

Editor  
**E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS**  
Contributing Editors  
Joseph McCabe • Lloyd E. Smith  
Harry E. Barnes • Isaac Goldberg  
Published weekly at 229 E.  
Forest Ave., Girard, Kans. Single  
copies 5c; by the year \$1 (\$1.50  
Canadian and foreign). Entered  
as second-class matter at the  
Girard, Kans., postoffice.

# The American Freeman

Formerly The Haldeman-Julius Weekly --- Published Every Saturday Throughout the Year

**COMING!**  
in an early issue  
Is "Trial by Jury"  
Fair and Just?  
By Harry Elmer Barnes

NUMBER 1766

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS

OCTOBER 5, 1929

## What Is a Liberal?

E. Haldeman-Julius

(Copyright, 1929, Haldeman-Julius Co.)

At first glance this does not seem an easy question to answer. Or perhaps I should say more fairly that there is no sweeping answer which will include all who call themselves liberals. In the first place, there is the human temperamental difference among liberals, the varying balance of intellectualism and emotionalism, special promptings of liberals on particular issues and a more general attitude of liberalism which is a free, humane, in the best sense a sophisticated or world-wise toleration. Taken as a general principle, without too careful and precise a definition, liberalism can of course be alleged in behalf of (or can be reconciled with) measures and movements that, seen more critically from another point of view, appear quite illiberal.

For an obvious illustration, there are liberals who advocate Prohibition and liberals who oppose it: the former defend Prohibition in the name of social welfare, while the latter say that this defense is fallacious, point out that if the greater social problems are solved liquor-drinking will be no problem (that its most conspicuously declared evils are effects rather than causes) and emphasize the viewpoint of personal liberty—insisting also that there is mischief in too narrowly moral an attitude toward life and that pleasant vices have their nicely, genially valuable social uses. Liberals, although they generally agree in a concern for the collective interest, nevertheless have various points of disagreement on economic questions. Politically, liberals—actuated by the same professed principles—are wont to place emphasis upon different issues: an economic, a moral, a humane issue may variously win their chief support, while on the opposite side there are other liberals proclaiming the leading importance of other issues. In the late national campaign, for example, many liberals were convinced that the issue of personal liberty—of freedom as contrasted sharply with the zeal for sumptuary legislation—

overshadowed all other possible issues of the hour: fortunately for these liberals, Governor Smith expressed the more liberal position on all other questions and those liberals who were wedded to Prohibition could support Hoover with none but an ill and inconsistent grace.

We remind ourselves too that in the late war a number of liberals sprang patriotically to the defense of American war policy, thinking that the cause of humanity was really going to be advanced thereby. Their intentions were excellent, no doubt, but they were simply victims of deception and were betrayed by Woodrow Wilson, who masked the most deadly batteries of reaction and terrorism with a camouflage of liberal phraseology and with a statement of aims that indeed sounded well but that turned out very badly.

We have to bear in mind, again, that a liberal who is religiously inclined must differ at times sharply in his attitude from a liberal who is at the same time completely removed from all religious influence; and a puritanical bias is certain to warp the viewpoint of a liberal who is thus afflicted, even though he protests sincerely enough that his allegiance to certain movements for purity—movements for censorship or prohibition or any unwarranted (that is to say needless) interference with individual behavior—is in accord with liberal ideals.

If a dozen liberals were to answer the question, "What is a liberal?" there would perhaps be a seventy-five percent agreement, let us say, but certain points of difference would be unavoidable. Both Clarence Darrow and Rev. John Haynes Holmes are liberals, each after his kind, but we know that these two men have very important contrasts in their attitudes toward life. Heywood Brown and Oswald Garrison Villard could find a plenty of things to dispute about if they were craving argument. Mencken and Bertrand Russell are not of one mind on all the great questions nor many of the minor questions of the day—although some critics would insist that Russell is a radical rather than a liberal, he being the spokesman of a socialistic program in modern life. Anyway, it is enough to understand in the first place that for all the broad ground of general agreement upon which they may be grouped, not all liberals would agree with a sweeping answer to the question, "What is a liberal?" They

would reserve to themselves the freedom to define the liberal attitude (or their attitudes, varying, as liberals) toward this or that issue. It is, then, my own definition which I shall try to give and it may be corrected by others (with the same limitations of "authority" that I respect) as their relative shades of conviction and interest may suggest.

To begin with, liberalism means a certain breadth and tolerance of outlook. Indeed when we say that a man is liberal we do not usually mean that he favors this or that specific principle of action, that he is wedded to a certain theory, that he belongs to a certain group or movement; but we imply an attitude of easy, friendly toleration toward all ideas and movements; at the very least, a willingness to understand rather than a fierce spirit of condemnation and repression. In other words, a liberal should be broad-minded, otherwise one fails to see how he can qualify under that term which, if vague, is not so loose as all that—liberality does mean open-mindedness, a belief in the virtue of reasonable discussion rather than forcible methods, a love of fair play and freedom, a spirit of considerate and indulgent and many-sided humanity.

Upon one point, I believe, all liberals—or nearly all, with the exception maybe of one in a hundred—agree: namely, that discussion and art and literature should be free. There is, of course, the exception of one in a hundred: this one liberal would be gravely convinced that censorship of some kinds of literature is necessary—puritanically biased, he would, let us say, favor the suppression of certain works of art that are to him excessively significant in a sexual way. Yet as to the freedom of discussion as respects ideas, I believe that liberals would agree without exception: that is to say, even should a puritanical liberal (which seems to me, of course, almost a contradiction in terms) favor the suppression of a work descriptive of free love he would not go so far as to suppress the advocacy of free love as a theory and method of behavior. He might be opposed to birth control (though I believe few liberals are opposed to it) but he would agree that it should be freely, openly discussed.

The moment a man begins to talk about an idea with a strain of bigotry, declaring that it is not fit to have free circulation among other

ideas, suggesting that it should be suppressed absolutely, manifesting pain even that the idea should be expressed in his hearing—you may know that such a man is not a liberal, no matter what he may call himself. I know that many who are on one ground or another, perhaps on very broad grounds, liberals have their prejudices and often use intemperate language and may feel some animosity toward a contrary idea: but, if they have the true spark of liberalism in their nature, they do not insist that their own opinions shall trample down all other opinions and that there shall be any official command as to what is the truth or the permissibly expressed attitude toward truth. Given the power to close another man's mouth, it is easy to "win" an argument with him: but the question is left unsettled and is, by this very policy of primitive unreasoning force, made more unpleasantly, more dangerously, more insistent. The more significant fact, however, is that a liberal does not wish to drive by a decree of law or superior force any idea out of the field of free discussion: intellectually, he has the spirit of "give and take."

Thus the genuine liberal, such as he may approve some of the social-economic aims of the Russian Soviet government, is bound to protest against the Russian limitations upon freedom of speech. It does not matter with how lofty a motive the Russian leaders profess to crush opposition to their program; it does not matter that they claim to be working in behalf of a more just and humane order of society; their official gospel may be the true one, but they are as censurable as any medieval bigot when they stamp out all criticism: moreover, as is always the case, they suggest that their position is not as strong as it might be. And of course in Russia, as in Italy and Spain, the object of such intolerance is to maintain certain groups or certain individuals in power. Liberalism, truth, speaking, appeals to reason and humanity rather than the blunt, crushing decisiveness of dogmatic power.

It is also broadly characteristic of liberalism that it has a lively contemporary—more, an advanced and forward-seeking—interest in ideas and social arrangements. It is contrasted with conservatism, which means the upholding of things as they are and which is hostile to new ideas and proposals of change;

and it is opposed, of course, to the reactionary spirit which would undo the work of progress and thrust us back if it could to an earlier, less advanced, less free time. Liberals really must have a progressive vision if they would justify claim of liberalism. They must be intelligent enough, just enough, mentally free enough to admit that the present notions of truth and policy are not final nor beyond the reach of criticism. With respect to any feature of life, if they are liberal they will admit that the principle of freedom of progress cannot be limited by tradition or by timid, pious precept. A liberal is not necessarily a hundred percent realist (few of us are that, even though we try to be) but he is at least capable of perceiving the elementary common sense of the changeableness of things. He knows that as conditions are altered, our theory and practice must sensibly accommodate itself to the new aspects of life. Even ideals and methods of social or individual behavior that were entirely valid in some past time must lose their force and virtue as conditions change and one good custom, outliving its need, may corrupt the world. The liberal is always ready to examine, as the need of the suggestion (perhaps premature) of the need arises, the rules and the institutions of our social life and discuss in what manner they may be wisely altered; in what manner the passing of time may have discredited what was formerly well enough; in what respect new ways of living commend the wisdom—eventually, perhaps, the necessity—of new institutions, new methods, a new viewpoint.

I think it may be correctly said that the liberal must, in a word, be a progressive. He must not only be up with the times but somewhat ahead of them. Take any question—at random, say the question of marriage and divorce—and the liberal must admit, not simply the possibility of change, but the fact that this question of change must be discussed in an open forum of variously contributory and contradictory observation and opinion. In discussing the question of marriage, liberals may differ on this point or that; some may be more cautious, some more daring, in their suggestions; temperamentally, they may be animated by very dissimilar ideas about sex. But no liberal will contend that marriage is a perfect,

final, sacred, indissoluble arrangement. He will not conceivably insist that marriage "until death do us part" is the irreducible minimum of moral and social necessity and that any criticism of this ideal is scandalous, any exception to it unthinkable, any broadening and liberalizing of standards a monstrous break with tradition. To liberalize marriage indeed is what any true liberal should naturally wish. Forms of compulsion are abhorrent to the liberal mind and they can only be tolerated on the ground of absolute, plain necessity. Harsh limitations upon belief and behavior are likewise intolerable, the more so as they are generally animated by a kind of bigoted ill-will and put forth but a sorry pretense of social helpfulness. A liberal is thus favorable, on the question of marriage and divorce, to more lenient and discriminating arrangements; to a greater measure of freedom and choice with the object of happiness for the most personally interested parties to such a contract; marriage as a form of slavery for an alleged vindication of virtue and duty is an idea utterly repugnant to liberalism.

This is merely an example; and it may be said that as regards divorce, there is almost unanimously an attitude of liberalism as compared with the attitude which prevailed fifty years ago. As believers in divorce, in a liberal interpretation of the ideas of marriage, nine persons out of ten are liberals although they may be smugly conservative or extremely reactionary on other questions. There are, to be sure, degrees of liberalism. One liberal may stoutly defend the principle of divorce, yet insist that the law should be quite meticulous and reluctant in granting the dissolution of marriages; another may endorse divorce most fully and not be very strict in his idea of its requirements, yet condemn as very immoral the sharing of sexual experience outside of marriage; another may believe in free love, but only in a compact that is firmly and ideologically equivalent to legal marriage. We expect such differences, for we know that men and women are influenced in their ideas by their personal relations, their experiences, their characters, strong or weak, stern or amiable, formal or latitudinarian; and the one who judges such a question as marriage and sex life by that one person's experience is looking at the question

narrowly—that, at least, cannot be accepted as a valid criterion—although happily that personal experience sometimes encourages the broadest and freest view. We are familiar, however, with the illogical tendency of a couple who have found in one marriage their ideal happiness to insist that their own example can easily, perfectly be followed by all men and women; and, on the other hand, those who have been disappointed in marriage are apt to condemn the ideal too sweepingly.

The point is that a liberal, no matter how convinced by personal experience or in theory that marriage—that the monogamic union of one man and one woman for life—is the true, idealistic solution of the sex problem, will not intolerantly insist that all others shall be forced to bow to this ideal. His liberalism consists in his very willingness to grant exceptions, to concede the right of others to disagree with him and experiment for themselves, to admit fairly the need of a code wide enough to embrace the various aspects and the various urges of human nature. Liberalism is the disposition to look at every side of a question and, however, convinced of the superior truth that lies on one side, to leave open the expression of all sides.

Yet liberalism, be it noted, is something more than toleration although that is indispensable, fundamental indeed, in the liberal attitude. The liberal is not simply tolerant of other views, but he himself takes a broad view and is responsive to the reasonable claims of advanced thought. Conceivably, one might be tolerant of a difference of opinion on the subject of marriage and yet be oneself narrow in the extreme, even denying that divorce is anyhow justifiable. But that would not be liberalism: liberalism means the admission of a goodly measure of free and easy latitude into human relations; it does not indeed mean anarchism, but it is assuredly incompatible with the classics, strict attitude of conservatism.

One would be surprised, for instance, to find one calling himself a liberal yet taking a conservative, narrowly individualistic stand on economic questions. Liberals must readily agree that the problem of the fair distribution of wealth—or, to put it more broadly, the problem of the just and wise arrangement

[Please turn to page two

## Why I Quit Being a Prohibitionist

Harry Hibschan

Copyright, 1929, Haldeman-Julius Co.

As a child I was brought up to hate whiskey and the saloon, and as a man I voted dry on a state referendum. And only a few years ago lecturing on the public platform on "The Law and the Profits," I defended prohibition, I advocated unconditional observance of the law, and I lived as a preacher—I remained personally dry and resolutely refused any drink of which I now think with regret.

But I can no longer be a defender of things as they now are. Visiting every corner of the land I have been compelled to see and to hear; and the facts have conquered me. It is not that I am so much concerned over the rotten booze we are drinking but that I am concerned over the rotten social conditions we are breeding. It is not bad liquor that worries me, but bad law. And beer, wine, temperance, and regulation seem to me preferable to poisoned alcohol, moonshine, Volsteadism and violation. I have come, therefore, to believe that prohibition must be scrapped and that a wiser scheme needs to be put into effect.

We should do away with prohibition, in the first place, for the paradoxical reason that we do not have it. Regardless of the Amendment and the Volstead Act, prohibition does not prohibit. This assertion no one but the fanatic would deny. And a cloud of witnesses can be called in its support. Take, for instance, the conclusion of the English observer, G. K. Chesterton, who writes, "The first thing to be said about it is that it does not exist."

Or turn to the field of jurisprudence and listen to Chief Justice Dempsey of the Municipal Court of Cleveland: "You can get a drink in any community in the United States—if you want it."

Or turn to the medical field, and find Dr. Chas. Norris, chief medical examiner of the city of New York, reporting, "My opinion, based on actual experience, of the medical examiner's staff and myself, is that there is actually no prohibition."

Or call a witness from the labor field, James O'Connell, President of the Metal Trades department of the

American Federation of Labor. He testifies, "My observation is that the Volstead Law is being flagrantly violated on every hand."

Or read the recent report of the Church Temperance Society of the Episcopal Church. Answering the question, "Is prohibition a success in your community?" 1,304 clergymen wrote, "No" as against 501 who wrote, "Yes."

Or finally refer to a newspaper, the El Paso (Tex.) Herald, once a strong supporter of the 18th Amendment. On December 3, 1927, it said editorially, "National prohibition by constitutional amendment and congressional enactment has had a thorough trial and has failed utterly."

And the facts support the testimony of these witnesses. The available evidence with reference to the extensive consumption of alcoholic beverages in this country at the present time is overwhelming. Just to mention a few unimpeachable facts:

(1) Government returns show that the export of alcoholic beverages from Canada to the United States is steadily increasing. During the year 1925 the value of shipments of alcohol cleared was \$16,056,797. In 1926 it was \$21,454,310; and 1927 it was \$23,457,230. This does not include the cargoes of smuggled liquor of which there is no record.

(2) How much pure industrial alcohol manufactured in the United States is actually diverted and made into beverages or how much denatured alcohol is re-natured, no one can say with certainty. But there are various facts that throw more or less reliable light on the subject. For instance the production of alcohol increased from 45,640,948 gallons in 1920 to 191,670,107 in 1926; and the withdrawals of denatured alcohol jumped from 22,398,824 gallons in 1921 to 105,279,246 in 1926. Congressman Henry T. Rainey, a loyal prohibitionist, estimated that 55,000,000 gallons were illegally diverted for beverage use in 1925. Others put it even higher.

(3) The wine grape production has more than doubled since 1920. There are certainly enough grapes now to make several gallons of wine for every man, woman and child in the country.

(4) The hops raised and imported in a year are sufficient to supply all the makers of cereal beverages and leave enough for home and other illegal brewing to produce 500,000,000 gallons of real beer. And though some of it is terrible, I have friends who never lose faith that eventually they will equal pre-prohibition Budweiser and Blue Ribbon.

(5) As to the moonshine produced, who can estimate the amount? Judging by the number of stills seized each year and the apparatus sold by good prohibitionists like S. S. Kresge, certainly the total for the country runs into millions of gallons. This conclusion is further justified by the fact that the amount of corn sugar now produced and consumed has increased nearly three hundred percent since 1921; and corn sugar is the favorite ingredient in the home manufacture of whiskey. One hundred pounds of the sugar yields seven gallons of moonshine. Thus the amount now produced in excess of the amount produced in 1921 and not required to satisfy increased demands of industry would be sufficient for at least two hundred million gallons of moonshine.

(6) As to cider and the many concoctions made in the homes of the land, no one can even guess the amount; but judging by personal experiences in domiciles of many acquaintances, scattered throughout the country I am led to believe that blackberries and elderberries are just about as precious today in this land of prohibition as tallow candles in an Eskimo igloo and that a dandelion has about as much chance to survive as a truffle in Germany or garlic in Italy.

In 1918 the total consumption of alcoholic beverages in the United States was a little over 1,700,000,000 gallons, making a total of actual alcohol of about 110,000,000 or a little more than one gallon per person. At present, considering only the facts already mentioned, the total must come disgracefully near that one gallon per capita. But I am not going to squabble over the actual amount now consumed illegally. Concede for the sake of the argument that it is but half of what it was before prohibition or even twenty-five percent of that amount, and obviously prohibition is not working.

However, there is no better proof in this connection than what one personally sees and hears. And there is not one person out of three who does not know absolutely that intoxicating, alcoholic beverages are now manufactured, transported, and sold on every hand contrary to the 18th Amendment and the Volstead Law.

I myself have studied the statistics for the purpose of trying to obtain accurate information. But I did not have to look at a single chart or examine a single table of figures to have it impressed upon me beyond all chance of denial or doubt that the good people of the land are dis-

regarding the law. On every hand I have seen the respectable citizens acting as if there were no 18th Amendment. How to make good home brew, the best recipes for wines, the most reliable bootleggers, the location of the nearest still, these are topics of conversation on every hand. And everywhere now it is considered necessary to entertain guests with something to drink.

In addition to the many private individuals who have offered me liquor within the last few years, I have been treated by two members of Congress, a federal judge, a judge of a state appellate court, two prosecuting attorneys, a sheriff, a United States Marshal, and several judges of lower courts of record. But the official who makes me smile most frequently is a member of Congress who virtuously talks and votes dry. Perhaps he has reformed. At any rate, I'll charitably give him the benefit of the doubt. But only a few years ago, while he was serving as district attorney in his home state, I took a drive into the country with him, one evening, and as we passed a certain spot he stopped, got out of the car, and placed some money in a hollow stump. A few hours later, when we passed that way again, he visited the stump and returned with a jug of moonshine. Great is prohibition! Greater still its defenders! And hypocrisy is a part of the price we pay for the prohibition we do not have.

The second reason for my defection from the ranks of those who defend prohibition and my present conviction that it should be done away with, is that we do not have the benefits that were promised by those who foisted the 18th Amendment upon us. We were promised a far-reaching social, political, moral, and economic reformation—saloons and drunkenness would disappear; drug addicts would be emancipated; health conditions would improve; life would be lengthened; jails would be empty; doctors, undertakers, and lawyers would be out of jobs; the divorce record would become negligible; politics would be pure as the driven snow; crime and vice would be reduced until America would be like a vast Sunday School; poverty would be unknown; workmen would be contented; everybody would be happy; and the millennium would be at hand.

But how different is the sequel! For saloons we have substituted blind pigs, dives, joints, and roadhouses. Arrests for drunkenness are on the increase in practically every city in the country. In 584 cities arrests for drunkenness in 1926 were

136 percent greater than in 1920. In 403 places for which there are records from 1914 to 1926, the arrests were greater than in any previous year except 1916. And there has been a continual increase in the number of drunken drivers of automobiles. In New Jersey Commissioner Dill revoked 1,636 drivers' licenses in 1927 as against 1,254 in the preceding year. Conditions in these respects are much worse in former dry states than in former wet states.

As to the drug menace, Capt. Richard P. Hobson recently said in a radio address, "The human race is now in the midst of a life and death struggle with the deadliest foe that has ever menaced its existence. Narcotic drug addiction has become the major factor in crime."

In 1911 this same wise sociologist delivered an address in Congress, millions of copies of which were later franked out under the title, "The Great Destroyer." In it he said: "It is conservatively estimated that 95 percent of all the acts and crimes of violence committed in civilized communities are the direct result of men being put down by alcohol toward a plane of savagery." And later when he was earning that \$171,000 that he received from the Anti-Saloon League during the eight years extending from 1914 to 1922 I heard him make the emphatic assertion that prohibition would be the miraculous wonder-worker that would usher in the golden age of virtue and do away with poverty, misery, crime and vice.

Still he has landed again on a cause that needs propagandists, for the use of narcotics is increasing under the beneficence of prohibition at an appalling rate. There are, for example, at this time 2,270 "dope" prisoners in the Federal penitentiaries as against 820 violators of the Volstead Act.

As to health conditions, there has been a steadily mounting tide of deaths from alcoholism and cirrhosis of the liver since 1920 especially in the former dry states; and the decrease in the death rate of twenty-one foreign countries has been three and one-half times that of the United States since 1919.

As to the divorce record, the facts are notorious. Despite the alleged blessings of prohibition, the rate is constantly rising. Politically there has been the same failure to realize the expected benefits from prohibition as with the promises of social improvement. It may be conceded that it was a boon to society to destroy the influence

of the saloon in politics. But unfortunately a more sinister condition prevails today; and politics is far from being the chaste business we were assured we would have after prohibition went into effect.

So far as moral conditions are concerned, the crime and vice records are as disappointing as the social and the political records. The census bureau reported some months ago that a survey of 58 prisons in 31 states showed an increase in the number of inmates of twenty-eight percent in three years. In Texas there were 30.1 prisoners for each hundred thousand population in 1923; in 1926 there were 37.2. In California there were 40.4 in 1923 and 41.5 in 1926.

The same thing is true of juvenile delinquency. Joseph C. Astredo, veteran juvenile officer of San Francisco, recently declared: "It appears that prohibition, as a cure for delinquency, has failed in its purpose. Our records show that alcoholism is still the chief factor leading to juvenile delinquency."

Nor have the economic results been any more satisfactory than the rest. True, there have been some undoubted benefits; but the wild predictions made beforehand have not at all been realized. Taxes have not been reduced—on the contrary. And certainly neither farmer nor workman will admit that he is better off economically because of Volsteadism.

I have changed my position with reference to prohibition in the third place, because we have brought upon ourselves an avalanche of new evils, and only stubborn blindness can keep one from concluding that the price is altogether too high. Socially there is the evil of general drinking to an extent unknown before prohibition. No matter into whose home one goes these days, a drink is the order of the day. People who in other days never thought of offering a visitor a drink, now consider it a necessary part of the proper spirit of hospitality. With this new order has come a new standard for the young; and the hip flask is the sign of good fellowship and sophistication. All this means, of course, that respectable folks, young and old, are making a joke of the 18th Amendment and the laws intended to make it effective; and that by their actions they are developing in their own minds and helping to develop in the minds of others a general disrespect for law as law.

But one of the worst evils resulting from prohibition and one that has been a potent influence in

turning me against prohibition is the creation of a highly organized and amply financed outlaw industry. Those who engage in the big-scale violation of the prohibition laws for profit are without the pale in the eyes of the law. Their transactions have no protection from organized society. They must, therefore, depend on such force as they themselves can muster to hold their outlawed products or to collect the price for their goods. Necessity, then, has compelled them to organize bands of armed retainers, whose might is their only means of redress.

A natural consequence of this condition is the bringing about of a partnership between the law-breaker and the law's guardian. Official corruption such as the old regime never knew has grown up under our noses. And the condition becomes worse as time goes on. Anyone who doubts the seriousness of this situation need only read the record of dismissals from the prohibition enforcement service for corruption.

From a juridical standpoint a deplorable result is the conversion of the federal courts into police courts with clogged dockets and the inevitable delay of important litigation properly falling within the jurisdiction of these courts. Nor is the least evil of prohibition the new atmosphere that has come to surround the federal courts since they have been converted into inquisitions for bootleggers, smugglers, gangsters, hijackers and such ilk. The golden dignity is gone and with it the respect and confidence that men once had for and in these tribunals.

But, cogent as has been the fact that we do not have prohibition, that we do not have the promised benefits of prohibition, that we have instead new evils, more cogent in driving me to my present position with reference to the 18th Amendment has been the conviction that we cannot have prohibition in other words, not merely does prohibition fail to prohibit, but it cannot be made to prohibit. It is not enforced because it cannot be enforced. It fails to operate because it is impossible to make it operate.

From a psychological standpoint it seems to me that no other conclusion regarding this matter is possible. Men cannot be made good by law—they cannot be made moral by fiat.

This is so, first, because man instinctively rebels against restraint. Whether one accepts the point of view and teachings of the older, in-

the Freudians, the result is the same. They all agree that one of the things with which we are born is an impulse to fight against any sort of shackle or curb. Watson refers to this impulse as rage and applies the word to the reaction manifested by even the tiniest infant if its head or limbs or body are held immovable. MacDougall implies it when he lists and describes the creative instinct, the instinct for self-expression and the instinct of self-preservation; Freud recognizes it as a part of our racial heritage, buried in the unconscious, but all-powerful to push us on to our destiny as men.

Of course, this impulse is brought under measurable control; but to whatever extent this happens, the result is brought about by a process of education, conditioning, and habit formation. Temperance, then, is altogether possible from a scientific point of view, for temperance can be developed in an individual by working with his natural mechanism of behavior. That process means cooperation with nature. Prohibition, on the other hand, is an antagonistic form of procedure. It proposes to attack nature, to break down its barriers, and to enchain the inborn impulses of the individual. It doesn't work, because it can't.

To be sure, men do observe laws that place them under restraint. But their obedience is the result of an inner constraint rather than of an outer compulsion. The only laws to which men render the obedience that makes them effectual are the laws that have a moral sanction behind them.

Events in American history have proven this contention more than once. The Alien and Sedition Laws and the Embargo Act might serve as pertinent illustrations; but the outstanding example is the Fugitive Slave Law. Under the federal constitution a man's property right in his slave was just as positively guaranteed as the manufacture of liquor is now prohibited; and it was his right to claim his property wherever he found it. To make this right effectual Congress passed an enactment that the Supreme Court upheld in the famous Dred Scott decision. Under that law it was a crime to give a run-away slave a crust of bread. But in spite of that, men and women in the North helped the slaves to escape; hid them, fed them, protected them and sped them on their way. Some of the state legislatures even went so far as to pass laws making it a crime to help enforce the constitutional provision and the federal law passed in accordance with it, thus affirmatively defying the federal government and attempting to nullify by law a provision of the federal constitution, just as binding as the 18th Amendment. Men to whom we have since erected statues participated in this proceeding openly and without shame. They believed the law to be inherently

evil and without binding force on the conscience of the citizen; and they defied it.

That is the story of all time. You cannot reform men by coercion. But there is specific historical proof that prohibition cannot be made to work. It has been tried in various forms on and off for more than eighty years in this country. Prior to 1914 when the present wave struck the country, nineteen states had adopted statewide prohibition. Of the nineteen, three retained it while the others abandoned it after an average trial of about seven years.

Our own record, then, shows that prohibition in the past has in most cases proven such a positive failure as to lead to repeal. The record of Canada and Europe shows the same results. Prohibition has been a failure wherever it has been tried. British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Russia, Turkey, Norway, Sweden—all these tried the prohibition experiment and found it wanting.

Experience corroborates what a scientific understanding of human psychology indicates, namely, that prohibition can never be made to work—that coercion of any sort as to human behavior is futile without a moral sanction.

But it is only now that I come to the real reason for my heresy in this matter of prohibition. The reasons I have discussed thus far were contributing factors, but the vital, convincing and compelling one is that we ought not to have prohibition even if we could. In other words, I have come to the inevitable conclusion that the 18th Amendment should never have been adopted—that it is wrong in principle—that, as Woodrow Wilson said, prohibition is the wrong way to do the right thing. I have been slow to reach this conviction.

Once I believed, like Hoover, that prohibition was a great social experiment. I believe now that it is a great social calamity. And I have come to this state of mind as a lawyer and because my background is that of the legal profession. I am not deeply concerned over whether or not I have a drink; but I am most earnestly concerned over whether or not I still live under law. I grant, of course, that prohibition is at present the law, but I submit that it is poor law. And that is the fundamental, overwhelming reason why I am now convinced we betrayed our trust as lawyers and American citizens when we permitted this perversion of historical, basic American principles of legal philosophy and legal science.

Let us obey for a moment one of the injunctions incorporated in the constitution of the state in which I formerly made my home. It says judges, members of the bar, and others shall occasionally recall and reexamine basic principles in order that they may guard themselves against departing therefrom.

Let us bring to our minds once again the philosophy back of the constitution—the guiding principles recognized by the founders of this nation and of its government.

Theirs was, in brief, the "natural rights" "social compact" theory of government. Its origin and growth it is unnecessary to trace. Nor is it important that in our day we know it to be a fallacy. What matters is that the constitution must be interpreted in the light of that philosophy.

The best-known expression of it is that which is contained in the Declaration of Independence, to-wit: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

However, I want to call attention to the Virginia Declaration of Rights adopted a few weeks before the Declaration of Independence. That document says: "That all men are by nature equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot by any compact deprive or divest their posterity, namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

Here is a clear statement of the view that man as an isolated individual enters into a state of society by a definite compact, and that every other individual has some rights that none but the individual himself can bargain away. "All men," it says, "—have certain inherent rights of which—they cannot by any compact deprive or divest their posterity."

We can properly understand the constitution and appraise the 18th Amendment and the Volstead Act only as we view them in the light of that political philosophy. Against that background the constitution emerges as a simple document setting up appropriate machinery of government, granting to this government certain powers, guaranteeing certain rights to the states and to the individual, and assuring for each state a republican form of government. But there was such grave doubt about the protection of the rights of the state and of the individual that the amendments known as the Bill of Rights were forthwith added. Let us refresh our minds regarding one of those, the 10th, not for the moment to study its legal but its philosophical import:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people."

We have here a positive incor-

poration into the constitution of the doctrine of natural rights—a declaration that all powers not granted to the federal government remained in the people.

Now, bearing constantly in mind this early philosophical aspect of the matter, let us examine the more strictly legal aspect of the question. For that purpose it will be well to remind ourselves of the wording of the 18th Amendment:

(1) After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

(2) The Congress and the several states shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

(3) This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several states, as provided by the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the states by the Congress.

Here is certainly something new under the sun—a grant of police power to the federal government, the incorporation in the constitution of criminal legislation, and the setting up of an anomalous concurrent jurisdiction in the enforcement of its provisions.

Regardless of the fact that the Amendment and the Volstead Act have both received the approval of the Supreme Court, I still believe that the 18th Amendment is inconsistent with the 10th, that it purports to take away from me rights that under the philosophy out of which the constitution received its first breath of life cannot be taken from me without my consent and of which, even though I consented, I could not under the plain doctrine of the fathers deprive my own posterity. And I venture the further suggestion that even now the states that did not ratify the 18th Amendment, Connecticut and Rhode Island, are not bound by it.

But, be that as it may, one thing is certain, and that is that the adoption of this amendment constituted a surrender by the states of certain of their traditional, fundamental rights and was, unless one believes in centralization in government, a revolutionary change in the relation of the states and the federal government. And I for one am convinced that Governor Ritchie, of Maryland, is justified in preaching the old doctrine of states' rights in its application to present tendencies and condition.

When we turn now to the Volstead Act we are struck first with the fact that it is itself contrary to the letter and spirit of the 18th Amendment and certainly contrary to the traditional spirit of American constitutional and criminal law.

Section 3 of the Act best illustrates this contention: "No person shall on or after the date when the 18th

Amendment to the Constitution of the United States goes into effect, manufacture, sell, barter, transport, import, export, deliver, furnish, or possess any intoxicating liquor except as authorized in this Act, and all the provisions of this Act shall be liberally construed to the end that the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage may be prevented."

Note the words, "the use of intoxicating liquor." The 18th Amendment says nothing about use. It forbids the manufacture, sale, transportation, importation and exportation of intoxicating liquors. Its advocates, of course, had in mind the prohibition of the use of alcoholic beverages, but they did not dare to express it that way in the Amendment. But when the representatives of the Anti-Saloon League prepared the Act under which we are now operating, they came out in the open and forbade possession and use.

But the most abominable feature of this section is the injunction that "all the provisions of the Act shall be liberally construed." A more vicious departure from all legal rules and precedents it is hard to imagine. Under American jurisprudence an accused person has always been given the protection of the principle that criminal legislation must be strictly construed; but the prohibition law, conceived in bigotry and born of intolerance, reverses all this—to the eternal shame, in my humble opinion, of the lawyers in Congress who, recreant to their trust, gave it their approval.

The Act is a lie, of course, in that it calls anything with an alcoholic content of over one-half of one percent intoxicating. It is contrary to the 18th Amendment when it so provides, and it operates unjustly against both makers and users of beverages containing a larger amount of alcohol but not in fact intoxicating. But for prohibition's sake truth and justice must alike be crucified.

The Act is also discriminatory. The man who owned liquor when the Act went into effect may drink it in peace. The Jew may have his sacramental wine—and, strange to say, he must be becoming holier with each year that passes, for the amount required is steadily rising. And then there are those who have homes where they can permit nature to take its course with the juice of the vine or the fruit of the tree. Nor is there a one-half-of-one-percent limit for these last. Grape juice and cider are forbidden only when they are actually intoxicating; and since the enforcement officers are not interfering with those who manufacture for home consumption only, the farmer, the orchardist, and the individual with a permanent place of abode need not go thirsty.

Another strange thing about this legislation is that it punishes not the act it is intended to prevent but the manufacture and possession of the means with which to perform that act. In other words, it is intended to do away with drink-

ing; but drinking is not punished. And drinking is to be done away with not because it is evil in itself but because excessive drinking is considered undesirable. By analogy, we should destroy all weapons to prevent murder, forbid the manufacture or possession of automobiles to prevent hold-ups, fast driving, and traffic regulations in general, and logically kill all the women—at least those who have "It"—in order to keep men from committing fornication and adultery.

However, so far as the legal aspects of the matter are concerned, I consider more serious even than the provisions of the Act itself, the manner in which and means by which it is being enforced. Before our very eyes the long cherished guarantees of the Bill of Rights are disregarded, constricted, violated, and destroyed. I am constrained to cry out against prohibition more because of our fading Bill of Rights than because of any other one thing. Illegal search and seizure, arrest without warrant, double jeopardy, denial of jury trials, excessive bail, cruel punishments, murder—all these are the order of the day.

Recently, for instance, according to the newspapers the Dean of the Yale Divinity School, was prevented from entering a dormitory with a suit case containing his laundry until he submitted to a search of the case by a prohibition officer, who was acting without a warrant but entirely on suspicion.

At Sheffield, Ala., Charlie Mitchell, a deputy sheriff, a few weeks ago fired at an automobile containing women and children—tourists passing through the state. Mitchell's defense was that he thought it was a liquor car and did not know it contained women and children.

At Raleigh, N. C., the Chief Justice of North Carolina was addressing the bar of Wake County on June 1, 1925. "The best friend you have," he said, "is the law of North Carolina. It protects you the day you are born; it surrounds you and shields you as long as you live, and it stands sentinel and guard at your tomb." A noble sentiment! And how often I have said the same thing!

But on that very day, one mile from where the Justice was speaking, a sergeant of the plain clothes department, in the presence of the Chief of Police, without warning, shot and killed S. S. Holt, a prominent member of the bar of an adjoining county on his way home from arguing a case in the United States District Court. The only justification offered by the officer was that Holt's car had stopped for a moment beside the road, and this had made him jump to the conclusion that the car was carrying liquor, though the fact was the contrary. And that is the way the law protects the individual in these days of Volsteadism and fanatical disregard of the rights of the citizen.

There is another aspect to this subject that gives me grave concern, and that is the religious. One phase

of it is as serious to my mind as the legal aspect with which it is so closely connected.

I am not referring now to the fact that the position of the prohibitionist is inconsistent with the teaching of Christ and the Church, though it is a fact that back as early as the second century there were those among the Christians who demanded that the use of wine be prohibited. They were officially condemned by the Church, and a canon was adopted that read: "If any bishop, priest, deacon, or layman abstain from wine out of abhorrence, as having forgotten that all things are very good, let him amend or else be deposed and cast out of the Church."

No, the specific thing to which I am referring is the relation between the church and the state as exemplified in this prohibition legislation. The Anti-Saloon League has always called itself with pride, "The Church in Action;" and to it does belong whatever credit or discredit must be given for the adoption of the 18th Amendment, the passage of the Volstead Act in its present form, and for the administration of the law. It has dictated terms to legislators and executive officials. It has named many of the enforcement officers. It has had members of Congress and other public officials on its pay-roll. It has determined administrative policies. It has intimidated and still does intimidate state and federal office-holders. It is the Church in Action, religion in affairs of state.

Now, many view this condition with complacency while the church in question is the Protestant Christian church. But what would be said if organized Catholicism demanded and attempted to dictate a law to the effect that no one dared to own or sell any Bible except the Douai version? Or if the Jews attempted to have Saturday made the legal Sabbath and Sunday secularized, prohibiting anyone from observing the latter as the Sabbath? Lord Bryce said somewhere that our greatest contribution to the cause of human liberty was our separation of church and state. But today we, the children of the fathers who in the light of their own experiences and the lessons of history brought about that separation, seem blind and indifferent to the sinister partnership that has been established under prohibition and to the import of the present interference of the church in the affairs of the state.

Prohibition is an abomination that has brought upon us much woe. But I sometimes wonder whether we are not having just what we deserve, whether men who permit a minority or at most a small majority to perpetrate such a crime against liberty are worthy of any other fate than that which at present is ours. Only those deserve to be free who are willing to defend their freedom.

The question is, shall we in silence submit, or shall we fight to recover that which we have lost? Shall we pay the price of prohibition or the price of freedom?

## What Is a Liberal?

E. Haldeman-Julius

Continued from page one

of our economic life—is no less urgent, no less the concern of government as expressing the collective interest, than the problem of education or sanitation or keeping the peace. It does not follow that the liberal must be a Socialist, that he must take an extreme position in favor of full collective ownership of industry, a position which is more commonly identified as radicalism (and which, even so, is not *prima facie* wrong because it is extreme); but at any rate, the liberal is bound to recognize that certain demands of collectivism are inseparable from the conditions of modern life; he observes that social interests must be protected and that in doing so old traditions are inevitably smashed here and there; he perceives clearly enough that the affairs of an enormously complex society cannot be managed on the principle of pure-and-simple individualism.

Thus we find liberals associating themselves significantly with public service movements and assailing the schemes of anti-social monopoly; they do not go so far as to demand a revolution in our economic system, yet they are by logic and their own sense of humanity compelled to assert in no small measure the very principle of collectivism upon which a revolutionary philosophy is based. Not even that unregenerate individualist, that rather indifferent yet, even so, not complete defender of private capitalism, Mr. Mencken, can utterly refuse to recognize the claims of public welfare. He may pose as a selfish Nietzschean, but we observe that he comes forward from time to time with pronouncements that are public-spirited in tone and thus, however coyly, embrace the socialistic principle: that is to say, Mencken cannot affect to deny that there are public interests which are and must be superior to private interests: as a citizen, he would not himself wish to be at the mercy of individuals and corporations and must admit that government or pub-

lic control, politically influenced though it may be in ways not ideal, is more and more a necessity of the modern age.

Here I do not intend to start an argument on economics any more than on marriage; but in one case as in the other, I am concerned solely to illustrate, generally rather than precisely, the liberal viewpoint; and I say that, just as a complete objection to divorce is illiberal, so is a stubborn, unexcepting attitude of antagonism toward collectivism—toward the principle of public interest and control—incompatible with liberalism in any real, valid sense of the term. Of course, there are few so illiberal, so bound to the old traditional dogmas of individualism in economics, as to reject utterly the idea of public control. Even the *New York Times* believes in public control to a certain extent; but the liberal does not stop where the *New York Times* stops; he goes on, let us say, with *The Nation*.

And, pertinently at this point it may be said that one characteristic which, as I see it, marks the genuine liberal is a fine regard for the broadest and most humble human interests. I have said that the liberal may not be a thoroughgoing realist; but he must be at heart a genuine humanist. The liberal must, and characteristically I am sure that every real liberal does, have a lively awareness of the various human interests that are bound up in all questions, in all the relations of life, in all the chances and changes of daily conflict and circumstance. Life, he knows, is full of compromises; it is a game, if one may so express it, of fair and even generous, "give and take"; malice, ruthlessness, the spirit of shamelessly selfish power and conquest—these are illiberal in their very nature; as no man liveth unto himself alone, so no man can consider his own interests alone but (while preserving a wise and self-realizing and just individualism) must adjust himself socially in a kindly, cooperative, liberal way. It is this strong consciousness and conviction of humanism which most certainly and most admirably distinguishes the liberal. He may be wrong on some questions; he may permit his emotions to outrun his reason; he may persuade himself, on this or that point, that a policy at bottom illiberal but apparently idealistic is the right policy; but, after all, he is guided in the

main by a very real consideration for the rights and opportunities and feelings of his fellow men.

Liberalism is, I believe, an impossible attitude for a man who is entirely without generous impulses and a sense of justice and a disposition to play fairly and honorably. Aside from any question of specific theory, a true liberal is quick on impulse to jump to the defense of any individual or group that is being harshly, unjustly treated. He (the true liberal) has a keen, spirited appreciation of human values which is not beholden to any precise code and which rises above any limitations of logic or theory: the easy-going way—the way, that is, which makes things most kindly easy for one's fellows—is the liberal way. The liberal would not wish to sacrifice his fellow men to a cold and dutiful theory; he would not forget, in gazing upon the grand and awesome assemblage and procession of power, the natural interests of even the humblest creature; he could not possibly believe that a narrow code or a narrow, crushing show of force could rightfully transcend the simplest considerations of humanity; he is a liberal because, first and last, he is a humane, not merely technically a human, being; he loves freedom, not altogether or in a narrow sense selfishly, but because, loving his fellow men and having only peaceful intentions toward all, freedom is the kindly and agreeable and expansive atmosphere which he finds most pleasant.

"Am I my brother's keeper?" is a question that not all liberals would answer alike. Some are more interested than others in the welfare of their fellow men; some—especially those who have a heavy load of morality to carry with them everywhere—may appear to be officiously interested in keeping their brethren in a straight and narrow path, although this tendency, I repeat, is illiberal and is really in contradiction what such liberal views as a man may profess; some liberals are very active in movements of social reform, others are rather more skeptical and while feeling good will toward such movements do not participate actively in their efforts. But any man who is at heart and in general attitude a liberal, even though he is not inspired by a hopeful and industrious zeal for improving the lot of his fellows, is friendly toward all movements and

suggestions that look to the broadening and brightening of life. If he has an attitude of skepticism toward, say, a utopian program, still that skepticism is not biased by any narrow or self-interested desire to maintain an unjust or imperfect condition. He has no ulterior designs that would lead him to scoff insincerely at or to obstruct such schemes for social betterment.

In other words, albeit the phrase has been much overworked—has, in fact, been used loosely and disingenuously and coupled with gospels that are unintelligent, "good will" may be emphasized as an ever-present characteristic of all who are liberal-minded. We may agree that good will is a pretty uncertain quality on which to depend when it is not backed and guided by intelligence; it may be in some respects a sentimental waste when there is no wisdom with it; yet fundamentally it is a right and important attitude, and it furnishes a certain emotional force that is invaluable to liberalism. It means, really, that liberals are disposed not simply as a matter of calm, reasoned conviction but as a matter of genuine feeling to take the humane side of any question. I wish my fellows well, therefore I believe in freedom for them; therefore I would prefer them to be prosperous and happy; therefore I favor a wide latitude in which they can pursue their various aims of labor and enjoyment; therefore I wish them to be helped, not hampered, in self-realization and self-expression.

It is social-mindedness—and this social-mindedness, quite obviously, has been a great agency of progress. Allowing for all other motives and admitting that many steps beneficial to humanity have been taken without that object clearly in view, it remains to be said that without a liberal interest or a humane interest or a progressive interest (all three being more or less synonymous) in the general welfare the major triumphs of progress would have been unthinkable. All great humanitarians and advocates of new thought and labors for social improvement have been liberals—some of them more than that, radicals and revolutionaries, yet whatever name one gives them it is clear that they were inspired by a zeal, not merely selfish but including their fellows, for liberty and knowledge and happiness.

The battles of free thought were

certainly waged by men who had a wide, liberal interest in what Heine called "releasing the imprisoned energy of the human spirit." No man who was indifferent to ideas as they affected his fellow men, who was indifferent to the social consequences of bigotry, who had no care for the benefits of enlightenment as they might be generally shared, would have set himself to combat the narrow-mindedness and the harsh intolerance of medievalism. It was the understanding that ideas are not exclusively the concern of and are not confined in their consequences to any one individual or group or official institution which gave force to the activities of the champions of free thought. True, these men individually were impatient of restrictions; they could not help demanding the fullest right to exercise their own minds and pens and tongues; they were stimulated too by the thrill of fighting in a good cause; but that they were, first and last, animated and vastly strengthened by a social-minded outlook no fair observer can deny.

Similarly, the opposition to monarchy, to all forms of despotism and unjust rule in government, was socially inspired. This does not mean that a socialistic ideal was envisaged by those pioneers of modernism. They were of course individualists, for the suggestions and the urgent demands of our complex modern society, which invalidate a good deal that was basic in the old individualism, were unknown to them. But if those fighters for progress waged their war in the name of individualism, they at any rate believed in a wide and free individualism; they were interested broadly in the welfare, in the liberation, in the enlightenment of their fellow men. In fact, the moment we touch upon any general condition—the moment we go beyond the immediate things that concern ourselves as private persons—we are thrown upon necessarily social considerations. The idea of political liberty, for example, included all who were the victims of tyranny. It could not have been a narrowly advocated idea. Social-mindedness, as it was understood a couple of centuries ago, was revealed in that early agitation.

Take more generally the interest in culture, in the development of knowledge, in the ideal that finally came to life of popular education; here we see the labors of men who

may have worked very individually, in solitude and sometimes with an apparent indifference to the mass of humanity—certainly the scholar is apt to be rather remote from the main stream of popular agitation—but nevertheless we see that this growth of culture has been cumulative and widening social in its nature. He who is seemingly the most selfish, solitary, unsocial person, laboring in any field of culture, contributes to the valuable heritage of mankind. The upshot of his labors is, too, that life is liberalized for his fellow men. Ignorance has visited great suffering upon men in the past, and insofar as wise and patient men have labored to increase the knowledge of their fellows and to present a more fairly intelligible viewpoint of life, the possibilities of happiness have increased for all.

The record of his political and private life shows that Francis Bacon was a very selfish, scheming fellow. It seems that he could and did take rather mean advantages, and that his chief interest, in practical day-by-day business, was the enrichment and advancement of Francis Bacon. That was one side of the man. But who can deny that he had a fine, and as the future was to show, an enormously useful measure of social-mindedness? It was largely due to the influence of Bacon that the idle, hair-splitting speculations of the medieval schoolmen were shown up as the nonsense they were; that the notion of knowledge (or mental activity that had really nothing to do with knowledge) as an esoteric, dignified, remote game of playing with essentially puerile though pretentiously flabbergasting ideas was discredited and came to be regarded as unworthy of the powers of really intelligent men; that the pursuit and the application of knowledge was given a useful direction, and men began to study the facts of life that they might learn how they and their fellows could better live. Of course Bacon was not a social-minded person in the political, economic, or extensively cooperative modern sense; perhaps he was not an altruist, though he gave pretty strong intimations of that attitude, probably as compensation to himself for his selfish political career; yet he must rank high among the benefactors of humanity. Orthodox scholars of his day regarded Bacon as an irreverent and dangerous radical; in a

sense he was radical; but for our present purpose we can say that he was a liberal—that is to say, he advocated the liberalization (the humanization) of knowledge.

It is, I believe, the aim of the liberal to widen the scope of human activity, interest, and enjoyment. He is impatient of narrow boundaries and restrictive codes. Beyond the fundamental necessities of social order, the liberal condemns any tendency to bind and impose dictation upon men: social-mindedness—to the true liberal—is a concern for the cooperative arrangements that will give the greatest freedom to all men. We cannot, as I have said, live entirely to ourselves; but we can agree to dwell together in a reasonable social latitude and amity, with rules that are sensible and yielding enough to include all fair possibilities of human need.

Here, indeed, we see the difference between the liberal and the bigot or dogmatist or traditionalist: the former wants rules, so to speak, that incline favorably toward freedom, that do not hamper the happy efforts of human nature, that do not bind all men, regardless of reason or temperament or various possible contingencies, to a narrow and unalterable code; whereas the latter, whether or not they consciously have such an aim, stand forth as advocates of an ungenerous repression and a limited scheme of life. There are many who stress rules, laws, duties, traditions, and the like as if these were innately sacred; they tend to forget what purpose, if any, these rules and traditions were intended to serve; they regard rules as being the end rather than the means. On the other hand, and most sensibly in contrast, the liberal never forgets that rules are simply means of making life go more smoothly and agreeably—that this, at any rate, is the sole reasonable justification of rules. It is, then, says the liberal, important that such rules shall be broad and generous enough to include all phases—all tolerable phases—of human nature; that such rules shall be capable of fairly varied application, according to circumstances; that such rules shall be as broad, as enlightened, as humanely considerate as possible. And the object of any rules or laws or traditions, as the liberal sees them, should be to facilitate a happier life for men generally. No matter how eloquently a convention or code of

morals may be defended, if its effects are to limit or embarrass the quest for happiness that code stands condemned from the liberal viewpoint—there is no moral defense fine enough to justify it—it does mischief, even positive injury, rather than good.

I think that this attitude very significantly helps to define the liberal: i. e., as one who wants men to be free and happy and who objects to harshly, dogmatically narrow rules which interfere with this freedom and happiness. It is illustrated well with regard to the question of marriage and divorce, which I have previously mentioned. It is impossible for the genuine liberal to look upon marriage as a strictly, unalterably binding arrangement between a man and a woman; he sees clearly that such a rule would defeat the end of happiness and of justice no less; it is a dogma, and not a sensible rule adapted to the needs of life. Yet the liberal does not fly to the other extreme and reject the principle of monogamy as utterly unimportant or erroneous; as an ideal, he recognizes its beauty and impressiveness—but he does not assert that every man and every woman can infallibly or at the first effort realize happily that ideal; unhappy mistakes will be made, and the liberal believes that arrangements should be made to correct those mistakes in the most convenient and amicable way. In short, the justification of any rule or law from the liberal viewpoint, is its workableness as an aid to success and happiness in human relations. Nothing is sacred or binding in itself, and the most powerful and impressive weight of tradition will not add one bit of reasonable force to an idea or custom that interferes with the easy, free, and intelligent realization of right human aims. Of course, the liberal has history on his side, for time and again customs that were considered sacrosanct in one period have been broken to make a clear way for the new demands of society. Certainly the ideas and the rules that were deemed almost inviolate by our ancestors of a generation or two back have no such unquestioned validity today; indeed, a good many of those old rules have been irretrievably smashed—and the result has plainly been a wider, freer scope of happiness for human beings. Some wit once remarked that rules were made

to be broken; and in a sense that is the liberal viewpoint; there should be discrimination and variation in rules and no rule should be so tyrannical as to be absolutely unbreakable. In a word, rules should not be carried to the extreme of slavery—they should not be exaggerated as inherently true and without exception binding—but they should be regarded simply as means, flexible and varying, toward the end of happiness for the greatest number of men and women.

Although liberalism can and should be stated in intellectual terms, it is not necessarily an intellectual attitude. As a matter of fact, some persons who are very intellectual have a stiff, repressive, illiberal sort of mind; while, on the other hand, among uneducated and unthinking people liberalism is frequently observed as a natural attitude. One may talk with quite ordinary people, who have no clear understanding of social interests, who do not reason out any convictions, who are unaware of the larger intellectual movements of the world, yet who as a matter of basic naturalness have a liberal attitude toward things. Here, for instance, is a workman who has not done much thinking and who is, in fact, a rough uneducated fellow. He has not paid attention to opposing schools of thought, nor has he reflected at all profoundly upon the problems of life. It would be perhaps stretching a point to say that he has convictions. But he has impulses that are liberal, he has a natural reaction to life that is tolerant and agreeable, and thus he illustrates a viewpoint that is not always certainly to be found (as it should be) among educated people.

This contrast, I confess, has been thrust upon me unavoidably and sometimes unexpectedly: that is to say, I once made the mistake of confusing an outward show of culture with an inward sense of free thought and liberalism—but now I know better. For I have read essays written by the most suave and ingeniously cultured men who were, as shown by their ideas, at bottom dogmatists of the most complete and fierce description. Most sedately an educated man may write in favor of some form of slavery, while his more humble uneducated fellow may express ideas of liberty. I find indeed that among workmen the

most easy, liberal ideas prevail—that my pressman, for example, has no wish to thrust his own conception of life upon others but that he is specially intent upon living his own life and (as an essential part of that scheme) letting others live their own lives. If I speak to my pressman on the question of marriage, for example, he will reply to this effect: If a man and woman do not make a "go" of it, why shouldn't they separate? If a man or a woman cannot be happy in married life—in a permanent compact with one person—why shouldn't he or she seek happiness in some other way? Ordinary men frequently have, it seems, a kind of instinctive understanding that amid the varied urges of human nature and the different constitutions of individuals life cannot be tied down with a tight set of rules, that a good deal of leeway is necessary and that, moreover, the world is not going headlong to the devil because someone chooses to act a bit unconventionally. As I say, this ordinary attitude is sometimes better than a carefully considered, cultured attitude by which, with great show of wise saws and ancient instances, an illiberal philosophy is defended. I recall a patriotic tirade by the late Brander Matthews—a very cultured but conservative man—which was as unreasonable, as unjust, as bad-spirited as one could imagine. Even educated men were led by the late war propaganda to rave about the Germans as if they were quite outside the pale of proper, normal humanity. On moral questions educated Puritans often put to shame the belief that man is a reasoning creature: expressing what is after all nothing but their own extremely prejudiced tastes, they set up what they claim is a standard which all men should respect on pain of damnation swift and sure. Professor Brown may produce a long argument pretending to show how anti-social and immoral divorce is; yet Bill Smith, thinking not at all and certainly not capable of building up much of an argument, may be far nearer the truth in his instinctively free attitude toward the subject.

Liberalism, to be sure, is an intelligent and well-reasoned philosophy of life and its propaganda is beneficial in clearing the air and setting many people on the right

track. Good reason can show how wrong and unnecessary is a restrictive policy, and the facts very impressively show the messy irrelevance and futility of such a policy. After all, liberalism is the philosophy of "live and let live," which it would seem could scarcely fail of appealing to any thoughtful person who really wants to take the reasonable view and who is not corrupted by a burden of prejudice and ill will. Even so, there is a kind of temperament that is naturally disposed toward liberalism, and that is why we find even among the uneducated men who, insofar as their awareness goes—insofar as they are called upon to express an opinion or to consider the various problems that urgently press for discussion—by the mere impulse of their nature judge fairly.

Chief among the ranks of those who oppose liberalism are, of course, the individuals and groups that have professional or economic reasons for maintaining an illiberal regime. There are the preachers, for example—we do not expect them to display a very liberal attitude, although the effect of modern progress and criticism has been to modify the pretensions of religion, so that a good many of the clerical brethren find it safer and more profitable to speak rather gently on some questions. Outside of the most unregenerate, unenlightened Fundamentalist circles, the really hopeless and inhuman religion of fifty years ago is not given very friendly consideration. That religion depended upon ignorance and, as men have learned more wisely to reflect and more freely to behave in a world of increased light and realistic interests, the old dogmas have lost their powerful influence. Still, we seldom look for and as seldom find very much liberalism in a man who is professionally engaged in telling others what they must do to be saved and what is the path of virtue they must follow or be condemned as sinners. They have to earn their living—they have to keep together their flocks by some pretense of special wisdom or righteousness—they have to set forth a certain gospel, and that gospel is most likely to have an illiberal aim. Where there is one John Haynes Holmes, who on social and moral questions is a liberal, there are a thousand preachers who, even when they are in some

And religion, again, is in its nature a foe of reason: certain dogmas are insisted upon which are identified narrowly and finally and absolutely with truth and which are said to be beyond the reach of criticism; that they are not beyond the reach of criticism is proved, of course, by the very impressive and successful activity of critics; but, even so, the mischief is done so far as a great many susceptible people are concerned—they let themselves be deluded and dogmatically bound by the claims of religion, which, even after being furnished and stretched by the lingo of "modernism," are incompatible with a happily, freely realistic attitude toward life.

One must further bear in mind that, aside from their definite commitment to a narrow, illiberal religion, preachers are numbered among those conservatives who, in a general way, have an interest in upholding things as they are—who depend a great deal upon traditions and find in the philosophy of a fixed unchanging social order a means of reliable support and assurance that they will continue to enjoy power and prestige—who, in short, fear in liberalism a threat to the familiar, established scheme of life with which their prejudices, their tastes, their training and their interests are involved. It is of course easy to see how the economic interests of many leading citizens strongly incline them toward conservatism and imbue them with an antagonism toward the liberal view on social questions; naturally such men resent any discussion that would challenge and unsettle the conditions under which they profitably engage in exploitive activities; they are alarmed when there is too much critical and zealous discussion of public welfare, of social measures, of liberalizing movements which would interfere with their operations and which emphasize the rights of the masses as against the claims of oppressive private interests. The motive of economic determinism works plainly enough and its forcefulness cannot be denied; it is, undoubtedly, illiberal in its tendency.

It is of course broader than the mere question of a certain economic loss. More largely, such men realize that, even when their particular schemes of profit are not assailed,

proposals of change and a procedure of progressive criticism are alarming in their suggestiveness. Even when it is a moral issue that is brought to the fore, even when a general policy of freedom and toleration and enlightenment is advocated, our leading citizens perceive a menace to their ramified interests of conservatism. It has always been true that those who have an extraordinarily large stake in the social order are hostile to the unsettling inquiries and demands of liberalism. Things as they are seem very suitable to them—conservatism on all questions seems to them the most favorable, safe attitude—and they naturally fear the influence of free thought no matter what direction it takes.

There are, finally, the persons who by temperament are hostile to the attitude of liberalism. They are ruled absolutely by their prejudices and they cannot bear the thought that others shall be free to pursue a different way of life. There are many persons who are just naturally born to be meddlers (so it seems) with the lives of their fellows; and who are illiberally bent upon deciding for others questions that are, after all, quite personal. Illiberalism is, at bottom, the disposition of narrowness and ill will that impels a man to interfere unfairly, officiously, mischievously with the lives of his fellow men.

And the main trait of the genuine liberal is a feeling of tolerant, civilized good will toward all men. He may lean toward idealism or toward a more skeptical realism; but in any case his guiding principle is freedom—he wants others to enjoy fully their rights and to indulge their own tastes however different they may be—he is soundly and intimately convinced that the making of harsh, narrow, all-inclusive rules is a fallacious and pernicious business altogether. Few men, as I have said, are one hundred percent liberals; on some questions they are variously led to take a narrow attitude; but true liberalism, wherever we find it, tends to broaden and make more humanly bearable and accommodating the ways of life. As in the words of Heine, the liberal is concerned with releasing, not confining, the energies and the infinite variety of the human spirit.

### In the World of Books

Weekly Reviews and Other Literary Ruminations  
Isaac Goldberg

[Copyright, 1929, Haldeman-Julius Co.]  
**LOVE—BOUND AND UNBOUND**  
Three Studies in the Grand—and Not So Grand—Passion

Our sophisticates may sing sad swan songs of love, hanging their harps then upon willow trees and departing from the waters of Babylon in quest of new values for a new life. Our novelists do not seem to hear their plangent music. For these simpler souls, love still makes the world go round, now in a simple dance, now in a merry maze, again in a dizzying ballet. Yet round and round goes love more precious—as that arch pessimist, Bertrand Russell, reminds us—than any other gift that Heaven may bestow.

Three novels arrive: "Farewell to Paradise," by the German Frank Thiess, in a fine translation by H. T. Lowe-Porter, and as finely printed by A. A. Knopf, at \$2; "Black Sun," by Aben Kandel, from Harper and Brothers, at \$2.50; "The Fiddler," by Sarah Gertrude Millin, from Horace Liveright, \$2.50. I read them at random, and yet at once they shape into a pattern. The first is an idyll of adolescence; Thiess, in all his work, is especially fascinated by the problems of love emerging from puberty. The second is a map of the platitudes by which marriage may turn radiant passion into passionless routine. The third reveals the platitudes that dwell, alas, even in the escape that men and women seek in experiences outside of wedlock. Paradise, for Thiess, is the innocence of adolescence; but we are forever bidding farewell to some paradise or other. The little German children found it during a vacation season; Kandel's Michael sought it in his unsuccessful love for Janet, his wife's best friend; the fiddler of Miss Millin's story was a fleeting glimpse of paradise for the good wife who eloped with him, deserting an excellent husband, into the wilds of Africa. Paradise is a place whence we are forever being exiled by a jealous God. Can it be that, even as Truth is not so important as the love of Truth, happiness is not so important as the constant search for it, or the constant readiness to receive it?

Thiess' children at the dawn of love are suspiciously like Kandel's and Millin's elders at the twilight. The same scrutinies, the same eternal questionings, the same jealousies, the same trepidation upon the threshold of joy. Thiess has a gift for the season of life called adolescence; he recaptures its charm, without sentimentalizing its awkwardness, its

disproportionate aches of the heart, its groping in mysterious shadows of the personality. What does he show? A boy and girl growing into their first kiss. That is almost all. Yet, out of this commonplace of childhood he distills an essence that is fragrant with tender recollection. Love once was pure and seemingly disinterested; let us remember that, he seems to say, for it will never come again. There is no hectic analysis in his tale—no seething of pent-up forces, to provide texts for Freud and Adler and Stekel. For love once was simple, too; not so simple as it appeared on the surface, yet a thing of Wedekind in Thiess—no *Erdgeist*; Thiess handles delicately the fragile souls of innocent children.

Kandel's milieu is Suburbia-on-the-Subway. Everything here is suburban—living, loving, working, eating, sleeping, drinking. Michael envies his pal Peter, who takes life as it—or, usually she—comes, and throws away the shell when he has eaten the kernel. Michael is an asker, unto whom all things are refused. He marries Louise after a most commonplace, pseudo-Bohemian intrigue. She has the regulation child; she has the regulation best friend, with whom Michael falls in love with regulation response. Michael has the regulation best pal, who takes this best friend, Janet, from him. And Peter, again following regulations, wears of the woman for whom Michael, at one time, would throw off wife and child. It is from Peter, in fact, that Michael learns the regulation lesson: stick to your wife and child, and don't hunt up trouble in the illusions of sexual freedom. Lucky boy, that Janet wouldn't listen to your pleadings.

It is the triumph of routine over rhapsody, of regimentation over abandon. Freedom, after all, of whatever kind, is not received for the asking; it is wrested from indifference or hostility. Neither is it a playground; it is a spiritual no-man's-land. Not everybody was made to be free. Those who were, are not easily frightened away by the spectacle of a Michael and his Louise. But Kandel's purpose was not to preach; rather he makes a study of a type who is strong enough to ask for freedom, yet too weak to build it out of his life. Had Janet cared for Michael, there might have been a different tale; as it is, her indifference to him, and the quiet possessiveness of Louise, sent him back from his poetic visions into the ranks of the undistinguished husbands of the nation. That is one kind of man; that is the usual kind of man, his head populated with adulteries that are as abortive as everything else he undertakes.

Miss Millin gives us the unusual type of woman: Jennie is a fine soul by nature, who would remain unsullied no matter what experiences she went through. When she leaves her husband and goes off with the weakling fiddler, Matthew, she walks into

hell with her eyes open. An inner compulsion moves her; she knows that she still loves her husband—how true this is of so many adulterous complications—yet she leaves him. She even foresees that the fiddler is not of the stature that withstands the assault of the conventions. The adventure, in fact, is from the first foredoomed. Her husband takes her back. How true is this, too, of adulterous complications. Perhaps Jennie's life would have been a different tale, had Matthew been less the whiner, less the Narcissus. Yet—who said that life was a funny proposition?—had he been a stronger man he might not have attracted her own strength. Farewell, then, to this Paradise also.

Miss Millin is deserving of special praise for her sure artistry. There is not a superfluous word in the book. A hundred little touches, so likely to be undetected by the reader who reads for the story alone, reveal her sure grasp of the material, and her certain understanding of her characters. She has a woman's reticence, without a woman's evasion. The end is in the very beginning, even as the flower is in the bud. I hardly need add that there is no moralizing. Granted that Matthew was what he was, and that Jennie was herself, the mad escapade could not have ended otherwise. It was even to be foreseen that Jennie's husband would take her back. Kandel's novel is varied with outbursts of verse—Michael is a would-be poet. The finer poetry, however, is to be found in the memories that assail him during the crises of his adventures. Can there be something wrong with marriage that to sensitive men and women it does these things? It is not for these novelists—as novelists—to say. It is for them to show what happens in special cases, given a set of characters and a set of circumstances. In all three books there is an evident sincerity that keeps the authors from striving for special effects. I think it would be a helpful experience to read them in the same order in which I read them. To the ever-recurring problems of love each brings suggestion and explanation in terms, not of sermon, but of human beings.

LITTLE BLUE BOOKS  
5¢ EACH POSTPAID TO ANY ADDRESS IN THE WORLD  
Average 64 3/4" pages, 15,000 words per-book  
MORE THAN 1300 DIFFERENT TITLES on all subjects  
Free Catalog on Request

Write to Haldeman-Julius Co., Girard, Kans., for free catalog.

### The Moving Finger Writes

Informal Comment on Developments of the Week  
Lloyd E. Smith

[Copyright, 1929, Haldeman-Julius Co.]  
**THE NEW IMMORALITY**

An unusual title is among those that bring the Little Blue Books to 1,500 different titles. It is *The New Immorality*, by Dr. Isaac Goldberg (Little Blue Book No. 1481). Dr. Goldberg subtitled it: "A Little Dictionary of Unorthodox Opinion." It is thoroughly unorthodox—and thoroughly delightful.

*The New Immorality* is a volume that liberal thinkers will enjoy for its verve and succinct expression of so many things in so few pages. They, having enjoyed it, readers will immediately feel that urge to give it to someone else to read. Indeed, they will want a dozen copies—a score or two—to give to other people to read! Any reader of *The Debunker*, for example; any reader and admirer of the works of Joseph McCabe—any freethinker, any liberal progressive, any really intelligent man or woman—could endorse a copy of Isaac Goldberg's *New Immorality* as representative (if not a complete summary) of his notions of what is right and wrong in life.

Dr. Goldberg writes in a style that makes readers return to his work again and again. His *In the World of Books*, a regular feature in this weekly, is one of the most popular departments that any H.-J. periodical has ever printed. His book reviews are dependably honest and soundly evaluated. A splendid collection of his reviews and ruminations on related subjects is available in *Panorama: A Book of Critical, Sexual, and Esthetic Views* (Big Blue Book No. B-34; if ordered with 9 other Big Blue Books—\$1 worth—10¢; one copy, 25¢ postpaid).

*The New Immorality* is Dr. Goldberg's 24th Little Blue Book. His others are quite varied in subject matter, but all will be found worthy of his enviable reputation. Readers who like Dr. Goldberg's writings may find the following checklist of his Little Blue Books useful:

- 213 Havelock Ellis and His Plea for Sane Sex Living
- 470 Jazz Music: What It Is and How to Enjoy It
- 476 A Guidebook to Gilbert and Sullivan Operettas
- 507 An Introduction to the Music of Wagner
- 519 How to Enjoy the Humor of Rabelais
- 530 Camoens: Portuguese Soldier-Lover-Poet
- 611 H. L. Mencken: Anti-Christ and Free Spirit
- 646 The Spirit of Brazilian Literature

- 732 The Spirit of Yiddish Literature
- 859 How to Enjoy Good Music
- 897 How to Enjoy Reading Good Books
- 984 Harmony (Music) Self Taught
- 1005 How to Enjoy Orchestra Music
- 1021 Italian Self Taught
- 1358 How to Acquire Good Taste
- 1379 President Harding's Illegitimate Daughter

The books listed above are all written by Dr. Goldberg—especially for the Little Blue Books. Five books he has edited, with characteristic acumen and originality: 444 Smart Epigrams of Remy de Gourmont; 489 Great Yiddish Short Stories; 733 Great Brazilian Short Stories; 803 Great Costa Rican Tales.

As a translator Dr. Goldberg has won not a little fame, particularly in the field of South American literature, on which he is a recognized authority. Anthologies of the world's best stories include translations by Isaac Goldberg—especially the recent *Great Short Stories of the World* (\$5.25 postpaid), with a large section of South American stories, which was prepared under the direction of Dr. Goldberg. In the Little Blue Books Dr. Goldberg has done an especially fine service for readers in presenting them with excellent English versions of Remy de Gourmont, a too little known and too little appreciated French writer: 540 Love Stories of Many Hues. Remy de Gourmont

541 Brightly Colored Tales of Passion. Remy de Gourmont. 582 Philosophic Nights in Paris. Remy de Gourmont. Several clothbound books have appeared from the pen—or, if I remember rightly, the typewriter, on which he composes directly—of Isaac Goldberg. Chief among those still in print and available are: *The Man Mencken*, a critical biography with some of Mencken's early poetry! (\$4.25 postpaid); *The Theater of George Jean Nathan* (\$3.15 postpaid); *Havelock Ellis*, his life and work (\$4.15 postpaid); *The "Complot" Gilbert and Sullivan*, undoubtedly the finest critical appreciation ever published of the creators of *The Mikado*, *The Pirates of Penzance*, etc. (\$6.25 postpaid).

**WHO'S WHO**  
The mind seldom does run along the same channels in small things. People have many different ideas about the Little Blue Books. Some think of them as the Pocket Series; some as the University in Print; some as the Five-Cent Books. Even the authors of the Little Blue Books have no consistency in their thoughts of them. I know this because *Who's Who in America*, in which many Little Blue Book writers are listed. These writers mention their Little Blue Book activities in as many different ways as there are writers. It is interesting to compare their statements, viz.— William J. Fielding lists the titles, except for his volumes on sexual hygiene, which he lumps under

"Rational Sex Series, 13 vols." He does not say that they are Little Blue Books. Charles J. Finger merely adds to his list of clothbound works this ambiguous phrase, "also numerous brochures."

Isaac Goldberg mentions his two Big Blue Books by name, without naming the series, but is more specific with his smaller volumes, thus: "Also numerous monographs in the Haldeman-Julius Blue Book Series."

Clement Wood lists *The Stone Age* (Little Blue Book No. 481) and *Slang Dictionary* (Little Blue Book No. 56) by name only, and adds: "Also more than fifty books in the Haldeman-Julius 'Little Blue Books,' on literary and scientific themes."

Maynard Shipley states: "Also 23 'Little Blue Books' on physics, astronomy and other scientific subjects."

Hereward Carrington lists 12 Little Blue Book titles by name only, and adds "etc."

Nelson Antrim Crawford mentions

### To My Friends and Readers of The American Freeman:

There will appear on the back pages, a series of large advertisements of the Mayflower Mines Corporation, Park City, Utah. I have secured these advertisements for this publication, in order that you might be given an opportunity to invest in what I believe will prove to be one of the best and greatest mining propositions of recent years. I made it my business to go to Park City, Utah, last June and investigate the properties of the Mayflower Mines Corporation. I made a thorough investigation. I was so well pleased with the outlook, that I contracted with Mr. Chas. Moore, President of The Mayflower Mines Corporation for 5,000 or more shares of stock at the very same price that he is offering it for—to the readers of The American Freeman. It may be six months or a year or a little longer before these properties are developed sufficiently to begin the payment of dividends. However, I personally believe that splendid dividends are bound to be paid and paid for many, many years when once begun.

If you have a small amount of money to invest, I trust that you will take advantage of this opportunity and order a hundred or more shares of The Mayflower Mines Corporation stock. They do not sell less than one hundred shares, so please bear this in mind when ordering stock. Please turn to the back cover of this issue and read thoroughly and intelligently the ad appearing thereon. I am sure after reading this ad, you will be so favorably impressed that you will request Mr. Moore to send you such information as he has regarding these opportunities. It is my honest opinion that these properties offer one of the greatest opportunities of recent years to make money, if you will bear with the management until the properties are thoroughly developed. Very truly yours, C. F. Waddell, Advertising Manager.

two of his Little Blue Book anthologies of poetry: *Today's Poetry* (Little Blue Book No. 298) and *Great Christian Hymns* (Little Blue Book No. 743), and adds vaguely, "Also many volumes of British and American poets."

Raymond S. Spears names *Camping, Woodcraft and Wildcraft* (Little Blue Book No. 749) and *Helpful Hints for Hikers* (Little Blue Book No. 750).

Esmond R. Long names his *Tuberculosis, Its Cause and Prevention* (Little Blue Book No. 870).

E. W. Howe names *Success Easier Than Failure* (Little Blue Book No. 1208), *Notes for My Biographer* (Little Blue Book No. 991), *Preaching from the Audience* (Little Blue Book No. 993); *Dying Like a Gentleman* (Little Blue Book No. 1083), and *The Wagon and the West* (Little Blue Book No. 378).

B. Russell Herts names his *Practical Hints on Interior Decoration* (Little Blue Book No. 685).

Gloria Goddard (wife of Clement Wood) states: "Also 8 volumes Little Blue Book series."

James Oppenheim ignores his Little Blue Books completely, though they were written especially for the series.

Many Little Blue Book authors are in *Who's Who* whose works have been added to the series after appearing elsewhere. These include Clarence Darrow, Upton Sinclair, Stephen Leacock, Fannie Hurst, Wilbur Daniel Steele, Ben Hecht, Sherwood Anderson, Theodore Dreiser, Konrad Bercovici, John Cowper Powys, Llewellyn Powys, George Sylvester Viereck, Frank Harris, Alexander Harvey (whose Greek translations, however, were made especially for the Little Blue Books), Manuel Komroff, etc.

Writers in *Who's Who* who have written Little Blue Books, but do not mention them among their works, include Henry C. Vedder, Dr. Morris Fishbein, Anna Louise Strong, Julius Moritzen, Walter White, Dr. Joseph Colt Bloodgood, Dr. William Allen Pusey, Wilfrid Lay, Rupert Hughes, Arthur Garfield Hays, Dr. Clifford G. Grulee, Will Durant, Dr. Arthur J. Cramp, etc.

Joseph McCabe, Bertrand Russell, and H. G. Wells, to mention but three foreign writers, are Englishmen, and so do not appear in *Who's Who in America*. There are many Little Blue Book writers who are not listed in *Who's Who*, though I think they deserve to be. These include Miriam Allen deFord, Leo Markun, T. Swann Harding, Clay Fuks, L. M. Birkhead, Harry Hirschman, Carroll Lane Fenton, Vance Randolph, Keene Wallis, Murray Sheehan, and others. Writers who have recently contributed to the series, who are in *Who's Who*, but who haven't had an opportunity to list their Little Blue Books (*Who's Who* is published only every two years), include Harry Elmer Barnes and W. E. B. Du Bois.

PAY UP AND RENEW NOW IF YOU WANT THE AMERICAN FREEMAN

The American Freeman, Girard, Kansas

I am bringing my account for the Haldeman-Julius Weekly up to date and enclosing another \$1 for a subscription to The American Freeman for a year. My total remittance is, checked below:

Weeks of the Weekly at 2c each \$
One year's subscription to the American Freeman \$ 1.00
Total \$

Name
Address
City State

The First Hundred Million

STARTLING facts about selling 100,000,000 books in ten years! If you want to learn how and what to write for publication; if you are curious about the present reading tastes of the book-buying public; if you have ever wondered how a great publishing plant prints and binds books by the million; if you would like to know exactly what goes on when an editor deals with authors; if the secrets of advertising and salesmanship, applied to books by millions, are worth learning; in short, if you want to know how books are written, what makes books popular, how advertising is prepared, etc., HERE IS THE BOOK YOU NEED: "The First Hundred Million," by E. Haldeman-Julius.

E. Haldeman-Julius, editor and publisher of the world famous Little Blue Books, takes you into his confidence. He conceals nothing that he has learned in almost ten years of publishing the pocket classics. He tells of outstanding successes, with sales figures. He laments, with the exact facts, his unhappy failures. The information in this book cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to acquire. A famous editor and his requirements—his relations with writers—his selling secrets. The "writing game" from start to finish, told by a veteran editor, a successful publisher, a daring advertiser, and a persuasive salesman—and also an insight into the tastes of the American reading public of today!

The True Story of the Little Blue Books!

Chapter Titles: What America wants to read; Are Americans afraid of sex? The quest for self-improvement; Americans want fun and laughter; Religion vs. freethought; Side-lights on reading tastes; Rejuvenating the Classics; The hospital; What a change of scenery will do; The morgue; An editor and his writers; How the Little Blue Books are produced; Following a new title from copy to customer; Business man or philanthropist; An editor turns to advertising; A comparison of advertising mediums; The passing of the "sales policy."

Read the enthralling story of how people's reading tastes are tasted, analyzed, and satisfied. Find out what America wants to read! Be astounded—be fascinated—be convinced. Learn, incidentally, what books YOU have shown that YOU want most to read! For this book takes you behind the scenes in publishing, and shows you one of the most interesting psychological laboratories in the world in its innermost workings.

NOW ONLY \$1.98
Reduced from \$3! "The First Hundred Million," by E. Haldeman-Julius, bound in dark blue cloth with gilt lettering; jacket in red and black; 17 chapters, 340 pages; introduction by Robert L. Simon—now only \$1.98 postpaid!

to advertising; A comparison of advertising mediums; The passing of the "sales policy."

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

"THE BIG AMERICAN PARADE" By E. Haldeman-Julius

A NEW BOOK BY THE AUTHOR OF "THE OUTLINE OF BUNK"

An incisive, serious review of the pageant of American life as it passes by before the eye of the thinker. The pomposities and smugness of "stand-pattism" are dissected and shown forth in all their grossness, and the dusty remnants of outworn traditions are swept into oblivion by the Logic and Rationalism of new standards. Read some of the challenging chapter topics below:

Some of the Challenging Chapters

- The Variety and Conflict of Social Forces Out of Which America Grew.
The Truth of the Charge of "Materialism" Is Something Upon Which America Is Ready to Accept Congratulations.
The "Sense of Sin" Is Not So Conspicuous Nor Common Today As It Was a Few Decades Ago.
Shattering the Old, Traditional and Sacred Has Brought a Liberalization of Our Attitude Toward Life.
The Modern American Workingman Has a Sense of Dignity and a Certain Relative Advantage Over His "Betters."
The Melting Pot Has Not Brought That Intelligent Exchange of Culture Which Some Idealists Hoped For.
Reformism As Practiced and Preached in America Is a Dogma, an Insult, and an Oppression.
Journalism in America Is a Standardized Machine and a Popular Show.
We All Talk Endlessly About "Americanism," But Who Knows What It Means?
The New American Summed Up and Compared With the Old.

\$2.85 "The Big American Parade," by E. Haldeman-Julius, a handsomely printed clothbound book, crammed with unusually stimulating reading, priced specially to H.-J. readers at \$2.85 postpaid.

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS

JOSEPH McCABE'S

"Story of Religious Controversy"

CLOTHBOUND 375,000 WORDS IN ONE VOLUME

Man has struggled for centuries to penetrate the "veil," to solve the riddle of life. This struggle has been called—in its various "successes"—Religion. In this book, Joseph McCabe, eminent scholar, tells the story of religion from the first tribal tabus to the present day. For the first time the complete history of religion, based on

authentic documents, has been told truthfully. McCabe has fearlessly written a story no one else has dared to tell!

THE THIRTY-TWO CHAPTERS

- Introduction, by E. Haldeman-Julius
The Revolt Against Religion
The Origin of Religion
A Few of the World's Great Religions
The Myth of Immortality
The Futility of Belief in God
The Human Origin of Morals
The Forgery of the Old Testament
Religion and Morals in Ancient Babylonia
Religion and Morals in Ancient Egypt
Life and Morals in Greece and Rome
Phallic (Sex) Elements in Religion
Did Jesus Ever Live?
The Sources of Christian Morality
Pagan Christs Before Jesus
Legends of Saints and Martyrs
How Christianity Triumphed
The Evolution of Christian Doctrine
The Degradation of Woman
Christianity and Slavery
The Church and the School
The Dark Ages
New Light on Witchcraft
The Horrors of the Inquisition
Medieval Art and the Church
The Moorish Civilization in Spain
The Renaissance: A European Awakening
The Reformation and Protestant Reaction
The Truth about Galileo and Medieval Science
The Jesuits: Religious Rogues
The Conflict Between Science and Religion
Do We Need Religion?
The Triumph of Materialism

A BOOK UNIQUE AMONG BOOKS

There is no other book like this; there has never been a book at all like this. The author, Joseph McCabe, was for twelve years a recluse in a monastery. There he caught the first glimmerings of the thesis he presents in this amazing, startling work. Without fear he has sought out the facts and has put them down in cold black and white. To read this book will be a revelation and an education such as you have never experienced before. The price is only \$4.85—special to Haldeman-Julius readers.

Only \$4.85 Postpaid

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, Girard, Kansas

Traffic in Women and Children

Extract from League of Nations Report (1927)
"The facts . . . show that the international traffic in women is still an ugly reality and that it continues to defy the efforts made to suppress it. . . . An exact knowledge of the facts, active supervision and the application of suitable laws and measures of protection, are all necessary elements in the campaign against the traffic. . . . The traffic [is] of an international character. . . if a neighboring country fails to exercise the same supervision, traffickers then immediately transfer to that country the scene of their operations in connection with the despatch and reception of women."

"The Story of a Terrible Life"

The Amazing Career of a Notorious Procuree
UNBELIEVABLE! Such a word might be flung against this book if it were not readily demonstrable that conditions such as it depicts really do exist. Basil Tozer, the author, has in the course of his wanderings come upon a woman who was one of the most notorious procureesses of Europe. A clever and experienced newspaper interviewer, he succeeded in worming out of her, bit by bit, the whole story of her atrocious career, and in this book he sets down all that she told him. She revealed the methods which are still employed to entice away girls and young women without chance of their ever afterwards being traced; the secrets and secret organizations of the modern maisons de tolerance in different parts of the world; the wiles to which male and female blackmailers and others have recourse, and much else that is of absorbing interest concerning the social evil known as the "white slave traffic." This book, while extremely outspoken, is in no way pornographic. On the contrary, it will be instrumental in setting on their guard all those who read it. This story of an actual "Madame" will intrigue and horrify you from its first sentence: "A woman of atrocious life has lately died in France."

A SNATCH OR TWO FROM THE OPENING PAGES
Nowhere was there sign of human by a curious-looking woman who habitation, and they seemed to be cast a sidelong glance at Messaline.

A SNATCH OR TWO FROM THE OPENING PAGES
Nowhere was there sign of human by a curious-looking woman who habitation, and they seemed to be cast a sidelong glance at Messaline.

The distance to the castle must have been 14 or 18 miles, judging by the time they took to get there; and by the time they arrived, after their long drive through dense forest, darkness had set in. Then, in the light of the rising moon, Messaline beheld for the first time the tall, forbidding gray walls of the centuries old pile standing out in blurred relief.
The great oak door was opened

"The Story of a Terrible Life," by Basil Tozer; bound in red cloth, with green title-lettering in mounted panels on front and back; 242 pages, 22 chapters; \$2.65 postpaid.

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

AGNOSTIC'S ANTHOLOGY Clarence Darrow INFIDELS AND HERETICS

Clarence Darrow, eminent lawyer and freethinker, has collaborated with Wallace Rice, in the compilation of this unique Agnostic's Anthology. This book is a beautifully printed "scrapbook" of paragraphs, poems, and brief essays which favor the agnostic point of view with regard to matters theological and spiritual. It is a glorious treasure-house of liberal, forward-looking, iconoclastic writing. Every freethinker and everyone with liberal leanings will be delighted with this splendid collection of literary gems. Read the contents below; note some of the famous authors represented. And remember that this selection has been made with the combined expert judgment of Clarence Darrow and Wallace Rice!

CONTENTS

The selections in this fine book are divided into fifteen classifications, as follows: (1) Foundation Stones; (2) Depths of Thought; (3) Honest Doubt; (4) Gods and Demigods; (5) The Wise of Old; (6) Priests and Dogmas; (7) Morals; (8) Men and Women; (9) Our Humbled Brethren; (10) Our Father, Time; (11) Death and Love; (12) In Time to Come; (14) Beyond This Life; (15) The Sun of Life.

AUTHORS

Scores of famous authors are represented in this compilation; some of those whose words are included are: Keats, Robert Burns, Huxley, Darwin, Spencer, Dewey, Santayana, Ingersoll, James Harvey Robinson, Nietzsche, Albert Bigelow Paine, Mark Twain, Darrow, Emerson, A. E. Housman, Matthew Arnold, Thos. Hardy, James Fraser, Schopenhauer, George Moore, Georg Brandes, Harry Elmer Barnes, Havelock Ellis, John Cowper Powys, etc.

"A Golden Book for Freethinkers" "Infidels and Heretics," by Clarence Darrow and Wallace Rice, handsomely bound in fine blue cloth, printed on heavy eggshell paper, 303 pages, 15 classifications of selections, striking jacket in blue and black on goldenrod, price \$2.98 per copy postpaid.

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas
I enclose \$2.98 for one copy of "Infidels and Heretics," by Clarence Darrow and Wallace Rice.

Name
Address
City State

LOOKING BACKWARDS

More than forty years ago, I was a boy, working hard, ten to twelve hours a day for two dollars a week. In those "good old days," jobs were few and far between. Men like Ford and Edison and hundreds of others had not then revolutionized the world.

In those days, carpenters, brickmasons, mechanics and people with good trades got two dollars to three dollars a day when they could get work, but work and jobs were mighty, mighty scarce. Salaried people got \$50.00 to \$100.00 a month, and I knew a bank president who got the great salary of eighteen hundred dollars a year, but a lot of the bank directors said it was too much for any one man to be paid, for any kind of work.

Well, in those "good old days," I was working hard, long hours, and getting what was considered big pay for a fifteen-year-old boy. I had great ambitions. I wanted to earn money and buy books and get an education; and I had another great ambition; I wanted to own a watch.

By working hard and faithfully, and by saving my money, I soon had many books, and best of all, as I thought, I had fifteen dollars in the bank. Here was my chance to get a watch.

Finally, I saw a watch advertised in a prominent magazine, and this was just what I wanted. It was represented to be a splendid watch with a case covered with a plate of gold, guaranteed to stand hard usage for fifteen or twenty years.

I sent and got this watch, and it was not worth as much as ten cents.

Up to that time, I had never made up my mind whether I would be a teacher, or a lawyer or a banker or a doctor or a business man or a farmer or an engineer or a mechanic. Right then I made up my mind what my life's work should be. I made up my mind right then that I would devote my life to trying to keep people from being "suckers" as I had been.

LOOKING FORWARDS

No doubt you have often glanced over my advertisements in the American Freeman, and no doubt you have often wondered why I should spend precious time and money, talking to you, when I could probably be doing something else to better advantage, according to your ideas, and accomplishing my purpose to better advantage in some other way, according to your ideas.

No doubt you have often said to yourself, "if this man has a remarkable good proposition—if he has such a wonderful layout, why bother to tell about it? Why does he not put this proposition up to his friends and acquaintances nearer home?"

Well, when I get hold of a remarkably good proposition, every few years (and they are mighty, mighty hard to find) I put about one hundred thousand dollars of my own money into it. Then I write to all my friends and acquaintances, or send them a circular letter and invite them to join me to the extent of their ability and I always limit them to just a few hundred dollars each. This generally brings in another hundred thousand or two hundred thousand dollars. Then the remainder, say another two hundred or three hundred thousand dollars, is raised by advertisements such as you have seen for the past few weeks in the American Freeman.

Every man has his own way of doing things and every man must live his own life and try to leave the world a little richer and a little better when he passes on—that is, supposing that he is A REAL MAN. I have never asked any man in personal conversation, in all my life to join me in helping to finance anything. My plans are exactly as given above and they have always worked.

Some times it requires a year, and sometimes it requires less time to raise five hundred thousand or six hundred thousand dollars in the manner indicated above but I have

and they have always worked.
Some times it requires a year, and sometimes it requires less time to raise five hundred thousand or six hundred thousand dollars in the manner indicated above, but I have never failed yet. I don't promise to make people rich quick, and I have no use for those who do. My own money and my friends' money is enough to carry on for sixth months or a year, and within six months or a year, the balance is raised by means of those advertisements.

THE SUCCESS HABIT

In all these years, I have never made a failure of anything, and I have never made some fool rich overnight. I only want those to join me who have some brains and who know that great and lasting success is not attained overnight.

If you are a plain, honest, sensible man, you want to be sure of three things before putting your money into any new enterprise that holds out the promise of big profits in a reasonably short time: First, you must be convinced that the management is absolutely honest; Second, you must be convinced that the management is thoroughly competent; Third, you have no money to lose or fool away, and you want to know if the proposition itself is sound and if it possesses remarkable possibilities.

INVESTIGATE—NOW

Now is the time to drop me a line and get all the facts and figures and complete data, and instructions as to how to investigate thoroughly.

THE BEST PLAN

The best plain is to come out and investigate thoroughly in person. Not one person has ever come out and investigated in person and failed to invest a few hundred dollars. This is the best recommendation I ever heard of. We have never asked any one in personal conversation to invest while he was here investigating. We want people to investigate calmly and carefully without being bothered by us, trying to persuade them to invest.

ACT NOW

Now is the time to act, because this proposition will not be before you much longer. Do it now. Don't wait until a more convenient season: Your great opportunity is before you now.

The Mayflower Mines Corporation, Park City, Utah.

MR. CHAS. MOORE, President, Mayflower Mines Corporation, 246 Main St., Park City, Utah.

Dear Sir—

I have just read your advertisement in The American Freeman, and I am curious to know what you have to say. I have some money to invest or speculate with, occasionally, in a real A-number-one proposition. Of course, I want to "be shown," but I have an open mind and I think I am fair-minded. It is understood that you have no mailing lists, and that you are only to write to me or send me your booklets, at any time, upon request from me.

Name
Address
City State