the U.S.S.R. in encouraging a great variety of languages instead of legalizing only one, use such languages as Russian, Moldavian, Polish, Yiddish, German, Bulgarian, Tatar, Greek, Czechoslovakian, Armenian and White Russian. The facts show that culturally, politically, industrially, agriculturally socially and economically, the Ukraine is welded into the U.S.S.R., so that any Hitleristic excursion into that progressive and advanced community will find the masses overwhelmingly against the Fascists and wholeheartedly determined to retain their present status as an important part of the immense Soviet Union. The Ukraine's numerous nations are now living together in peace and harmony. They know that Hitler's racialism would strike the Republic like a blight. It's sensible to conclude that these teeming millions will make every sacrifice to resist any move by Hitler to separate them from the U.S.S.R. The Ukrainians have every reason for continuing the present ar-

rangement. Take the Republic's agriculture, for example—its land is collectivized to the extent of 96 per cent. This means immense farms—supplied with the best machinery—are being worked cooperatively for the common good. This fact alone shows that the Ukraine is highly socialistic and not a province that would like to escape and join the capitalistic nations. The Ukraine's agriculture, as the world knows, is highly productive. In 1937, its rich soil, aided by an excellent, temperate climate, produced 780,000,000 bushels of grain. This is 20 percent of the total grain crop of the U.S.S.R. Sugar beets, a comparatively new crop for the Republic, supply the Union with two-thirds of its sugar. Even cotton is being cultivated, helping to bring prosperity to many collective farms. Flax is another crop which is becoming an important item in Ukrainian agriculture. But, to return to the grain crop for a moment, let me add that an item found in my newspaper filing system reports that the U.S.S.R. is finding it so easy to guarantee the people's bread supply that it's seriously considering the idea of making bread as free as water. If that happens, and it's a possibility in the near future, people will draw supplies of bread with the same ease and freedom that they now draw air into their lungs. If that happens it will put the U.S.S.R. in a class by itself in the world picture, and the Soviet Union will have to give the major portion of its thanks to its immense breadbasket—the Ukraine, the land which Hitler covets. The Russians will put up a real fight before surrendering a section that means so much to them. So much for agriculture. Now let's turn to industry. Here the Ukraine makes an excellent, impressive showing. Beginning with coal, we find that the Ukraine, in 1937, produced 67,000,000 tons, more than half of it the best grade of anthracite. As for water power, the Ukraine has harnessed for its growing industries the Dnepr, where a hydroelectric station has a power capacity of 1,800,000 kw. Then let's not fail to mention that central Ukraine, in 1937, produced 9,000,000 tons of pig iron, which was half the production of the U.S.S.R. In the

days of the Czar all of Russia produced only 4,200,000 tons. The Ukraine also contains numerous large cities which are highly industrialized and becoming more productive from year to year. Space doesn't permit me to make use of my items dealing with the Ukraine's output in the fields of steel, machine building, chemical industries, farm equipment, aluminum, and a whole string of light industries capable of turning out consumers' goods. To the South, along the Black Sea, the shipbuilding industry is making headway. So much for the Ukraine's industrial life. On the cultural side, we find a real passion for the flowers of civilization—science, music, literature, the theater, the cinema at its best, medicine, art, and so on. It would take a great deal of space to relate the cultural achievements of the Ukraine. In the face of these facts, I repeat the opinion that Hitler isn't going to find the Ukraine a push-over. If anything, he may break his teeth when he bites into that tough country. The Ukrainians have something to fight for. If they're conquered by Hitler, their future will be one of slavery and misery. They know these facts. That's why I say the Ukrainians will join hands with the rest of the U.S.S.R. and keep the Fascist aggressors from taking an acre of their precious soil.

\* \* \*

## ANSWERS TO UNASKED QUESTIONS

I admit frankly that I'm a middle-of-the-roader. I hate extremes. And I'm always suspicious of hurry-up schemes to save humanity. History teaches us that man progresses slowly. I don't care for the extreme right, and have equal objections to the extreme left. Don't try to establish utopia between days. It won't work. You can't build a vast structure without putting a solid foundation under it first, and that takes time.

Hitler and Mussolini have never learned the importance of the old Latin admonition: *Noli Nocere!* "DO NOT HURT." That's wonderful advice. There's enough unavoidable suffering in life without adding it on unnecessarily. The two dictators deliberately go out of their way to impose new sufferings on humanity. The world will never forgive them for that. They failed to learn the old lesson—Do not hurt.

Montaigne said a mouthful when he

remarked on man's stark madness in making gods by the dozen when he can't even make a flea.

I always feel uncomfortable in the presence of people who have a mania for indulging in self-pity. A dash of it now and then doesn't do any harm—nor any good, for that matter. But pouring it on is terrible for everybody, especially those who have to see it coming in an endless stream. Squawk about your troubles, if that'll relieve your feelings, but try to finish the squawk in reasonable time and turn to other things.

Most people's mental ailments could be banished quickly if they could look at themselves calmly, rationally, and candidly. Most physical ills need the help of a good doctor, but most mental ills need only self-discipline, the policeman—or rather, the physician—of the mind.

Once I was asked why I considered it so important for people to be intellectually free. Offhand, I didn't know of any good reason except that it appeared to be nicer to be free than enslaved. People have learned from long experience how to live comfortably with lies.

How can one know if one's life is happy or unhappy? I often think about that. The other day I found a simple, obvious line in Schopenhauer that showed how easy the answer is. If you laugh a great deal you're happy; if you cry a great deal, you're unhappy. Could anything be more reasonable? Why didn't I ever think of that myself, especially since the question has bothered me many times? I wonder how many other puzzlers could be answered as simply by a person who has the knack of turning light on our problems of mind and heart.

It's better to think a lot about life and very little about death. When you're dead you'll have plenty of time to think about it—but you won't. It's while you're alive that you can think about life—and it's better to do as much of that kind of thinking as you can. Act as though you're going to live forever.

Of course, you have a thousand reasons for being sad, but it seems there are many reasons for not parading it. Goopiness is a disease, even when there are valid reasons for it.

The trouble with my days is they're too short. How much worse would it be if my days were too long!

Words, words, words, cried Hamlet. Yes, but words are important. Words—in books, pamphlets, lectures, conversations, etc.—can make over a life. That happens often. Single sentences have

moved the world. Single slogans have caused revolutions. Words are powerful engines.

Democracy has its faults, but it's the best way man's ever worked out to make it possible for a human being to live decently as a free being. You can live, breathe and think under the worst democracy. You can't do those things under the best dictatorship.

If you strike at the branches of the tree of evil you're a respectable citizen, but if you hack at the roots you're a dangerous radical. Thoreau said words to that effect. I can't recall them as he wrote them down, but that's the thought anyway. And it's a good one.

I rarely write about death because I rarely think about it.

When every argument fails to tear down the logic of a truth-seeker you can always fall back on the charge that he is showing bad taste.

I wonder if anyone reads these thoughts of mine. I'd write them even if they weren't read by anyone, they help me to get a lot of stuff off my chest. An hour of such writing has the same inspiring, uplifting effect as a healthy, strong, powerful, all-inclusive, foundation-shaking movement of the bowels. And I don't mean maybe.

If a person is sane, healthy, happy and intelligent he must be moral regardless of how many things he does which the world considers immoral.

I'm a great believer in propaganda—my kind. When a man sits down to write he should have some point (call it moral, if that suits you better) or the whole thing's bound to be pointless. Of course, this doesn't mean he's to sermonize. He can do his job in such a way that the reader will figure out the moral.

This old definition of Freethought is still the best: "Thought unbiased by the authority of dogma."

Heard the other day at the Connor bar, in Joplin, Mo.: "One of the first things I noticed about women was that while many dressed on credit they un-dressed only for cash."

I never tire of Mark Twain stories. Here's one I'm quoting for the first time. Mark Twain was attending a German opera in Berlin. The tenor was obviously senile and his voice was cracked, and yet the man sitting next to Mark Twain applauded enthusiastically. Turning to his neighbor, Mark Twain commented: "I don't think he's so good." "You're right," the other said, "but you should have heard him 30 years ago!"

Charles Bradlaugh, one of England's greatest Freethinkers, wrote a sentence

which we Americans can follow to our good: "Let us feel that we are alive, not on our knees, cringing, creeping, but walking on our feet, erect, unflinchingly."

There's a lot of truth in Mark Twain's remark: "Woman is unrivaled as a wet nurse."

After calling George Sylvester Viereck a rat I find it necessary to apologize—to the rat.

I've just come away from a fellow who apologized because he drives a 1931 Ford but didn't show the slightest feeling of disgrace over his moth-eaten, fly-specked, sun-bleached ideas, superstitions and prejudices.

Be careful how you select your authorities. The other day I read an article by a man who described himself as an expert on farm problems, and to prove it he mentioned the fact that he has three acres under cultivation on Long Island.

\* \* \*

"Having read the writings of E. Haldeman-Julius for years, I have had the audacity to concoct a little advance epitaph for his stone: 'He was an intellectual orgasm in the intercourse of time.'—Charlie Lake, O.

\* \* \*

"In these days, when editors are so fearlessly charging the haystacks, it is a joy to read the 'Kansas Voltaire' . . . and I mean it! The editors in this country haven't got guts enough to make a stew."—Reader.

\* \* \*

"I figure that about a dozen persons read each copy of my Freeman, and two have just told me they intend to subscribe. I'll have them all taking it soon."—Robert Russell, Wash.

\* \* \*

When a magazine like *The Saturday Evening Post* runs a serial is it the same in every respect as the novel in book form?

It is, if the story's some "harmless" mystery or detective yarn, or a chunk of literary tripe of the Faith Baldwin type. But when a novelist tries to get to grips with life, he usually doesn't recognize his own brain-child when it appears in the virtuous, chaste columns of *The Saturday Evening Post*. For example, John P. Marquand's "Wickford Point," appeared in the magazine just mentioned, but, according to T. S. Matthews' review in *The New Republic* (March 29, 1939), "Those old *Post* editors are mighty scared of their readers, and they did a lot of cutting. The bowdlerized version of 'Wickford Point' that *The Post*

printed was 80,000 words shorter, and left out one of the principal characters because she was the hero's mistress." Even consumers of fiction have to be on guard when they buy the output of the capitalistic publishers of magazines of mass circulation. That's a form of "adulteration" that the FTC pays no attention to, but that doesn't dispose of the charge that such bowdlerization is a form of deception that consumers have a right to be protected against. Consumers of fiction, in Mr. Matthews' vigorous words, should know "the laws of the swineherd editors who feed the public trough."

\* \* \*

Here's a clipping of a sermon in which a parson says the philosophy of the Agnostic is "Let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die." What about it?

I don't have any objections to eating, drinking and being merry. All sensible people enjoy having a happy time. But that doesn't mean a Freethinker (or Agnostic) suggests that we should limit our lives to such things because it happens he doesn't believe in the myth of immortality. W. K. Clifford, the English Agnostic, was once asked this same question and he replied: "On the contrary, I say: 'Let us take hands and help, for this day we are alive together.'" To this Freethinker the fact that death doesn't mean the opening of what our pious friends look on as an "eternal life" is no reason for concluding that he holds one should spend one's life in coddling one's belly. The humanitarian impulses in him challenge him to lend a hand to making life for future generations more intelligent, rational, humane, free, beautiful and peaceful. Yes, this day we live together, so let's fill it with deeds that will help make the world a better place for our children if not for ourselves.

\* \* \*

Editor: There seems to be some kind of atavistic will-to-withdraw which acts as the mainspring of the assuredly negative reasoning of the people who advocate an impossible to realize attitude of "neutrality" and "isolation" for America in the face of the fast-growing menace of Fascism in Europe and throughout the world.

Just as a group cannot be healthy and thriving whenever several of its

members adopt an I-don't-care-about-others position, so a society of nations can't feel safe when some of its members attempt to isolate themselves from a proper, dutiful intercourse among their neighbors.

A passage in John Stuart Mill's essay "On Liberty" is worth quoting in support of the principle of mutual duties and mutual responsibilities which, by all the lights of good reason, are binding not only on individuals of a community but equally on nations worthy of the name of civilized, moral and law-abiding nations.

Let, then, all those selfish advocates of isolation and neutrality ponder the words of Mill in the passage that follows. If they do that with an open mind they won't encounter difficulty in seeing themselves guilty of "causing evil to others" simply by their ill-advised advocacy of policies of inaction which, by all the overwhelming evidence of world events, have helped the international wrongdoers, with a consequent worldwide demoralization of the masses who look in vain for some nation to demonstrate its real worth by leading them against their common enemy—Fascism. The Mill quotation alluded to above reads:

"There are also many positive acts for the benefit of others which he may rightfully be compelled to perform; such as to give evidence in a court of justice; to bear his fair share in the common defense or in any other joint work necessary to the interest of the society of which he enjoys the protection; and to perform certain acts of individual beneficence such as saving a fellow-creature's life, or in interposing to protect the defenseless against ill-use, things which, whenever it is obviously a man's duty to do them, he may be rightfully made responsible to society for not doing. A person may cause evil to others not only by his actions but by his inaction, and in either case he is justly accountable to them for the injury."

New York City \* \* \* A. GARCIA DIAZ

A preacher dismisses Freethought with the argument that it means the end of morality. Please comment.

The notion that morality can't exist without religious sanctions was exploded generations ago. No modern thinker accepts that unsound claim. Since the Freethinker accepts the philosophy of Rationalism he establishes the fact that he seeks, above everything, to have his actions, especially those that have social implica-

tions, reflect that scientific form of knowledge. Since he rests his case on reason it follows that he is ready to reject those codes of conduct that are based on mere dogmas and embrace those codes that reflect the scientific spirit. If that is the Freethinker's mood I can't see how the growth of his philosophy can hurt morality, using the word in its scientific sense. Karl Pearson, the British Rationalist, discussed this subject as follows:

Freethought is an ideal to which we can only approximate—an ideal which expands with every advance of our positive knowledge; morality is an ideal of human action to which we can only approximate, an ideal which expands with every advance of our positive knowledge. As the true freethinker must be in possession of the highest knowledge of his time, so he will be in possession of all that is known of the laws of human development. He, and he only, is capable of fulfilling his social instinct in accordance with those laws. He, and he only, seems to me capable of being really moral. Morality is not the blind following of a social impulse, but a habit of action based upon character—character moulded by that knowledge of truth which must become an integral part of our being.

One might as well say that we mustn't permit intelligence to grow because that would mean the end of morality. Yes, it would mean the end of religion's code of morality, but that doesn't mean true, scientific morality would die. Just because a Church says something is, moral it doesn't follow it's a fact. The Roman Catholic Church, for example, says scientific birth control is immoral. Millions of educated people disagree. The Church says divorce is immoral. Millions of educated people disagree. The Church says a woman who is married to a syphilitic must submit to his sexual desires because she is denied the right to divorce him. Millions of intelligent people disagree. And because these millions disagree with the Church it doesn't follow they reject moral ideas.

\* \* \*  
Editor: There is so much misinformation spread around about foods and their combinations, that it is no less than criminal in its effect upon a misguided public. Your comment on Dr. B. Beck's book is brief and correct. But

how is the public to differentiate between correct and incorrect data on foods? After all, that book is written by a doctor. I don't know who he is. The public is just as apt to believe him as any other doctor.

For the benefit of your readers, a few lines may summarize the essential information on foods. It is the following about which there is so much misunderstanding.

Science has analyzed foods into two main classes, according to those which produce acids or alkalis in the blood, after being broken down or digested. Four main foods produce acid in the blood. They are meat, fish, eggs, and bread. You will recognize these as being a very necessary food in our diet, despite their acid-forming properties. Those which form alkalis in the blood are, mainly, milk, vegetables, and all fruits, except prunes, plums, and cranberries. All these foods may be eaten in any combination, which, by the way, puts to rout all lay prejudices. In fact, neither group should be used exclusively. They should be balanced. And it is not necessary to balance them exactly, since the blood has the remarkable property of adjusting itself to any excess of either class of food. But it must be remembered that even this special property of the blood cannot be abused indiscriminately without exerting some effect sooner or later.

Oranges, lemons and grapefruit, when broken down in the body, produce alkalis, and not acids, as most people believe, because they taste acid in the mouth.

If one wants to eliminate bread (acid) one may replace it with potatoes (alkali). Besides this helps to balance the meal. Neither bread nor potatoes in themselves are fattening. If either is eaten in large quantities it is fattening. This is true of other foods also. Milk is not fattening, unless it is added after the body has had sufficient food. Milk is a food and must be treated as such, or calculated in the meal, as well as any other food.

Much acidosis is produced by eating too much bread and meat. A bread and meat diet must be balanced by eating the alkali foods, such as vegetables, fruits, and milk.

Foods are also divided according to the following substances: carbohydrates, as bread, starches and sugars; proteins, as eggs, meat, beans, milk, nuts; fats, as occurs in vegetable and animal matter; minerals, as calcium, magnesium, phosphorus, iron, sodium, etc.; water, contained in all foods, as milk contains 85 percent, eggs 65 percent water; vitamins, as Vitamin A, in milk, butter, eggs; Vitamin B, in yeast,

milk; C, in oranges, milk, vegetables; D, in butter, oils, fish; E, in eggs, cereals. New York City B. G. LIPTON, M.D.

\* \* \*

### PEACEFUL CHANGE

[A review, in "Unity," March 20, 1939, by George Maychin Stockdale, of Upton Sinclair's "Your Million Dollars":]

Here is just the booklet for those who are anxious to get peaceably the social changes necessary before it is too late for peaceful change. The whole working of capitalism is made plain: How scarcity is subsidized; interest, rent and profits taking between 30 and 44 percent of our income, before one "can sit down to eat supper"; the impossibility of running an economy of plenty that machine production makes possible, as long as the profit motive is retained; the folly of the public ownership of the postoffice, but the private ownership of the telephone and other public utilities; these and just about every phase of life affected by capitalism are given a fascinating treatment by this keen student, for 42 years, of our economy.

The little book is composed of 17 letters to "Joe," former chum who helped Sinclair get his material from the Chicago stockyards for "The Jungle" so many years ago. "Joe" has now "made" his million dollars. Hence the title. Letters I to VI paint the picture of our present debacle here in America with our unemployed millions, empty factories, deserted farms, dearth of purchasing power, as 2 percent of the people own 60 percent of the wealth, etc. Letters VII to XVII deal with remedies; and what practical remedies they are!

One of the finest features is Sinclair's manner. This alone makes this little gem worth its weight in some of that gold buried at Fort Knox, Kentucky. If there is a better book for convincing wealthy and privileged people of the need for social change, this reviewer does not know it. Sinclair makes clear the relation of Capitalism to Fascism, as developed in Germany, Italy and elsewhere, and that America cannot escape. Government credit alone remains. When that goes, then the deluge!

Readers of "UNITY" know Sinclair well enough to realize that no "crackpot" inflation, easy money or impossible pension plans can ensnare him. He knows that more money on the market demands more production to avert inflation. Let him tell you and your friends what can be done now.

\* \* \*

Can you give me Ingalls' classic entitled "Grass"?

"Grass" was written by a distinguished Kansan, John J. Ingalls. It's

a real classic that has beauty and meaning anywhere in the world. This piece of prose poetry has simplicity and dignity, truly a masterpiece. It reads:

"Grass is the forgiveness of Nature—her constant benediction. Fields trampled with battle, saturated with blood, torn with ruts of cannon, grow green again with grass, and carnage is forgotten. Streets abandoned by traffic become grass-grown, like rural lanes, and are obliterated. Forests decay, harvests perish, flowers vanish, but grass is immortal. Beleguered by the sullen hosts of winter it withdraws into the impregnable fortress of its subterranean vitality and emerges upon the solicitation of spring. Sown by the winds, by wandering birds, propagated by the subtle horticulture of the elements which are its ministers and servants, it softens the rude outlines of the world. It invades the solitude of deserts, climbs the inaccessible slopes and pinnacles of mountains, and modifies the history, character and destiny of nations."

\* \* \*

What about the Universal Order of Plenocrats?

This outfit is a Chicago organization with a plan called "Plenocracy," purportedly yielding a 30 percent annual return by its "science of creation and distribution of nature's abundance." The "Universal Order" was subject of an SEC injunction, and recently, in Wichita, Kans., one of its solicitors, Ralph Clarkson, was arrested, charged with violating the Kansas blue sky law in selling memberships in this so-called society.

\* \* \*

Has the length of a wink been timed?

Dr. J. F. Neumueller, of the American Optical Company, Southbridge, Mass., has made tests in order to find out what we mean when we say "Quicker than a wink." We now know that the involuntary wink of the human eye ranges from one eighth to one fourth of a second: a voluntary wink is about twice that long.

\* \* \*

Is medical science able to say that the best contraceptive methods are safe and reliable?

Not yet, by any means. The several methods that meet with the most approval among scientists are about 95 percent effective, which means that 5 percent of all women who practice

them are fairly certain to be disappointed. However, considering that this field is somewhat new, one has the right to say that the results are encouraging, and that science, in time, will be able to work out a 100 percent safe method.

\* \* \*

Editor: You had a discussion of a stunt called "Christly method" etc. . . . and you quite incidentally said that if this gets piped down, why don't the powers-that-be go after so-called Christian Science? . . . Well, I wonder! In 1910 I went to Mother Mary Baker Eddy's funeral, and I am telling you that they actually installed a telephone in her temporary tomb (tho' they deny it now, as usual) . . . so the old geezer could rise from the dead, the way Christ was supposed to have done. Did I say supposed? . . . Well, when will the good people of this world wake up?

Boston Mass. SAMUEL R. GAINES

\* \* \*

Editor: I was amused by the comment of the Oxford divinity student who cited the size and position of the mouth and nose of the bulldog as being evidence of divine providence's provision for the interests of said dog in tackling the bull. Even the most elementary dog books that can be got by sending coupons from cans of dog food say that the bulldog is probably descended from the mastiff and the position of his nose was changed by careful and skillful breeding methods. Man certainly used the laws of nature in effecting the result, but I doubt very much if the dog, the bull or God had much to do with the purpose in view. Certainly an all-wise, all-loving Creator wouldn't purposely design one of his own creatures for the maiming of another. Perhaps if the student had studied a little less theology and a little more dog he might have known better what he was talking about.

Stonington, Maine EDITH ROBINSON

\* \* \*

What kind of people use your news-clip filing system?

I've seen orders from U.S. Senators, ambassadors, preachers, editors, students, teachers, lecturers, authors, publishers, public officials, advertising men, businessmen, scientists, publicity specialists, professional newspaper clippers, doctors, lawyers, bankers, brokers, librarians, merchants, mechanics, printers, compilers of facts, and so on.

\* \* \*

What does science say about the lactation procedure?

Many women hold to the lactation

(nursing) theory, meaning, of course, that they can prevent a new pregnancy by prolonging the nursing period. It's a bad idea to prolong nursing because it's ineffective. While it's probably a fact that women are less likely to become pregnant during the period of lactation, there's nothing to show that deliberate extension of the period will have the desired effect. Nature has its own cycle which it covers in its own way, and it won't be frustrated through this little trick of over-extended lactation.

\* \* \*

I agree with your comment that the people who say they're sure about immortality and an eternal life in Heaven don't act that way when they get the least bit sick. I've seen it happen a thousand times.

So have we all. I'm reminded of an amusing story that appeared in *Parade*, a popular British magazine:

A village doctor was noted for his failure to attend church services. A new clergyman in the village was taken ill and this doctor attended him. Time passed, and the doctor could not be induced to render a bill for his services. The clergyman insisted he must know what he owed the doctor. "Well, in order to keep down an argument," the doctor said, "let's make a deal. I understand you are a pretty good preacher, and you seem to have the opinion that I am a fair doctor. So let's work it out this way: I'll do what I can to keep you out of Heaven if you will do what you can to keep me out of Hell. And it will not cost either of us a penny."

\* \* \*

Can you give me the text of the statute on religious liberty prepared by Thomas Jefferson?

The statute referred to was drawn up by Jefferson and passed by the legislature of Virginia, in October, 1785, and reads:

Be it enacted by the general assembly: That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by arguments to maintain, their opinion in matters of religion, and that the same shall in nowise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities.

And though we well know that this assembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding assemblies, constituted with powers equal to our own, and that therefore to declare this act to be irrevocable would be of no effect in law; yet we are free to declare, and do declare, that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present, or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right.

Thomas Jefferson, as many readers know, was a Freethinker. The facts to support this statement will be found in my volumes of questions and answers.

\* \* \*

The enclosed Catholic pamphlet makes the claim that Catholicism is the most rationalistic philosophy in the world. Please comment.

I've heard this claim before, and it always leaves me amused. Rationalists are terrible people, in the eyes of priests, but they themselves always seem anxious to appear rationalistic. There's something there for a Freud to mull over. Let me quote a passage from Catholic literature and then ask ourselves how people who can accept such appalling bosh can have the insolence to compare themselves to Rationalists, people who believe in being guided in all things by the rule of reason. What I print below is taken from the *Times of Malta*, which offered a biography of St. Salvador da Horta, who was honored by the Church on Easter Sunday, 1938, by being canonized. This "humble lay brother" is supposed to have comported himself as follows:

Francis Borgia, Duke of Gandia, visited the holy brother during his stay at Horta, and requested him to dispossess a devil who was troubling a community of Poor Clares, where his aunt was abbess and his daughter a nun. Salvador willingly complied, and no sooner had he made the sign of the cross and sprinkled holy water on the outer walls of the convent than the devil disappeared and peace was restored to the community.

In the Friary of Horta Brother Salvador was given the post of cook's help. On one occasion, during an illness of the cook the holy brother was requested to prepare

lunch for the community. Nothing daunted by this responsibility, he went to seek divine guidance at the altar before beginning his morning's work. Oblivious of all earthly affairs, he remained the whole morning wrapt in ecstatic contemplation until the refectory bell summoned the community to lunch. Salvador was sought and found in church, but great was the surprise of the superior and the entire community when, the kitchen door being opened, the meal was found prepared by angelic hands.

All priests are compelled to believe every word of the above, and yet they have the gall to talk about their Rationalism! Pardon me while I take time out to snicker.

\* \* \*

Editor: Opinions expressed by youth cannot be ignored, for they are direct and spontaneous expressions of growing, vigorous minds. Every effort should be made to encourage youth to express itself in the world of ideas, as there is a great need for youth's inspiring thought. Youth's opinions are usually strong and pointed. Youth is impatient with obvious errors and demands a sane solution of pressing problems. However, this does not mean that the world's best thinking is done by youth, for history shows that the greatest wisdom is produced in the later years of life. But youth is often first to recognize this wisdom and demand its practical application to the problems of the world. Spokane, Wash. ROBERT SLOCUM

\* \* \*

Editor: Please take my name off your subscription list. Freethought and Leftist literature make me hate the enemy a little too bitterly so I can't keep my attention on my work. It makes me take life a little too seriously so I can't get any joy out of living. I think Judge Rutherford and his followers are taking the better way to fight the religious and political racketeers. Freethought literature is usually too shockingly different from what the average person has been trained from the cradle to believe. I think it would be better to try to enlighten people more gradually and carefully as Judge Rutherford is doing.

Storm Lake, Iowa WOODROW LOWE

\* \* \*

Was Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, judge or prosecutor in the Moyer, Haywood, Pettibone labor case, back in 1903 or 1904?

Senator Borah was the prosecutor in the State's case against the officials of the Western Federation of Miners. The late Clarence Darrow

was the lawyer for the defendants. Some years before he died, Darrow visited me here in Girard, and among other subjects we discussed his famous trials, including the Haywood case, the McNamaras, the Loeb-Leopold murder, and, naturally, the appalling and amusing Scopes trial, in Dayton, Tenn. When we came to Borah's conduct in the Haywood trial Darrow volunteered the opinion that even though the prosecutor was his opponent he couldn't find a thing to complain about, for he was convinced from the opening of the trial to its close that Borah was sincere, conscientious, honest and fair in every respect.

\* \* \*

Editor: I have been disappointed to observe that you do not print as many items on Freethought in The Freeman as you used to do. Most of your readers, I doubt not, enjoy your comments on world affairs and are glad to have one source to which they can turn for the unvarnished facts. However, I, for one, would like to see you put more facts and comments into The Freeman that debunks established religion. If you start leaving out such items, where else in the U.S. can one find similar items. Certainly no other periodical I read—and I read a great many of them—has your exact slant on religious moonshine.

It has been mostly through the pages of The Freeman that I have learned to cast aside the "supernatural" powers and stand firmly on my own feet. I can't tell you in this letter how much this liberation now means to me. But I do want you to know I appreciate the work you have done and are doing. Two or three years ago I was a "believer"; steeped in "mystical moonshine." Yet, now at the ripe old age of 27, after having read many of the Little Blue Books written by Joseph McCabe and others, I am the most staunch of skeptics.

By now, very likely, Freeman readers are Freethinkers, materialists, skeptics, atheists, agnostics, and what not, to the tune of 100 percent. However, your comments on religion serve as grist to your readers' mill; they go forth and puncture the complacent saints. They have the facts. The proof—not poof.

You are doing the world a great service when you batter away at the foundations of religion. The religious structure has already started to topple. Within a few years—50 perhaps—the structure will be completely leveled. The world cannot move very much forward with most of its denizens tied to

Christ's and the so-called virgin Mother's apron strings. In a Dallas church recently I heard the pastor of that city's perhaps finest religious plant name three of the world's "greatest" (his word) men. And, he wanted his congregation to understand, they were all three "men of God." (Which was true.) He named Luther, Fox, and Wesley. The preacher was a Methodist, of course. He also dished out a little Roman history which Joseph McCabe wouldn't have found the least bit palatable. That sermon was a sample of the usual evangelistic tripe. No food for thought here for an educated, thinking person. And yet, he pleaded for a "return to the church"; the church alone stood undaunted in this turbulent world of ephemeral things, etc. I resolved, after listening to that piffle, to follow Bruce Barton's example and sit in the car during the sermon; or better still, not to go to church again and stay home and read. I can find more of real inspiration in Anatole France's "Garden of Epicurus"—one page of it—than a thousand sermons.

My observation has been that people who are steeped in "mystical moonshine" are not inclined to face the facts. They know that all is not right with the world by a great deal; that there is ignorance, suffering, poverty. They agree that Hitler, Mussolini, et al, are doing the world inconceivable harm; that if those sinister forces get control the world and civilization will revert backward instead of go forward. Yet instead of becoming greatly concerned, they say, "There is no reason why I should step in and take a hand or be concerned about the mess things are in. God will attend to Hitler and Mussolini."

Azle, Tex. A. M. PASCHALL

\* \* \*

Is it possible for a person like myself, a lover of adventure, to join some expedition into the Far North, as near the North Pole as possible?

I know of no expedition now being formed in the U.S., but if this reader will be patient for a few more years he'll be able to buy a tourist's ticket to the North Pole, where an immense airplane will descend, remain a few days for hikes and hunting, and then come back home. The other day I read a piece by an old-time explorer who used to go into the Arctic lands by dog-sleds. Recently he covered the same territory by airplane, and he saw in six hours territory that had taken him three months to cover by foot. Aviation has extracted much of the adventure from polar exploration.

It's an exact, scientific, mathematical and, in great measure, mechanical problem. However, anyone who wants to work in the Arctic Zone should try to connect up with one of the numerous expeditions constantly at work in the Soviet Union, the country that's doing the most of that sort of pioneering. The reason isn't hard to find after one takes a look at the map and sees what an immense frontier Russia has in the Far North. Its expeditions are doing their jobs for scientific and economic reasons—the former, of course, for valuable data about weather, and the like, and the latter for practical means of tapping the Far North's prodigious natural wealth. The tasks are being done in a matter-of-fact way, without heroics or ballyhoo. It's all in the day's work. And after a few more years of such efforts it'll be a simple matter for a vacationist to decide, between yawns, to remove some of life's tedium by taking a little trip to the North Pole for a look-see.

\* \* \*

Your remarks concerning certain people's maudlin concern over our duty to posterity struck me right where I live. I had similar ideas years ago when I was still relatively bunk-ridden. I remember seeing a movie sometime in the heyday of Ernest Torrence—"The Iron Horse," I believe it was called—which made much of The Great Sacrifice which these frontiersmen were making in order that posterity might live more happily. I know that I remarked then that to me it seemed they were about a hundred percent intent on having a hell of a good time at the moment and that the future was just about the last of their considerations. Anyway, I failed to see then—and see even less now—how their wanton Indian and buffalo killing and hoggish land and gold grabbing could ever hope to be of benefit to posterity.—C. A. Lang, Maplewood, Mo.

\* \* \*

Editor: What sort of a mongrel German does Hitler speak, anyway? I thought I could understand German pretty good, so on Friday morning, April 28th, when I found my first opportunity to hear him, I listened. So far as I was concerned he might as well have spoken Russian; beyond a few words such as "democratischen," "Herr Roosevelt," and "mein antwort" I didn't get a syllable of his over-long harangue. I heard someone that understood him say yesterday that the interpolated translations which came every so often

were frequently almost diametrically opposite in meaning to what he had actually said. I was especially amused by one remark I found in the version which the press dished up for us. It came after he had listed a series of assurances (of peaceful intention) which he said had already been given—some of which, or at least similar ones, have already been violated—when he asked President Roosevelt, "In view of all this, of what use could further assurance be?" When I hear such naive self-incrimination I sometimes wonder if the man comprehends the meaning of his own words and deeds. At any rate I can't say that I noticed in this speech anything of the hysterical, strident tone which some seemed to have noticed on other occasions. As a matter of fact, judging entirely from his tone and not from his meaning which, as I said, I didn't get, it seemed to me that his voice carried a peculiar persuasiveness.

Maplewood, Mo. C. A. LANG.

Do the American people want any changes in the relief set-up?

Dr. George Gallup, of the American Institute of Public Opinion, shows that surveys indicate the American people believe there should be a number of changes in the technique of relief administration in order to take out some of the politics. From surveys made over a period of months, Dr. Gallup was able, on January 21, 1939, to show public sentiment on the following questions:

1. Would you favor a law prohibiting any person on relief from contributing money to a political campaign?

Yes ... 78% No ... 22%

Would you favor a law prohibiting any relief official from contributing money to a political campaign?

Yes ... 70% No ... 30%

2. Should employes of the Federal Government be prohibited from contributing money to political campaigns?

Yes ... 62% No ... 38%

3. Would you favor a law making it a crime for a relief official to attempt to influence the vote of persons on relief? (Survey taken May, 1938.)

Yes ... 86% No ... 14%

4. Do you think officials in charge of relief should be under civil service? (Survey taken November, 1938.)

Yes ... 75% No ... 25%

5. How large a part does politics play in giving relief in your com-

munity—none, a little or quite a bit? (Survey taken May, 1938.)

None .. 16% A little .. 31%

Quite a bit .. 53%

Readers undoubtedly will recall how, in the early days of the New Deal, it was argued whether the Federal government had a right to provide relief for the needy. How much of that attitude reflected public opinion in those days I have no means of finding out, but today, according to Dr. Gallup's survey, about 70 percent of voters "declare that the government should take responsibility for the jobless." About the same number "think that the relief problem is no temporary phenomenon but that relief appropriations will have to continue permanently." A majority of 71 percent said it thought the people on relief are getting as much as they should from the government.

How many totally blind people have we? Is blindness on the rise?

I find several items in my newspaper filing system which enable me to answer these questions authoritatively. According to a report by the U.S. Public Health Service, released on January 21, 1939, our population of blind persons is estimated at 117,000. According to this report, blindness will increase in the future because it is, mainly, an affliction of the aged, and surveys show that the old people are increasing in number. One-fourth of the blind are over 75 years old and three-fifths are over 55, according to the report. About 75 percent of all total blindness "is caused by cataract, glaucoma, trachoma, optic nerve atrophy and other eye diseases, coupled with more general diseases, such as high blood pressure, hardening of the arteries, and diabetes," according to the Health Service. Accidents account for 21 percent of all cases of blindness. About 7 percent are caused in early infancy or by congenital conditions. Another fact to bear in mind is the tie-up between blindness and poverty. Let's bear in mind the damning fact that blindness is a condition that strikes the poor much more than the middle class or the rich. The Health Service says "70 percent of the blind were found in families

with annual incomes of less than \$1,000, with nearly twice as much among colored as white persons in proportion to their numbers, and 11 percent more in men than in women." The fact that 70 percent of the blind belong to families that have yearly incomes of less than \$1,000 indicates anew how important it is for our civilization to tackle the problem of poverty and root it out—a campaign that could be won if only we were ready to apply our intelligence to our social relationships. We have the scientific knowledge and the material resources to eliminate poverty, if only we would apply ourselves unreservedly to the job of cleaning up our economic house and putting it in order. This task of wiping out poverty can be done, but it'll have to be tackled by social scientists, not political and economic quacks who come before the people with glib stories and wild promises, along the lines of \$30-every Thursday, or \$200-per-month, or Every-Man-a-King, or divide the wealth, or freakish money, and other forms of political illiteracy. The problem of poverty won't be eliminated by some trick lifted out of some utopian's dream-book. It'll have to be met by trained, patient, cautious, informed, educated men and women. And the program they apply themselves to won't bring heaven-on-earth overnight. It'll take time—perhaps generations. It won't be spectacular. That's why the average person prefers to listen to the sensational rabble-rousers who can promise paradise by the mere pressing of a button. The people lack patience, so they turn to political quacks, who lose precious time and leave the masses worse off than ever. Instead of saving time they've merely postponed the scientific remedy, which is the erection of a social order in which the people will have free access to opportunity, in which the large-scale industries will produce wealth for the people instead of the capitalists. By socializing the industries, banks, systems of communication, insurance companies, mines, power plants, and natural resources in general, we put down the foundations for a social order which will make possible the distribution of goods and services to all, instead of piling immense wealth

in the laps of a few and letting the majority suffer in dire distress. Poverty is our greatest curse, but it can be cured. The fact that we tolerate it shows we're as blind as the poor people who are really sightless because of their low economic status. Poverty is a disease of blindness, as blindness is a disease of poverty.

\* \* \*

Please comment on the statement in the enclosed clipping, that "yearning for beauty is peculiar to Aryans."

Baldur von Schirach, presiding at a Dresden meeting of the "Faith and Beauty" movement, on January 22, 1939, said the words quoted above. This means there was no yearning for beauty among men like Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Mendelssohn, Rodin, Phidias, Dante, Heine, Cellini, the creators of Negro spirituals, the authors of numerous poetic passages in the Bible, Anatole France, Tchajkovsky, Saint Saens, Goldmark, Dvorak, the composers of Gypsy music, Bizet, Massenet, Gorky, Tolstoy, Chinese craftsmen, Japanese artists, Berlioz, Chopin, Verdi, Paganini, Cesar Franck, Victor Hugo, Voltaire, Lucretius, Epicurus, Ovid, Sappho of Lesbos, Anacreon, Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Sophocles, Pindar, Euripides, Plato, Aristotle, Plautus, Virgil, Horace, Omar Khayyam, Francois Villon, Desiderius Erasmus, Montaigne, Cervantes, Moliere, La Rochefoucauld, Corneille, La Fontaine, Benedict Spinoza, Racine, Fenelon, and other crass barbarians.

\* \* \*

#### FUNDAMENTALS OF LIBERALISM

**Editor: 1. DEMOCRACY:** Liberalism advocates democracy as a way of life in which people generally participate in their affairs, political, social, and economic, and in which the common welfare is kept above the selfish interests of groups and minorities. Democracy advocates the widest possible diffusion of a share in the control of common affairs. Democracy believes "in counting heads instead of breaking them."

**2. FREEDOM:** A society of free and cooperating persons is the aim of liberalism. Liberalism believes that permanent progress comes only from voluntary allegiance. As Gladstone said, "Liberty alone fits men for liberty." Or to quote the late Justice Holmes: "The ultimate good to be desired is better reached by free trade in ideas. In the frank expression of conflicting opinions

lies the greatest promise of wisdom in government action." The essence of liberalism, therefore, is a deep concern for the preservation and enlargement of liberty.

**3. PROGRESSIVE** (not revolutionary): There is no such thing as an orthodox liberalism. Liberalism believes in reform and progress; it believes in leaving the door open to change and advancement. Liberalism works for orderly and gradual changes which can be brought about by planned endeavor and the conscious direction of human evolution.

**4. THE OPEN MIND:** Liberalism seeks the continual adjustment of our ideas to new truths in all fields of thought. It seeks to keep in tune with advancing knowledge and changing needs. The dogmatic mind is a "tight mind." It is one of the greatest barriers to human progress. The dogmatic mind must have finalities. Infallibilities have no place in the philosophy of the liberal. Because the liberal cannot make up his mind about every question he is accused of being a straddler, when, as a matter of fact, he is merely of the open mind and the suspended judgment.

**5. FAITH IN INTELLIGENCE:** Liberalism believes that intelligence and ideas represent the supreme force in the settlement of social and economic questions. Liberalism has faith in disciplined inquiry, in the technique of the laboratory, and in scientific control. Liberalism believes in the validity of the cultural claims of life.

**6. THE SCIENTIFIC HABIT OF MIND:** Liberalism is scientific and experimental. It represents the scientific habit of mind in application to human affairs. "A liberal is a person in whom belief and judgement dance on evidence." "A liberal is a person who holds no belief or prejudice which he will not or cannot discard in the face of fact." Liberalism stands for a free and critical search for the truth.

**7. TOLERANCE:** The liberal believes that our opinions are not more important than the spirit and temper with which they possess us. The liberal's point of view is classically expressed in the words: "I wholly disagree with what you say but I will defend to death your right to say it." Liberals agree in their abhorrence of the regimented and intolerant world of dictatorships.

Kansas City, Mo. L. M. BIRKHEAD

\* \* \*  
I want to know how many motion picture theaters we have in the U.S. How many of these are wired for sound? Please go back a few years.

I find, in my newsclip filing system, a digest of a report compiled by Nathan D. Golden, chief of film section,

Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Department of Commerce, based on "trade estimates" at the end of each year, as follows:

Year	Total	Sound
1909	9,000	
1912	13,000	
1915	17,000	
1932	19,042	14,000
1933	19,000	15,000
1934	10,143*	10,143*
1935	15,378	15,378
1936	16,258	16,258
1937	17,000	17,000

\*Based on a Bureau of Census trade survey later found to be incomplete.

\* \* \*

Can you give me the attendance records at our movie theaters for some years back?

Nathan D. Golden, chief of the film section, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Department of Commerce, gives the following attendance estimates (weekly) for the U.S.:

1922	40,000,000
1923	43,000,000
1924	46,000,000
1925	48,000,000
1926	50,000,000
1927	57,000,000
1928	65,000,000
1929	95,000,000
1930	110,000,000
1931	75,000,000
1932	60,000,000
1933	60,000,000
1934	70,000,000
1935	80,000,000
1936	88,000,000
1937	85,000,000

\* \* \*

Supposing I wanted to go to Russia to work as a skilled worker. How could I do this?

You would have to apply at a Russian consulate for the usual permission. I doubt that the Soviet Union is anxious for any kind of workers, as its own man-power is ample to meet its needs. This wasn't the case a few years ago, when there was a serious shortage of skilled labor and technicians. However, the demand has been supplied through intensive workers' education in technical schools and colleges, and the like. The government now is able to train even top-ranking engineers, where not so long ago foreigners had to be brought in to direct operations, especially in the heavy industries. If you aren't a Russian and know nothing about the Russian language, I advise you

against going there in search of work. If you feel you simply must find out for yourself at first hand, let me suggest that you visit the country on a tourist's passport, which will give you opportunities to study the situation at first hand and learn if there's any need for your type of service.

\* \* \*

Pass this Freeman on to your neighbor, after you've read it. How many industries, arts and professions are involved in the making of a single feature film?

Almost 300.

\* \* \*

What percentage of all pictures shown in the world are produced in America?

Until recently, 70 percent. Restrictions imposed by the three great Fascist powers (Germany, Italy and Japan) are cutting into this volume of business.

\* \* \*

What's the annual production of the motion picture industry?

The average is 800 feature pictures; 1,000 shorts.

\* \* \*

## ANSWERS TO UNASKED QUESTIONS

Those editors who keep yelling for a balanced budget are always careful to say they believe in taking care of the needy, but they never fail to bring out the thought that the surest way to get the job done is to take it out of the hides of the unemployed. They ought to know that that's the surest way to unbalance the budget so thoroughly that it'll fall in a heap.

Freedom of speech is more than the right to wag one's tongue in endless chin-music. It's the mind that first has to have freedom. The tongue is just the instrument of the mind. Frequently one can feel free without expressing an opinion, because the mind hasn't been quarantined against ideas.

I'll grant you that much knowledge is useless, but I agree with Joseph Wood Krutch's notion that such useless knowledge never did anyone any harm.

It's important to look over our ideas now and then in order to find out which should be chucked out, or brushed over, or repainted and papered, or left just as they were. Ever since I began acting like a man of thought I've taken for granted you can't crush ideas by force. You know how it goes—"Truth crushed to earth will rise," etc. Today it occurred to me—during a moment of inspiration—that I'm not altogether sure ideas can't be disposed of that way. I then spent several minutes wondering how many of my most positive ideas

are always taken for granted because I never go to the trouble of revaluing them. There's material for a sermon here.

We often get the truth from slips of the tongue. This is shown in the announcement made by a preacher who was getting impatient over the small contributions from the pious souls who were supposed to show a little more financial appreciation for the holy benefits imparted to them through his sacrificial efforts. But he rejected pessimism. He said: "We've tried to raise the necessary money in the usual way. We have tried honestly. Now we are going to see what a bazaar can do."

Being little people we're usually upset by little things. John Fothergill, in his book, "Confessions of an Innkeeper," tells of a Roman inscription giving a wayfarer's bill at an inn. "Dinner \$1.25—Wine \$.75—Waitress \$6—hay for ass 10c. My God, this ass will be the ruin of me."

All anti-Semites agree that the Jews everywhere present a united front. What a myth! Jews are divided—in religion, politics, economics, government, finance, and so on. As the old saying has it, any two Jews will agree on only one proposition, and that's how much money a third Jew should turn over to charity.

There's no such thing as a Jewish "type." Lewis Brown, in The Virginia Quarterly Review, Spring, 1939, shows up the nonsense in this notion of a Jewish physical type, as follows: "Some Jews are as dark as Tartars, some are as fair as Swedes, some are full-blooded Negroes, and some are real Hindus. Think of Edward G. Robinson and Melvyn Douglas. One is short, swarthy, and typically a Mongol in appearance, while the other is tall, blond, and as typically North European. Yet, both are called Jews. Racially they are no more akin than the Shah of Persia and the Duke of Windsor. Think of petite Luise Rainer and angular Fannie Brice. All these are known to be Jews, yet, so far as 'blood' is concerned, the most one can say is that they are 'Caucasians.'"

When Heinrich Heine, the literary genius, decided, as a youth, that he wanted to become a lawyer he found it would be necessary for him to become a Christian before he could learn this profession. He then turned Christian, but explained himself this way: "I was merely baptized, not converted. No Jew can ever be converted to Christianity, for no Jew can bring himself to believe in the divinity of another Jew." There's an element of self-criticism here, for Jews are given to condemning one another, even though non-Jews prefer to hug the delusion that they use only

battered verbiage when speaking of one another. I recall the words of a witty rabbi, who defined an anti-Semite as "a person who condemns the Jews more than is absolutely necessary." Such self-criticism is commendable. It proves willingness to recognize one's faults, for Jews, like all human beings, have their share of faults.

Some non-Jews, in a spirit of friendship, tell their Jewish friends they shouldn't stand apart, that they should throw away their superstitious religion. The facts, of course, show that only a Jewish minority accepts the Old Testament. Lewis Browne, who once was a rabbi but is now a Freethinker, gives the facts this way: "Here in America, for example, not one Jew in 10 belongs to a synagogue, not one in a hundred adheres strictly to the kosher diet, not one in a thousand observes the Mosaic Sabbath. But that has not saved us from discrimination."

The trouble with the Jews is that they are disproportionately active in the motion picture industry, say certain critics. Lewis Browne comments on this point, as follows: "But, in the same way, the Basques in this country are disproportionately active in sheep herding, the Italians dominate in wine making, the Germans in brewing, the Armenians in rug dealing, and the Greeks in the restaurant business. Is there anything wicked in that?" Usually at this point the critic will reply that the situation in Hollywood is different because it offers the Jews an opportunity to propagandize in their own behalf. Mr. Browne takes up this point with disarming frankness, thus: "You will frequently see films which depict a pastor or a priest in an heroic role. But have you ever seen one shedding glory on a rabbi? For that matter, have you ever seen one depicting any Jewish character save in a blatantly comic role?" Mr. Browne continues with a shrewd comment on the argument that Jews are directly responsible for the poor quality of most U.S. films. "But," asks Mr. Browne, "can you point to any country which produces better ones? The German cinema has been purged of all 'non-Aryan' influence, and look at the result. The current productions there are technically so inferior and theatrically so dull that even the Storm Troopers stay away from them in hordes. There is only one reason why Hollywood is the film capital of the world. It is because the products of Hollywood are the best—or, if you insist—the least bad in the field. And for that the Jews there should be given due credit. Apparently, they have a knack for showmanship—just as the Swedes have a knack for navigation,

and the Dutch for gardening." The Jews have several other knacks—garment making, diamond merchandising, medicine, law, and music.

A writer refers to George Gershwin as the Bach of Broadway. He was closer to being the Offenbach of Broadway.

It's one of my ambitions to write a piece sometime in which the word "phantasmagoric" is used.

I haven't any prejudice against platitudes if they can be made to serve useful ends. Often they do.

\* \* \*

Please comment on the statement often made by Theists that the world shows there is a Divine Purpose at work.

Bertrand Russell, who specializes in tearing to shreds the arguments of Theists, writes, in his book, "The Scientific Outlook," (page 130):

"If indeed the world in which we live has been produced in accordance with a Plan, we shall have to reckon Nero a saint in comparison with the Author of that Plan. Fortunately, however, the evidence of Divine Purpose is non-existent; so at least one must infer from the fact that no evidence is adduced by those who believe in it. We are, therefore, spared the necessity for that attitude of impotent hatred which every brave and humane man would otherwise be called upon to adopt toward the Almighty Tyrant."

Let me, at this point, answer those readers who wonder how I'm able to produce so many apt quotations from the books I've read during the past 30 or more years. I'm able to do this by using simple, inexpensive tabs, which I attach to the pages that contain statements I'm sure I'll want to use in the future. I make these tabs so I can write a few words on them, which make it easy for me to find the quotation in a few seconds. One must work out an orderly system if much work's to be done. I'll be glad to explain this system in more detail some other time.

\* \* \*

Editor: I was amused by your sermonizing on happiness; some of it sounded strikingly similar to passages from Mary Eddy's "Science and Health." "Nothing conduces so directly to happiness as cheerfulness." It's just as simple as that! Of course, I know the two words don't mean quite the same thing even if such a malicious thought does pop into one's head at first. Cheerfulness is an outward manifestation

which can be simulated in the total absence of happiness, at least by most of us. And then a greater or lesser degree of happiness may, in consequence, supervene. That principle, of course, is the one applied by Christian Scientists and other faith healers and it is the thing which, to us materialists, makes them so exasperatingly successful at times. And then, "... the human heart, which is so easily agitated, never beats more peacefully than in the natural activity of vigorous yet satisfying work." Absolutely true, to be sure. But at the risk of appearing "goopy" I cannot refrain from remarking that precisely for that reason our well-nigh universal state of unhappiness is readily explainable. It need only be remembered that some 15 or 20 million of us haven't any work at all, being either at the useless poor end of the social scale or else at the worse than useless parasitic rich end. Now, of course, the rest of us are saddled with the happy job of supporting these drones and, to make matters still happier, for reasons completely beyond our control—that is as individuals—a good deal more than half of those who do the world's useful work are square pegs in round holes. And, to top it all off in the interest of general happiness, very much of this so-called useful work is really useless, or worse, positively harmful. Such a situation, to say the least, is highly conducive to making "... the cultivation and the wise use of all our powers the supreme ideal and end of our lives. . . ."

But there's still another angle to the matter: the main source of happiness of many of us comes from actually cultivating a cheerless outlook. That, you'll doubtless say, is about the last word in goopiness, and I'll readily agree. But it's a fact, nevertheless; I'll leave the explanation for it to the psychologists. Maybe it's an adaptation to an environment that appears impossible and that it is, therefore, abnormal; perhaps it's akin to sadism. In that event it would disappear in a sane social set-up. But it's here, and many of us "normal" ones occasionally fall into its moods temporarily. At such times and for such individuals a counsel of cheerfulness is an affront with potentialities for homicide.

I'll sum up my reactions to all happiness philosophies thus: compared to what happiness can, and doubtless some day will, be in this world, I doubt that we, today, are getting even within hailing distance of it.

I had set down the thoughts in the preceding paragraphs tentatively, with some doubt that I would use them. Then I came to that gem of a quotation from Spencer about "Whoever hesitates

to utter," etc.: you are having inflicted on you, therefore, a letter that if not unusually long is perhaps unusually trying on your patience. Therefore just let me add here that, while I scoffed irreverently at your happiness formulas, the column you wrote immediately following them, in answer to the query as to why you continue to offend people by saying things that are years ahead of their time, was easily the most inspired and inspiring thing I'd read in years. Yet, even that piece was capped by the closely following quotation from Santayana which had to do with the alleged pains of materialistic disillusionment. All in all, I'd say that this July issue of *The Freeman*, and especially the third page, was one of the best yet. Maplewood, Mo. C. A. LANG.

\* \* \*

"Thanks for your belated answer to my question about the future of your publications, that is, after you go to the Elysian Fields—in a cigar box! (I pray Yawveh, delay that day.) I'm thinking, however—with the utmost respect for your children, whom I'd like very much to know—that they're not likely ever to be able to fill your shoes. Education? Of course. But not the sort needed to run *The Freeman* and edit books. That sort of education can probably be acquired only in the way you got it; and I can see that it goes way back to pre-Girard days. So if I outlive you I'm quite resigned to witnessing the extinction of the H-J press, at least as we now know it. That's one thing you're going to take with you."—Reader.

\* \* \*

Are employers usually opposed to the unionization of their plants?

The only survey I know of was conducted by *Fortune* magazine, in January, 1939, according to an item in my newsclip filing system. The question that was asked executives follows:

"Do you think it is wise or foolish for the management of business to try to keep unions from organizing in their plants?"

The replies:

Wise .....	28.2%
Foolish .....	55.1
Don't know .....	16.7

Intelligent employers are about convinced (and the above survey shows the actual figures) that the day of the open shop is gone forever. Of course, there are many diehards, but their days are numbered. Executives, and the public generally, have come around to the view that workers

have as much right to organize into unions as employers have to form associations, chambers of commerce, and the like. One of the great things done by John L. Lewis was to go out and organize millions of unskilled workers, the kind of toilers who usually were overlooked by the older, conservative, and sometimes reactionary, A.F. of L. It would be folly to say that the employers welcomed Lewis' activity, but when they realized the movement was here to stay the majority bowed to conditions, so that now, according to the survey referred to above, we find business executives, in the main, more open-minded to unionism.

Please compare the U.S.S.R.'s air transport with the U.S.A.

Official figures, as of January 1,

Country	Length of		CARRIED		Extent of commercial loading (%)
	airlines in miles	Passengers	Mail	(TONS) Freight	
U.S.S.R.	65,888	211,787	9,188,100	36,885,300	86%
U.S.A.	63,973	1,267,580	10,600,000	4,046,900	56%

Please give me the story sources of our motion picture industry, covering originals, books, plays, or magazines. Also the cost. Please cover the last few years.

#### STORY SOURCES

	Total	Originals	Books	Plays	Magazines	Cost	Average Cost
1935	614	312	222	73	7	\$3,070,000	\$5,000
1936	901	497	170	67	167	4,505,000	5,000
1937	648	390	104	75	79	3,240,000	5,000
1938*	503	289	145	28	41		

\*To December 1st.

How many definitely anti-Jewish organizations are there in the U.S.?

There are 800 organizations in the U.S. which include anti-Semitism in their programs. The most active are: the Rev. Gerald B. Winrod's outfit in Wichita, Kans.; Father Coughlin's activities; Silver Shirts; Defenders of the Christian Faith; Industrial Defense Association; American Nationalist Confederation; James True Associates; Knights of the White Camellia; the German-American Bund. I have, in many articles, commented on the activities of the above, and intend to continue such work so long as our country is menaced by such dangerous, fascist propaganda. According to Dr. Alvin Johnson, di-

rector of the New School for Social Research, N.Y.C., these organizations claim 6,000,000 adherents, but he credits them with about half that many members, which certainly is bad enough. Dr. Johnson writes: "We are dunces if we refuse to face the menace of anti-Semitism, weaklings if we fail to supply our resources in combating it." I agree with that statement. We should, as he warns, recognize the evil and then stand up and fight. By fighting I haven't in mind violent action. We supporters of toleration, democracy and freedom don't have to resort to violence in order to counter the propaganda of the hate-mongers. We can, as I've

1938, give the following comparisons between aviation in the Soviet Union and the United States:

The only figures I can find in my newsclip filing system is a table prepared by Theatre Patrons, Inc., New Haven, Conn., as follows:

said before, work together quietly and efficiently to build up a powerful anti-Fascist press. Tremendous engines of publicity can do much to nullify the campaigns of our Fascists. We mustn't forget that we are faced by what Dr. Johnson calls a "motley array that has been waiting for years for a Hitler to come and organize them into a unified power." While they're waiting, we believers in the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights should make financial and other sacrifices in the drive to establish institutions that will stand like stone walls against the rising tide of racialism and Brutalitarianism. Dr. Johnson, who is head of the famous University in Exile, in N.Y.C.,

classifies the methods of anti-Semitic propaganda, as follows:

"For the average timid soul, identification of the Jews with the Reds. For the romantic moron, the grand conspiracy of the Elders of Zion. For the blase society lady, the fake letter of Benjamin Franklin. For the anti-New Dealer, a catalogue of government posts held by Jews under the New Deal and 'proof' that obnoxious New Deal measures were devised by Jews. For the small businessman, assertions that the great corporations destroying him are controlled by Jews. For the Fundamentalist, blood ritual whisperings. For the Southern gentlemen, identification of the Jew with Negro domination. Nothing for the parlor anti-Semitic, who hates the Jew on his own, to the admiration of his women folk."

While on this subject of anti-Semitism, let me answer questions from a few of my readers anxious to get light on this difficult problem. Some have asked me if the AFL and CIO are anti-Jewish. I'm able to say definitely that these two great labor organizations are free of such bias. They know how the Fascists everywhere (who always are labor-haters) include anti-Semitism in their programs as a smoke-screen to hide their designs against organized labor. The Jew is always a convenient scapegoat when union-haters are out to crush labor. Others ask if the farmers are anti-Semitic. They're not. Their organizations never give support to racial prejudice. They are strong defenders of democracy and freedom of speech, press, etc. And then, I'm asked, what kind of women join the Jew-baiters? They're not the average woman, by any means. As Dr. Johnson says in his report, the female anti-Semites usually come from the ranks of the fluffy suburbanites "who fear that a Jewish family might move into their environment and disturb their knitting raptures." How about the unemployed? Are they given to race baiting? Not so you can notice it, though many of them have received leaflets containing: "You haven't got a job. Who's got it? A Jew. How do you like it?" The least bit of thinking shows the unemployed worker that the Jew isn't to blame for his unfortunate condition. If anything, the

average unemployed man or woman (if properly led) is ready to stand with unemployed Jews and others to help bring about conditions that will remove the social roots of unemployment. The next leaflet of the Jew-baiters may criticize the "Jewish" New Deal policy of relief. As Dr. Johnson remarks, "that was intended for another group, but literature gets mixed in a society like ours." We should remember at all times that anti-Semitism is a weapon used by people who have aims far beyond the persecution of a small minority. Here we get sound words again from Dr. Johnson, as follows:

"Anti-Semitism enabled Hitler to overthrow the German democracy. But it was a weak democracy, forced upon a defeated people who had never had the opportunity to develop democrats, and without real democrats, democracy is a mere book definition. It was a democracy sore with defeat, repeatedly humiliated and mistreated by the victors. Given a similar situation of defeat and humiliation, of indemnities, inflation, the destruction of every hope of modest security, we could turn Nazi, too, and undoubtedly our designing Hitler would seize upon endemic anti-Semitism as one of his chief sources of strength."

That's why I say so often that the best way for Americans to fight Fascism (though by no means the only way) is to meet the arguments of the anti-Semites through the dissemination of sound, informative, truth-telling literature. Dr. Johnson, in his useful report, refers to the fact that there are forces making for the increase in anti-Semitism in our country, but he adds the constructive thought that there are also forces making for its abatement. His words here are worth studying:

"In this country, fortunately, the conditions that give color to anti-Semitism are abating. The vast immigrant groups from Eastern Europe are now passing on into the third generation on American soil: Yiddish speech and Yiddish clanishness are giving way. The concentration of Jews in merchandising and the white-collar trades is gradually but surely breaking up. We have a fair beginning of a movement of Jews to the soil. The number of Jewish farmers is still un-

determined, but there are certainly 16,000, on the whole succeeding well, and there are many stirrings to indicate an increasing movement to the land. A quarter of the union carpenters of New York City are Jews; a fifth of the electrical workers; nearly half the painters and paperhangers; half the plasterers; nearly half the plumbers and steam-fitters; more than half the sheet-metal workers. These are the union figures. The point is that the unhealthy concentration in commercial pursuits forced upon the Jews by the Old World anti-Semitism, itself operating to intensify anti-Semitism, is gradually breaking up here. People still say, to be sure, 'You never see a Jewish artisan or farmer.' Parrots will still be saying that a generation hence.

"It behooves us, as good American citizens, to set about building a bridge of understanding between the two groups, Jewish and Christian. By good modern practice, a bridge is always begun from both sides of the river simultaneously.

"It is wise not to presume on fate, at least so long as there is something we can do ourselves. It is still open to us to form an engineering organization representing both groups, to discuss frankly, without reservations or tabu, ways and means for softening the edges of inter-group conflict, of clearing away inter-group misunderstanding. At least we owe it to our democratic civilization to do something more than denounce and wring our hands. We can try."

Yes, Dr. Johnson is right—we can try. There's no reason why we should stand by and wring our hands in despair. We don't want the evils of Fascism, but mere wishful thinking isn't enough. We need action, not verbiage. If we don't meet our responsibilities we'll be forced to accept the things we don't want—concentration camps, purges, forced labor, conscript armies, mob violence, censored newspapers, controlled education, controlled thinking, race hatred, dictators, goose-steps, aggression, torture, persecution, hate-mongering, militarism, and, finally, WAR. We don't want these things. Let's try to keep them out of our country by fighting against the various objectives of Fascism, not the least of which is anti-Semitism. We will stand together and work together because we believe in

other ideals than Fascism—it's democracy we want—law and order, free citizenship, fair play to all minorities, free press, free speech, free worship, love of humanity instead of hatred for helpless minorities, tolerance, jobs as free workers, unionism, cooperation, and a full bread-basket. With Abraham Lincoln, let's say:

"I have faith in the people; let them know the truth and the country is safe."

That's our job, as anti-Fascists. We must make it our job as democrats to bring the truth to the people, for in the truth rests the country's safety. And what's more effective and wide-reaching than the outpourings of a free, independent, progressive, unsubsidized press? There is the foundation-stone of our liberties. We must remember that fact, for without it we're lost. We have it in our power to build up a tremendous press dedicated to the truth—the truth that Lincoln said will save the country. Let's not shirk. As Dr. Johnson said: WE CAN TRY.

Let's listen to Theodore Roosevelt, another great American who always took a stand against racial prejudice of any kind. Here are his powerful words—words that mean much to us in these trying, difficult times:

"We are opposed . . . to any discrimination against or for a man because of his creed. We demand that all citizens, Protestant and Catholic, Jew and gentile, shall have their rights guaranteed them. There can be no fifty-fifty Americanism in this country. . . . Americanism is a question of spirit, conviction and purpose, not of creed or birthplace."

That's the spirit we want to preserve. That's the true and real America. Let's keep it that way.

\* \* \*

Editor: Your article in the July, 1939, issue of *The Freeman* on the rights of the Nazis to destroy democracy is extremely disappointing. Obviously the examples of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Spain (where that idea has been in effect) means nothing to you.

The only reason that these countries were conquered by Fascism is because they were first undermined by the Nazis and Fascists, their friends in the government, and some capitalists. They are the shock troops, the advance scouts of

the main army of Germany, Italy, and Japan.

If Franco had been stopped before he began his revolt, Spain would now be free and democratic. If Konrad Henlein had not been permitted to Nazify the Sudetens, Czechoslovakia would now be a free state.

The Soviet Union got rid of all her fifth columnists, and many experts agree that she is the strongest nation in the world.

The American Communists have always advocated that we get rid of our fifth columnists. What kind of a general would allow the enemy to advance well within his lines and capture vital ground before attempting to fight back? That's exactly what you and the American Civil Liberties Union advocate.

The only sane way to fight Fascism is by FIGHTING it, by passing bills directly against Fascists and Nazis, by not permitting them to hold meetings or distribute literature, by banning their organizations, and deporting their foreign leaders.

New York City JOHN BIRMINGHAM

\* \* \*

"I had to laugh at your listing of various headaches occasioned by cantankerous questioners. Unlike some of the opposite sort who are considerate enough to write 'no answer expected,' I've never done that; I've just assumed that you'd know I had enough sense for that. But that isn't denying that I've gotten much satisfaction out of your frequent brief notes even while I realized that you couldn't possibly do that with all of your correspondents."—Reader.

\* \* \*

"Your series of Lecture-Outlines is one of the most beneficial services conceivable, to me, that any publisher could render the reading public—and listening public! I congratulate you, and may this be but the beginning of your many lecture-outlines to follow."—Paul A. Baldwin, Co-ordinator, Lexington Public Schools, Lexington, Miss.

\* \* \*

How do the German people like the "ersatz" suits the Nazis make them wear?

They love 'em—when a brown-shirt waves a length of rubber-hose over them. But in private they cuss, because they know wool is the ideal raw material for a suit of clothes while wood pulp can't do anything but disappoint. The money saving is slight, while the service they get from an "ersatz" (substitute) suit isn't very far from zero. Berliners, according to the United Press, are laughing over a jokester's amusing

way of spoofing the wood fabric. He doped out a phony bill, like this:

Woodman & Co., 205 Forest Ave.  
Bill for Theophilus Bleat.

	Marks
1. Suit material chopped down	50
2. Branches trimmed off	10
3. Material planks stained	10
4. Jacket sawed and nailed	35
5. Lapels screwed on and hinged	25
6. Collar polished	7
7. Trousers stained and finished	38
8. Buttonholes bored	10
9. Pockets chiseled out	10
10. Wages for mounting	5
(Reforestation 10 percent extra.	
If suit sprouts in Spring please cut off shoots and keep them for patches.)	

The latest story that's going the rounds in Nazi Germany, according to *The New Republic*, reports a conversation between an enthusiastic Hitlerite and a friend of his, an inhabitant of the Netherlands. The conversation:

Says the German: "Why don't you get yourselves a Fuehrer like us? You'd have prosperity then—factories going full tilt, everybody busy." To which the Hollander replied:

"Well, perhaps you are right. Maybe if we had a Hitler we would have better employment, factory chimneys smoking. But then again—if somebody knocks on my door at 4 o'clock in the morning, I know it is the milkman."

\* \* \*

Editor: My sorrow is inexpressible at the passing of my very dear, personal friend and chief counsel, Frank P. Walsh. I doubly grieved because I have not seen him since my liberation, and was looking forward with great delight to meeting him in New York City, where I shall be going in a few weeks for the first meeting of a series that will take me all over the United States, and where it was our plan to have Frank Walsh as one of the speakers at our meeting in Madison Square Garden.

One great consolation is the fact that he at least lived long enough to see his noble services in the Mooney case crowned with glorious success in my liberation and vindication on January 7, 1939.

Sixteen years ago, before the Hon. W. Bourke Cockran (chief counsel at my trial) passed away, he made the request of Frank P. Walsh that he take up and carry on the burden thus far borne by Cockran, to bring about my vindication and liberation. Immediately upon the

death of Bourke Cockran, Mr. Walsh volunteered his services and gave generously and unstintingly of his great legal talents and his financial resources until I was liberated. And, all during our struggle, at no time did Mr. Walsh ever receive a single penny, either as a fee for his services or expenses, in connection with the great and noble services that he rendered us, and on more than one occasion he made direct, generous financial contributions to the defense fund so that the work might go on.

In the passing of Frank P. Walsh, mankind and particularly the common people have lost one of their great friends and champions. He had a profound and deep, sympathetic understanding of the labor movement, and gave of his time and talents on many a crucial occasion to effect a solution of the many perplexing problems that confronted it. Throughout his lifetime he devoted himself unselfishly to public service.

He served his country in many high places. In 1912, President Wilson appointed him as Chairman of the United States Industrial Relations Commission of nine, three representing the public, three representing labor, and a like number representing capital. This commission toured the entire United States and held 25 important hearings in the largest centers of the country, to determine the causes of industrial unrest and the remedies therefor. During the World War, President Wilson also appointed him as Joint Chairman, with ex-President William Howard Taft, of the United States War Labor Board. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, when Governor of New York State, appointed him Chairman of the New York State Power Authority. He held many other public offices during his lifetime. He was one of the foremost advocates in America of absolute independence for Ireland.

In the passing of Frank Walsh, America has lost one of its foremost citizens, mankind one of its truest friends.

San Francisco, Calif. TOM MOONEY

Wherever I go I hear bankers and business leaders in general rail at the President for getting us into debt to the tune of \$40,000,000,000. They say the country can't go on that way. Can it?

I don't want to rehash the numerous pieces I've written about our national debt. If interested readers will look up my articles in my volumes of questions and answers (all carefully indexed) they'll find I've considered every argument and offered sincere comments. However, I

shouldn't close this paragraph without calling attention to one aspect of the problem which our business leaders never discuss but which has bearing on the controversy. The people who say the U.S. government can't go on with a \$40,000,000,000 debt make themselves ridiculous, for we could still be solvent if the debt were three times that size, as I've shown before. They forget the obvious, and overwhelming, fact that business—corporate and private—has never taken a pessimistic view of business debts. Statistics show that corporate and private debts total about \$200,000,000,000—five times the size of our national debt—and yet these "leaders" howl about going broke. Businessmen have never looked on debt as an evil, so long as the borrowed money is used constructively. They may deny that the Federal government has used the people's money constructively, but I believe I've shown several times that we citizens have received value for the money the government has spent. I don't want to go into that now. Let the howling bankers and business leaders clean up their own debts—\$5 for each dollar owed by Uncle Sam—and we'll look on them as sincere critics.

\* \* \*

Can one Congress outline a policy in such a form that it commits a subsequent Congress?

No. President Roosevelt called attention to this fact during his press conference on January 20, 1939.

\* \* \*

Is it true that homosexuals are unusually fond of perfumes?

Yes. Adolf Hitler keeps 20 kinds of fancy perfumes handy wherever he stays.

\* \* \*

#### A NEW LOW

The Kansas City Star, May 8, 1939, ran an AP story on the announcement that Italy and Germany had decided to become allies in a formal military pact. The Star's headline said: "Italy Apparently Is Leaning Away from French Friendship."

\* \* \*

What's the cost of book-match color covers, including the cost of four-color process plates?

In large quantities, 25c per 1,000.

# Index

- Advice, to Alaskan mechanic, 67.  
Agnosticism, in Omar Khayyam, 86.  
Aliens, and Dickstein bill, 56.  
Alliances, Washington on, 14.  
Ancestry, of each State governor, 97.  
Anderson, Marian, and D.A.R., 40.  
Animals, big game, how many in the U.S., 93.  
Answers to unasked questions, 87, 105, 117.  
Anti-Jewish propaganda, exposed by The American Freeman, 24.  
Anti-Semitic organizations, how many in the U.S., 120.  
Anti-Semitism, Stalin on, 20.  
Arico, Anthony, on American journalism, 64.  
Astrology, is it scientific, 35.  
Astronomy, and Catholic Church, 6.  
Baseball, professional, is it honest, 100.  
Bigamist, difference between one and a digamist, 85.  
Birkhead, L. M., on Coughlin, 44.  
On fundamentals of liberalism, 115.  
Birth control methods, are they safe and reliable, 110.  
Blind people, how many, 114.  
Bonds, of Catholic Church as investments, 85.  
Borah, Senator W. E., prosecutor in Haywood case, 112.  
Borgese, G. A., on blessing of American citizenship, 99.  
Born on Sabbath, 73.  
Boycott, against Nazi goods, its effect, 8.  
Against Nazi goods favored in the U.S., 22.  
Against Nazi goods, urged, 25.  
Bridges, Harry, case and U.S. immigration laws, 15.  
Broun, Heywood, on "The American Way," 94.  
Has he joined the Catholic Church, 99.  
Business, how it is interfered with in Nazi Germany, 95.  
Cameron, W. J., Ford's propagandist, 8.  
Canada, its aims in arming, 34.  
Its disregard for civil rights, 36.  
Carter, Boake, his anti-Roosevelt propaganda discussed, 97.  
Catholic Church, and science, 6.  
And tolerance, 6.  
Its attitude on labor, 9.  
And Walter Winchell, 43.  
Claims to be unchanging, 43.  
Its bonds as investments, 85.  
Catholic claims, regarding rationalistic nature of the Church's dogmas, 111.  
Catholic-Fascism, in Eastern Canada, 53.  
Catholics, and unmarried bishop, 42.  
Censorship, in the U.S., of movies, 7.  
In Ireland, 18.  
Chicago newspapers, appraised, 43.  
Children, not backward merely because they are slow, 36.  
Chiroquaker, 25.  
Cigarettes, how many consumed in the U.S., 8.  
Civil rights, in the U.S., facts about, 26.  
In U.S. possessions, 47.  
Clifford, W. K., urges respect for one's doubts, 82.  
Cliveden, how to pronounce, 24.  
Cloves, where obtained, 50.  
Comet, denounced by a Pope, 64.  
Comfort stations, closed in Washington on holy Sabbath, 35.  
Colonial ambitions, of Hitler, 8.  
Concentration, of economic and financial power in the U.S., 29.  
Congress, can one Congress commit a subsequent Congress, 124.  
Consumers' goods, deteriorated in Nazi Germany, 15.  
Contraceptive methods, are they safe and reliable, 110.  
Corporations, extent of their control over U.S. economic life, 29.  
Assets of, 34.  
Corporation taxes, should they be reduced, 84.  
Coughlin, Father, uses Pope's encyclical on labor, 9.  
His anti-Semitism, 21.  
Is he recognized by Fascists as one of their own, 23.  
His magazine printed in non-union shop, 29.  
His slogans, 37.  
Claims Nazism is defense mechanism against Communism, 44.  
His use of Nazi propaganda material, 59.  
Described as repulsive speaker, 73.  
Question of his U.S. citizenship, 79.  
Who is putting up the money for his propaganda, 95.  
Criminals, are Jews among them in disproportionate numbers, 97.  
Crusaders White Shirts, their general orders, 12.  
Curved space, what it means, 49.  
Daniels, Josephus, denies Mexico is persecuting Catholic Church, 12.  
Daughters of the American Revolution, and Marian Anderson, 40.  
Debt, U.S., what it got the people of the U.S., 12  
Declaration of Independence, was it

- signed entirely by men of English stock, 92.
- Deportation**, of aliens proposed in Demsey bill, 74.
- Diaz, A. Garcia**, on Pacifism, 76.  
On Mill's statement regarding social responsibility, 108.
- Dice**, crooked, how to test, 43.
- Dickstein bill**, aimed at aliens, 56.
- Digamist**, different from a bigamist, 85.
- Douglas, Lloyd C.**, criticism of, 14.
- Douglas, Melvyn**, his interest in great public questions, 32.
- Durante, Jimmy**, on the futility of buying love with money, 49.
- Dynamite**, what causes it to explode, 92.
- Eastern Canada**, Catholic-Fascism in, 53.
- Einstein, Albert**, his "active pacifism," 35.
- Emigrants**, which may enter the U.S. without quota restrictions, 23.
- Encyclical**, papal, on labor, 9.
- "Ersatz" suits, 123.
- Eskimos**, learn directions easily, 42.
- Ethiopia**, its colonization attempted by Mussolini, 21.
- Faith cures**, are they real, 35.
- Fascism**, steps to resist, 60.  
Best way for Americans to fight, 121.
- Fascist scientists**, and Harvard, 45.
- Fascists**, in Hitler's press, recognize Father Coughlin as one of their own, 23.  
Should they have free speech in the U.S., 61.  
In uniforms in the U.S., 63.
- Fish**, why it dies out of water, 79.
- Flies**, full-grown at birth, 66.
- Ford, Henry**, financial backer of Father Coughlin, 95.
- Foreign governments**, with progressive policies, 53.
- Frankfurter, Prof. Felix**, public pleased with his appointment to Supreme Court, 16.  
On great seal of U.S., as first proposed, 94.
- Free press**, lacking in Ireland, 18.
- Free speech**, lacking in Ireland, 18.  
Should Fascists enjoy it, 61.  
Attacked in bill aimed at aliens, 75.  
Opposed for Fascists, 122.
- Freethought**, does it mean the end of morality, 108.  
More asked on this subject, 112.
- Genesis**, does it conflict with science, 50.
- German refugees**, how they help our economic life, 100.
- German Republic**, was rapidly remedying evils of Versailles Treaty, 71.
- Germany**, under Hitler, expected to be main cause of coming war, 17.  
Its growth since World War, 56.  
Its standard of living under Hitler, 57.
- Goethe**, on happiness, 81.
- Government**, interference with business, 95.
- Graphology**, is it scientific, 35.
- Haeckel, Ernst**, denies faith in an after life is needed to make life endurable, 83.
- Haldeman-Julius, E.**, article about him in Public Opinion Quarterly, reprinted in H-J News-Letter, 23.  
Personal data, 39.  
And creditors, 52.  
Answers question about perpetuation of his work after his death, 84.
- Harvard**, its way of handling Fascist scientists, 45.
- Hessians**, in the U.S., 19.
- Hitler**, his colonial ambitions, 8.  
Given divine attributes, 16.  
Expected to be main cause of coming war, 17.  
On U.S. history, 19.  
His kissable mouth, 22.  
His use of torture, 22.  
How American consumers can declare war on, 25.  
Pays lip-service to peace, 32.  
His record of contradictions and broken promises, 33.  
Charges Jews with being war-mongers, 34.  
His claim that Germany's standard of living is higher, 57.  
Has he solved unemployment problem, 70.  
His attacks on the Versailles Treaty, 71.  
How much money he spends on foreign propaganda, 97.  
Misstates history, 100.  
His mongrel German speech, 113.  
Joins homosexuals in unusual fondness for perfumes, 124.
- Hoan, Mayor Daniel W.**, his record as head of Milwaukee's government, 10.
- Homosexuals**, are they unusually fond of perfumes, 124.
- Houdini, Beatrice**, and spiritualists, 37.
- Humanitarianism**, as seen by Ingersoll, 74.
- Ickes**, on press freedom, 5.
- Ideology**, meaning of, how to pronounce, 18.
- Immortality**, does it make life worth living, 83.
- Incomes**, sentiment if American people on set limit to, 92.
- Infantile**, how to pronounce, 18.
- Ingalls, John J.**, his classic words on grass, 109.
- Ingersoll**, his ideal of happiness, 73.
- Isolationism**, in the U.S., 17.
- Insurance**, how it can be nationalized, 67.
- Insurance policies**, how many in effect in the U.S., 24.
- Integrity**, intellectual, 82.
- Intellectual freedom**, upheld by Jefferson, 75.
- Intellectual integrity**, 82.
- Ireland**, its intolerance under de Valera, 18.
- Japanese**, shaving brushes, 16.  
Tricks to conceal origin of its exports to the U.S., 18.

- Jefferson, Thomas**, upholds intellectual freedom, 75.  
 Upholds religious freedom, 76.  
 As Rationalist, 76.  
 Text of his statute of religious liberty, 111.
- Jewish students**, how persecuted in Poland, 10.
- Jews**, their position in the Soviet Union, 20.  
 Under King John, 22.  
 Attitude of George Washington towards, 33.  
 Why called Hebrews, 47.  
 Mark Twain on, 78.  
 Favorite scapegoat, 80.  
 Is disproportionate number among criminals, 97.  
 Are most of Roosevelt's advisers, 95.
- Jokes**, about Nazis, 50.
- Journalism**, Anthony Arico on, 64.
- Khayyam, Omar**, his skepticism or agnosticism, 86.
- King John**, and the Jews, 22.
- Kuhn, Fritz**, Bundist propagandist, 39.
- Labor**, papal encyclical on, 9.  
 Ancient and modern compared, 38.  
 Question, Lincoln on, 73.
- Lactation procedure**, what science says about it, 110.
- Lang, C. A.**, on basic essentials of democracy, 33.  
 On Listerine, 73.  
 On divine guidance, 77.  
 On our duty to posterity, 113.  
 On Hitler's German speech, 113.  
 On happiness, 119.
- Lawson, Alfred**, his theory of economics, 96.
- League of Nations**, its activities, 34.
- Lenin**, didn't want Stalin to assume leadership, 79.  
 Did he die of syphilis, 87.
- Liberalism**, fundamentals of, 115.
- Life insurance**, 101.
- Lightning**, facts about, 85.
- Lincoln, Abraham**, owned newspaper, 54.  
 On labor question, 73.
- Lipton, B. G.**, on problems of diet, 109.
- Literacy**, among U.S. Negroes, 21.
- Lockjaw**, is it caused by rust, 66.
- Mann, Erika**, on Nazi youth, 35.
- Marx, Karl**, coined word "ideology," 18.
- Mass psychology**, how controlled by Mussolini, 103.
- Materialists**, are they unhappy because of their philosophy, 83.
- McCabe, Jos.**, on happiness, 81.
- McGlynn, Father**, silenced by Catholic Church, 9.
- McKinley, Wm.**, heard from God regarding Spain, 46.
- "Mein Kampf"**, contains proof Hitler's desire for war, 34.
- Mencken, H. L.**, why he broke with Nathan, 51.
- Mexico**, is it persecuting the Catholic Church, 12.
- Michigan Bank Roll**, what it is, 87.
- Military forces in the U.S.** under private control, 63.
- Milwaukee**, Socialist administration, its achievements, 10.  
 Insurance rates in, 57.
- Millet**, why it is a popular crop, 95.
- Mirabeau**, on Hessians in the U.S., 19.
- Miracles**, 111.
- Monopolies**, extent of, in the U.S., 29.
- Mooney, Tom**, on passing of Frank P. Walsh, 123.
- Morality**, is Freethought the sure sign of its end, 108.
- Movie industry**, its tax-bill, 67.
- Mule**, most valuable farm animal, 77.
- Musical manuscript**, how to submit, 77.
- Mussolini**, his attempts to colonize Ethiopia, 21.  
 Demonstrations in his honor organized by officials, 29.  
 Control of mass psychology, 103.  
 Theory of his propaganda, 103.
- Nathan, George Jean**, why he broke with Mencken, 51.
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People**, its aims, 48.
- National Protective Insurance Co.**, 97.
- Nazi**, its goods boycotted in the U.S., 8.  
 Rule, its effect on the people's standard of living, 15.  
 Goods, boycott favored in the U.S., 22.  
 Germany, and torture, 22.  
 Boycott urged, 25.  
 Youth, Erika Mann on, 35.
- Jokes**, 50.  
 Comedians cracked down on, 90.  
 Interference with business, 95.  
 "Ersatz" for suits inspires joke, 123.
- Nazi newspaper**, on U.S. censorship, 7.
- Nazis**, their use of exchange students, 46.  
 Should they have free speech in the U.S., 61.  
 Their contributions to philosophy, 66.
- Nazism**, as defense mechanism against Communism, 44.
- Negroes**, their rate of literacy in the U.S., 21.  
 How words offend, 41.
- Nelson, Ben**, on life insurance, 101.
- Newsclip filing system**, facts about, 19.  
 Compared to one used by writer of fiction, 54.
- Newspapers**, how they handle certain kinds of news, 66.
- Nickel**, Canada world's greatest producer, 45.
- Non-Aryans** who have made contributions to civilization, 115.
- Nordic mouth**, most kissable, says Nazi, 22.
- Occupatin**, of each State governor, 97.
- Owls**, can they see in daylight, 84.
- Pacifist**, case against, 76.
- Parents**, are they closest relatives, 91.
- Paschall, A. M.**, asks for more Freethought, 112.
- Pearson, Karl**, on Freethought and morality, 108.
- Penner, Joe**, is he funny, 24.
- Physiognomy**, is it a science, 93.

- Pianos, how many in the U.S., 55.  
 Number bought in 1938, 87.
- Plenocrats, 110.
- Poe, Edgar Allan, was he drunkard, 46.
- Poland, its "Ghetto benches," 10.
- Polar trips, for tourists, 113.
- Policeman, how many killed, 54.
- Pope, denounced a comet, 64.
- Pork, how popular, 51.
- Postage rates, 100 years ago, 84.
- Press freedom, Ickes on, 5.
- Problems, of life insurance, 101.
- Propaganda, Ford's 3.
- Public works, in U.S., 52.
- Pyramids, how much labor needed to construct, 39.
- Questions, some queer ones, 78.
- Radios, how many in U.S., 55.
- Rationalism, of Jefferson, 76.
- Red tape, in business in Nazi Germany, 95.
- Refugees, should we shut them out for economic reasons, 100.
- Relief setup, do people want a change, 114.
- Religion, and science, 54.  
 Of each State governor, 97.
- Religious beliefs, poll on, 68.  
 Freedom, upheld by Jefferson, 76.  
 Liberty, statue of, prepared by Thomas Jefferson, 111.
- Republicans, their leading contenders for the 1940 nomination for President, 16.
- Reynolds, Senator, misquotes Erika Mann, 56.
- Roosevelt, President, his foreign policy, 17.  
 His policies criticized, 53.  
 On Statue of Liberty, 93.  
 Are most of his advisers Jews, 95.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, on racial prejudice, 122.
- Roulette, beating it when it's crooked, 83.
- Rousseau, his theory of man's natural goodness, 51.
- Sadist, Streicher known as, 4.
- Santayana, George, on Materialists, 83.
- Saturday Evening Post, how it mutilates novels, 107.
- Savings accounts, number in the U.S., 6.
- Schopenhauer, on happiness, 80.
- Science, and Roman Catholic Church, 6.  
 Does it conflict with Genesis, 50.
- Seal of the U.S., first sketch, 94.
- Sinclair, Upton, review of his booklet, "Your Million Dollars," 109.
- Sinful, to be born on Sabbath, 73.
- Skepticism, 82.
- Skin, human, how far it will stretch, 87.
- Slocum, Robert, on youth, 112.
- Smokers, how many in the U.S., 92.
- Socialism, explained, 30.  
 Its practical program, 10.
- Soviet Ukraine, facts about, 104.
- Soviet Union, is it self-supporting, 9.  
 Its attitude toward anti-Semitism, 20.  
 Was sincerely for Czechoslovakia, 98.  
 How to get job there, 116.
- Its aviation, 120.
- Spencer, Herbert, on intellectual integrity, 82.
- Spiritualism, and Mrs. Houdini, 37.
- Stalin, on anti-Semitism, 20.  
 His leadership opposed by Lenin, 79.
- Stars, chances for collision, 86.
- State governors, their religion, ancestry and occupation, 97.
- Statue of Liberty, inscription on, 92.
- St. Augustine, his rationalism, 6.
- Steiner, Franklin, on Milwaukee Leader, 36.
- Steinmetz, Charles P., his agnosticism, 86.
- Streicher, Julius, honored in German universities, 4.
- Students, exchanged between countries, 46.
- Sulzberger, Arthur Hays, on article in The American Freeman, 69.
- Symphony orchestras, how many in the U.S., 54.
- Telephone conversations, rate at which words are used, 93.
- Theists, their claim for divine purpose, 118.
- Tibbett, Lawrence, his singing, 4.
- Tobacco, taxes, in 1938, 85.  
 Companies, financial position of, 91.
- Tolerance, and Catholic Church, 6.
- Torture, in Nazi Germany, 22.
- Truth, loyalty to, 81.
- Twain, Mark, on the Jews, 78.
- Unemployment, in Nazi Germany, 70.
- Unionism, are employers usually opposed, 119.
- Universal Order of Plenocrats, 110.
- U.S. its attitude regarding Nazi colonial ambitions, 8.  
 National debt, what the country got for the money, 12.  
 National debt, its limit, 22.  
 Facts about civil rights in, 26.  
 Possessions, civil rights in, 47.  
 Public works, 52.  
 Debt, can country bear the load, 124.
- Vacuum cleaner, speed at which it works best, 55.
- Valera, Eamon de, his intolerance, 18.  
 And Mussolini, 32.
- Ventriloquism, does it have detrimental effect, 36.
- Versailles Treaty, assailed by Nazis, 71.
- Versailles, were Germans stoned at, 100.
- Viereck, George Sylvester, Nazi propagandist, 30.
- Walsh, Frank P., his passing commented on by Tom Mooney, 123.
- Washington, George, his real words on entangling alliances, 14.  
 On the Jews, 33.
- Watch, how many parts in, 55.
- Wiggam, E. A., opinion on, 38.
- Winchell, Walter, and Catholic Church, 43.
- Wink, its length timed, 110.
- Youth, their opinions should be studied, 112.