

Editor
E. Haldeman-Julius
Published weekly at 229 E. Forest Ave., Girard, Kans. Single copies 5c; by the year \$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
Debunking the Old Red Schoolhouse
By E. Haldeman-Julius

NUMBER 1775

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS

DECEMBER 7, 1929

This Paper's New Policy Will Be a Livelier Use of Its Old Policy

Beginning with this issue The American Freeman will have more liveliness and variety. Its appearance will be striking and its contents will include all the interesting subjects of the day as well as of the ages—news comment and intelligent discussions—attractive departments, thoughtful articles, short editorials, and snappy paragraphs. My plan is to make this the most easily readable, as well as the most important, paper in the United States. There will be few articles of great length, although from time to time there will be specially featured articles of more than editorial length.

Idea of a broad, general, timeless nature—the wisdom and the fine humanitarian principles that have an impressive background in the history of culture—will still be reflected clearly and inspiringly in these pages. The best thought will go into the editing of every issue of The American Freeman. At the same time, there will be a steady and keen-searching review of the major events, issues, and day-to-day discussions of the world in which we live.

The American Freeman is of course more than merely a newspaper; it is, first and last, a journal of liberal and progressive opinion; its purpose is to make men think and to scan the world of culture as well as the world of action; but it will not fail, while keeping in view its sound policy of intellectual enlightenment, to be a newsy, interesting, timely, entertaining, even a gossip publication. If at times the reader doesn't feel like tackling a long article, there will be an abundance of shorter material which he can quickly read.

And let me assure you that every line in The American Freeman, whether in a two- or three-column article or report (for we shall have reports of a news character) or a brief editorial or a paragraph will be important and well worth reading. Each week you will

find not only items of thought but items of news in The American Freeman which you cannot find in any other publication.

With respect to policy, I believe I am quite truthful and not moved by a spirit of boasting when I say that The American Freeman is the freest journal which is published in the United States. (The Debunker, with the same policy of freedom, is different in form and in its way covers other ground.) It is afraid of no idea, no organization, no individual. It has no fetters. It has no so-called obligations, no predilections or prejudices, which would prevent it from speaking candidly and with direct, full force upon any subject. Neither politically nor religiously nor morally nor socially nor racially nor nationally is The American Freeman withheld from truthful utterance by any predetermination of self-interest or emotional favor.

There are other journals which are, on the whole, liberal but which are rather timid in dealing with moral questions, fearing to offend the puritanical feelings of their readers—or, to place a more charitable construction upon their attitude, sincerely reflect the puritanism which is to a degree the conviction of their editors. In contrast, The American Freeman approaches all questions of sex and morality from the same dispassionate, rationalistic standpoint as any other question. Some journals of liberalism, very admirable and useful in their way, are very polite and even friendly toward religion; these journals do not take a clear, uncompromising stand on this major issue. Saliently in contrast, The American Freeman handles religion without gloves in the manner of barehanded truth.

In short, my policy is to make of The American Freeman the one journal in America (including The Debunker) which is absolutely free from bank of any style

or degree; and it is easy, after all, for me to follow a policy which is to me so natural; and a policy too which, I am proud to say, is so intelligently favored by my readers. For even when a reader disagrees with something expressed in these columns, he states his disagreement as a ground for honest, fair, mutual discussion and not as a cause for bitter, intolerant hostility. We shall have some hot discussions, some merry discussions, some far-reaching discussions in the new department appearing in this issue under the heading "Around the Table." They will be conducted, however, with good nature and with advantage to all of us in thought-stimulation.

The familiar departments by Isaac Goldberg and John Langdon-Davies will continue. "In the World of Books" reflects literature both old and new as viewed by a first-rate critic. There are no better book reviews printed anywhere; and most literary criticism, you may believe me, is far below the Goldberg standard. Concerning the department entitled "A Window on Europe," what more need be said than that it is written by a celebrated Oxford scholar and scientific observer of life-with-culture who, like Joseph McCabe, has the talent to write simply and entertainingly? Mr. Langdon-Davies is one of the best of the younger men who are interpreting the modern world. There is, to be sure, a special and piquant interest in reading the views of a cultured Englishman on the affairs of Europe; through "A Window on Europe" we are afforded a wider, cosmopolitan outlook.

A fighting policy, aimed at contemporary movements that threaten our liberties, telling the full and emphasized truth (which, you know, the daily newspapers often neglect to tell) about current events that deal with questions of free speech, free thought, and the free pursuit of happiness—such an aggressive, con-

stantly watchful, up-to-the-minute policy will characterize The American Freeman. Here is a paper in which you can keep informed, better than through any other medium, of the things which are of the very first importance to the free-minded—and, for their fellows, freedom-wishing—persons who comprise what I have often been pleased very sincerely to call "the Haldeman-Julius family."

And, by the way, it is peculiarly in The American Freeman that we shall have this feeling of being such an intimate group associated with watching and effort in a common cause. Here we shall have the close intercommunicativeness implied by the "family" identification—not so apt a word, perhaps, as few families, aside from the bonds of nature and household affection that unite them, have the inspiration of a common purpose which is felt, I am sure, by all of my readers as I feel it myself with regard to my readers. Naturally, this sense of speaking closeness will be stimulated delightfully by our exchange of talk on anything and everything in the department "Around the Table." That department, I assure you, will be as friendly and chatty and many-sided as I, with necessarily the help of my readers, can make it.

I want The American Freeman to be the most particular and personal paper—at once the broadest and freest in scope and the most directly meaningful to you—that comes to your fireside. I have great ambitions for it. And I want all of you to have great expectations and, in the ways I have indicated, to cooperate with me in realizing those expectations. Together, we cannot fail to achieve the very best.

E. Haldeman-Julius

Rush Madly to Priest's Grave

Reading of the streams of pitifully deluded folks who rushed to the grave of a sixty-year-dead priest in Malden, Mass., in quest of miraculous signs, benedictions and cures, one's first thought is that here is a concentrated movie spectacle of the Middle Ages. It is all so unreal, this outburst of the grossest and— to use words carefully—the most revolting superstition. Is this the Twentieth Century which has shed and is more fully shedding its scientific light upon the nations?

The very unusualness of such a mad rush of medievalism in the modern age is what makes it striking. After all, even where narrow traditions and false beliefs still linger, even though humanity has not yet reached the full stature of freedom and truth, our age is predominantly one of realism. By far the great majority who read of the Malden insanity—one can call it by no other name—will read with disbelief. Psychologically the whole thing is an anachronism. It does not fit in with the general, with the deciding, temper and interests of the age. It is in its way a startling, though not necessarily an alarming, reminder of the past.

Malden takes us back in grotesquely embodied retrospect a half dozen or more centuries. It is a breath from the tombs of history in which are laid away the obscenities and the cruelties and the absurdities of the Middle Ages: absurdities raised to the highest power of overwhelming mass credulity. There is a difference. In the Middle Ages there were not as a rule such intensified dramatizations of mad and withal pathetically hopeful faith. The attitude and the atmosphere of superstition were familiar, continuous; insinuated closely into the daily life of the people. Catholic dogma and Catholic faith were supreme in power and, in spite of heresies, impressed themselves successfully upon the illiterate masses of the people. The notion of saints and devils, of miraculous places and persons and rites, was a commonplace of those dark centuries. Men generally knew only the crudest little, in the spirit of an animal-like accustomedness to the earth, of nature and her ways, scientifically speaking. Of critical knowledge there was little or none in active circulation, certainly not in common circulation, and men had no contacts that would throw doubt upon their ideas nor reports, carefully made, that would analyze the credibility of many remarkable tales. One might say not excessively that before science, and general education, and modern culture were well established in the world men would believe almost anything. And the stranger the tale, one might add, the reader the belief.

Our age is not perfect, and there are traces of medievalism or modified medievalism which a clear mind can at once detect; but certainly this gross, downright, uncritical superstition is not common—is, rather, an egregious exception—in the modern

world. Theoretically men still believe much that is indefensible; and in some ways life is still badly confused by falsehood (sincere enough and unrecognized as such on the whole) and narrowness. We have made a splendid beginning of progress in the fully conceived modern sense, but we are far from the culmination of it. Even so, our world, while it is yet foolish and intolerant and slow to learn in many things, is not crazy as was the medieval world, and to characterize it in another way, it is not sunk in wretched, hopeless stupidity as was the medieval world.

So Malden is an exception. It stands out and is exploited in the news, for one chief reason, because it is such an astonishing, freakish, unexpected thing. From time to time we read of these special eruptions of wild folly, these cults, these odd spectacles—not really dramatic but having an air of theatricality, even in the closest view—of human error.

There are some features of the Malden furore of faith that deserve to be particularly noticed. One thing, of course, which is no more than we should have expected in the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church. The Church let this frenzy go on for days with its tacit approval. No doubt it thought to profit by this publicity—but whether that was good policy or not remains to be seen. At last, after the so-called "shrine," the alleged magic-working grave of a long-dead young priest of absolutely no special importance while living (although this, to be sure, would not matter as to the miracle question), had been widely advertised, the spot was barred to further visitors. We shall look with not a little interest to see whether or to what a degree the Church officially sanctions the view that this unimportant mound of earth has supernaturally, sacredly efficacious qualities of magic.

One cannot forbear at the same time a rebuke to the newspapers of the country, which published with a distinct friendliness and an air of reverence and complaisance, if not downright approval of the whole pitiable amazing farce, stories of the thousands who pilgrimaged to the priest's grave; there were suggestions of the simple, beautiful faith of these people; there were intimations or reports of cures, quite uncritically given if not actually vouchered for, as if the news consisted in an atmosphere of the miraculous rather than in the atmosphere of the absurdly credulous. It was very evident even to the casual reader that the newspaper reports from Malden were carefully friendly to the Catholic Church. It is in strict truth that we accuse the American press, in its character of a reporting agency, of betraying the modern spirit rather than give offense to a rich, powerful Church whose whole spirit and aim is to maintain a poisonous, propagating center of medievalism in the modern age. Editorially some newspapers—the Kansas City Star, for example—cast doubt upon the authenticity of these rumored or reported miracles; although none, so far as we know,

came out flatly and debunked with unsparring critical truthfulness this utterly incredible and monstrous orgy of superstition.

In part, the American press was no doubt influenced by the desire for sensationalism at any cost. But it must bear the graver charge of describing in a friendly and favorable light a kind of superstition that has still a considerable spread of popularity.

We repeat that the tales of miracles at the Malden priest's grave will be widely disbelieved and considered only as a curious freakishness (and disbelieved not quite consistently—although any degree of removal from superstition is so much to the good—by many people who profess a belief in "spiritual," religious notions). Scientifically we know that this Malden business is the worst kind of nonsense. Doubtless in time we shall have reports written by impartial observers, which will specifically debunk this spurge of miracle-mongering, precisely as similar things have been debunked again and again in the past. Meanwhile we can only reflect rather sadly—yes, and more than a bit disgustedly—upon the folly that men here and there and in this way and that way, are still heir to. But our final thought will be one of deep gladness that Malden has furnished, so to speak, only a movie spectacle of folly and not a true picture of the age—an age not finally and fully free but more and more realistic in tone and tendency—in which we are fortunate to live.

Beyond the Malden priest's grave we see the grave of medievalism, which is not the less real in its character of an entombed past if in some places it is covered with only a little earth and in other places there is a crevice which offers us slightly though vividly enough a glimpse of bones that once walked alive in a world given over to tyrants, bigots, charlatans and their helpless victims.

"An honest god," said Ingersoll, "is the noblest work of man." That reminds us how an epigram, witty indeed and containing an element of truth, can sacrifice a very important aspect of truth. Of course Ingersoll knew very well that imagining a god, even an honest god, would be the most trifling and useless job that man could undertake. The real task of man is to understand life and to perform the progressive works of civilization. Ingersoll also knew that man never imagined an honest god; all the gods ever offered speculatively to our gaze have had features not merely of contradiction but of dishonesty.

S. Parkes Cadman, the New York City preacher who "tells all" to newspaper readers whether he knows anything or not, says in a reply to an inquiring farmer that "in the country there is more fodder for the soul than in the city." Since "Spark Plug" has been inelegant (speaking of "fodder" for the "soul"), we can afford to be. Thus we suggest that maybe "manure" would be a good word to exchange for "fodder" in this instance.

"The Tiger" An Atheist

On the death of Georges Clemenceau, the great French statesman popularly known as "The Tiger," the newspapers quoted briefly from his autobiography (finished just before his death) a mild paragraph stating his view of death as merely "an endless sleep." By implication that showed plainly enough that Clemenceau did not believe in immortality—but it is very inadequate as an indication of the man's views about religion. He was really an atheist. He says in his autobiography (in the *Evening of My Thought*) that "God is nothing but a word, bearing no relation to fact. Experimental proof is established as the only criterion of truth." The atheistic position could not well be put more incisively; and there is a flat rejection of all "spiritual" perceptions of truth, which is so important a claim of religion.

It is evident that Clemenceau had an unusually clear and strong mind. He regarded religion as nothing better than superstition. He was a realist, grim at times maybe, but consistent and serene in accepting the fundamental "laws"—that is to say, the facts and the familiar, unescapable processes—of life. His opinion of Christianity was very low; if anything, it is the worst religion of all because it has a more terrible history of suffering that it has inflicted upon the race. It has brought more fear than hope into the world, and every historical student knows that its intolerance has been superlative.

Not even the Jesus-revering gesture—the idea that Jesus was, viewed merely as a man, the greatest and best man who ever lived—imposed upon the clear mind of "The Tiger." He says that as "specimens of human greatness Buddha, Socrates and many others were no whit inferior to Jesus."

Superior to the intellectual fallacies and the emotional deceptions of religion, Clemenceau looked at life philosophically. He perceived that the idea of free will is "an illusory sensation": a man who does not reflect has the sense of being free because he does not sufficiently understand the causes of things and that human behavior is conditioned even as is the behavior of atoms or stars. Clemenceau lived, too, without any childish dream of immortality: the "endless sleep" was one which he approached serenely, as skeptics usually do, better than Christians. He recognized no moral law in a dogmatic or supernatural sense. He clearly saw the truth that "The only basis of human morality . . . is man himself." Man's laws are made for man and by man, as a part of the business of living, and, as we are well aware, these laws have been of slow growth, many of them have been seriously disputed, and we cannot regard them as final. Volumes and volumes have been written about the "moral law," conceived as something formulated by a supernatural person or power; yet the proof of its naturalness, the variability, and the human aims and limitations of all laws and ethics

is clearly seen in the records of evolution.

Within the limits of nature, man is great and can be greater; with his growing intelligence (which involves a surrender of the follies of religion), man can, says Clemenceau, develop "a rich idealism that would make him the equal of the gods, did not the pangs of following out his own destiny already make him superior to them." And, of course, man is greater than the gods because he has himself imagined the gods and, what is so much more to his glory, has achieved grandeur of daring and culture infinitely more sublime than his puerile, even when poetic, conception of divinity. But there is an illusion of soulful, unique egotism in man—a feeling, translated by the religions into various statements of belief, that a Supreme Power, enscathed in the uncharted blue of fancy, has marked out a spiritually precious destiny for man—an illusory feeling which Clemenceau, in the tradition of those other French skeptics, Voltaire and Anatole France, is honest and clear-thinking enough to renounce in the interest of truth. Man "is subservient to the ends of the universe. . . . At best, life is the implacable law which requires us to atone for our emotional pleasures. It is a series of favors diversely felt and diversely paid for." Life is a spectacle, a drama of thought and action, and—to put it modestly—to the best thinkers there is the best show. Understanding is wider living.

In a world of statesmen (politicians) from whom we hear little beyond certain well-carried platitudes of piety and hypocrisy, it is refreshing to have an expression of thoughtful, witty, skeptical culture from Georges Clemenceau. He was a leader of men politically, but in thought he trod the lonely ways. A few of us, at least, will honor him more for his allegiance to truth than for his association with the narrowly patriotic spirit of war and revenge that was the climax of a long, virile, and interesting life.

Bunkle, Bunkle, Little Star

A "Horoscope" appearing in the Tucson (Ariz.) *Daily Citizen* (and, as a syndicate feature, appearing in other papers) for November 20 says that November 21 is a lucky day. This optimistic news is published a day in advance for the purpose (we take the liberty of supposing) of expediting all births that may be on the point of occurring. Left in ignorance, contemporaneously expectant mothers might let their children be born a day too late. The day itself is not all, however, for we are told: "If November 21 is your birthday, the best hours for you on that day are from noon to 2 p. m., from 5:30 to 7 p. m., and from 10 p. m. to 11 p. m. The danger period is from 8 p. m. to 9:45 p. m." Evidently the planetary influences are remarkably erratic: they can switch from good to bad and back again and then again to bad within a few hours: the stars don't seem to know their own minds in this matter, and probably this is why human beings are so vexed with indecision.

One must in honesty report that, insofar as this "Horoscope" indi-

cates, there is a disappointing insufficiency of evidence to establish that November 21 is a lucky day. Only six names of lucky ones are given:

- Jacob Sleeper—Merchant and Philanthropist.
- Lewis Henry Morgan—Father of American Anthropology.
- Mary Johnson—Novelist.
- William G. Angell—Inventor.
- George Howard—Politician and Governor.

It is not a list which, in numbers or eminence, sweeps one off one's feet. The only one of first-rate achievement, who is soundly and impressively known to fame, is Morgan the scientist. And there is nothing said about the bad luck and troubles which not unlikely—upon a reasonable supposition—have afflicted these examples. Nor does this list represent the lucky star or moon or moonshine of November 21 as a consistent character-builder. We are given five different types of mind and character, and only two of them (the merchant and the politician) probably serve as object lessons of the "Horoscope's" assertion that children born on November 21 have "shrewd, determined and combative natures."

And, after all, how incomplete is this list! Just think of the millions and millions who have been born on November 21! Surely these millions have represented every kind of character, every kind of mentality good, bad and indifferent, every kind of fortune. There are thousands of unfortunate men and women who, reading that November 21 is a lucky birthday, must smile derisively. Bums, criminals, yokels, average men, men of various talents and near-talents, poor men and rich men and men who are not much of anything—one can but suggest the range, including as many contrasts and contradictions as life, of November 21 as a "lucky" birthday.

Those who are born on November 21 will, like those who are born on any other day, be influenced by the structure and chemistry of their body machines, by their environment, and by the accidents of life. A sow's ear will not make a silk purse, even though the sow was born on November 21.

One objection to the athletic "education" which bulks so large in our modern American universities is that only a few share actively in this "education" while the rest look on. They share to the extent of cheering, of course; and that is what they do out in the world after they have left the universities—they hurrah for the flag, for their home towns, for the Nordic "race" (which, as a race, does not, correctly speaking, exist), for the traditions and sentimentalities in which they have been drilled. The materials of modern education are wonderful, and so are its possibilities; but if education means the development of individuality and the critical faculty, then it fails of this object in a great many instances.

One simple definition of progress is: The breaking down of the barriers, physical and mental and emotional, that separate mankind.

Joseph McCabe Month in Kansas City

Joseph McCabe will be in Kansas City, Mo., during the entire month of February, 1930, and will deliver at least ten lectures at All Soul's Unitarian Church, L. M. Birkhead, pastor. The dates of the lectures will be announced later. Mr. McCabe is making a special trip from his home in London, England, for this month's lecture engagement.

For many years known to an intelligent minority in the United States, Joseph McCabe has been made widely known in this country by the Haldeman-Julius Publications. He has written 52 Little Blue Books (and 15 more Little Blue Books by him are soon to be published); 5 Big Blue Books; 40 volumes of The Key to Culture; 8 volumes of The Key to Love and Sex; 12 volumes of The True Story of the Roman Catholic Church—which are scheduled for early publication.

In all, Mr. McCabe has written ten very impressive sum of 2,842,500 words for the Haldeman-Julius Publications within the past four years. And all of these nearly three million words have been potent messengers of the most profound and vast-ranging scholarship.

Mr. McCabe's special writings have also appeared in The Debunker and in The American Freeman.

Significantly, this greatest scholar of the modern age has said that his work for the Haldeman-Julius Publications has afforded him, at the summit of his wonderfully productive years, a new and the most inspiring interest in his life.

There is a good deal of foolishness talked about the sense of reverence. Is there a man living without a feeling of reverence for something? Certainly there must be very few, if any, who are lacking in this attitude. It is simply a question of what is and what is not worthy of reverence. The intelligent, consistent man cannot reverence an idea or an image or a tradition or a theory of behavior when critically he has analyzed it and discovered it to be false.

Men make plans about their real life on earth, but who ever heard of a man making, with any similar interest and decision, plans for his alleged "immortal life"? This suggests that men are not really so convinced of "immortal life" as they pretend to be. Whatever they may state as their belief, psychologically they have the deep feeling that immortality is only a dream.

The history of men's ideas—in the mass—teaches us very illuminatingly what not to believe.

In the World of Books

Weekly Reviews and Other Literary Ruminations
Isaac Goldberg

WHERE DO PEOPLE GET THEIR NOTIONS?

Some six or seven years ago I was asked, at very short notice, to give a talk on the drama in place of Professor G. P. Baker. Prof. Baker, then conducting his famous English 47 Workshop at Harvard, has since transferred his activities to Yale, where he puts the finishing—the beginning—touches to dramatists. I accepted the invitation and, naturally, on opening my talk I expressed sympathy with the audience; they had expected to hear a noted teacher of dramatics, and instead they were confronted by me. I also spoke of the importance of Baker's work. Well, a number of persons left my talk very much incensed; I had no right, they declared, to make disparaging remarks about the man for whom I was substituting! I availed me little to answer that I had made no disparaging remarks about Baker; I'm very grateful to him, in fact, for a reason that he doesn't know to this day. At the oral examination which was part of the ordeal through which I had to go in order to get my Ph.D. degree, Baker kindly asked a question—about the influence of Ibsen upon the Spanish drama—that enabled me to gab for almost a half-hour. The examination was three hot hours long; the day was so sultry, indeed, that when at last I arose from the torture, the chair came up with me, glued to my seat. I was being pressed pretty hard by the sixteen other professors ranged around me, and his question came as a welcome breeze through the torrid desert of their persistence.

To this day, nevertheless, I hear stories of my impoliteness toward the man.

I was reminded of this the other day, after I had delivered a lecture on "Immortality and the Arts," before the Jewish Community Institute of Boston. I do not believe in lecturing. I told my audience so. I also made mention of a few other matters, such as the Censorship—in which I absolutely disbelieve, refusing to recognize any compromise; about laws against obscene literature—which I believe accomplish nothing; about birth control, which should be universally understood, and practiced at the discretion of the two parties chiefly concerned; about adultery, which, if it be wrong is wrong for other reasons than the much cracked Decalogue, and which is not always in my opinion wrong; about abortion, which needed a more civilized approach than we at present accord it. I made it clear that I advocated nothing. Advocacy in such personal matters is silly. What I asked for, and what I received, was dignified attention for topics that are too often passed off with hysterical laughter.

A few days later I was informed that I had advocated adultery, and

I was asked, through a friend, whether I practiced what I preached. I had preached, of course, nothing but an open mind; I had advocated nothing but the dignified examination of an all-important subject. I had tried, as I frankly stated, to unsettle the mind of my audience. I had no desire, however, to implant specific reactions into that mind. Minds must find their own salvation. What I can pour into a mind arbitrarily can be poured out of it by the next strong personality that comes along. My sole idea, that evening—and I enjoyed it thoroughly, though it is by no means a simple matter to stand up before half a regiment of listeners and give voice to seemingly violent heresies—was to justify independent thinking; to show that State and Church were still hand in hand; to destroy the theological conception of Sin, and to restore the body and its joys to their rightful place in the scheme of things.

Well, nobody walked out on me, at least. I remember a far less radical talk, delivered in the vestry of a synagogue shortly before the outbreak of the war, in which women arose by the dozen, and finally by the phalanx, leaving me some three hundred listeners out of an original eight hundred. And you must believe me when I tell you that what I said that evening is now commonplace commentary on the women's pages of our most conservative newspapers.

The world moves. At least, we get the illusion that it does.

A NEW VENTURE

I notice the names of many Haldeman-Julius Writers in a new, indeed a triple, venture by the Quality Group Publications of New York. Monthly they issue a trio of magazines, somewhat larger than what is known as pocket-size. The trio comprises "The Thinker," given over to scientific, philosophic and artistic matters; "Popular Biography," sufficiently characterized by its title; and "The American Short Story," ditto. The magazines sell at 25c per copy. They are well printed, attractively illustrated, and made additionally interesting by an original layout.

Among the Haldeman-Julius names that I select as I glance through the magazines are Will Durant, James Oppenheim, Benjamin de Caseres, Clement Wood. You'll probably be seeing mine there, one of these days, as I have been asked to do, among other things, a vignette of none other than Chief Haldeman-Julius himself.

Das Politische Theater, by Erwin Piscator. Adalbert Schulz Verlag, Berlin, Germany.

This is the tale of the Political Theater of which Piscator is the founder. We shall be hearing more of this gentleman shortly in the United States. For the present, I desire to call the book to the attention of those drama enthusiasts who read German, and who will appreciate a finely printed, excellently illustrated work.

To inquire reasonably the evidences for a theory would seem, to a well-constituted mind, the first thing to do; but it is not only the last thing which many people think of doing, but the one thing which they stubbornly refuse to do.

And Now I Am Biamed For the Country's Crime!

By E. Haldeman-Julius

The worst has been said about me (or so it is the worst) now that Rev. Christian Reischer, highly flourishing Broadway (New York City) exponent and practitioner of percent religion has gone and laid the crime wave onto me! True, I but share the guilt. Other "loose writers" (that is Rev. Reischer's pretty loose characterization) are culpable intellectual banditti in this conspiracy—I suppose it is regarded by Reischer, Rev., as a conspiracy. Harry Elmer Barnes, Theodore Dreiser, Will Durant, and John B. Watson have figuratively been joined upon them the same pot of tar or something worse. Everybody has had his swing at solving the crime wave, so why not Reischer? He limps along behind, and he staggers, but here he is at last.

This remarkable fulmination from the heart of New York City's strangely assorted splendor of materialism and culture and tawdry rascalsness of bunk was deemed so important by somebody in charge of dispatching all the latest "news" to panting millions that it got as far out in the hinterland as the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier. And it is from this Iowa newspaper that I reprint the charges and rages of Reischer:

Much lawlessness may be traced to the loose writers of note like Harry Elmer Barnes and a few fanner preachers, who, having failed every place else, have joined this crowd in denying God's existence, discarding religion and the church and then furnishing either no substitute or a cheap and intangible thing called humanism.

If the God of love is fiction what sold basis exists for law to rest upon? If we are as the loose behaviorist, John Watson, claims, but the creatures of our surroundings, who has a right to punish us for stealing or for carrying out an "impulse" to murder? If, as the book publisher, Haldeman-Julius of Girard, Kans., claims, sex appetite is to be appeased as that for food, who can complain over polygamy either open or hidden?

Who are Barnes, Dreiser, Durant, Watson, Haldeman-Julius and similar writers whom we allow to sneer about and spit upon this "faith" without offering any substitute? First, they had better show us how to construct a finer nation than Christianity has built. They and their teaching are the chief cause of crime today. Why, then, do the papers give so much space to these blind leaders, even though some of them still retain the titles the Christian church gave them. [Note: I am proud to retain any titles the Christian church has given me.—E. H.-J.]

We are proud to have men like Fred Stone, George Jessel, Will Rogers and Eddie Cantor speak in this pulpit and they have all spoken for me. They help restore people to health by starting laughs which break up destructive absorption at serious tasks. Puppets furnish the salt and pepper to life, the vanilla extract, the tang and taste to things. But God pity one who lives alone for or on pleasure.

Naturally Reischer would rather have comedians than thinkers appear in his pulpit. Laughs, not ideas, are fitly in his line: very superficial laughs (with no disrespect to the comedians named, who are cleverly and frankly such in their popular roles), even as poor and superficial and twisted ideas are the only kind that conceivably could find welcome in Reischer's pulpit. Reischer himself is a very low sort of comedian without knowing it.

It is so easy to debunk these wowlings of Reischer that it is difficult. You know what I mean? Why point out elementary truths in reply to such a brainstorm? But it must be done now and again. The Augean stables must be cleaned and even a handful of mud must be removed patiently when it is thrown upon a clean, clear philosophy of life.

I can see readily enough, at the very outset of his gibberings, what is wrong with the man Reischer. He is concerned about dogma rather than about life. That is shown when he refers to the "cheap and intangible thing called humanism." What! Human beings, the problems of human life, the spirit of making this earth a joyous and intelligent place for human habitation—is all this "cheap and intangible"! On the contrary, what is so precious as human life and aspirations and endeavors? What is so tangible as a philosophy, an attitude toward life, which is human in all its aims and definitions?

You see, Reischer has a hopelessly warped viewpoint: he thinks that religion—his business of preaching about "God" and the other doctrines which emanate from his pulpit—is of greater importance, is more real and vital, than the realistic dealing with life's issues in terms of human enlightenment, happiness, and progress. With such a viewpoint, how could the man speak sanely on any subject?

"If the God of love is fiction," he asks, "what solid basis exists for the law to rest upon?" I recommend that Reischer read Joseph McCabe's *The Human Origin of Morals* (Little Blue Book No. 1061). There he will have explained clearly and at length what is the driving human force back of laws and mor-

als, realistically understood. There are social ethics, and there are individual ethics, and they have very intelligible and (to any but a man of Reischer's dogmatic mental fixation) humanly obvious reasons without dragging in the myth of a God. Actually Christians no more than atheists think of theft and murder as features of behavior to be decided in relation to whether there is or is not a God. Man's attitude toward such criminal behavior, evolved by man himself, is sufficiently clear without anachronistic dogmatizings about a "law of God."

Of course Reischer doesn't understand (or doesn't want to understand) the psychological and sociological theory of behaviorism as principally expounded by Dr. John B. Watson. Far from being a "loose behaviorist," Dr. Watson's main and reiterated theme is that we should study how scientifically to control our behavior and to direct it in ways that are best for civilization. Using the word "morality" in an intelligent bearing, there is a thousand times more hope for a higher morality and a morality more carefully guided (because more carefully understood) from Dr. Watson's teachings of the psychology of behaviorism than from Rev. Reischer's screaminings of ancient, ridiculous dogmas from his pulpit.

As for my having said that sex is an appetite (and, please observe, Reischer puts it bluntly and without any elaborating and defining context), that is an expression of fact which is beyond dispute. It is infinitely harmful to be false, dodging, and, as the phrase goes, "nastynice" about sex. Ignorance on this, as on any other subject, can lead only to unhappiness. It has led to incalculable unhappiness. And one can recognize quite simply the character of sex as an appetite, yet have full appreciation of the more subtle possibilities of this thrilling expression of our nature and of the emotional associations that have been woven by time and culture into the very essence of sex. There are, of course, appetites and appetites. Basically they are all materialistic. But material things and the mental or emotional reactions to them are capable of various shades and definitions—that is, to a humanist who is at once curious and sensitive about life, though evidently not to a ranting dogmatist of the doleful, purblind genre of Reischer. The desire to look upon gorgeous sunsets and to feast upon all the beauties of nature may be called an appetite of the human vision—of our eyes and the nerves which carry to the brain these keen and (certainly) physically felt responses. What then? The beam in Reischer's eye is that if somebody points out to him, as a matter of clear seeing and understanding, that sex is an appetite, he thinks (*that's the nice way* in which a Christian mind can work) that it must be a degraded appetite. It is Reischer who has poured all the evil that he himself imagines into my own perfectly scientific and innocent remark.

Reischer wants to know—and I am disposed to grant that he is honest in his implied confession of ignorance, for really it appears that he needs to know—who are Harry Elmer Barnes, Theodore Dreiser, Will Durant, John B. Watson, and E. Haldeman-Julius. Very well: Harry Elmer Barnes is a leading scholar of America who is devoting his intelligence to examining history (especially recent history from 1914 onward) in the light of truth and internationalism; and he has been, even so, one of the modern group of devoted teachers of that humanism which Reischer dismisses as "cheap and intangible"—his (Reischer's) bloodless, abstract image of a God is more precious and tangible, he would imply, than red-blooded, yearning, thinking, endeavoring, suffering human beings.

Theodore Dreiser is one of America's very greatest novelists and more than that or consistently with that, he is a man who has a quality of understanding and pity for life which one such as Reischer could never appreciate. If Reischer would read what Dreiser has written—if he could read understandingly any one of Dreiser's novels—he would perceive that here is a man who expresses in the medium of a sympathetic art a philosophy of life which upholds the standards of courage, honesty, intelligence and a fine discrimination-with-tolerance in facing life.

Will Durant—well, Durant's share of the blame in starting the crime wave (which crime wave, by the way, and where?) is presumably derived from his having written *The Story of Philosophy*, in which he introduced modern readers to the great philosophers of the ages. And, again, Durant has in contemporary articles set himself the task of helping apply a living philosophy (rather than a dead religion) to the serious problems of our life. One would be curious to know how many inmates of American prisons would accuse Durant as the author of their guilt.

John B. Watson, as I have said, is the chief writer (in fact, the originator in its well-known form) of the theory of psychology called "behaviorism." Simply put, this theory is that we can best know the nature of people by studying

their behavior under various circumstances. And I repeat, for Reischer's edification (though that aim is, I am pretty sure, futile), that "behaviorism" lays great stress upon the importance of a sane, wholesome, well-ordered environment for human beings from infancy up. How can the theory and the teachings of behaviorism cause crime? Ask Reischer; he doesn't know.

Myself—well, if Reischer will look carefully through the new Jubilee Catalog of 1500 Little Blue Books, he will probably be just where he was when he started: namely, chained to the charlatanism and dogmatism of his pulpit. He might, however, get a glimmering of the idea that I believe in education. What does Reischer believe in besides what isn't so? Evidently he doesn't believe in education. His sermon is a shrieking denunciation (and an ignorant denunciation, even so) of the educational influences of the modern age.

What nightmares must, in the hours of sleep, plague and confuse such a distorted mind!

A Labor of Love in Easy Guidance to Good Reading

A labor of love that is excellent and inspired by the very spirit of humanism is an attractive little guide to good reading (*Good Books at Small Prices*) prepared by John Cotton Dana and published by the Newark (N. J.) Public Library for the use of its readers. Mr. Dana, for years in charge of the Newark Library, has undoubtedly won a secure eminence as the greatest librarian in the country; and it is he who has made, along with himself, the Newark library famous.

In his very nicely printed pamphlet, Mr. Dana informs readers about book series which are of distinct, outstanding cultural value and yet appeal financially to those who have not much money to spend on books. And it will interest readers of *The American Freeman* to know that the Little Blue Books are favorably listed by Mr. Dana in the following text: "*Little Blue Books* represent a 'democracy of literature.' 1260 titles, paper covers. 24 mo. Average 64 pages. Minimum order 20 books. Five cents apiece. Haldeman-Julius Publications, Dept. C-64, Girard, Kansas." You will note that the pamphlet was prepared before the Little Blue Book series had reached the Jubilee number of 1500.

In an appropriate brief introduction, which reveals the interest (not merely in his own reading but in his wish that others should read) of a genuine lover of books, Mr. Dana offers some reflections which are well deserving of quotation. He says:

Everyone should buy books. By that I mean that every person of intelligence, able to read ordinary print with some ease, will find that the habit of owning books and having them about will give him more pleasure in the long run than any other habit he can form. Only a few buy and read books, to be sure; but then only a few get out of life all the pleasure they are capable of getting. So the small number of the bookish does not prove anything except that the wise are always few!

But the book-buying public is much larger than it was ten years ago, and the publishers of books are working overtime to satisfy the demands of an ever-growing group of people eagerly curious about conditions in our rapidly changing modern world. The last word on children, flight and death is demanded. Perhaps you are one of those impatient seekers of war, peace, science, politics, labor, leisure, love, something new. Perhaps you are not. You may be afraid of the increasing cost of books; two dollars and a half for a novel, three for a volume of essays and five possibly for a popular biography. Perhaps you live in a small apartment and have little room for large and many books; possibly you travel and have a distaste for the heavy book in an overcrowded suitcase. Probably it would distress your thrifty soul to discard the heavy volume that cost so much; but surely you would buy an inexpensive and small-sized book for your apartment in town, for the guests in your summer camp, or to tuck into your hand luggage. . . .

It may be interesting to point out that the Little Blue Books are the lowest-priced series in Mr. Dana's list; most of the series which he lists range in price from fifty cents to a dollar. And the Little Blue Books include the widest variety of literature, scientific and cultural and practical (that is to say, practical books of guidance in various branches of knowledge, books of home study, and books of general and specific self-help); they also include the classics and modern literature and the liveliest up-to-date reports and discussions. It may truthfully be said that the Little Blue Books are the real "democracy of literature."

Another note: The New York Public Library and the Newark Public Library are the only two public libraries in America which have complete sets of the Little Blue Books. Is it just a coincidence that they are also the two greatest and best public libraries in America? You might care to inquire why your public library does not have a complete set of the Little Blue Books.

A lazy man is a man who just isn't sufficiently interested to move.

Life is full of accidents; but we can learn to take advantage even of the accidents.

Those who, discarding this doctrine or that superstition, talk about "true religion" are trying to dodge the truth about religion.

One should know how to ignore the folly that is petty and harmless and how to resist the folly which is a serious threat to our civilized purposes.

It is an adventure to disagree with a man. You don't know whether he will debate the question reasonably or, figuratively speaking, call for the police.

It is wisdom to know where wisdom is: to read the books of the great thinkers, the great truth-bringers, the great historians, the great scientists of mankind.

Perhaps men are not hypocrites—not consciously, which is what we usually mean by this unpleasant term. Still, they are remarkably given to saying one thing and doing another.

War is outlawed (on paper), yet the nations continue to maintain massive armaments and they show no disposition to turn them over to the movie companies for use as theatrical scenery.

Martyrs are not, by token of their martyrdom, necessarily right in their beliefs; but we must admit that they are better than the fanatics who, in trying to enforce their beliefs, make martyrs of other people.

Henshaw Ward in his book of delightful debunking forays, "Thumbing," tells of a university professor who was exasperated by his students saying "I think this" and "I think that," almost always in preface to some loose theory or hearsay. At last the old professor exclaimed: "Don't think. Try to notice."

When you hear anyone saying that the word "bunk" is a crude and impolite word, you will be safe in concluding that this person is self-conscious and on the defensive about some form of bunk which he cherishes. Those who object to the word "bunk" are not, as a rule, so esthetic in their sensitiveness for language.

Happiness is an illusion, if it be meant as a state of being in which there is no pain, no sadness, no uncertainty, no struggle, no occasion for regret or complaint. Yet it is not utterly an illusion, as we commonly use the word, for each man defines happiness in his own way and is able to reconcile it with many contrasts.

Senator Bingham of Connecticut, in resenting criticism of his employment of a manufacturer's representative to assist him on tariff schedules, declared with impetuous oratory: "I resent it and I will resent it until the end of time." Evidently the Senator has faith in immortality or, maybe, he believes that time has not much farther to run.

Is Truth Partisan?

Should a writer, relating the facts on a subject of peculiar and historic and yet contemporary importance, hesitate to give the plain meaning of these facts? Can a scholar, devoted to truth, refuse to follow where truth leads? Is a clearly expressed viewpoint, derived from a truthful survey of ideas and events, to be branded with any fairness at all as "partisanship"?

One wonders what screw was loose in the mind of a writer in a recent issue of *The Nation*, who reviewed Joseph McCabe's *The Story of Religious Controversy*. Inconsistency, at least, was as rattled as a 1915 Ford car in the mind of this writer. He said that McCabe's scholarship and his facts were beyond dispute. But, he added, McCabe was "partisan" toward religion; and this, we are told, mars a work that is admittedly truthful and scholarly.

If Joseph McCabe, in being strictly truthful, writes history—whether the history of religion or of any other human institution—as a "partisan," then let us have none of the men who write history "impartially": who, in other words, shuffle the evidence to conceal or minimize the truth and who, by implication and gentle circumlocution, reduce or distort the actual significance of such facts as they give.

The Censor—a Tin God

Isaac Goldberg in *The New Immorality* (Little Blue Book No. 1481). "I do not wish to; I am afraid to; I do not believe I should. . . THEREFORE YOU MAY NOT!" Here, in a nutshell—I almost said in a numbskull—is the subterranean working of Censorship.

The Censor is not always, he is not usually, a hypocrite. He is simply a bigot.

He may not always be wrong in wishing to do away with the object of his disapproval. The wrong lies in his method. He is a King who can do no wrong. His wish must be law. There is no argument; no discussion. There is only obedience.

This is obviously preposterous. Let him believe what he pleases to believe; let him work in the interests of that belief. But why seek, by law and other compulsion, to tie his opponent hand and foot? Why deny to ideas different from his own the right to death—or life—in the open field?

The Censor opposes, in life, the survival of the fittest. He seeks for himself special privilege, special concession. He is a Tin God. His way alone is the right way. Instinctively he dreads competition.

Is it not significant that, with all the centuries in which he has sat in the saddle, with all the agencies of suppression over which he has ruled, he is still on the defensive? He, without experience, would deny to others the right to learn from experience. Blind himself, he would lead an army condemned by his own bigotry to blindness. Eyes has he, and dreads to see; ears has he, and dreads to hear. Brains has he—and

No. One doubts that he has brains.

Whoever fears the opinions of his neighbors probably has no real opinions of his own.

NEW AND COMPLETE ATLAS OF THE WORLD

FEATURES THAT MAKE THIS ATLAS INDISPENSABLE IN HOME, SCHOOL, AND OFFICE

207 Pages of Maps are comprised in this Atlas. Besides new maps of the nations of Europe and other countries of the world, it contains a map of Canada, separate maps of the Provinces of Canada, a map of the United States, separate maps of each state, territory, and insular possession.

The Maps are Printed in Five and Six Colors of Ink instead of three colors—yellow, red, and blue—as ordinarily employed.

The Locations of Towns, Rivers, Mountains, and Boundaries are indicated by map markers rather than in the old form of many Atlases. Railroads are represented by a thin line of Red Ink, thereby clearly defining them. In other Atlases, railroads are printed in black ink which makes it difficult to distinguish them from river and boundary lines.

Mountain Ranges are shown in Brown Ink, on a new system of hachures which bring the ranges into bolder relief.

The Maps are 8 1/2 x 10 3/4 inches in size. The handy size of the volume fits it for a bookcase and the library table; it may be carried in a grip which opens a wide use for an Atlas for business men and travelers. The Atlas closed measures only 7 x 9 1/2 inches. A full size map, such as is found in an Atlas that measures twice the size, is presented in the open book which measures 14 x 9 1/2 inches.

A Gazetteer of the countries, of leading cities of the world, with their locations on the maps.

With New Maps of Europe; Of Canada and Its Provinces; Of the United States, Its Forty-eight States, Its Territories and Insular Possessions and Maps of the Whole World with Boundaries as Established by the Treaties of Peace Following the World War.

POSTPAID This Complete Atlas, size 7 x 9 1/2 inches, comprises 350 pages, 207 pages of which are maps printed in five and six colors. It is printed on sturdy, super-calendered paper and durably bound.

\$2.68

Order from Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

THE WONDER BOOK OF KNOWLEDGE

Compiled and Edited by HENRY C. HILL

The Marvels of Modern Industry and Invention; the Interesting Story of Common Things; the Mysterious Processes of Nature Simply Explained

What is an Airliner? Why do we get Hungry? How do Talking Pictures Talk? How does the Robot Work?

BROADENS THE MIND AND STIRS AMBITION

This book is intended for young and old who wish a simple account of the history, evolution and production of everyday wonders of the modern industrial age. It also describes the wonderful object lessons afforded by Nature in her activities in the animal, vegetable and mineral kingdoms, and simple understandable answers to the myriad puzzling questions arising daily in the minds of those for whom the fascination of the "Why" and "How" is always engrossing.

OVER 700 ILLUSTRATIONS

There are more than 700 pictures in the complete work, which measures 7 1/2 x 9 1/2 inches in size and comprises 600 pages. It is printed on super-calendered paper, handsomely bound in cloth, stamped in gold and colors.

POSTPAID **\$2.65**

Order from Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

Essence of Unitarianism

L. M. Birkhead

Copyright, 1929, Haldeman-Julius Co.

INTRODUCTION

Unitarianism has made an important contribution to the rationalization of religion, and it is now leading the liberal religious forces toward the humanization of religion.

To define this movement is no easy matter. It has never had any creed or standard of beliefs, and it has been variously interpreted. There has been a great diversity of faith among Unitarians. I have assumed that running through its entire history has been a protest against creeds and dogmas, particularly against the dogma of the Trinity. The movement acquired its name from its protest against the trinitarian conception of God, but it has always been a much more significant movement than such a protest would imply.

The most familiar definitions of Unitarianism are those having to do with its emphasis upon the unity of God. "The word Unitarian properly and originally applies to one who holds to the uni-personality of God, and, consequently, the unmixing humanity of Jesus Christ" is the definition offered by one church historian.

Orthodox Christians have for more than a millennium insisted upon the doctrine of the Trinity as fundamental. There is no better statement of the importance and significance of the Trinity to traditional Christianity than that contained in Professor A. H. Hopkins' popular and widely used three-volume edition of his "Systematic Theology." He defines and states the importance of the Trinity in the following series of affirmations:

- 1 In Scripture there are three persons who are recognized as God
- 2 These three are so described in Scripture that we are compelled to conceive of them as distinct persons.
- 3 This tri-personality of the divine nature is not merely economical and temporal, but is immanent and eternal.
- 4 This tri-personality is not tritheism; for while there are three persons, there is but one essence.
- 5 The three persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost are equal.
- 6 Inscrutable, yet not self-contradictory, this doctrine furnishes the key to all other doctrines.

These statements he then proceeds to prove and elucidate by quoting from the Bible, the church fathers, and the theologians of the ages.

Since Christians have considered the doctrine of the Trinity "the key to all other doctrines," it was very fortunate that the Unitarians began their attack on orthodoxy at this point.

It has enabled them to make their attack on traditional Christianity at a very vulnerable point. All defenses of the Trinity have been irrational and many of them humorous. The problem of properly relating the three persons of the Trinity and of explaining their significance in the Trinity has been insuperable.

To one minister who tried to rationalize the Trinity, and yet used the trinitarian formula in his baptismal services, Robert Hall said: "Why, sir, as I understand you, you must consider that you baptize in the name of an abstraction, a man and a metaphor."

The anonymous author of "Painted Windows" tells of a Japanese Christian who listened with "corrugated brow" to a painful exposition of "the Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity" by a modern theologian. Suddenly, as the exposition continued, the Japanese, with radiant face, exclaimed, "Ah, yes, I see, a Committee!"

I am willing to admit that my interpretation of Unitarianism may not be accepted by very many Unitarians, the reason being that no one can speak authoritatively for this liberal religious movement. Each Unitarian gives his own interpretation. It may be, as the orthodox Christians have said, that this extreme individualism has been a fatal weakness in Unitarianism.

Dr. Henry Gow, in his recent book on "The Unitarians" (a book to which I am much indebted) disclaims any final authority, in his exposition of Unitarianism. "No one can speak authoritatively for all Unitarians, seeing that they have no creed to be expounded, no Articles of Faith to be explained," he says.

Dr. Earl Morse Wilbur has written the best book, so far, on the history of Unitarianism, "Our Unitarian Heritage," and I want, in the beginning, to express my gratitude to him for his researches in the obscure phases of Unitarian history. I am more indebted to him than to any other historian of this liberal religious movement. And yet, I do not agree with his interpretation of Unitarian history, as those who read my sketch of Unitarianism will discover.

For instance, the United States Census Bureau, in a recent issue of the "Religious Census Year Book," has given a good definition of con-

temporary Unitarianism, but I cannot subscribe to it in full, and I know many of my fellow Unitarians who do not accept it as a complete definition.

Unitarianism is marked for its insistence upon absolute freedom of belief, its reliance upon the supreme guidance of reason, its tolerance of difference in religious opinion, its devotion to education and philanthropy, and its emphasis on character as the principle of fundamental importance in religion; a general consensus upon the unipersonality of God, the strict humanity of Jesus, the essential dignity and perfectibility of human nature, the natural character of the Bible, and the hope for the ultimate salvation of all souls.

The following statement by Dr. Henry W. Crosskey, once President of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, reveals the attitude of the majority of Unitarians, and presents a point of view that needs to be understood by those who find it difficult to apprehend why a ready and definite answer cannot be given to the question as to what Unitarians believe.

Every Unitarian speaks for himself and himself alone. I am the mouthpiece of no organization; I cannot be "brought to book" by any authority on earth for any word I utter, however wild and foolish it may be. I am no more amenable to a "Unitarian Association" than I am to a presbytery or a general assembly, or a lord bishop or a court of arches, or a general council of Christendom or a pope.

Although born and bred, trained and educated among Unitarians, and a minister in the churches they have frequented during my whole period of active life, I have never signed with my hand, or professed with my lips, a dogmatic "Unitarian Creed." The principles of my Unitarianism forbid me to sign a "Unitarian Creed" as peremptorily as they would forbid me to subscribe to the "Westminster Confession of Faith," or the "Thirty-nine Articles," even though I should personally believe every doctrine those documents enunciate. In this I do not stand by myself; no Unitarian can speak authoritatively for another Unitarian. The Unitarians are not like an organized regiment of soldiers, keeping step with each other in the ranks, and promptly obedient to their commanding officers; they are simply and solely a band of independent men, who are bound together, as friends are linked to friends, by certain broad and deep, though unwritten and unenforced, sympathies, ends, and aims.

WERE THE EARLY CHRISTIANS UNITARIANS?

It is characteristic of every Christian sect to trace its beginnings back to the New Testament. Each sect claims to be nearer to Christ than any other and also more loyal to him.

The Unitarians, though more progressive and liberal than other Christian denominations, have been no exception to this rule. The claim of Unitarians has usually been that "Unitarianism existed among Christians from the beginning. The belief in the Trinity and in the deity of Jesus was three or four centuries forming." Until very recently the leaders of the Unitarian movement have maintained that "Unitarianism is simply a return from the corrupted doctrines of orthodox Christianity to the pure religion of the New Testament."

Searching through the literature of this liberal religious movement, one discovers that the Unitarians have argued about the Unitarianism of early Christians in the following manner:

1. The Jews themselves were Unitarians in their view of God. They believed in the unity of one God. The first Christians were Jews. They apparently never thought of their Messiah as a god; he was merely a prophet or king divinely sent.

2. Those who heard Jesus never understood him to claim to be God, but they did hear him frequently speak of his subordination to God. (See Matthew 19:17, Matthew 26:42, Matthew 27:46.)

3. The first Christians never presented him as a prophet, "a man approved of God among you."

4. It was only after Christianity moved away from its Jewish environment that Jesus began to be deified. The deification of men was not uncommon in the Graeco-Roman world.

Progressive scholarship now recognizes the truth of the claim of Unitarians that the deification of Jesus was a gradual process. In the course of four or five centuries, the character of Jesus was transformed from that of a man into that of a god, "Very God of Very God," as one of the creeds expressed it.

Certainly the early Christians were not agreed concerning the nature of Jesus. There was plenty of speculation as to his nature. During the first few centuries of Christian history, while theology was still in its formative period, there were many different sects representing as many views of the character of Jesus. It is only necessary to mention a few of these to illustrate the point that Christians were far apart in their judgments concerning the humanity and divinity of Jesus:

Adoptonists—Jesus was a man chosen by God, in whom the di-

vine Spirit dwelt, and who was adopted by God as his Son at the baptism in the Jordan River.

Docetists—Christ had no real material body and human nature, but only an apparent body, a phantom of humanity. He acted and suffered in appearance only.

Sabellians—According to their theory, there is one God, who first manifested himself as Father, then became incarnate as the Son, then lastly came as the Holy Spirit to the Church. In other words, God exists as one person—the Father, Son, and Spirit being but different manifestations of God.

Samosatenians—Followers of Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, 260 A. D., who thought that Jesus was originally a man like other men, who gradually became divine, and was finally united with God.

The two most important schools of Christological thought—the Arians and Athanasians—will be described later. There were a number of other minor sects. Dr. Charles A. Briggs, in his book "The Fundamental Christian Faith," writes of one of the more important of these, lesser sects:

The Church at Rome was troubled in the second and third centuries by heretical teachers, coming from other parts, who in their doctrine of Christ were essentially Unitarian. These were named Monarchians by Tertullian. He says: "They are constantly throwing out the accusation that we preach two gods, three gods." "We hold," they say, "the monarchy."

There were some Christians who held that "the divine Spirit and not Christ was the pre-existent Son of God," Dr. Briggs writes. This was particularly the view of Hermas who was a very influential leader in the second century. A. D. Justin Martyr, in the latter half of the second century, said that "some there are among us who admit that Jesus is the Christ, while holding him to be a man of men."

For those who are particularly interested in following in detail this gradual deification of Jesus, I commend William L. Sullivan's "From the Gospel to the Creeds," Wilbur's "Our Unitarian Heritage," and especially Harnack's "History of Dogma." Here I have only space for a summary of this theological development.

In the first three gospels, Jesus is regarded simply as the Messiah. He does not claim equality with God, he confesses his own inferiority, and recognizes his own intellectual limitations. He acknowledges that he is not as good as God. If he really had been God and believed himself to be such a thing, is it likely he would have said on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (See Mark 6:5, Mark 10:18, 10:40, 13:32, 14:36, 15:34.)

With Paul, there was a further development of beliefs about the nature of Jesus. Dr. Wilbur writes: Jesus is sometimes referred to as man, but more often as Lord, by Paul. Jesus is spoken of as sent from heaven, where he existed before the creation of the world; God is said to have created the world through his agency; he is regarded as in a sense divine, though still subordinate to God.

According to the Gospel of John, Jesus is the Logos—"the Word"—a semi-divine being intermediate between God and man. Jesus bridges the chasm between man and the unapproachable God. "The Word stands between God and men," said Philo, the Jewish philosopher, who had been influenced by Grecian philosophy. This doctrine of the Logos was undoubtedly a significant step in the direction of the fourth century doctrine of the Trinity and the deity of Jesus. How the Logos was related to the infinite and eternal God on the one hand and to the man Jesus of Nazareth on the other constituted a serious theological problem among second century Christians.

The Trinitarian formula occurs but twice in the New Testament. In Matthew 28:19 we read, "Go ye therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." It is one of the most questioned passages in the New Testament. This text is frequently quoted by early Christian writers, but always without the Trinitarian addition. The early Christians baptized simply in the name of Jesus. The other Trinitarian formula is in 1 John 5:7—"There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." This passage is now recognized by all scholars as an interpolation and its insertion in the New Testament is credited to a Spanish heretic living in the fourth century.

Dr. Wilbur gives us some interesting facts about Tertullian, born at Carthage about 150 A. D. Tertullian taught that "the Son (or Logos) existed before creation, and was of one substance with God, though distinct from him and subordinate to him. Christ was born upon the earth as Jesus, and Father, Son, and Holy Spirit became mysteriously united into a trinity—a term which Tertullian was the first to introduce."

The influence of Graeco-Roman thought upon the development of Jesus into a god was very marked. To Romans and Greeks, the idea of a god-man was a familiar one. There were many inscriptions similar to the following: "To Augustus, God and Savior. The birth of this god was for the whole world the beginning of good news."

Julius Caesar was also dignified as "God" and "Savior." When, therefore, the controversy over the nature of Jesus waxed hot, it was not difficult for the Christians to find philosophical and theological support—outside of their own documents—for Jesus as god-man.

Was Jesus an adopted son of God, or a manifestation of God as Son, or was he the only begotten son of God? Or was he Yahweh Himself? Was he pre-existent or was it the divine Spirit which became manifest in him, which was pre-existent? Was he "begotten, not made?" or was he created, as the Arians believed? Was he like the Father in essence or simply a creature? Or was he simply a man possessed of the Logos in exceptional fulness? These and similar questions concerning the nature of Jesus disturbed the Christians for several centuries.

The debate as to whether "the Son" was of the "same substance" (homo-ousian) or "similar substance" (homo-i-ousian) with the Father has caused the Christians to be the subject of many a sneer. Thomas Carlyle once snarled "the Christian world was once torn in pieces over a diphthong."

The most violent phase of the Christological controversy is associated with the names of Arius and Athanasius. Arius was a presbyter in Alexandria in 318. Duchesne, the Catholic historian, thus summarizes the views of Arius concerning Christ:

God is One, eternal, and unbegotten. Other beings are His creatures, the Logos first of all. Like other creatures, the Logos was taken out of nothingness and not from the Divine Substance; there was a time when He was not. He was created, not necessarily, but voluntarily. Himself the creature of God, He is the Creator of all other beings. God adopted Christ as Son. From this sonship by adoption results no real participation in the Divinity, no true likeness to It. God can have no true like. The Logos was made flesh, in the sense that He fulfilled in Jesus Christ the function of a soul.

To Arius, therefore, Christ was not God. He was far above man, but less than God. He was of a different nature from either God or man.

Bishop Alexander of Alexandria, called upon Arius to change his views. But Arius refused. He wrote to a friend that he would die a thousand deaths before he would assent to beliefs which were not sound. The bishop, therefore, deposed Arius from office.

A council at Alexandria in 321 excommunicated him from the church and banished him from the city as "an atheist." (How unoriginal the hurlers of the epithet "atheist" in "these modern days!") A violent controversy concerning the views of Arius spread through the eastern churches and Emperor Constantine, recently converted to Christianity, and uneasy about the state of his Empire, called the Council of Nicea, with the hope that these theological disturbances might be quieted.

May I quote Wilbur's story of the council? The Council of Nicea, with more than three hundred bishops present from every part of the Roman Empire, was opened by Constantine himself. He also presided over its sessions. It lasted six weeks. There was little calm reasoning over the important matters of Christian beliefs, and a Christian spirit of forbearance was conspicuously absent. Feeling ran so high that the most abusive language was often used in debate, and, sometimes, it is said, even physical violence was used by members against one another.

Athanasius, a young deacon (about 25 years old) of Alexandria, handsome in appearance, fiery in temper, violent in argument, and passionately devoted to his conviction that Jesus was of the same substance with the Father, and, therefore, equal with God, led the opposition to Arius. He called the Arians by such names as "devils, anti-Christians, maniacs, Jews, polytheists, atheists, dogs, wolves, lions, hares, chameleons, hydras, eels, cuttlefish, gnats, beetles, and leeches," and, no doubt, the Arians repaid him measure for measure.

The followers of Athanasius were uncompromising, unyielding, and the Emperor found it necessary to compel an acceptance of their creed though they did not have a majority of the council. (A third party, Semi-Arians, they were called, under the leadership of Eusebius, constituted the great majority of the Council.) And thus the deity of Christ was foisted upon the Christian world.

The Council of Nicea, however, did not quiet the controversy. It was finally settled by Emperor Theodosius, who, upon his baptism in 380, issued an edict that all nations in the Empire should adhere to the belief in the Trinity as an equal deity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Debates concerning the "two natures" of Christ, the "two wills" of Christ, and other abstruse points in the controversy about the strange nature of Christ, continued for a century or more. The Councils of Alexander (362 A. D.) and Chalcedon (451 A. D.) decided that the doctrine of the "two natures" of Christ meant that "the one person, Jesus Christ, possessed two wholly distinct and alien natures, the divine and the human, neither of which was destroyed or transformed by the other."

Eventually the various heresies were killed off, and orthodox reign supreme. The triumph of orthodoxy was so complete that heretical doctrines with respect to Christ were not heard of in the councils of the church for nearly a thousand years. To be a Christian, it was necessary to believe that Jesus Christ "was Perfect God and Perfect man, equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching His manhood, begotten, not made, of the same substance with the Father and Very God of Very God."

And thus the orthodox theology as to God and Christ by gradual evolution was completed. Here are the steps as summarized by Wilbur:

1. The first three Gospels make Jesus the Messiah, but a man.
2. Paul makes Jesus a man, but one raised up by God to a unique position in the universe.
3. The Gospel of John makes Christ the Logos, subordinate to God, yet somehow sharing his divinity.
4. The Fathers of the second and third centuries waver between

present from every part of the Roman Empire, was opened by Constantine himself. He also presided over its sessions. It lasted six weeks. There was little calm reasoning over the important matters of Christian beliefs, and a Christian spirit of forbearance was conspicuously absent. Feeling ran so high that the most abusive language was often used in debate, and, sometimes, it is said, even physical violence was used by members against one another.

Athanasius, a young deacon (about 25 years old) of Alexandria, handsome in appearance, fiery in temper, violent in argument, and passionately devoted to his conviction that Jesus was of the same substance with the Father, and, therefore, equal with God, led the opposition to Arius. He called the Arians by such names as "devils, anti-Christians, maniacs, Jews, polytheists, atheists, dogs, wolves, lions, hares, chameleons, hydras, eels, cuttlefish, gnats, beetles, and leeches," and, no doubt, the Arians repaid him measure for measure.

The followers of Athanasius were uncompromising, unyielding, and the Emperor found it necessary to compel an acceptance of their creed though they did not have a majority of the council. (A third party, Semi-Arians, they were called, under the leadership of Eusebius, constituted the great majority of the Council.) And thus the deity of Christ was foisted upon the Christian world.

The Council of Nicea, however, did not quiet the controversy. It was finally settled by Emperor Theodosius, who, upon his baptism in 380, issued an edict that all nations in the Empire should adhere to the belief in the Trinity as an equal deity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Debates concerning the "two natures" of Christ, the "two wills" of Christ, and other abstruse points in the controversy about the strange nature of Christ, continued for a century or more. The Councils of Alexander (362 A. D.) and Chalcedon (451 A. D.) decided that the doctrine of the "two natures" of Christ meant that "the one person, Jesus Christ, possessed two wholly distinct and alien natures, the divine and the human, neither of which was destroyed or transformed by the other."

Eventually the various heresies were killed off, and orthodox reign supreme. The triumph of orthodoxy was so complete that heretical doctrines with respect to Christ were not heard of in the councils of the church for nearly a thousand years. To be a Christian, it was necessary to believe that Jesus Christ "was Perfect God and Perfect man, equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching His manhood, begotten, not made, of the same substance with the Father and Very God of Very God."

And thus the orthodox theology as to God and Christ by gradual evolution was completed. Here are the steps as summarized by Wilbur:

1. The first three Gospels make Jesus the Messiah, but a man.
2. Paul makes Jesus a man, but one raised up by God to a unique position in the universe.
3. The Gospel of John makes Christ the Logos, subordinate to God, yet somehow sharing his divinity.
4. The Fathers of the second and third centuries waver between

the simple humanity and the complete divinity of Christ.

5. The Council of Nicea (325 A. D.) makes Christ of the same essential nature with God.

6. The Council of Constantine (381 A. D.) unites Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in one Trinity.

7. The Council of Ephesus (449 A. D.) makes Christ's two natures not distinct but united.

8. The Council of Chalcedon (451 A. D.) makes these two natures united in one person.

The other doctrines against which Unitarianism was later to protest—total human depravity, predestination, the vicarious atonement, etc., were also in like manner gradually built up and forced upon Christendom.

[To be continued next week]

The Game of Life

Thomas Huxley in *A Liberal Education* (Little Blue Book No. 7).

Suppose it were perfectly certain that the life and fortune of every one of us would, one day or other, depend upon his winning or losing a game at chess. Don't you think we should all consider it to be a primary duty to learn at least the names and the moves of the pieces; to have a notion of a gambit, and a keen eye for all the means of giving and getting out of check? Do you not think that we should look with a disapprobation amounting to scorn upon the father who allowed his son, or the state which allowed its members, to grow up without knowing a pawn from a knight?

Yet, it is a very plain and elementary truth that the life, the fortune, and the happiness of every one of us, and, more or less, of those who are connected with us, do depend upon our knowing something of the rules of a game infinitely more difficult and complicated than chess. It is a game which has been played for untold ages, every man and woman of us being one of the two players in a game of his or her own. The chess-board is the world, the pieces are the phenomena of the universe, the rules of the game are what we call the laws of nature. The player on the other side is hidden from us. We know that his play is always fair, just and patient. But also we know to our cost that he never overlooks a mistake or makes the smallest allowance for ignorance. To the man who plays well, the highest stakes are paid, with that sort of overflowing generosity with which the strong show delight in strength. And one who plays ill is checkmated—without haste, but without remorse.

Well, what I mean by education is learning the rules of this mighty game. In other words, education is the instruction of the intellect in the laws of nature, under which name I include not merely things and their forces, but men and their ways; and the fashioning of the affections and of the will into an earnest and loving desire to move in harmony with these laws. For me, education means neither more nor less than this. Anything which professes to call itself education must be tried by this standard, and if it fails to stand the test, I will not call it education, whatever may be the force of authority or of numbers upon the other side.

And one suspects that the "competent authority" for whose "searching and impartial investigation" this reader of the *Star* pleads that we wait is the "authority" of the Roman Catholic Church. When the Church comes forward with an official report about Malden, then we may expect the truth—yes, we may expect it, but what a long time we shall be waiting for anything remotely approaching the truth from that source!

"Undermining Faith"

Referring to the thronging of miracle-seekers about the grave of the Malden, Mass., priest, the *Kansas City Star* commented, mildly enough, upon the pathetic delusion and inevitable disillusionment of the tens of thousands who came seeking a miracle and would see only a mob. At the same time the *Star* suggested that perhaps a few cures might be authentically made, not of course by the priest's grave, but by the influence of this strange excitement and hope: cases, that is to say, in which the victims were troubled with a mental malady primarily, which has been known, for instance, in cases of paralysis. By psychological treatment and experiments medical science has removed imaginary afflictions of paralysis, where there was nothing wrong with the patient in an organic way. Again, it is well known that in a variety of illnesses, so called, the patient is only "borrowing trouble" and only thinks that he is ill.

Now this comment by the *Star* was but the simple truth, very moderately expressed. And it is illustrative of what blind faith can be when we read a letter to the *Star* from one of its readers in Marysville, Kans., as follows:

We are interested in your views as to the significance of passing events in their relation to the social, economic, industrial and political life of the community and nation; but when you go outside your proper sphere and assume the right to sneer at simple folk who still believe that the Author of Nature can suspend his laws, we may justly complain. The sensible man will suspend judgment as to the reality of the alleged miracles now receiving attention in the public press until competent authority, after a searching and impartial investigation, shall have passed upon the matter; or, if he speaks at all, will not, under the guise of expressing an opinion on the instant case, covertly seek to undermine the faith of countless millions of his fellows.

One understands this letter a bit more clearly when one knows that Marysville, Kans., is the home of a Catholic academy and has presumably a larger Catholic population than is usual in Kansas towns. It is a very safe bet, to be more definite, that the writer of this letter to the *Star* is a Catholic. Thus we can interpret his statements; don't suggest any skepticism about Catholic faith and wonders, or you "go outside your proper sphere"; suspend judgment—that is, try to believe in the possibility of "miracles" which, as a general idea and as specific claims, have been thoroughly and repeatedly exposed as indefensible superstition—suspend judgment, the writer means, and think that maybe science is wrong and Catholicism is right.

And one suspects that the "competent authority" for whose "searching and impartial investigation" this reader of the *Star* pleads that we wait is the "authority" of the Roman Catholic Church. When the Church comes forward with an official report about Malden, then we may expect the truth—yes, we may expect it, but what a long time we shall be waiting for anything remotely approaching the truth from that source!

BIG BLUE BOOKS

10c NOW 10c EACH (10 BOOKS FOR A DOLLAR) POSTPAID

One of the Biggest Book Bargains Ever Offered in the History of Publishing!

Big Blue Books are separate and distinct from Little Blue Books. They are much larger, measuring 5 1/2 x 8 1/2 inches in size, and running from 30,000 to 75,000 words. The type is large, clear, and easy to read. Furthermore, thousands of people paid 30c apiece for these excellent books—books which are now offered at 10c each (if 10 or more are ordered at one time) postpaid to any address! Be sure to order at least 10 books (\$1 worth), as many more as you like, to get the 10c price. (Less than 10, 30c each.) Good paper, stiff card covers, the finest literature in the world! Build a library of liberal books—start here!

- Your Choice 10c Each—Order by Number
- | | |
|--|--|
| LOVE AND SEX | FAMOUS PLAYS |
| B-16 The Sexual Life of Man, Woman and Child. Dr. Isaac Gowenlock. (Chapters include "Sexual Morality," "Lust and Love.") | B-2 The Maid of Orleans: A Romantic Tragedy. Friedrich von Schiller. Adapted from the German by George S. Ylvestier Viereck. |
| B-41 Love's Coming of Age: A Series of Papers on the Relations of the Sexes. Edward Carpenter. (Chapters include "Sexual Fascination," "Men the Ungrown," "Woman the Serf," "Intermediate Sex," "Note on Preventive Checks to Population," etc.) | B-9 Faust, A Drama of Eternal Youth (Part I). Goethe. Translated by Anna Swanwick. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Margaret Munsterberg. |
| B-32 The History of a Woman's Heart (Love-Vie). Guy de Maupassant. (Complete novel by the famous French master of fiction.) | B-10 Faust (Part II). Goethe. Translated by Anna Swanwick, etc. |
| B-3 The Love Sorrows of Young Werther. Goethe. (Famous love story.) | B-17 William Congreve's Way of the World (A Somewhat Naughty Comedy). With an essay by Macaulay; extracts from Lamb, Swift and Hazlitt, etc. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Lloyd E. Smith. |
| FICTION | B-26 Nathan the Wise (Famous Liberal Play). Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. Translated and Edited by Leo Markun. |
| B-19 Farmington: A Novel of American Boyhood. Clarence Darrow. (This is Mr. Darrow's favorite work!) | AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND BIOGRAPHY |
| B-6 Zadie, or Destiny. Micromegas and the Princess of Babylon. Voltaire. (Famous satirical fiction.) | B-19 Persons and Personalities. Paragraphs and Essays. E. Haldeman-Julius. |
| B-12 Grimm's Famous Fairy Tales. | B-13 John Brown: The Facts of His Life and Martyrdom. E. Haldeman-Julius. |
| B-24 An Eye for an Eye. Clarence Darrow. Complete. (A Journey Through France and Italy. Laurence Sterne. (Fiducial account of travel experiences—one of the most famous books in English literature.) | B-45 Confessions of a Young Man. George Moore. |
| B-31 The Sign of the Four (Sherlock Holmes Detective Story). Conan Doyle. | B-28 The Truth About Aimee Semple McPherson, Notorious Woman Evangelist. A Symposium. Louis Adamic, and Others. |
| B-35 A Study in Scarlet (Sherlock Holmes Detective Story). Conan Doyle. | |

BIG BLUE BOOKS—NOW 10c EACH POSTPAID

- PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION**
- B-4 The Wisdom of Life. Being the first of Arthur Schopenhauer's Aphorismen zur Lebensweisheit. Translated with a Preface by T. Bailey Saunders.
 - B-5 Confessions and Maxims. Being the second part of Arthur Schopenhauer's Aphorismen zur Lebensweisheit. Translated by T. Bailey Saunders.
 - B-1 On Liberty. John Stuart Mill. (Chapters include "Liberty of Thought and Discussion," "Individuality," "Limits to Authority of Society over the Individual," etc.)
 - B-11 Evolution and Christianity. William M. Goldsmith.
 - B-18 Resist Not Evil. Clarence Darrow. (Chapters include "Nature of the State," "Arms and Navies," "Crime and Punishment," "Cause of Crime," "Law and Conduct," "Penal Codes and Their Victims," etc.)
- FAMOUS TRIALS**
- B-20 Clarence Darrow's Two Great Trials (Reports of the Scopes Anti-Evolution Case and the Dr. Sweet Negro Trial). Marcell Haldeman-Julius.
 - B-20 Clarence Darrow's Plea in Defense of Loch and Leopold, the Boy Murderers. (August 22, 23, 25, 1924).
 - B-47 Trial of Rev. J. Frank Norris, Shooting Salvationist. Marcell Haldeman-Julius.
- CULTURE AND EDUCATION**
- B-15 Culture and its Modern Aspects. A Series of Essays. E. Haldeman-Julius.
 - B-22 A Road-Map to Literature: Good Books to Read. Lawrence Campbell Lockley and Percy Hazell Houston.
 - B-36 What is Wrong with Our Schools? A Symposium. Nelson Antrim Crawford, Charles Antrim, etc.
 - B-34 Panoramia: A Book of Critical, Sexual, and Aesthetic Views. Dr. Isaac Goldberg.
- COMPLETE SET OF 49 VOLUMES FOR ONLY \$4.65:** Get a good supply of excellent reading—in a complete set of 49 Big Blue Books, all now ready and in stock for immediate delivery. You can get all 49 volumes for only \$4.65 prepaid. Use the blank below to order this set, or for your choice of any books (10 or more) at 10c each postpaid. (Less than 10 books must be paid for at the rate of 30c each.)
- Clip and use this handy order form!**
- HALEDMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS
- I enclose herewith \$..... for..... Big Blue Books at 10c each postpaid. I am putting a circle around the numbers of the books I want, below, corresponding to the numbers before the titles in your list. (Minimum order 10 books, or \$1 worth.)
- | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| B-1 | B-2 | B-3 | B-4 | B-5 | B-6 | B-7 | B-8 | B-9 | B-10 |
| B-11 | B-12 | B-13 | B-14 | B-15 | B-16 | B-17 | B-18 | B-19 | B-20 |
| B-21 | B-22 | B-23 | B-24 | B-25 | B-26 | B-27 | B-28 | B-29 | B-30 |
| B-31 | B-32 | B-33 | B-34 | B-35 | B-36 | B-37 | B-38 | B-39 | B-40 |
| B-41 | B-42 | B-43 | B-44 | B-45 | B-46 | B-47 | B-48 | B-49 | |
- If you want a Complete Set of 49 Volumes, remit \$4.65 and check here..... If you want a handy Letter Slip Cover to fit your Big Blue Books, add \$1.00 to your remittance and check here.....
- Name.....
Address.....
City..... State.....

Around the Table

Chats Among the Editor and His Readers

By E. Haldeman-Julius

WHAT ARE YOU THINKING ABOUT?

There is nothing more interesting than chatty discussion, ranging freely over many subjects, points of views, and topics of the passing hour. It is my wish that in this department, "Around the Table," my readers and I shall enjoy ourselves each week in an exchange of views that shall be various, breezy (tingling breezes of fresh and honest opinion or even of humorous relief), and good-natured. No subject is barred which will furnish ground for a bit of entertaining discussion. "Human nature" will, after all, be our broad subject, as it is manifested in the behavior and ideas which we find in the news, in our reading, and in our direct personal looking at life. Apparent trifles may suggest ideas; humor will lighten and sweeten and, often, will happily inform our thinking; sometimes we shall be serious about little things and sometimes we shall touch lightly upon profound subjects—always our object shall be to find the most intelligent entertainment in the moving, many-shaped, and multi-colored spectacle of life.

Good talk—that is really what I want, and what I am sure my readers will enjoy, in this department. Let us imagine that we are sitting around a table and speaking "as the spirit moves." Of course, we shall want to talk to some point, even though it is not the most important point in the world. We don't wish to bore one another. We do not wish to talk on any one subject until we have wearily worn it to wretched ravelings and tail-ends of repetition. A spirit of lively, fresh interest should always be with us, whether we happen to be discussing—and maybe dealing one another blows—a subject in a very serious mood or take our ease now and again among reflections and impressions which are not so profound and yet have the sparkle of genuinely thinking, feeling life.

A good many topics for this table talk will naturally be suggested by editorials and articles in *The American Freeman*. You may wish to make additional comment upon something you read in *The American Freeman*. You may wish to have a doubtful point cleared up—and this will be your clearing house, so to speak. You may (very likely you often will) disagree with some of the opinions editorially expressed in *The American Freeman*; and disagreement when it is tolerant (which does not mean tame) is the very breath of good talk which is at the same time intelligent talk. Or, whatever it is that urges you to grab your pen or your typewriter, don't hesitate to "get it out of your system." You can speak freely here.

Naturally, as this department grows we shall have a plenty of topics to keep us going full blast. And there will be a pleasant strain of familiarity and continuity in these discussions. Certain subjects will bob up from week to week, will appear and reappear, treated from a slightly different angle. And it is a

delightful surprise to observe how many subjects, at first glaze perhaps seemingly far apart, border upon one another and suggest ideas which are, in one way or another, related. It is truly an adventure. What better adventure is there, indeed, than in thinking about life which finds a familiar, free, and easy outlet in mutual discussion!

You will, of course, understand that this department must have its limitations—mainly physical limitations. Obviously, not every letter can be printed. (But that, if you look at it rightly, only makes the adventure more interesting—to see whether your letter appears! And, sooner or later, you are pretty sure to be among the talkers "Around the Table" while always you are seated as a privileged, intimate listener.) Again, letters should not be too long. A snappy impressionism, an effect of ideas glimpsed, with quick understanding, in attractive flight, is the style I wish in these letters and in my own comments upon them. Use your own judgment, of course—speak out your thoughts—and, if sometimes I have to omit a part of your letter, I shall carefully preserve its readable identity and be scrupulously fair to your point of view; in editing letters, that is to say, I shall not misrepresent your opinions.

PLAIN SPEAKING AND CATHOLICISM

Plain speaking is admirable in a writer, and never more so than when he is dealing with an important controversial subject. Next to his scholarship—the great value of the knowledge he has to offer on so many subjects—the simplicity and candor of Joseph McCabe are the qualities that win for him the admiration, the enthusiasm, of Haldeman-Julius readers. McCabe never hesitates to call things by their correct names. He is discussing aspects of thought and history and life which are very serious, and he would consider it an unpardonable dishonesty to be obscure, evasive, or polite in his writings. His scholarship, after all, is rendered finally valuable by the sterling integrity of his attitude toward everything that he discusses. I don't know of any writer who can be compared with McCabe for his plain speaking. Charles E. Ruby, a lawyer in Boston, Mass., expresses his pleasure in McCabe's downrightness—yet, as he adds, candor is always accompanied by good will. He is addressing McCabe:

I have just finished reading your latest book, "The Story of Religious Controversy." You are sixty-two years old, and while I am twenty-six years your junior and have received considerable education both in science and law, with side excursions into literature and music, I feel quite certain that twenty-six years more of education would not enable me to turn out a book one-half so excellent. There is about this book,

as there is about your book on Shaw, a downright forthrightness—bluntness, if you like, sweet but firm. And you are so aware of that cardinal principle of all research—seek the original sources for data—a principle not fully appreciated by some men of high position in the scientific world.

I hope that your prediction of a world freed of Christianity will come true—I hope that it is not a mere wish-fulfillment. Catholicism is growing each year stronger and stronger, and it must be remembered that it requires only one determined minority to govern this country, and in particular to tamper with the first amendment to the Constitution. Protestantism is on the toboggan. Perhaps there will be a bloody religious war or wars which we shall not see. Catholicism is not dead: consider the shrine in Malden.

I look not for the masses of people to become skeptical in thinking. At best, they will become merely indifferent to religion, which, any more than any other human institution, cannot survive under indifference and lack of financial support. But indifference can be a very effective substitute for skepticism, where the real article cannot be obtained. Hear the bawlings of the clergy today about the loss of religion by the people! Somebody's income is evidently suffering some diminution. These impresarios of the oldest show on earth are learning that their public wants some change of the bill.

In fact, the various stages of Modernism remind me of the successive skits in a 10-20-30 vaudeville, each act worse than the preceding one. The Roman Catholic Church has thus far refused to change its show, but there may come a time when its High Mass will be presented via the talkies with the Pope presiding and admission at \$10 a head; the Host will be presented to the faithful either by the local representatives, or perhaps by an as yet un-invented electrical means. I favor the latter method—it can be more easily controlled by His Holiness.

On the subject of Catholicism—the nature of its menace, its tactics of propaganda, and the best way to combat it—McCabe has written fully in "The True Story of the Roman Catholic Church" (12 vols. in the same form as "The Key to Culture"), which is now on the point of publication. While he is sure that the modern age in its scientific and emancipated and progressive character will triumph over Catholicism, as over all religion and the mind-narrowing influences of the past, he says plainly that it is still a real menace; as long as it is in existence, it cannot be anything but a menace. The Roman Catholic Church is today, especially in America, using all the tricks of what may be called a diplomatic warfare to insinuate itself favorably even into the minds of non-Catholics. It will (says McCabe) take any position politically for the sake of power. In America, Catholic propaganda persistently lies about what Catholic official dogma really is, and about what Catholic practice is in lands where there is not so much need of guarding against Protestant critics.

I do not think we or our children will see "a bloody religious war." Both Protestantism and Catholicism—all religion—will be defeated finally and completely by the progress of civilization. There will indeed be serious controversies in which we must bear our part; if religion in its guise of formal and absolute theology is nearly dead if not altogether dead, religion as an interference with and confusion of the social, political, personal, behavioristic issues of life is still a force, expressing itself in more than one way and not always openly, against which our libertarian vigilance is required. Our children—or perhaps our grandchildren—may see the struggle ended and religion merely a strange congeries of aberrations to be read about in history. That day is not yet.

When one speaks of one's conviction that modernism will go on to a final and complete triumph over every department of human life—when one expresses an optimistic evolutionary belief with regard to the future—one is assuming that those who believe profoundly in freedom and culture will continue to be active as the necessary human agents of social evolution. When we trace the evolution of liberal ideas in the past, we see how necessary to that progress was the labor of free thinkers and groups that were dedicated to liberty. Even so, our attitude today—our very interested and articulate attitude—must needs keep moving, as it were, the movement of modernism. We must live our thoughts. We must utter the words of truth and freedom unceasingly.

NEVER TOUCHED HIM

A newspaper bunk-shooter fires at Charles Darwin and sadly misses: this is the amusing item for which we are indebted to T. H. Lowry (Denver, Colo.). Mr. Lowry read in a Denver Post article by one Albert E. Hayes, entitled with unconscious irony "Lest We Forget," the following statement: "Darwin is just as bad as the Fundamentalists in explaining the greatest miracle of all—the electron." Hayes has forgotten what little he probably never knew in the first place about Darwin and about the electron. Mr. Lowry is on the right track when he comments: "I don't feel able to decide what he means by taking Darwin to

task, a biologist, for being without explanation of a physics theory that I do not believe (I may be wrong) was in existence in his day. Is Mr. Hayes sincerely though ignorantly feeding this tripe to his readers, many of whom are only too eager to credit as unimpeachable anything they see in print, and does he really believe his own arguments or is he—well, just what is he doing?"

It is true that Darwin wrote very specially on biology and had nothing to do with the science of physics. It is also a fact that the electron was not discovered—that the atom was not refined by scientific perception into the smaller units, electrons and protons—until 1895. Thus the remark by Hayes is perfectly ridiculous.

And that is not all. What does Hayes think he means by comparing Darwin and the Fundamentalists as explainers of anything? The Fundamentalists don't explain—they simply assert the dogma of creation. On the contrary, Darwin explains by the evolutionary method. It is also very loose language to speak of the electron as a "miracle," when we know that the word "miracle" means a suspension of the natural order or "law"—in other words, a miracle is a word for an imagined kind of supernatural happening which has never happened. The "electron" is, of course, no more correctly called a miracle than any other fact of nature.

Thanks, Mr. Lowry, for reminding us again how ignorant or dishonest (in either case the effect is the same) these bunk-shooters are.

A World in Little

Clarence Darrow in *Farmington* (A Novel of American Boyhood) (Big Blue Book No. B-49).

After my father and mother—whom I did not appreciate, and who, I am bound to think, but half understood me—no other men or women came very near my life. My relations were with the boys and girls—especially the boys. The men and women were there only to board and clothe the children, and furnish them with a place to sleep at night. To be sure, we knew something of all the men and women in the town, but we saw them only through childish eyes.

There was the blacksmith, who was very strong, and whom we liked and called "clever" because he sometimes helped us with our games. There was one old farmer in particular, who had a large orchard and a fierce dog, and who would let his apples rot on the ground rather than give us one to eat. We hated him, and called him stingy and a miser. Perhaps he was not that sort of man at all, and the dog may not have been so very fierce. No doubt someone had given them bad names, and the people preferred to believe evil of them instead of good.

Then there was the town drunkard, whom all of us knew. We liked him when he was sober, and looked upon him as a friend, but when we were told that he was very bad; but he always laughed and joked with us, and watched our games in a friendly way, but when we heard that he was drunk we were all afraid of him and ran away.

Then there was another man who kept a little store, and we knew he was very rich; we had no idea how much he was really worth, but anyhow we knew that he was rich. And so on, through all the neighborhood, we knew something of the men, and classified them by some one trait or supposed fact—just as the grown-up world always persists in having a right to do.

The women, too, we knew even better than the men, for it was the mothers who controlled the boys, and in almost every case it depended on them alone whether or not the boys might go and play. Still, we children only knew and cared about the grown-up people in a remote secondary way. Every home was full of boys, and by common affinity these boys were always together—at least, as many of them as could get away from home. As a rule, the goodness and desirability of a parent were in exact proportion to the ease with which the children could get away from home. I am afraid that in this child's world my good parents stood very low upon the list—much lower than I wished them to stand.

JUBILEE!!!

An exclamation for each five hundred titles—1500 Little Blue Books now attractively listed, with ample descriptive material, in our new Jubilee Catalog. Send for your copy. Every reader of the Haldeman-Julius Publications will want a copy of this catalog, which is a useful guide to reading, an interesting suggestion of splendid vistas of knowledge and entertainment, and a reminder that—the Haldeman-Julius reader—has shared in a great cultural adventure. In the opening pages of this catalog a number of eminent leaders of our time set forth their views of the importance of the Little Blue Books—what these very popular yet excellent books have meant to America and the world, and what they will increasingly signify in the future. The Jubilee Catalog is 128 pages in size and every page is interesting.

Most people do not grow old; they do not grow in any real sense; they merely let the years go empty by.

A Window on Europe

A Weekly Letter from an Englishman About Europe

John Langdon-Davies

BIRTH CONTROL AS A COMMUNITY NECESSITY.

A subject which has been the center of much controversy this year in England has been the preservation of "rural amenities": committees for the protection of the countryside, deputations to parliament, bills for the prevention of building development near famous "beauty spots," appeals for funds to buy for the nation fifty acres of woodland here or there to prevent it going on the market as house sites, and shoals of letters to the press. Nothing could bring out more vividly the differences between England and America than this state of affairs. America has several National Parks larger in area than the whole of England and here we crowded folk are clamoring that a few hundred acres may be found to provide our first National Parklet! A quite extraordinary confusion of thought is being shown over the matter, however, and it is very interesting to note how people insist upon holding doctrines about social affairs which clash with one another.

For example, I know a worthy gentleman, a reactionary Tory by birth and upbringing who in later life, realizing the horrible conditions of the workers, the slums, the sordidness of overcrowding, became a supporter of the Labor Party and advocated the rehousing of the working classes and a policy of building a million houses in five years: yet whenever he sees a new building on a country road where from childhood he has only hitherto seen trees, he has apoplexy. He is a symbol of the human habit of trying to eat your cake and have it, a habit which makes so much of politics and social work unreal.

There are two ways of solving the horrors of slum dwelling without ruining the countryside. The first is birth control, which is in any case making tremendous headway among even slum dwellers. The second is a law insisting that not only must workers live near their works, but that slaveholders and everyone who makes a profit out of a factory must also live within sight and smell of the chimney. As things are at present the men who make the money in Pittsburgh go to live in Palm Beach, the men who make the money in east end London have country estates in Sussex. The first of these two is not politics at all but common sense, the second is unfortunately not practical politics.

Birth control is much more than a method of cleaning up emotional and economic personal problems; we in England are realizing that it is a community necessity as well. People argue that there is no danger of over-population at all, that if wealth was properly distributed, and production reasonably controlled there is enough food for everyone. "Why," I have heard a prominent socialist say, "if electricity is properly developed and agriculture industrialized we could support twice as many people as we can today, in comfort and happiness." The answer is that if food could be made synthetically and food was the only human necessity you could have one man to the square yard of the earth's surface, only even then certain problems, such as drainage, would be very difficult to solve; but that man cannot live by bread alone; he needs, for example, parking space for a motor car and somewhere to be able to drive it in comfort and safety; beyond that he needs a room with a view, and solitude. "I think," said Walt Whitman, "heroic deeds were all conceived in the open air"; he was probably wrong, but nevertheless it is certain that the prospect of the world becoming one large town, even if some good-sized parks were kept for children to play in, means a curtailment of the human potentiality for good and happiness.

On the other hand you have the nice old country clergymen and retired army colonels who want to have birth control stopped at all costs. These same people have this summer become curiously vocal because the new electrical development schemes involve the carrying of high tension cables and the building of pylons over the green downs and country woodlands of southern England. What confusion of thought lies here: you advocate an increasing population and yet you kick at anything which may make it possible to feed and support that population!

Not many miles from where I am sitting—in my lovely room with a view—lies the wild upland of Dartmoor. Somebody wants to start a china clay works in one of the valleys of the Moor; immediately a violent outcry is raised against the spoiling of the amenities of Dartmoor and the pollution of the streams. There you have it, on the one hand a chance of employing five hundred men, on the other some views and expensive fishing spoilt. You must have both or neither. Everybody is theoretically in favor of reducing unemployment, but when they find it interferes with their solitude or view they begin to have doubts and to find excuses. And

yet I would bet a large sum that the majority of those who have protested against a curtailment of their landscape in the interests of employment, would oppose birth control instruction being given to all parts of the community. I would also bet a smaller sum that most of them practice birth control themselves!

There is another point which seems to me to illustrate human stupidity very well: people are screaming out that this, that and the other will ruin the beauty of the country as if any change or any artificial feature must ruin the landscape. An owner of several thousand acres finds that a new road may be built within sight of his property; along that road thousands will be able to pass to enjoy the trees and fields on every side; no, the road, the work of man, will ruin natural beauty. I would like to know where our English landscape would be without the works of man, roads, lanes, hedges, fields, farmsteads, villages; instead of this there would be nothing but messy marshes and impenetrable bog. New things are often more beautiful than old; a steel girder bridge, the Brooklyn Bridge for example, is a finer work of art than an old stone arch with ivy growing on it. Suppose we do have electricity pylons on the Down: a hundred years hence when power will be brought to us by "wireless" they will want to pull down the obsolete pylons; then listen to the wailings and anger of the Society for Protection of Ancient Pylons at the threatened desecration of our rural amenities. Lord! what fools these mortals be!

Views of Paradise

Remy de Gourmont in *Evigrams of Remy de Gourmont* (Little Blue Book No. 444).

Paradise, according to the various social classes:

A salon, where one is presented to the king and the court.

A theater, where one is introduced, behind the scenes, to the actors of destiny.

A circus without formalities where one may fraternize with the heroes of the ring.

A society, where one may sing in chorus the eternal refrains; and so on.

One should not commit oneself to an idea as one signs a note at the bank or the lease of a house. Surely one should make the greatest effort to live one's ideas and be true to them. But then living means growing; and one should ever be receptive to new vistas and values of growing, seeking, undogmatic life.

"For right too rigid hardens into wrong." That is a line seen somewhere in an old book. It is a line packed with social and intellectual criticism. Just for your private edification, look about you for pointed personal examples of this rigid "rightness" that is really the most insidious wrongness.

Gossip is talk about people; it makes all the difference whether it is intelligent talk about interesting people.

Wit is the talent of making foolishness piquant to the wise.

He denounces people's pet notions and makes them like it!

\$1 Astounding Bargain!
Best Liberal Reading
1,157 Pages, 300,000
Words—Almost Two
Pounds for \$1.00!

Here are books that will startle you into new lines of thought! A handy pocket library of books of liberal viewpoint! The whole set \$1—we pay the postage!

WORKS OF CLARENCE DARROW

18 THRILLING SECTIONS—27 TITLES

- Is Capital Punishment Justified? Debate vs. Judge Talley.
- Is Prohibition Right? Debate vs. John Haynes Holmes.
- Is Life Worth Living? Debate vs. Frederick Starr.
- Is the Human Race Getting Anywhere? Debate vs. Starr.
- Facing Life Fearlessly. Courageous Philosophy of Life.
- Lord's Day Alliance. Debunking "Blue" Sundays.
- Insects and Men: Instinct and Reason.
- How Voltaire Fooled Priest and King.
- The Skeleton in the Closet. Famous Lecture.
- Essay on Walt Whitman.
- Essay on John P. Altgeld.
- Realism in Literature and Art.
- Essay on Robert Burns.
- Essay on Geo. Burman Foster.

- Some Paragraphs Addressed to Socialists.
- The Ordeal of Prohibition.
- The Edwardes and the Jukeses. Question of Heredity.
- Are We Machines? Debate vs. Dr. Will Durant.
- Can the Individual Control His Conduct? Debate vs. Prof. Smith.
- Dry-Law Pro and Con. Debate vs. Wayne B. Wheeler.
- Do Human Beings Have Free Will? Debate vs. Prof. Foster.
- Resist Not Evil. Discussion of Non-resistance.
- An Eye for an Eye. Complete novel.
- Plea in Defense of Loeb and Leopold, the Boy Murderers.
- Darrow vs. Bryan in the Famous Scopes Anti-Evolution Case.
- The Defense of a Negro. Famous Dr. Sweet Case in Detroit.
- A Day With Clarence Darrow.

Easily Worth \$3
All Yours for \$1!

This is unquestionably the greatest bargain ever offered in the annals of printing! These works of Darrow comprise 1,157 pages, or 300,000 words, almost two pounds of excellent reading—all for \$1 postpaid to your address no matter where you live!

Send \$1 With This Blank
Haldeman-Julius Publications,
Girard, Kansas
I enclose \$1. Send me WORKS OF DARROW, 18 sections, 27 titles, postpaid.
Name.....
Address.....
City..... State.....

LOVE & MARRIAGE

LITTLE BLUE BOOKS AT FIVE CENTS EACH

These Little Blue Books contain facts about love and marriage which every intelligent person should know. Yet this library of love is available to everyone's pocketbook. See "How to Order" below.

- 43 Marriage vs. Divorce. Greeley vs. Owen
- 88 Evolution of Marriage. Leo Markun
- 87 What is Love? Montaigne
- 98 How to Love. Clement Wood
- 175 Hindu Love Book (Kama Sutra). Leo Markun
- 197 What Frenchwomen Learned About Love
- 203 Love Rights of Women. Havelock Ellis
- 434 Love Affairs of Lord Nelson and Lady Hamilton. Leo Markun
- 644 Women Who Have Lived for Love. Leo Markun
- 675 Love Code of a Parisian Actress (Sarah Bernhardt)
- 712 Shelley and the Women He Loved. Clement Wood
- 713 Lord Byron and the Women He Loved. Clement Wood
- 727 Psychology of the Affections. Vance Randolph
- 730 Mistresses of Today. Leo Markun
- 737 Eleonora Duse's Love Affair with D'Annunzio. Luigi del Riccio
- 786 Catherine the Great and Her Lovers. Leo Markun
- 789 Digest of U. S. Marriage and Divorce Laws. Frank Eggin
- 929 Maxims of Love. Stendhal
- 964 How to Be Happy Though Married. James Oppenheim
- 975 Cleopatra and Her Loves. Clement Wood
- 976 Casanova: World's Greatest Lover. Clement Wood
- 977 Pope Alexander VI's Loves. Clement Wood
- 987 Art of Kissing. Clement Wood
- 988 Art of Courtship. Clement Wood
- 990 Wagner's Great Love Affair. Ralph Oppenheim
- 1085 Love-Life of George Sand. Ralph Oppenheim
- 1113 Love from Many Angles. Max Ehrmann
- 1212 Marriage and Morals in Soviet Russia. A. L. Strong
- 1225 How to Avoid Marital Discords. Gloria Goddard

HOW TO ORDER

Your choice 5c each; order at least 20 books (\$1 worth) at one time. Order by numbers instead of titles. We pay the postage when remittance in full accompanies order. C.O.D. orders postage extra. No C.O.D.'s can be sent to foreign countries. If you want all the books listed on this page (49 books) remit \$2.45, and list all the numbers as given before the titles above.

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas