

## Christian Scientists Scheme to Suppress Biography of Mrs. Eddy

Christian Science intolerance—a very serious scheme to suppress free speech concerning this religion and its founder, Mary Baker Eddy—is exposed in the story of how this tyrannical, tight-minded cult is trying to browbeat booksellers of the country into refusing or obstructing the sale of the latest biography of Mrs. Eddy. Stated quite baldly, the Christian Scientists are doing their worst to kill a book which they don't like.

And it is significant that the story of this conspiracy—a news story of great importance—has not been given adequate notice in the daily press of the country.

Although the offending book (*Mrs. Eddy: The Biography of a Virgin Mind*, by Edwin Franden Dakin, published by Charles Scribner's Sons) is not an attack on Christian Science—though, even so, why should it not be if that were the author's viewpoint, and wish?—it does not deal tenderly enough with the "sainted" "Mother" Eddy. Even a lack of sympathy or politeness toward Christian Science is enough to set the suppressionists of this cult at work. If a line offends them—if a fact stated is displeasing—if the suggestion of an idea does not fit in with Christian Science tyranny, away with the whole book; that seems to be the policy, and certainly it is the demonstration of dogmatic policy which is now being given by Christian Scientists.

A well-organized—and cowardly—campaign by this minority (according to the 1926 United States Church Census there are 202,098 members of Christian Science churches in the United States) has brought to light a real, important battle between the publishers of the book and the "Mother" Eddy fanatics who plainly aim to hustle the book out of sight. Booksellers vary in their reactions to this amazing conspiracy. Some are frightened or bluffed into taking the book out of their stock, some or them keep their copies of the book hidden away under a counter and sell it only on special request.

It is not simply that individual members of Christian Science churches have concerted in this boycotting movement, although that would be bad enough. The Com-

mittees on Publication, located strategically in every State (and sometimes several in a State), have evidently taken a hand: official protests have been made and there have been, with a method of responsible and significant timeliness, threats direct or implied. It is sufficiently clear also that from the center and throne of this throttling despotism—from the Mother Church in Boston, Mass.—the fight and the conspiracy to suppress an important book has received inspiration which is all too glaring in its anti-modern, anti-libertarian character.

"Presumably [at first] the Mother Church Board of Directors was amazed," writes Craig F. Thompson in *The New Republic*. "At any rate it is known that summonses to all Committees on Publication were sent out from Boston, and a conference was held in that city. The discussions at this conference were, of course, not made public. It is not even known that the meeting was called with Mr. Dakin's book in view. It is known that shortly thereafter the fight on the book took on added intensity. *The Christian Science Sentinel*, without naming either the book or the author, editorially exhorted its readers to eschew unauthorized literature and called the attention of communicants to the by-law in the 'Manual' on obnoxious books."

The "Manual" mentioned is *The Manual of the Mother Church*, and its by-law, referring to what we can only call in plain words a deliberate, insidious censorship of all things appearing in print which impinge upon, the sensibilities or the dogmas of Christian Scientists, is comparable only to the notorious index of prohibited books which is maintained by the Catholic Church. There is indeed a significant resemblance between the tyrannical spirit and policy of Christian Science and Roman Catholicism. The by-law in this "Manual" of bigotry reads as follows:

"It shall be the duty of the Committee [on Publication] to correct in a Christian manner injustices done Mrs. Eddy or members of this Church by the daily press, by periodicals or circulated literature of any sort. The Committee shall be responsible for correcting or having corrected a false news-

paper article which has not been replied to by other Scientists, or which has been forwarded to this Committee for the purpose of having him reply to it. If the correction is not promptly published by the periodical in which it is desirable that this correction shall appear, the Committee on Publication shall immediately apply for aid to the Committee on Business.

What this means of course is that the agents of Christian Science intolerance use every weapon—of suggestion, of reprimand, of disfavor, of commercial boycotting—to stifle any utterance that is not agreeable to them. Their "Christian manner" is revealed pointedly in the present instance. The publishing house of Scribner's and booksellers throughout the country—even in Hawaii and in Canada—have been warned that this biography of Mrs. Eddy and story of her religion is "obnoxious" to Christian Scientists and will be boycotted by them. An official letter sent to Scribner's from a Kansas City, Mo., Christian Science Church ("written," says Craig F. Thompson in *The New Republic*, "over the names of the members of the Executive Board signed by the hand of the clerk") refers in an unmistakably threatening manner to the censorship rule in the "Manual" under the heading "Obnoxious Books," as follows: "A member of this church shall not patronize a publishing house or bookstore that has for sale obnoxious books."

And from another Kansas City church a more specific threat was sent to Scribner's: "We will have to desist from patronizing your company unless the book be removed from sale."

From over a wide territory—from Winnipeg (Canada), from Chicago, from San Francisco, from Toledo (Ohio), from Seattle, from Atlanta, from Cleveland, from Port Orchard (Washington), from a little town in New Hampshire—have come to Scribner's the reports of booksellers telling how the Christian Scientists have conducted their boycott. A few quotations from these booksellers' reports will suffice to indicate the varied effectiveness of Christian Science intolerance:

From the New Hampshire town: "We are returning to you by parcel post one only Mary Baker Eddy book as we have been requested

by members of the Christian Science Church not to have it for sale."

From an Atlanta department store: "I have had more than my share of sinister opposition to the book. Since they are so powerful in this town it would probably be the better part of discretion for us to withdraw it from sale."

From San Francisco: "Our attitude is not to be influenced by the position being taken by the publication office of the Christian Science Church."

From a Cleveland bookseller: "I am sorry that I cannot accede to your suggestion to take a more active interest in the sale of 'Mrs. Eddy.' We have it under the counter. It was a compromise, and in view of the fact that we have quite a few very good patrons who are Scientists, it seemed necessary."

So extensive and serious and well-organized is this conspiracy (showing what amazing mischief an organized minority is capable of) that Scribner's ran the following statement as a conspicuous advertisement in daily newspapers of the country:

"We have been forced to take off our tables all copies of 'Mrs. Eddy' by Edwin Franden Dakin." This is from a bookseller who writes that because of pressure from individuals who are trying to smother this biography, he has been obliged to return his stock of copies and compelled to write a letter of apology to "two agencies" in his city. Personally this bookseller endorses the book.

This is a sample of many letters which have come to us from coast to coast.

The result is a situation almost incredible in a free country. You may find that your bookseller either will regret his inability to sell you this biography, universally endorsed by the press of the country, or he may produce a copy hidden away under a counter. Some booksellers actually have the courage to display the book. We hope your bookseller is one of these.

Throughout almost eighty-five years of publishing, we have been able to say of our books, "on sale at all booksellers." We regret that in this one case we must qualify this statement.

What Christian Scientists want,

amazingly, is to exercise by hook or crook an arbitrary, official censorship over all literature that touches upon the life of their cult's founder or upon their "sacred" dogmas: that is the plain meaning of this graphic case in which Christian Scientists are trying to kill a book which they do not like. As Heywood Brown says in *The New York Telegram*, "the field of independent research would soon be closed if every organized group in America undertook to enforce a boycott against books which it did not like."

This Christian Science conspiracy is cowardly because it seeks to boycott a book out of existence or out of attention; because it is animated clearly by the spirit of bigotry and not by the principle of truthful and free and fair discussion; because it seeks not to correct alleged errors, not to set its own view fairly in contrast with other views, but to kill an "obnoxious book" with whose viewpoint these fanatics do not agree.

If Christian Scientists want to draw a circle of close-minded orthodoxy that shall isolate them from modern civilization—that is one thing. But when they attack, in so cowardly and illegitimate a way, the freedom of literature which is the breath of life to modern civilization—that is something which concerns us all most vitally. It is a conspiracy which should be scornfully exposed and denounced in every quarter where standards of intellectual decency—where the simplest fundamental notions of truth and freedom and fair dealing—are felt to be at all important.

### How Christian Scientists Tried to Suppress Two Little Blue Books

This latest demonstration by the Christian Science brigades of bigotry recalls the efforts that were made a few years ago to suppress two Little Blue Books—*The Real Mary Baker Eddy* (Little Blue Book No. 982) by Clement Wood and *The Truth About Christian Science* (Little Blue Book No. 983) by Clement Wood. Of course a boycott such

as that which is now being applied to the Scribner's book would have been impossible for two reasons: (1) The Haldeman-Julius Publications deal directly by mail with readers everywhere, not only in this country but throughout the world; we do not depend upon local booksellers who may be intimidated by threats. (2) The Haldeman-Julius Publications, while having a far wider scope than any kind of propaganda exclusively would imply, are nevertheless established—and have been established from their beginning—on the impregnable basis of a thoroughly free, rationalistic enterprise; having appealed from the beginning to free-minded readers, the Haldeman-Julius Publications are extraordinarily free.

But a Mr. Rhodes of Topeka, Kans., representing (or functioning as) the Christian Science Committee on Publication for this territory, tried to persuade Mr. Haldeman-Julius that Clement Wood's "obnoxious books" should be withdrawn from circulation; and persuasion was not all—there were ugly intimations which, as you shall learn, were carried to the point of an amazing, attempted action. "Censor" Rhodes was defeated in Girard. Then he called upon Clement Wood in New York City, armed with similar persuasions, intimations, and menaces. He was defeated in New York City.

"Censor" Rhodes might better have known beforehand that his efforts would be futile with either the publisher or the author of these Little Blue Books.

The most astonishing climax was that Mr. Rhodes requested the county attorney for Crawford county, Kansas, to issue a warrant against Mr. Haldeman-Julius and prosecute him on the remarkable charge of "maligning the dead." The Crawford county prosecutor informed the Christian Science "censor" and would-be modern Torquemada of thought that he had legally no semblance of a case. Still unsatisfied—still eager to kill "obnoxious books" or to imprison or somehow punish their publisher—Mr. Rhodes appealed to the United States district attorney in this territory. Again he was told that nothing could be done.

Fortunately, it was not possible

for Mr. Rhodes to gather a committee of Christian Scientists and have a private execution of the "obnoxious" editor and publisher. Neither did the Christian Science bigots have a private jail in which they could have locked Mr. Haldeman-Julius.

The book on Mary Baker Eddy and the book on Christian Science are still in the Little Blue Book list. They will remain in the list.

### L. M. Birkhead in Kansas City Arouses Eddyttes

The biography of Mrs. Eddy which has so aroused her worshipers throughout the country was the subject of an address by L. M. Birkhead, All Souls' Unitarian Church, Kansas City, Mo., on Sunday, December 8. We are informed by Mr. Birkhead that a stenographer took notes of his address. That of course was perfectly proper. It is not the objection of Christian Scientists to the Eddy biography which is wrong in itself but rather the boycotting, threatening method and the intolerant aim of this objection. Mr. Birkhead was also deluged with telephone calls and letters, denouncing him for daring to discuss in a spirit of critical appraisal the life and religion of the Christian Scientists' idol.

One can understand how Christian Scientists, living in such a peculiar mental atmosphere of fixation on their fantastic dogmas, disliked Mr. Birkhead's saying that "Mrs. Eddy borrowed from many of the outstanding movements and ideas of her time"; that she "was a definitely pathological type"; that "all her life she suffered from the delusion of persecution"; that she "also suffered from the delusion of grandeur"; that "Mrs. Eddy was mad, she was a psychopath, and she was the victim of hysteria." But the proper course for the Christian Scientists is to present their own version of Mrs. Eddy and their own defense of this queerly mixed religious brew—and let the truth win. Discussion is the civilized attitude. But as we have seen, a browbeating and boycotting intolerance is the Christian Science method.

### "No Immortality"—Upton Sinclair to Conan Doyle

Busy novelist and pamphleteer-extraordinary that he is, Upton Sinclair yet finds time to write long and interesting letters of discussion. Nothing escapes him. He has the eagle eye. He is the world's champion quick-reply artist—and right he is, too, in his conscientious way. Sinclair does not wish to be misunderstood. And he is tirelessly, patiently expressive.

Now Sinclair sends *The American Freeman* a copy of a letter he has just written to Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, the creator of the fictitious Sherlock Holmes and of much less interesting fictitious spirits roaming the ether mild or wild. It was the following passage in Conan Doyle's latest book (*Our African Winter*) which made Sinclair articulate:

I have been agreeably occupied in reading Upton Sinclair's "Boston." I look upon Sinclair as one of the greatest novelists in the world, the Zola of America, and his power of detail and marshaling of facts leaves me amazed. I think he has become almost monomaniacal in his reaction against our settled law and order, but his high, unselfish soul shines through it all.

Correcting, Sinclair explains to Conan Doyle his attitude on social problems, on spirits, on mind-reading, and on immortality. What he says about immortality, and especially about the quality of human inspiration needed for human progress and ideals, is very good. Evidently these two celebrated authors (and how different they are!) have had a previous correspondence, and it is to this correspondence that the discussion of spirits and mental telepathy must refer.

The answering letter of Sinclair to Doyle is as follows:

December 4, 1929.  
Sir Arthur Conan Doyle,  
Windesham, Crowborough,  
Sussex, England.  
My Dear Sir Arthur:  
I have your extremely interesting book, and am very grateful to you for sending it to me and, also, for the kind opinion which you have expressed concerning "Boston." Of course, I am very much gratified that you should feel that way about my book. Please let me explain to you that I am not in reaction against "our settled law and order." I am in reaction against our system whereby the natural sources of wealth, the heritage of all men, are used and exploited for the private profit of a few. I am trying to preserve our settled law and order by preventing the violent re-

volution which is certainly on the way if our privileged classes do not soon give way.

As to the subject which is nearest to your heart, I am sorry I cannot show a more coming disposition. But the idea of personal immortality seems entirely meaningless to me. It seems to me that I see human personality grow, and then I see it decay, and I can as easily think of the personal immortality of a soap-bubble. Of course, I believe that there is some fundamental reality behind these phenomena, but what that is and how it operates is beyond my knowledge.

You say that we should have no motive for personal improvement if we knew that we had to die. We should merely give ourselves up to pleasure. Apparently you entirely overlook the possibility that personal improvement may be a pleasure. Personally I know no other kind of pleasure than the improvement of myself and others, nor can I conceive of any other motive for improvement except pleasure, which is simply the feeling which accompanies improvement, and the means of its recognition. Of course, there are some pleasures which endure longer than others, and we have to learn to recognize these and to seek them. But nothing endures forever, and the idea that we have any right to demand that it should endure forever seems to me entirely irrational.

You give me evidence of a tender heart in your narrative. Also, you give me evidence of belonging to the Anglo-Saxon ruling classes. At one minute you want us all to follow the noble example of Jesus, and in the next minute you manifest enthusiasm for the wholesale slaughter of human beings. I could point out a score of such moral inconsistencies in your book, but I am afraid that in so doing I would only confirm you in the idea that I am "almost monomaniacal." Perhaps I should add that this is not meant to be a personal criticism. This muddled ethical condition is shared by all the ruling classes of the world which profess and call themselves Christian. I note with interest your statement that the Mohammedan religion has a better effect than the Christian religion upon the African native, and I think the same thing should be given a trial by all our ruling classes who are accustomed in practice to exploit and slay their fellow humans. They should take up some religious system which permits and glorifies this.

I call your attention to a typographical error on page 95, where the word *physic* is used instead of *psychic*. Also, I point out that you are apparently in error as to the meaning of the doctrine of

the immaculate conception. It refers to the Virgin Mary, not when she conceived Jesus, but when she was, herself, conceived.

As to the book about my wife's experiments in telepathy, it is to be published in the spring, both in New York and London. I understand, of course, that you who believe in spirits find telepathy a comparatively tame subject, but you see, it is my belief that the beings which you call "spirits" are the creation of our own subconscious minds plus impressions which we draw from the subconscious minds of others. You and I, who have functioned as creative artists, can understand the same reality, which is assumed, by products of the creative imagination: how they take a life of their own and develop a personality of their own. We are only in the beginning of understanding the powers which are locked up in the subconscious mind. It seems to me there is an ocean of mind out of which our individual minds are formed, just as our individual bodies are formed out of the mass of existing matter. Fundamentally, of course, mind and matter are the same, and some day it may be that our minds will develop to a point where we can understand this proposition. The reason I mention it here is merely to point out to you why I think the idea of telepathy so much more important than you think it. Thanking you again for your kind letter.

Sincerely,  
UPTON SINCLAIR.

We hope that Sinclair's book on mind-reading will be interesting; how convincing it is remains to be seen. From a note by Isaac Goldberg in *The American Freeman* ("In the World of Books") some months ago, it would appear that Sinclair and his wife have experimented in a private and limited way. Such inquiries are likely to be inadequate, and at any rate we should ask for a more extended scientific inquiry. If there be any truth in telepathy, it is still very much disputed and obscure and awaits a scientific verdict. If there is communication between minds in the telepathic meaning of the word, it will some day be materially understood by science; it will be related to other natural phenomena; and it will have nothing more to do with supernaturalism than the radio transmission of sounds, which is, by the way, an analogy most often and rather inaccurately used in support of the mental-telepathy theory.

Anyway, so little is known (although so much is loosely and sometimes ludicrously said) about mental telepathy that it is a good subject

to defer until further enlightenment. The theory remains to be proved. If Sinclair and his wife can prove it—well, we shall see when their book appears.

The accents of fanaticism and faith and a political pronouncement are seen in the statement of a chiropractor as reported recently in the *Kansas City Star*. A chiropractor of Jackson county, Missouri, was fighting against the efforts of his brethren in the faith and practice of this "healing art" to expel him from their association. One of the chiropractors in good standing explained the issue thus pompously: "The fundamental basis of the trouble between Dr. Terhune and the association seems to be that we who are orthodox chiropractors believe in confining our practice to trouble of the spine, but Dr. Terhune and associates, calling themselves progressives, take a wider range of treatment." Italics are ours. The idea of a chiropractor calling himself a "progressive" and expecting to stay in good repute as "orthodox"!

When you begin to doubt the truth of an idea, you are on your way to doing one of two things; either you will discover eventually that the idea was always a false one or you will understand the idea better and make it more a part of yourself by living and thinking it out and placing it on a basis of sterner conviction. In neither way can you possibly lose. If an idea is good, it is all the better to you for a thoughtful examination of it from all angles; while if an idea is not good—that is, if it is not true and not intellectually speaking, mature and genuine—you are fortunate to see it more clearly as it is and reject it in the interests of mental growth.

Whatever we feel about death—whether we can look upon it rather abstractly as a natural, impersonal end to all things (for us) or whether we feel it deeply as the pronouncement of a personal doom upon us—we should at least be able to say, each to his own self, from day to day: "I sh. ll not die without having lived fully and sensitively; and while life is in me I shall beat Old Death by the intense and significant quality of my living; and by making all things mean so much more to me, I shall crowd many, many lives into one."

A good deal of argument is not correctly so called but is merely a refusal to recognize facts.

### "Bad Books"

Inaccuracy is a minor phase of an editorial in *The Leader* (a San Francisco Catholic weekly) which is throughout an expression of stupid bigotry—so foolish, really, that it is rather amusing. The editorial is a denunciation of "bad books" and is based upon the official Catholic *Index Expurgatorius*.

First let us note the inaccuracies: Girard, Kans., is mentioned as the former home of the anti-Catholic weekly, *The Menace*—BUT *The Menace* was published in Aurora, Mo. George Oakes is mentioned as the editor and publisher of *The New York Times*—BUT the publisher (not the editor) of *The New York Times* is Adolph Ochs. It is asserted that the Little Blue Book biography of George Sand, the Frenchwoman with whom love and literature were so intimately related, was retitled "The Love Letters of a French Woman"—BUT the title of the Little Blue Book on George Sand (Little Blue Book No. 1085) is actually *The Love-Life of George Sand (Frenchwoman)*.

The point which *The Leader* was chiefly desirous of making was that Little Blue Books are sometimes given misleading titles for reasons of prurient appeal. That is not true in a single instance. *The Love-Life of George Sand*, for example, is a quite truthful title; in any truthful biography of George Sand her love-life would have a position of pre-eminence; and this brilliant biography by Ralph Oppenheim is exactly a study of George Sand's free and love-adventuring personality.

That error disposed of (really critics should know the bare facts at least upon which their criticism pretends to base itself, even though their viewpoint may be hopelessly awry), it is interesting to note that (if the otherwise inaccurate *The Leader's* statement can be trusted) the complete works of Alexander Dumas are on the Catholic *Index Expurgatorius*. In the edition of the *Index* preceding the latest one, only *The Three Musketeers* was listed as a "bad book." How were the editors of the *Index* so careless as to let all the rest of Dumas' works slip by for a few years? One understands why Dumas is placed in this position of honor. His historical novels reflect too vividly the cruelties, the intrigues and the immoralities of the Catholic priests, leaders and laity in France of the latter Middle Ages. In his novel, *Marguerite de Valois*, Dumas portrays the infamous St. Bartholomew's massacre (1572) in a bold

and free style that would not make pleasant reading for faithful Catholics. Dumas tells the truth; but it is not pleasant; and it is the special purpose of the notorious *Index Expurgatorius* to prevent Catholics from having such views of the unpleasant truth.

*The Leader* further tells us that Sir Richard Steele (he of the famous and delightful Addison literary partnership in *The Spectator*) and Oliver Goldsmith are among English writers placed under the ban of the *Index*. Goldsmith, whose name is so sensitively and beautifully distinguished in English literature, is dismissed with the silly line that he "was a poor neighbor and a bad son." Goldsmith's "badness" consisted, of course, in not being a Catholic; and in having the impulses of a liberal spirit.

It is obvious that the Catholic Church only shows its hopelessly bigoted opposition to culture and freedom and to ranges of literature that are far broader than and far superior to the confines of religion when it places such writers as Dumas, Steele and Goldsmith on its anachronistic *Index*.

The wise man can be interested by the illogical tangents and extravagant conceits of human folly; he can regard folly as a very particular and amusing branch of the study of human nature; he can be superior in his own mind to the delusions of the unthinking among mankind. Yet at the same time the wise man, to whom wisdom is something very precious and progressive in the life of mankind, is very genuinely interested in opposing (with a variety of styles, to be sure) the folly that he sees on every hand.

Strange how men have worshipped the gods who, according to religious ideas, have so despitely and cruelly used them! Yet it is not so strange when one reflects how potent is fear in producing any attitude and how religion especially has depended upon the terrors of ignorance. The conviction that there is no God to fear is the beginning of courageous wisdom in dealing with the realities of nature.

It is probably not accurate to say that some men are satisfied to be dull. They simply are dull and they do not realize it. That dullness, of course, carries with it its own satisfaction—a condition of mind which is unsuspecting of the more stimulating interests of life, personal and artistic and intellectual.

### The More the Damned

Somewhere Ingersoll suggests sarcastically what a joy it must be for a Christian mother, rocking the cradle of her child, to reflect that "she is probably only raising kindling wood for hell." Nowadays when birth control is a question (and more and more a practice) prominently to the fore, there is a more definite and deliberate attitude of producing victims for Satan. We are reminded of this by a little bit of very serious irony from Bertrand Russell, the great English philosopher of humanism, who says:

Catholics use their political influence to prevent Protestants from practicing birth control and yet they must hold that the great majority of Protestant children whom their political action causes to exist will endure eternal torment in the next world. This makes their action seem somewhat unkind, but doubtless these are mysteries which the profane cannot hope to understand.

To be sure, kindness and reasonableness are not what one expects from religion. Inasmuch as Catholicism has damned so many millions to hell in the past, and inasmuch as it pronounces this positive doom upon millions of non-Catholics living today, it is but a step further to consign the unborn to the sulphurous solicitude of Satan. The more non-Catholics the damner—that seems to be the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church.

And for that matter Protestants, if they do not quite go so far as to insist that adherents of rival Christian sects will go straight to hell, do most decidedly damn all atheists and persons who refuse to believe in Christianity. To the Catholic, Protestants are hell-bent. To the Protestant as to the Catholic, "infidels" are hell-bent. And Protestant preachers as well as Catholic priests (albeit Catholicism has a more insistent official attitude of antagonism) oppose birth control and thus condemn many—if one takes their theology at face value—to the very threatening chance if not the certainty of hell.

Good, intelligent laughter—of the kind that may be silent outwardly but that is clear as a joyous bell with more majestic overtones within—has a fine usefulness, besides being enjoyed for its own sake, in keeping one free from the bunkistic illusions, delusions and confusions of this world. And that laughter should, often enough, be directed at oneself. That laughter is a sign that one is human and that one is free.



## Around the Table

Chats Among the Editor and His Readers

By E. Haldeman-Julius

BY RADIO FROM STATION "BUNK" Inevitably the radio conveys a great deal of bunk. So do the newspapers. So does every medium that caters to immense, indiscriminating masses of people. And undoubtedly many who receive all this bunk, or certain features of it, favorably are simply victims of a lack of reflection. If they would stop and think they would know better than to believe much of what they hear and read which bears, for even a fairly clever person (capable, let us say, of putting two and two together), its own self-contradictions.

One example of radio bunk, from what one might call Station BUNK itself, is laid on the table by D. Pearl (Michigan). It follows:

The last few nights I have been listening on the radio to radio station KWKH of Shreveport, La. This station is owned and operated by W. K. Henderson. A few of his statements are: "The chain stores are the most contemptible and damnable thing in this country. They are worse than the saloon ever was. They take the money all out of your home town and leave none of it for charity, or to donate to the churches. They put the money on Wall Street. In order to be one hundred percent Americans we must stop trading with the chain stores, drive them out of town." Mr. Henderson sells figs, grapefruit, turkeys, etc. by mail.

Last night a radio fan in Detroit telegraphed to Mr. Henderson objecting to the use of the word "nigger" over the radio. "NIGGER! NIGGER! NIGGER!" Mr. Henderson screamed. "That fellow stepped on my toes. OUR niggers know their place and they will stay there."

Aside from the amusing fact in contradiction of himself that Henderson is doing the very thing he denounces—i. e., taking money out of many home towns and concentrating it in Shreveport if not in Wall Street—I can only say that it is most ridiculous to burst out emotionally in an attack upon such significant phenomena of national trade as the chain stores. You will observe that Henderson (at least in the quotation given by Mr. Pearl) does not analyze the chain stores, their origin and their relation to the economics of our time. The thing rationally to do is to recog-

nize the chain stores as an inevitable development of our more widely systematized age. It is an axiom of economic development which others, considerably more thoughtful and less ready to explode irately than Henderson, have long understood that the larger and more concentrated systems of business must gradually (or, in some cases, rapidly) supplant the smaller businesses. In the process there is much unpleasant and even grievous readjustment; this is principally due to the fact that our ethical concepts of social life (including those chief factors, industry and trade) are not as far advanced as our technical ideas of efficiency.

How inadequate and absurd to face a situation, which springs from the very fundamentals of economic evolution and which is not only national but international in scope and significance, with the cry that it draws money from "the old home town." For that matter, can the "old home town" erect a Chinese wall around itself and keep all the money within that wall?

It is not so much a question, either, of money being kept in a town or going out of it. The question is: Who has the money? Is it of such wonderful advantage to a small town as a whole that certain local merchants shall have, sizable bank accounts, stocks or title deeds? For the clerks in the chain stores, and for the householders who trade with the chain stores, the situation wears rather a different aspect.

Anyway, why try to recall the past? It is our job to adjust ourselves to new conditions as, from causes which we should study dispassionately, they arise in this or that sphere of our social life. When Henderson says that the chain stores are "contemptible and damnable," he reveals the hopelessness of his attitude. He is not expressing a thought nor stating a studied analysis. He is having an outburst. Rage and such an emotional misuse of terms are incompatible with clear thinking on any subject.

Muddleheadedness and anger are also sufficiently and, truth to tell, disgustingly revelatory in Henderson's scream of fury about the Negro. He is just expressing, in terms of ignorant irascibility, a well-known and uncivilized attitude toward the

Negro which, sad to say, is prevalent in what is still "the Old South." But that attitude we shall take time to discuss on another occasion. I shall say this, however: the Old South is finding its way, here and there among hopeful groups of progressive readers and thinkers, to becoming really the New South. There are many charming things about the South and about Southern people. But many Southerners have their inherited prejudices, bound up very closely, one can well understand, with their emotional life and their most cherished traditions: just as people in other sections of America and in other parts of the world have their inherited prejudices. The friendly way to put it is that we should all try to grow up together into the ways of civilization.

### LEGEND AND TRUTH ABOUT JOAN OF ARC

What is truth and what is legend about Joan of Arc? E. D. Bourne (Kentucky) wants to know. Or rather I should say that Mr. Bourne is curious concerning an editorial note in the *Woman's Home Companion*. Very properly cautious, the editorial is presented in a questioning manner. Even so, it has some reckless—not carefully historical—implications. It follows:

Was Joan of Arc ever really burned at the stake? Modern investigators are beginning to believe that she was not, but was pardoned upon her promise to go home, stop wearing male garb and never fight again. The evidence for that view is fairly strong. Some of it was gathered as much as three centuries ago, when a French priest discovered in dusty archives a record of a visit she paid to Mertz in 1436, five years after the date of the famous execution of heretics in Rouen. The same priest found a subsequent marriage contract between Robert des Armoises and Jeanne d'Arc, called the Maid of Orleans. Documents unearthed lately include a letter in which the Duke of Orleans mentioned a reception that he was planning for "Jehanne, Maid of Orleans," and a reference in the records of the city of Orleans to the cost of a present given to her "in memory of the good which she did do to the city in the time of the siege." This was in 1439, eight years after Joan's ashes were supposed to have been scattered on the Seine.

Of course it is quite possible that these later Joans were impostors or that the documents are forgeries. Such is the contention of those who do not approve of shattering myths. There are people who argue that heroic and beautiful legends, even when proved false, should still be preserved and repeated for the inspiration they

lend. For our part, we prefer to let the truth even when it hurts. In the long run and in the total sum, nothing is so inspiring as true knowledge.

Of course we all agree with this editor in wishing to know the truth. It seems very hasty and it is certainly exaggerated, however, to say that "modern investigators are beginning to believe" that Joan of Arc was not burned. The term "modern investigators," by which one should mean really competent historical scholars, is here stretched too broadly; or rather we are left in the dark as to who these "modern investigators" are; the "discoveries" of an obscure French priest do not have an important sound. Today Catholic apologists would doubtless be glad to "prove" somehow or other that Joan lived happily ever after and that the records of her trial and execution are a libel on the Church.

And the *Woman's Home Companion* has the wrong angle on this "myth-shattering" question, when it suggests that the burning of Joan is important for the story's sake to the lovers of legend. That is no doubt the feeling of many people; but its mention in this connection gives a false impression. It seems clear enough that in this instance it is the Catholic myth-makers who are seeking to discredit history with regard to Joan for the purpose of adding false credit to the monstrous Catholic myth that the Church was a friend to humanity and culture. Joan's blood is a dark stain which the Church wants to remove—and that, as far as I can see, is the significance of this evidently rather poor attempt to establish that the Maid of Orleans was not the victim of Church and State.

There is of course legend and truth mixed in the story of Joan, but historians have fairly separated the two elements. There was no miracle about Joan's life or death. But the fact of her death and the manner of her death are not seriously disputed by historians of any consequence today.

Joseph McCabe, whose broad and profound historical scholarship is well known to my readers, mentions the burning of Joan of Arc in two of his Little Blue Books—*The Horrors of the Inquisition* (Little Blue Book No. 1134) and *New Light on Witchcraft* (Little Blue Book No. 1132). McCabe does not question the main record of Joan's trial and burning, because, as I have said, there has been no authentic doubt cast upon the record; it is sound and, in its more dramatic outlines, familiar history.

There is an interesting discussion of the character and background of the Maid of Orleans in McCabe's *New Light on Witchcraft*. It presents both the subject of witchcraft and the character of Joan, as having probably been a "witch," in a light that is not generally known. Witchcraft, says McCabe, was undoubtedly a very serious and well-organized religion, numbering a host of adherents, and practiced (as a religion with its own definite superstitions and ceremonies) in opposition to Christianity. "Joan's greatest friend in the French army, Gilles de Rais (or Retz), was an acknowledged witch," says McCabe. "Joan chose him as her special protector in the army, and he was devoted to her."

Of Joan more particularly McCabe (who, we may be assured, is thoroughly and intimately familiar with the fate of the Maid of Orleans and with her time and who never loosely accepts any story that is suspiciously unhistorical) writes as follows:

The evidence in regard to Joan is puzzling and contradictory. Time after time when she was asked a question, and an emphatic negative would be expected from any orthodox Christian, she refused to reply or replied evasively. She would not say if she believed fairies to be, as the Church certainly held, evil spirits. She would not explicitly reply when it was said that she had been taught witchcraft and magic. She would not swear on the Gospels, and would not repeat the Paternoster except in confession. She had seen "St. Michael" with her bodily eyes, in the shape of a "good man." Her "St. Catherine" was physically present somehow in her castle-prison. She had seen "God," in a scarlet cap and long white robe. She spoke throughout of "those of my party"—she had a secret sign on her letters for them—and she sometimes saw her saints, or the sources of her voices, "amongst the Christians."

The evidence indicates, says McCabe, that Joan may very probably have been a witch—that is to say, not the popular conception of a magic-working "witch" but a member of a religious cult that defied Christianity and performed strange rites in secret—but that Joan was "neither a perfectly orthodox witch nor a perfectly orthodox Christian." There is no serious dispute among historians as to the burning of Joan. And obviously this suggestion of "myth-shattering" is inspired by the Catholic Church in protection of its own myths.

### \* \* \* CORRECTING A "CORRECTION" \* \* \*

I am amused by a paragraph in the "What-do-you-say-to-that?" style in a letter from H. W. Fee (Chicago, Illinois). Mr. Fee says:

Here's the truth of it all. Atheists are not true atheists unless they actually believe in the non-existence of a God. Voltaire, Paine, etc., were not atheists, they

believed in God, not the orthodox church God, but the Universal Mind God. Here's where your statements as to their being atheists are "all wet." And you cannot deny the existence of a God, some all-pervading power—that is, successfully.

Mr. Fee's "correction" is incorrect on two quite simple matters of fact. In the first place, it has never been stated by me nor by any writer for the Haldeman-Julius Publications that Voltaire and Paine were atheists. Their position as skeptics and deists—believers in an undefined Supreme Being but critics of Christian dogmas and indeed of religious speculation both in its specific claims and as an attitude of mind—has been always clearly defined in our references to these great liberators of human thought.

But considering the immense advancement of science since their time, and the clearer light in which anti-religious thought has naturally been placed by this advancement, it is very reasonable to suppose that Voltaire and Paine would be atheists if they were living today. This, of course, is only an assumption and may be taken for what it is worth. Certainly there has never been any confusion on our part as to the true nature of the opinions held by Voltaire and Paine about religion.

Mr. Fee lays himself open to a correction in his haste to "correct" us. He makes the astonishing statement that Voltaire and Paine believed in "the Universal Mind God." Neither Voltaire nor Paine defined God as "the Universal Mind" or as anything else. They assumed that the belief in a Supreme Being was broadly speaking a true belief; but they did not discuss the nature of this assumed Supreme Being; and both men considered religious speculation to be useless at best and, on its lower levels, viciously and vulgarly superstitious.

It is enough to say with regard to the last flourishing challenge by Mr. Fee that our successful denial of a God is based upon the fact that there has never been any successful proof of a God.

### How Culture Helps Us to Live

John Cowper Powys in *The Secret of Self-Development* (Little Blue Book No. 112).

The whole problem of culture lies in the sphere of the immediate reality which presses upon us. If culture does not assist us to wrestle with this reality it is just a pleasant by-play and of slight importance for the baffled spirit of man. A waiter, a stenographer, a department-store assistant, a factory-worker, an office-hand, is much more in need of a penetrating and delicate

philosophy, of a subtle and distinctive taste, than a person of leisure who can hunt foxes and fish for trout.

Self-culture is of little account if it cannot take the place of religion, of morality, of courage, of humor, and even of love itself. Consider the case of a man with a soul-withering job, a scolding wife, noisy and aggressive children, and a home in some city basement! What is the use, a cynic might say, of culture to such a man as this? Well! This is just the test. According to the only view of culture I can understand, a man in this position surreptitiously reading *King Lear* or *Faust* or the *Inferno* or Charles Lamb in hurried snatches on a hard chair between stove and window, struggling to summon up the right kind of ironic submission, the right kind of crafty evasion, the right kind of drastic forbiddance, for dealing with the situation in hand, without having recourse either to suicide or desertion, will be a man whose culture, whether it succeeds or fails, will be of the genuine and authentic quality, will, in other words, be an assault on the raw, crude, brute-facts of life so as to draw out of them, willy-nilly, the nectar of the immortals.

Self-culture is man's retort to the hard realities of the universe. True self-culture has as much iron and cunning and sagacity in it as is possessed by the most unscrupulous worldly ambition. Only it is used for a different purpose. It is used to squeeze out of this difficult and tough universe such celestial-tasting drops of the magic of beauty as may redeem our miseries. Nature is kind. She lets fools live. Nature has a lofty cunning. She lets the wise work in ways that are beyond the comprehension, and thus beyond the menace, of the fools.

The catch in the Christian's saying that he has certain beliefs is that his attitude is not one of belief but rather of dogmatic positiveness. And his beliefs—or dogmas—are supported by arguments that can only by courtesy be called reasons; they are assumptions, assertions, or mere phrases embodying no concrete image of intelligible thought.

The censor type of mind is afflicted with the desire to make everyone else see books and characters through its own distorted, evil-tinted vision. For there are evil as well as noble visions, and the censor's mind is certainly of evil all compact.

Obviously liars would not be so troublesome if there were not so many people who have a very poor level of capability in distinguishing between truth and falsehood.

### The Sun Will Rise Tomorrow

Clarence Darrow in *Why I Am an Agnostic* (Little Blue Book No. 1500).

When I was a boy the theologians used to assert that the proof of the Divine inspiration of the Bible rested on miracles and prophecies. But a miracle means a violation of a natural law, and there can be no proof imagined that could be sufficient to show the violation of a natural law; even though proof seemed to show violation, it would only show that we were not acquainted with all natural laws. One believes in the truthfulness of a man because of his long experience with the man, and because the man has always told a consistent story. But no man has told so consistent a story as nature.

If one should say that the sun did not rise, to use the ordinary expression, on the day before, his hearer would not believe it, even though he had slept all day and knew that his informant was a man of the strictest veracity. He would not believe it because the story is inconsistent with the conduct of the sun in all the ages past.

Primitive and even civilized people have grown so accustomed to believing in miracles that they often attribute the simplest manifestations of nature to agencies of which they know nothing. They do this when the belief is utterly inconsistent with knowledge and logic. They believe in old miracles and new ones. Preachers pray for rain, knowing full well that no such prayer was ever answered. When a politician is sick, they pray for God to cure him, and the politician almost invariably dies. The modern clergyman who prays for rain and for the health of the politician is no more intelligent in this matter than the primitive man who saw a miracle in the rising and setting of the sun, in the birth of an individual, in the growth of a plant, in the stroke of lightning, in the flood, in every manifestation of nature and life.

As to prophecies, intelligent writers gave them up long ago. In all prophecies facts are made to suit the prophecy, or the prophecy was made after the facts, or the events have no relation to the prophecy. Weird and strange and unreasonable interpretations are used to explain simple statements, that a prophecy may be claimed.

It is quite possible for lying to be practiced as a fine art; and we ought at least to get this satisfaction—we ought, if lying there must be, to have the entertainment of artistic lying. But alas, nine times in ten, how crude liars are!

## WORKS of CLARENCE DARROW

**\$1**  
POST PAID

**Astounding Bargain! Best Liberal, Progressive Reading—1,157 Pages, 300,000 Words, Almost 2 Pounds for \$1**

**All These Titles for a Dollar Bill**

**18 INTRIGUING SECTIONS**

**CONTAINING THE FOLLOWING 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.

*A Persian Pearl.* Essay on the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam.

*Insects and Men: Instinct and Reason.*

*Voltaire, Who Fooled Priest and King.*

*The Skeleton in the Closet.*

*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 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.*



CLARENCE DARROW

The name of CLARENCE DARROW is famous throughout the world as that of a liberal, agnostic, progressively forward-looking lawyer. In the courts Clarence Darrow has proved himself an attorney extraordinary, but he has done more. He has always defended, and in his defense of great labor cases; in his defense of Dr. Sweet, the Detroit Negro accused of murder when defending his home from an angry mob; in his defense of Scopes, the Dayton teacher who taught evolution in Tennessee—in all of these and other cases, Darrow has shown magnificent generosity to the oppressed and a depth of human understanding and sympathy that has seldom been equaled. Clarence Darrow believes in humanity. As a liberal and agnostic, Darrow is better known and has more influence probably than any man since Col. Ingersoll. In his debates with such men as Prof. Foster, Will Durant, Frederick Starr, John Haynes Holmes, etc., Darrow shows the same likeable qualities, the same dynamic personality, the same wit and the same pity for those needing defense. Read the works of this man: be amazed, be enlightened, be persuaded! Just a dollar bill—the greatest bargain in the history of publishing!

**JUST PIN A DOLLAR TO THIS BLANK**

Haldeman-Julius Publications,  
Dept. R-4, Girard, Kansas

I enclose \$1. Send me postpaid the Works of Clarence Darrow, in 18 intriguing sections, containing 26 titles.

Name ..... Address .....

City ..... State .....

**\$1**  
WE PAY THE POSTAGE!

## The Big American Parade

Modern life, which is most characteristic and climactic in America, is impressive by reason of its very rushing, tireless quality—its varieties of entertainment and action. Yet this very attraction of many big things passing constantly before us in a hurried parade may detract from the attitude of reflection which is, after all, due to this wonderful spectacle. *We are all members of this big American parade—but what fun it is to fall out of the ranks for awhile and watch the parade with a studying and amused eye!* It is such an estimating, intensifying view of our parading activities and ideas that E. Haldeman-Julius has given in *THE BIG AMERICAN PARADE*. There is the fascination of movement, of a world fronting change and adventure, in this review of all the figures and features of "Americanism" (and, in essence, of the modern world)—and there is the stirring interest of free, realistic thought applied to this show. *What is it all about? Where is the big American parade heading?* These questions, directed searchingly at every aspect of American life, are answered in a spirit of friendly, keen, humorous and serious debunking criticism in *THE BIG AMERICAN PARADE*. Here is America in an intimate view—our life seen at close hand by one who is taking an active part in that life. And here is America in a world view, connected with the wider movements of life today and with the cultural, historic background. Above all, a glance at the chapter headings will reveal that *THE BIG AMERICAN PARADE* is alive and significant in every line. This is a most important work of description and criticism.

**In this Book E. Haldeman-Julius Analyzes in Brilliant Review the Ideas, Customs, Social Tendencies and Personalities of American Life Today**

CHAPTER HEADINGS  
I. The Background of America.  
II. The Meaning of Materialism.  
III. Losing Our "Sense of Sin."  
IV. Jazz and Puritanism.  
V. A Liberal Attitude Toward Life.  
VI. The American Workingman Today.  
VII. Where Are We Headed?  
VIII. The Failure of the Melting Pot.  
IX. Problems of Democracy.  
X. A Study of Individualism.  
XI. The Dogma of Reformism.

CHAPTER HEADINGS  
XII. Are We a Christian Country?  
XIII. The Conflicts of American Life.  
XIV. Sectionalism in America.  
XV. The Growth of American Culture.  
XVI. Journalism in America.  
XVII. Education in America.  
XVIII. Our Colorful Advertising.  
XIX. "Leading Citizens."  
XX. America's Opportunity.  
XXI. "Americanism"?  
XXII. America, New and Old.

You can see that every part and form and vision of this interesting America is revealed, as if it were a tremendous and thoughtful "moving picture," in *THE BIG AMERICAN PARADE*. To mention only one of its outstanding qualities—the amazing breadth of its survey of American life, missing nothing and yet giving everything its proper place, *THE BIG AMERICAN PARADE* is a book for which no comparison with other books is adequate. It is the ONE BOOK about America—about ourselves and our life—which you should have. The order blank below will let you in on the fun of standing aside and watching the parade!

**\$2.85**

Postpaid

Bound in Cloth

424 Pages

### Use This Order Blank

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I am enclosing \$2.85 (which includes postage) for which send me a copy of *THE BIG AMERICAN PARADE* by E. Haldeman-Julius.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State .....



## Essence of Unitarianism

L. M. Birkhead

(Copyright, 1929, Haldeman-Julius Co.)  
(Concluded from last week)

### UNITARIANISM IN AMERICA

Most of the American colonies made definite efforts from the beginning to prevent heretical doctrines from finding lodgment in the minds of any of the colonists. Virginia, for instance, made Unitarianism a capital crime. Lord Baltimore's colony in Maryland in 1634 tolerated Protestants, but Unitarianism was legally punishable by death. To be a Unitarian in Connecticut disqualified one from holding public office and abridged one's court rights. Certain of the Calvinistic colonies had heresy laws which were aimed at Catholics, Episcopalians, Baptists, Quakers, and all other sects holding views objectionable to the founders and overseers of the colonies.

The colonists in New England, however, inadvertently left the door open to theological progress. They took orthodoxy for granted, and had only simple undogmatic covenants as the basis of church membership. The covenant of the First Church, Salem, Mass., will suffice as an example:

We covenant with the Lord, and with one another, and do bind ourselves in the presence of God, to walk together in all his ways, according as he is pleased to reveal himself unto us in his blessed word of truth.

With no formal and binding creed (written into the fundamental law of the church), it was, therefore, easy to slip away from orthodoxy. And this is just what happened. It began in the 18th century when doubts of the Trinity and of the Calvinistic theology began to creep into the preaching of certain of the leading preachers in and around Boston. "They began insensibly to relax the full rigor of dogmatic Calvinism" as Barrett Wendell expressed it. Unitarian literature from Europe found its way into the New England colonies, and was read by ministers of the Congregational and Episcopal churches. Reactions against the fanaticism and excesses of "the Great Awakening" under Jonathan Edwards also contributed to the liberalizing tendencies.

The first American church to become definitely Unitarian was King's Chapel, Boston. This came about as a result of the influence of the visit of an English Unitarian minister to America, William Hazlitt, the influence of English Unitarian literature, and the consequent doubts of James Freeman, the lay reader (afterwards minister) of the Chapel. The Athanasian Creed was, as a matter of fact, unpopular in America anyway. Dr. Wilbur tells us of a young Episcopal clergyman of Salem, who about this time, when asked why he read the Creed if he did not believe it, replied, "I read it as if I did not believe it."

The leaders of King's Chapel authorized Freeman to revise the liturgy, and, following Lindsey's revised English Prayer Book, all references to the Trinity and prayers of Christ were omitted. This took place in 1785. It was nearly a generation before any other American church became avowedly Unitarian, though many of them were practically so in the latter part of the 18th century.

The influence of commerce with India, centering at Salem, which brought the leading citizens into contact with high-minded citizens of India is also said to have caused doubt of some of the Calvinistic dogmas, particularly of total human depravity.

The breach between the orthodox and liberal forces in New England Congregationalism was gradually widening. With the appointment (in 1805) of Henry Ware as Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard (up to that time the stronghold of Calvinism) a definite split was caused, and Andover Theological Seminary was established shortly thereafter to combat the liberal tendencies of Harvard. (It was one of the professors of Andover who a little later said that "there is enough human depravity in the smile of an infant to damn it throughout all eternity.")

The Calvinistic opposition was led by Rev. Jeddiah Morse (father of S. F. B. Morse, inventor of the electric telegraph), who insisted that the liberal ministers declare themselves on the important doctrines.

The aggressive orthodox established the Park Street Church in Boston in 1809 to combat heresy in Boston. Its minister, delivering a sermon entitled "On the Use of Real Hell Fire," caused the church location to be designated "Brimstone Corner."

Dr. Morse continued his bombardments of the liberal ministers and discovering in an English book, by Lindsey, a chapter on "American Unitarianism," which said that there were several ministers in Boston who were Unitarians, he continued to call upon them to announce their views to the world, and declare their Unitarianism. But with all of Dr. Morse's storming and many noble defenses, the old cruel system of

Calvinistic theology could not resist the civilizing tendencies of the time. In his "History of Religion in the United States," Dr. Henry K. Rowe writes:

It was inevitable that the stern, rigid system of Calvinistic theology should produce a reaction. Certain thinkers could not believe that man was a helpless creature, crushed like a worm under the heel of an angry God. They could not believe that every man must approach God like a cringing criminal, only to be admitted to his presence by an Advocate who could mollify the divine wrath.

Ministers began to speak out more boldly in condemnation of Calvinism. In 1809, William Ellery Channing, then a minister twenty-nine years old, and later to be the leader of the Unitarian movement, expressed his contempt of Calvinistic theology in the following terms:

Calvinism teaches, that, in consequence of Adam's sin in eating the forbidden fruit, God brings into life all his posterity with a nature wholly corrupt, so that they are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually. It teaches, that all mankind, having fallen in Adam, are under God's wrath and curses, and so made liable to all miseries in this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell forever. It teaches, that, from this ruined race, God, out of his mere good pleasure, has elected a certain number to be saved by Christ, not induced to this choice by any foresight of their faith or good works, but wholly by his free grace and love; and that, having thus predestinated them to eternal life, he renews and sanctifies them by his almighty and special agency, and brings them into a state of grace, from which they cannot fall and perish. It teaches, that the rest of mankind he is pleased to pass over, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sins, to the honor of his justice and power; in other words, he leaves the rest to the corruption in which they were born, withholds the grace which is necessary to their recovery, and condemns them to "most grievous torments in soul and body without intermission in hell-fire forever." Such is Calvinism, as gathered from the most authentic records of the doctrine. Whoever will consult the famous Assembly's Catechisms and Confession, will see the peculiarities of the system in all their length and breadth of deformity. A man of plain sense, whose spirit has not been broken to this creed by education or terror, will think that it is not necessary for us to travel to heathen countries, to learn how mournfully the human mind may misrepresent the Deity. "Unitarians thought they were destroying pernicious and ugly heresy—the Calvinists believed just as sincerely that in angelic disguise the devil had possessed himself of New England," Barrett Wendell writes in his "Literary History of America." "To the Unitarian mind, there has never been any valid reason why good men of other opinions than theirs should not enjoy everlasting bliss; but the very essence of the Calvinists' creed condemned to everlasting bliss every human being who rejected the divinely revealed truth of their grimly uncompromising system."

A significant event, making a memorable contribution to the separation of the conservatives and the liberals, happened in 1819. William Ellery Channing, resenting the abuse and unfair criticism heaped upon himself and his liberal associates, took occasion to reply boldly and aggressively to the conservatives. Let me quote Barrett Wendell's excellent summary in his "Literary History":

In 1819, Channing preached at Baltimore, on the occasion of the ordination of Jared Sparks, his famous sermon on Unitarian Christianity. He took his text from I Thess. v. 21: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." His first point is that "we regard the Scriptures as the records of God's successive revelation of his will by Jesus Christ." The Scriptures, he goes on to say, must be interpreted by the light of reason. So, applying reason to Scripture, he deduces in the first place the doctrine of God's unity, "that there is one God, and one only"; secondly, that "Jesus is one mind, one soul, one being, as truly one as we are, and equally distinct from the one God"; thirdly, that "God is morally perfect"; fourthly, that "Jesus was sent by the Father to effect a moral or spiritual deliverance of mankind; that is, to rescue men from sin and its consequences, and to bring them to a state of everlasting purity and happiness"; and, fifthly, that "all virtue has its foundation in the moral nature of man, that is, in science, or his sense of duty, and in the power of forming his temper and life according to conscience."

This sermon seems mild enough to us, but it created at the time of its delivery a real sensation in New England. "Probably no other sermon ever preached in America has had so many readers and so great an influence," according to Dr. Wilbur.

The division between the two groups became permanent with the decision (by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts) of the Dedham case in 1820 in favor of the liberals. There was a distinction in the towns of the state between the "parish" (the male voters) and the "church" (those persons in the parish who had made a public profession of

their faith and were admitted to the Lord's Supper). The Supreme Court decided that the "parish" (which in most cases was on the liberal side), was "the real church" and held the property and could decide finally, if necessary, on the choice of the minister. As a consequence of this decision, a majority of the "first parishes" in eastern Massachusetts became Unitarian.

In May, 1825, the American Unitarian Association was formed by the younger liberal ministers recently graduated from Harvard, and the Unitarian movement was thus formally launched upon its career in America.

Among the many who were alarmed about the spread of the Unitarian heresy was Dr. Lyman Beecher (father of Henry Ward Beecher) who came to Boston, in 1826, to live, and he began in behalf of old-time Calvinism a revival which lasted five years.

Let me quote Paxton Hibben's account of Dr. Lyman Beecher's Boston crusade in his recent biography of "Henry Ward Beecher":

To Lyman Beecher, a menacing heresy under the name of Unitarianism was spreading. For seven years, the mind of Lyman Beecher had been "heating," heating, heating," as he put it, over the awful peril to men's souls of this blasphemous doctrine. Now he elected himself the champion of orthodoxy and sallied forth to Boston to attack the fearsome record in its lair. It is not of record that Unitarianism was greatly shaken by Lyman Beecher's onslaught; but to Beecher and his friends "it was a great victory."

However, as Dr. Wilbur puts it, "he did arouse the drowsy Unitarians to unaccustomed activity." And Dr. Beecher himself became more liberal, softened the Calvinism of his fathers, and began to preach what he called a "new Calvinism."

The controversy continued unabated with both sides hurling epithets and the Unitarians usually surpassed by the orthodox in violence and unreason. "Cold-blooded infidels" was one of the epithets most frequently hurled in the direction of the liberals. The separation of church and state in Massachusetts in 1834 softened somewhat the asperities of the controversy, because that event settled the quarrels over the respective property rights of the "churches" and the "parishes."

Following the organization of the American Unitarian organization, Unitarian Churches sprang up in other sections of the country, and it looked for a time like it would become something other than a "Boston notion." "Are you of the Boston religion or of the Christian religion?" was the question the Rev. Jeddiah Morse would ask in order to discover who were the sheep and who the goats in the days of his leadership of the Calvinistic forces against liberalism.

Ralph Waldo Emerson's so-called "Divinity School Address" delivered to the graduating class of the Harvard Divinity School in 1839, created a furore approximating that stirred by Channing's famous Baltimore sermon in 1819. In it, Emerson discounted the importance of miracles, of traditions, and of persons and events of the religious past. He urged his hearers to seek the truths of religion in their own souls, and thus make religion a vital present-day experience. The address inspired many eloquent replies and was the subject of innumerable private and public discussions.

Following closely upon Emerson's challenging and shocking address, Theodore Parker, one of the most fearless and progressive leaders of the time, preached an ordination sermon in Boston, in 1841, on "The Transient and Permanent in Christianity," that so shocked Boston that it was suggested Parker ought to be prosecuted for blasphemy. The forms and doctrines of Christianity are "transient, changing from year to year," he said. "The permanent elements are to be found in the teachings of Jesus and need no miracles to prove them true." The great majority of the ministers of both the liberal and orthodox beliefs would have nothing more to do with Parker. He became the voice of the extreme progressive wing of the liberals, and his views, though opposed bitterly during his lifetime, were eventually adopted and have now been largely outgrown among the progressive Unitarians.

Transcendentalism and the higher criticism of the Bible coming to America via Germany also helped to liberate and free the majority of the Unitarian ministers from outgrown traditions.

Following the Civil War, Unitarianism experienced a phenomenal growth. It spread throughout the country, a few churches even being established in the south. Particular attention was paid to the establishment of liberal churches in university towns.

Conferences (very loose and unauthoritative organizations) were established in every section of the country, the Women's Alliance was organized in 1880, the Young People's Religious Union was formed in 1896, and in our day the Laymen's League has come into existence. During the history of Unitarianism in America, many different periodicals have come and gone, and only the *Christian Register* (established in 1821), the present national weekly of Unitarians, is

still appearing in print regularly. Channing, Parker and Emerson have become the great saints of Unitarianism in America. Their words are revered and sometimes quoted with almost the authority of scripture.

Many Unitarians perpetually boast of what Dr. Wilbur calls "Our Unitarian Heritage." They like to quote Barrett Wendell's statement from his "Literary History of America" to the effect that "almost everyone who attained literary distinction in New England during the 19th century was either a Unitarian or closely associated with Unitarian influences."

Here, for instance, is typical Unitarian boasting:

Many great names are listed on the roster of the Unitarian Church. In the Hall of Fame in New York stand the bust of the sixty-three most distinguished Americans. More than one-third of these, twenty-two, were formally identified with the Unitarian church, and almost another third of them held Unitarian beliefs.

Nearly three percent (2.9) of all the names in the 1926 "Who's Who" are names of Unitarians. This means that Unitarians constituted three percent of all best-known leaders in science, literature, politics, the professions, etc., in America. At the same time the Unitarian denomination formed less than one-tenth of one percent of the population of the United States. Apparently Unitarianism either breeds leaders or attracts them. (See the chapter on "Religion and the Birth Rate" in "The Builders of America" by Huntington and Whitney.)

Many representative men and women of the past one hundred years have belonged to the Unitarian fellowship. May we instance the following?

**Statesmen:** John Adams, John Quincy Adams, Millard Fillmore, William H. Taft, Edward Everett, Harrison Gray Otis, Charles Sumner, Daniel Webster, John Marshall.

**Religious Leaders:** William Ellery Channing, Jared Sparks, Theodore Parker, James Freeman Clarke, Thomas Starr King, Edward Everett Hale.

**Scientists and Educators:** Joseph Priestly, Louis Agassiz, Horace Mann, John Fiske, Charles W. Eliot, Luther Burbank, David Starr Jordan.

**Literature:** Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry W. Longfellow, James Russell Lowell, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Louis M. Alcott, Bret Harte, Margaret Fuller, Julia Ward Howe, Henry D. Thoreau, Nathaniel Hawthorne, George Bancroft, Francis Parkman, J. Lothrop Motley, Samuel M. Crothers.

**Philanthropists and Reformers:** Dorothea Dix, Dr. S. G. Howe, Henry W. Bellows, Peter Cooper, Ezra Cornell, Mary A. Livermore, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone Blackwell.

And we can forgive this sect (always a very small minority) its boasting because of its influence and its achievements. Its following has been distinguished, not only in America but in other countries where it has existed, and its influence has been far-reaching.

It has been a movement, says Dr. Wilbur, which has profoundly influenced the religious life of Poland and Transylvania, England and America, has furnished important episodes in that of Italy and Switzerland, and has left a lasting impression on the thought and tendencies of the Protestant world. The orthodox Protestantism of the 20th century, in both its teaching and its spirit, is a far different thing from what it would have been if Servetus, Socinus, Lindsey, Priestly, Martineau, Channing and Parker, had never lived, and Calvin and Luther had been suffered to rule the thought and life of their followers unchallenged and uncriticized. Insofar as the religious life of our time is comparatively free, reasonable, and tolerant, and lays greater stress upon personal character and lives of service than upon doctrines of theology, the pioneers and prophets of Unitarianism deserve more credit than has generally been given them.

Moreover, the end is not yet. For there has risen within the Unitarian denomination during the last decade a revolutionary movement known as Humanism. It has attracted the attention of the whole denomination and has become the faith of a considerable and very important minority of Unitarian ministers. The germs of Humanism are found in traditional Unitarianism with its emphasis upon the humanity of Jesus and the value and dignity of human nature.

Humanists make their religion man-centered instead of God-centered. Instead of religion being "our knowledge of God and our duties toward him," it has become with the Humanists "our knowledge of man and our duties toward him." Humanism is interested in the glory of man and man as end in himself rather than in man as a means "to the glory of God." The enrichment of human life will come about not by depending on prayer or "Providence" but only by man's own efforts, according to the Humanists.

The church and its services are being "humanized" by these religious progressives, the old traditional vocabulary has been discarded and realism reigns in the Humanist pulpits. "A theology of Man" is replacing the traditional theology "of God." Humanists, however, protest that they are "not Anti-God but pro-man." Nevertheless, they are not

afraid to be known as "Agnostic-Humanists."

The Humanist movement is, without doubt, the most significant and revolutionary contemporary movement in any sect, and its spirit and influence are spreading to all other denominations.

### WHAT'S RIGHT AND WHAT'S WRONG WITH UNITARIANISM?

Unitarians have always been, and still are, sneered at in evangelical (orthodox) Christian journals. Even when evangelicals become quite liberal (practically Unitarian), they still go to great lengths to prove that they are not Unitarians. Outside of the section in and around Boston, Unitarians have never been popular and have never had any recognized social standing as a church.

In Boston, however, their power was undisputed during the 19th century, and they still have social standing there. Even "Billy" Sunday, so violent in his assaults on Unitarianism in other parts of the country where the Unitarians are relatively weak and unimportant, was willing to soften his attacks in Boston where Unitarians are numerous and important and influential.

However, in nearly every other section of America, people of orthodox churches will have no fellowship with Unitarians. Any evangelical minister who speaks in Unitarian churches is almost certain to be punished in one way or another.

Unitarians have always been accused of having a religion of protests and negations. As one lady who had a doubting husband expressed it: "I am sure that my husband must be a Unitarian for he doesn't believe in anything either."

Unitarians "sit in smug content offering the world of Christian missions only the dry bones of criticism," the critics of the liberal movement have said. "Unitarian neglect of the heathen" has been a favorite topic of the aggressively missionary sects.

A lax view of sin has been fostered by Unitarians, the orthodox have said. Unitarians have given up belief in hell and in the atonement, and they think of the death of Christ as simply that of a noble martyr. How can they, therefore, be alarmed about sin and salvation, or about the state of "the heathen?"

That "Unitarians are without sectarian zeal" has been one of the favorite traditional criticisms both within and without the denomination. In the anonymous book "Painted Windows," we read in the chapter on L. P. Jacks (a distinguished English Unitarian), that Dr. Jacks

confessed to the author that there is no zeal of propaganda in the Unitarian communion. "It is a society of people which does not thrust itself upon the public notice of men, does not compete for converts with other churches in the market-place. It is rather a little temple of peace around the corner, to which people, who are weary of the din in the theological market-place may make their way if they choose."

George Albert Coe in his "A Social Theory of Education" criticizes liberalism on the score that it is too intellectual to promote vital religion; it too easily fails of ethical fervor, and it too little appreciates the importance of such organizations as the church.

Evangelical leaders have rather enjoyed explaining the smallness of the Unitarian church, and they nearly always do it by saying that it is small because it is not orthodox and does not accept traditional Christianity. In his "Religion Since the Reformation," Dr. Leighton Pullan offers the following explanation which is a good illustration of the evangelical point of view:

It has been truly said that no religious denominations ever started with such advantages as American Unitarianism. Yet it failed, and even the simplicity, earnestness, and lofty eloquence of its great advocate, Dr. Channing, would not prevent its decline. The Unitarians failed spiritually, because the Christian life is a product of the Incarnation and is not the acceptance of good rules. No Unitarian can say with St. Paul, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." They failed morally, because while claiming to be liberal, they were intolerant, using their social and even their political power to ostracize their former co-religionists. They failed intellectually, because they began claiming to be intensely scriptural, like the English Unitarians, who published a careful mistranslation of the New Testament to support their claim. And then one of themselves, a prophet of their own, Theodore Parker, turned upon them saying that "if the Athanasian Creed could be proved the work of the apostles, Unitarianism would deny it taught the doctrine of the Trinity."

Professor Rufus M. Jones (a distinguished Quaker) of Haverford College, offers another reason for the lack of growth among Unitarians: "With the advance of higher criticism and the growth of modern thought within all Christian sects, there is less call for the protests which the earlier Unitarian leaders made; and all types of liberals now find themselves closer together."

Chief Justice Taft, one of the

most distinguished of living Unitarian laymen, said in 1913, that "since the other folds have become more comfortable, the Unitarian company has ceased to gain in membership."

Unitarianism, particularly at its sources in Boston, has been too dignified, proper, respectable, and without enthusiasm, according to critics both within and without. A book, once popular among Boston Unitarians, "The Religion of a Gentleman" by Charles F. Dole, illustrates the characteristics of Unitarianism which have handicapped the movement.

A gentleman loves God, loves his fellow-men, seeks the truth, world-wide in his sympathies, simply and devoutly religious, believes prayer is reasonable, is good, and his ideals are summarized in a favorite text: "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things." A gentleman's life is a life rich in sweet joys, adorned by a gracious culture, and possessed of refined tastes—

And this sort of "a gentleman's religion" was too characteristic of Boston Unitarianism of the past.

Of course, Unitarians (so the critics say) have always been for the most part above reproach in their living. This did not fit into the theory of the orthodox that heretics are inevitably immoral. It, therefore, made the heresies of Unitarians all the more dangerous. As Fuller said of Bartholomew Legate, the last heretic to be burned at Smithfield in 1612: "The poison of heretical doctrine is never more dangerous than when served in clean cups and washed dishes."

There is some justice in the criticism that Unitarians have not been able to produce their own ministers. They have been recruited largely from other sects, from among the men who wanted to escape the tyranny of creedal uniformity. Almost a hundred years ago, Emerson remarked that there was more progressiveness and more enthusiasm in Unitarian ministers of orthodox antecedents than those of Unitarian birth.

Mrs. Humphrey Ward, in an address on "Unitarianism and Its Future," delivered at Essex Hall, London, June 19, 1894, spoke of the barren word "Unitarianism." She said that "Unitarianism in many of its phases looks like the remains

(Please turn to page four)

## VIOLENCE A Story of the Real South of Today By Marcet and E. Haldeman-Julius

The swift, graphic action of *VIOLENCE* starts with a fatal bullet-shot from the revolver of the Reverend Phil Jordan, servant of God—and squire of dames. The preacher-mankiller is blessed not only with eloquence, good looks and an ability to deceive himself, but also with a white skin. His acquittal, by a jury of his (white) peers, stands in dramatic contrast with the fate of Skip Early, the mulatto boy who murders fourteen-year-old Sue Jean Jean. Skip's narrow escape from the faggot and kerosene can is again contrasted with the Judge Lynch "justice" handed out to the half-wit Negro, Mose. Back of this bloody triangular dramatization is a portrayal of the life, at once barbaric and decadent, of the town's middle and younger generation whose bodies and passions ripen early.

*VIOLENCE* is from the first line to the last a rapidly-moving story. It is also a novel written from a thoroughly civilized point of view. It is not propaganda; but it is grimly realistic. It is not falsified by any touch of sentimentality; yet it is written with a rare, sympathetic, thoughtful understanding.

### A Fearless and True Picture

This is the first searching and intelligent and fearlessly true picture of today's South. The antics of religious bigotry in Tennessee and other Southern States, several outbreaks of race hatred in the form of nationally startling mob violence, and a number of notorious shootings for personal "honor" or vengeance have in the past few years brought the South theatrically into the limelight. In *VIOLENCE* the reader beholds on a massive canvass this astonishing Southern life.

Although the scenes of *VIOLENCE* are in the imaginary State of Texlarkana, this novel is the outcome of concentrated and broad study of the real, contemporary life in America's Central South. Drama is tremendously here—but not exaggeration. There is tragedy, beauty, pity, humor, and quick unexpected happenings of strange fatality—but there is no striving for false effect.

A glance at the list of characters shows you that *VIOLENCE* is an amazingly yet carefully comprehensive picture of the American society which it makes active as a drama and reflective as a study. High, low, black, white—all the characters and classes are portrayed. *VIOLENCE* is a novel of 374 pages—clothbound—printed in very attractive type. \$2.50 postpaid.

There has been no book of equal importance—both as a story and a social study—published in recent years. ORDER YOUR COPY WITHOUT DELAY ON THE BLANK BELOW—

### Use This Order Blank

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I am enclosing \$2.50 (which includes postage) for a copy of *VIOLENCE*, the new novel by Marcet and E. Haldeman-Julius.

Name .....  
Address .....  
City ..... State .....

The Time: One Year—June 24, 1928, to June 24, 1929.



## In the World of Books

Weekly Reviews and Other Literary Ramblings  
Isaac Goldberg

### MAKING CREAM OF SPILT MILK

*Caught Short.* By Eddie Cantor. New York. Simon & Schuster. \$1. This little saga of Walling Wall Street (that pun is worth almost the price of admission) is a short monologue by that black-face favorite, Eddie Cantor. Since there is no sense in crying over spilt milk, our comedian attempts to make it into cream and laugh over it. Hence a rapid succession of wise cracks and jokes tailored in the latest mode. The publishers, to live up to the spirit of the occasion, might have used stocks as "end-papers." (They proved "end" papers for more than one investor; that one is donated gratis to the cause.)

"Caught Short" is certainly short, and it may catch on. It is bitter reading, even in jest, for sore losers; good losers will find in it a transient solace for their losses. New York, especially—I just returned from the Unholy City—is populated entirely, in these days, by persons who were "wiped out." It is the great Alibi. Rich and poor alike find magic in the phrase. It explains everything. Indigent gentry who never had a nickel to invest go about pulling long faces. "What's the matter, old top?" "Matter? I was wiped out!"

Eddie, too, it seems, was "wiped out." Anyway, read it and laugh—if your memories of the Walling Wall Street will let you. Weep no more, my lady. The market will rise. Shooting craps on the street-corner will continue to be against the law. Lotteries will continue to be against the law. But the Stock Exchange will remain an eminently respectable institution. There, ladies and gentlemen, was the real joke, but Eddie Cantor left it out. He was caught short.

### SUPER GUIDE BOOKS

*Stories of the Great Operas.* By Ernest Newman II. Mozart to Thomas. New York. Knopf. \$3.50. Mr. Newman does not, in this excellent series, write hasty notes for a program book. He is a thorough musician, with much more than the average musician's endowment of scientific objectivity. He does not easily melt into hyper-thyroid raptures. His enjoyment is not a facile wordiness that disguises an innate incapacity for deep feeling. His appreciation, moreover, is founded upon a sound and long acquaintance with the technique of music.

His first book of *Stories* was devoted to the Wagnerian music dramas. Newman, of course, is among our foremost exponents of Wagner, and is the author of "Wagner as Man and Artist." The present volume deals with the chief operatic works of Mozart, Beethoven, Rossini, Weber and Thomas. The operas, as well as the lives of the composers, are fully and sensibly discussed; there are copious illustrations; there is a necessary minimum of technicality.

I know of nothing better for the purpose in musical literature.

### ONCE FORBIDDEN FRUIT

*Dime Novels.* By Edmund Pearson. Boston. Little, Brown & Company. \$3.

Did we ever imagine, in those days when we concealed ourselves to finish a dime novel—in my childhood they were only a nickel—that we should ever be paying three dollars for a book about them? (And a good value at that, for Mr. Pearson writes with the proper admixture of irony and nostalgia; moreover, he is generous with extracts that bring back the beating heart of yore, even if a smile appears now that would have spoiled our enjoyment in those pristine days.) It was high time that "Dime Novels" should have been written. And let us be thankful that Mr. Pearson did the deed.

"Dime Novels" is a rapid-fire history of the novels, their publishers, and conditions during the era of their florescence. Beadle's series, the Old Sleuths, Old Cap. Collier, Nick Carter . . . you'll find them all here, together with reproductions of their once magnetic covers, and selections containing all the well-known phrases. Here Indians come back to life, only to bite the dust again; here villains are torn limb from limb; here brains are blown out by intrepid heroes who are proof against every natural law; here men are men and women are impossible angels. And to think the censors of our boyhood considered these fictions immoral! They are altogether too moral, too rigid in a humorless code. The worst they ever did for me—and I read hundreds of them—was to increase my vocabulary. Some of them, considering their goal, were written pretty decently. Pearson gives an example from Cavendish's "The Reeler of '76" that is surprisingly chaste and, within its self-set limitations, very careful in diction.

I should not wonder if a number of the old-timers would soon be reprinted. In fact, the first of them

all, "Malaeska: The Indian wife of the White Hunter," has recently appeared in modern guise, from the press of John Day. It was the work of Ann Sophia Winterbotham Stephens. Have you ever had to listen to that dramatic recitation entitled "The Polish Boy"? Well, she's the guilty authoress. La Stephens was most popular in her time. She won attentions from royalty; Thackeray, Dickens, Humboldt, and others at the top in art and science, paid her homage. To think that our dime novels should have been originated by a woman, and such a woman!

Pearson's book is replete with rare detail. It is not a full work, but it makes a glorious start. If you have several hundred dime and nickel novels on your conscience, here is a handsome way in which you may atone.

*The Story of Crime*, by Judge Louis Harris. Boston. The Stratford Company. \$2.50.

An enlightened outlook, a simple style, and a mine of information, make this book an excellent value. Judge Harris knows his subject in theory and in practice. He is, above all things, humane. The final paragraph of the book might serve as epigraph for the whole:

"Let us remember and be guided," he suggests, "by the beautiful thought of Macaulay: 'It is not the duty of man to praise his brother, nor yet to blame him; but only he acts justly who looks deep into the heart of humanity, and there searches for Truth, through eyes dim with tears.'"

I am not too sure about the tears. Truth may be visioned as clearly through a smile. But compassion we must have—and the feeling that the man over whom we pretend to sit in judgment is but another shape of ourselves, had we been born from his mother's womb.

### Essence of Unitarianism

*Continued from page three*  
of something else." Many Unitarians have agreed with her point of view.

The late Dr. S. M. Crothers (for twenty-five years a leader among the Unitarians) a short time before his death, in a discussion of Mrs. Ward's remarks, said:

The history of Unitarianism for the last one hundred years has not been very interesting. As a denomination, in this country and in England, it has held its own; but it has never developed into one of the major sects. It has never appealed to popular imagination. It is still the religion of a small minority.

And then in extenuation of the smallness of the Unitarian body, Dr. Crothers offers the following:

It was a very different road which Channing and his friends chose a century ago. They chose it in spite of the difficulties which they saw, but they did not foresee all the difficulties which actually have been encountered. To organize religion in an atmosphere of intellectual freedom has proved to be no easy matter. A religion that does not use tradition as a guide, has voluntarily given up hope of immediate success. Its progress must be slow as all educational processes are slow.

That Unitarians are not Christians is one of the commonest charges against this liberal movement. Dr. Charles Harris, in his recent book, "Creeds or No Creeds," gives his opinion as follows:

Unitarianism and Christianity are different religions, for the simple reason that they have different objects of worship. Christianity worships God incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth, and pays to the latter, regarded as God-man, the supreme homage of adoration. Unitarianism not only denies such worship to Jesus, but (quite rightly from its own standpoint) usually regards it as idolatrous and blasphemous.

In "Christianity and Liberalism," Professor J. Gresham Machen of Princeton University insists that Christianity and liberalism are two separate and distinct religions. He even goes so far as to say that only fundamentalists are real Christians. Machen accuses the liberals (who are no longer Christians) in the evangelical church of dishonesty and commends the Unitarian church to them.

"The Unitarian church is frankly and honestly just the kind of a church that the liberal preacher desires—namely, a church without an authoritative Bible, without doctrinal requirements, and without a creed," he says.

The late G. Stanley Hall, in his book "Morale" in a chapter entitled "Morale and Religion," puts forward the thesis that religion is always compromising with its environment and lapsing to lower levels. This has been particularly true of the Unitarians—

The most liberal of all the Christian denominations still harks back to Channing, Emerson, and perhaps Parker, and in place of the earlier radical Protestantism which characterized it, tends to a mild aestheticism, and is declining because it is uneugenic and does not make good by adding proselytes to make up for its losses from race suicide. With the casting off of old forms, it lost the saving sense of reality, and lives with a touch of Narcissism in a beautiful dream-world it has made for itself. It disapproves revivals, and its seminaries have not led as they ought to have done in the advancement of liberal Christian scholarship. It clings tena-

ciously to the dogma of a personal objective God and individual immortality, hopes for Heaven, but has allowed the doctrine of Hell, its vital counterpart, to lapse to innocuous desuetude while even in the liberality it has so long plumed itself upon it is very often surpassed by individual leaders in other denominations commonly thought more conservative. In the gentle and charming invalidism of this originally most virile and promising movement, Protestantism is without any kind of organized advance guard but is led onward toward freedom by noble volunteers and stragglers.

Many Unitarian leaders are too much dominated by the fine splendid traditions of the movement. They have no creed, it is true, but they do believe in their leaders almost blindly, and so they are not free to interpret religion in terms of present-day information. They constantly look back to "the golden past of Unitarianism." O. B. Frothingham in his "Boston Unitarianism: 1820-1850," writes that there were three types of Unitarianism during this period.

1. Channing, representative of one—the spiritual.  
2. Parker, of the practical.  
3. Emerson, of the cultivated, the scholarly, the elegant, the refined, the safely conservative, and cautiously progressive.

And beyond the teachings and personalities of these great leaders, too many Unitarians are loathe to go, so the critics say.

The Unitarians suffer, as do a number of other denominations, from a name that has lost its force. Secular names are all losing their significance. Baptists are no longer much concerned about forms of baptism, though that subject was once a challenging one. Methodists, as their name signifies, are supposed to live according to method. But they live no more methodically than other people. Universalists could once stir the country over the question of universal salvation. But now that hell has been abolished, there is little concern over questions that once gave the Universalists their name. The question as to whether God should be thought of as a unity or a trinity gave the Unitarians their name. That question is now dead.

Henry W. Crosskey, once president of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, expressed his protest against the name "Unitarian":

The body of men called "Unitarian" hold that no series of dogmatic articles of faith, no "creed," ought to be imposed upon ministers or members of a "church" as a condition of religious fellowship; in other words, that a church ought to be kept as freely open for the pursuit of religious truth as a college is for the advancement of learning.

In the irony of fate, a body of men who place less stress upon dogma than any other body of men in the world, have yet been christened with a dogmatic name. There are certain noble qualities that have always characterized the majority of Unitarians and have especially been present in the ideals of the movement.

Unitarians have been more progressive than other sects. The pioneers among the religionists and heretics have more frequently escaped to the Unitarian denomination than to any other. The evolution of Unitarianism has been rapid. First, the liberals were set free from the creeds, then they gave up the infallibility of the Bible. In time, the teachings of Jesus as an infallible guide were surrendered. Gradually the leaders have arrived at a rationalistic and humanistic interpretation of religion.

I do not mean to say that there have not been periods of stagnation. It was against such a period of sluggishness that Channing protested in 1841—a year before his death:

Unitarianism began as a protest against the rejection of reason—against mental slavery. It pledged itself to progress as its life's end; but it has gradually grown stationary, and now we have a Unitarian orthodoxy.

Religious liberals have nearly always recognized the folly of creeds. They know that it is unwise to substitute one creed for another, for all creeds are eventually outgrown. Liberals have always put loyalty to truth above loyalty to creed or sect. Even the shortest creed has been rejected by them. They have insisted that religion could survive without dogmas. Fixed and unalterable statements of faith are always bars to further progress. True religion is a matter of life and character and tolerance and not a matter of beliefs, they have said. They have not been willing lightly to say "I believe."

As Dr. Crothers once wrote: Unitarians have not been able to repeat creeds with mental reservations. To say "I believe" could not be by them interpreted as meaning "I am glad to join others in a form of words which is no doubt good for them and for the church, though it does not coincide with my personal opinions."

Unitarian leaders in the past have said that it is not for us today to say to the great tidal waves of human thought: "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther." In speaking of the English churches with "open trusts," an English Unitarian leader said: "If our children can find a better religion, the temples

in which their fathers worship today shall still be theirs."

Unitarians have been impatient with those who play with words. For that reason, it is difficult for them to appreciate the attitude of straddling modernists. And that is the reason for the following gently chiding statement signed by twenty-seven leading Unitarian ministers, when there was a controversy over the meaning of the creeds in 1924:

With all courtesy and consideration, let us make it plain that religious teachers who play with words in the most solemn relations of life, who make their creeds mean what they were not originally meant to mean, or mentally reject a formula of belief while outwardly repeating it, cannot expect to retain the allegiance of men who are accustomed to straight thinking and square dealing.

Unitarians have always advocated freedom of conscience. Of course, you say, it has been to their interest to do so because they have always been in the minority. Possibly so, but the very spirit of this liberal movement has been against coercion in matters of opinion. That is the significance of Dr. Charles W. Eliot's statement concerning the religious training of youth:

The genuine Unitarian values so highly his liberty of thought and his freedom from all bonds of traditional and gregarious opinion, that, as a rule, he is not willing to attempt the imposition of his opinions on anybody else, not even his own children. He is rarely interested in foreign missions except on their medical and anthropological side, and he makes a poor propagandist at home; for he is apt to hold that nobody ought to be or become a Unitarian except a person whose own mind and will work in such a way that he cannot help being or becoming a Unitarian.

Unitarians have found comfort in Mrs. Browning's beatitude, because they feel that it particularly applies to them: "Blessed are those among the nations who dare to be free for the rest."

The humanistic phase of Unitarianism gives the lie to all those critics who say that Unitarianism is a moribund movement. It, however, confirms the fears of the evangelicals who have said that Unitarians were giving up all of the fundamentals of the Christian religion. The Humanists have in mind "a church ample as the wants of man." And, as Dr. John Haynes Holmes has remarked, "Unitarianism has a future only as it listens to and follows its progressive wing."

It seems rather trite to say the Unitarians have been pioneers and trail blazers, but, in justice to them, it must be said. They have not had in mind the church as an institution for the preservation of ancient opinions. Agnes Lee's recent poem "Convention" expresses just the opposite of what Unitarians have been:

The snow is lying very deep,  
My house is sheltered from the blast,  
I hear each muffled step outside,  
I hear each voice so soft and fast.

But I'll not venture in the drift  
Out of this bright security,  
Till enough steps come and go  
To make a path for me.

Such timidity has never been characteristic of the leaders of the Unitarian movement.

And what comfort is there for Unitarians who are a part of this movement, still small and insignificant (with only 400 churches in America, 350 in Great Britain, 125 in Transylvania, and a few scattered ones in other countries—less than one thousand all told), still sneered at, and suffering somewhat from the psychology of defeat? The comfort, it seems to me, that pioneers get from contemplating such words as those spoken in 1916 by Dr. Charles W. Eliot, at the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Harvard Divinity School:

The pioneer has two happinesses. He has first, the happiness of walking his chosen path alone. If he is a real pioneer, he enjoys this. He has later another happiness, no less real. It is that of seeing others jostle one another to tread broad the path which he once trod alone.

The whole religious world is moving toward the liberalism of Unitarians. It is time for them to strike their tents and be on the march. And that, I believe, the Unitarians are doing under the banner of the Humanists.

### Epigraph

Isaac Goldberg in *The New Immortality* (Little Blue Book No. 1481).  
The Good, the True, and the Beautiful.  
Alas!  
The Good is so often Untrue.  
The Truth is so often Unbeautiful.  
The Beautiful is so often Not Good.

"It is easier," wrote Oscar Wilde, "to have sympathy with suffering than to have sympathy with thought." We may add that a great deal of the trouble in the world can be traced to false thoughts and to ignorance.

The man who is unfriendly to new ideas lacks, in the first place, a solid and full acquaintance with the wisdom of the ages.

Paradox: The "Devil" is kept alive by the devil-killers.

# LAST CALL!

Only Until Jan. 30 ---So Rush Your Order!

Sale offers you the pick of our list of Best Sellers! Not a plug in the lot---all fast movers---all books that we have sold by the tens of thousands at the regular price.

**\$2.39**

Was \$2.65

*Sexual Apathy and Coldness in Women*, by Walter M. Gallichan, is a book of information seldom available to the general public. Frigidity in women has been a problem that only psychologists have faced squarely. Here are the facts. Frigidity in men is also frankly discussed. 183 pages. \$2.39 postpaid.

**\$2.98**

Was \$4.00

*The Outline of Bunk*, by E. Haldeman-Julius, the sensation of the year. Everywhere condemned by bigots, praised by liberals. The story of mankind from a debunker's viewpoint. A huge volume of intensely interesting reading, one-half attacking bunk, the other half admiring worth-while accomplishments of man: 500 pages, 27 chapters, 142,000 words. \$2.98 postpaid.

**\$2.49**

Was \$2.65

*The Crazy Fool*, a hilarious novel by Donald Ogden Stewart—you'll split your sides with laughter at this convulsingly funny book. Mr. Stewart is well known for his excellent humor. Do not fail to grab this chance to get this \$2 novel for such a low price. 246 pages. \$1.28 postpaid.

**\$1.28**

Was \$2.00

**\$1.35**

Was \$1.85

*Dust*, by Mr. and Mrs. Haldeman-Julius, is a first novel, but a novel that will not die. People everywhere still clamor to read this book. "Only a man and a woman together could have written so honestly," said the critics. You can now get a handsome clothbound copy. 251 pages, for \$1.35 postpaid.

**\$2.72**

Laws of Sex

*The Laws of Sex*, by Edith Hooker, is exceptionally outspoken in its treatment of what has too often been a taboo subject. Here hypocrisy never masks the facts. You will be gratifyingly amazed at such lack of reserve, for once! 373 pages. \$2.72 postpaid (was \$5).

**\$1.36**

The Jesus Myth

*The Jesus Myth*, by Georg Brandes, places Jesus in the same class with William Tell and other heroic but imaginary figures. A book that provokes discussion. 190 pages. \$1.36 postpaid (was \$2).

**\$2.48**

Was \$2.65

*Cleopatra's Private Diary*, by Henry Thomas, is a satirical novel, supposed to be written in the form of a diary by Cleopatra, notorious Queen of Egypt. The scenes are ancient; the wit and the follies at which it is aimed are modern. A book amusing and enlightening. 306 pages. \$1.89 postpaid.

**\$1.89**

Was \$2.00

**\$1.19**

Mysterious Glands

*Your Mysterious Glands*, by Dr. Rubin, informs you concerning the so-called ductless glands, about which science has known so little until recent years. One of the most informative sex books ever published. 179 pages. \$1.19 postpaid (was \$2.50).

**\$1.98**

The First Hundred Million

*The First Hundred Million*, by E. Haldeman-Julius. A complete history of the Little Blue Books, including a careful analysis of what the American people are interested in, their tastes, their desires, their ambitions, their habits. An extraordinary book which has attracted a great deal of attention. Was \$3. Now only \$1.98.

**49c**

New Lives for Old

*New Lives for Old*, Carleton A. biography, full of new material. A charming, interesting, useful and amusing book. Was \$1.75, now only 49c.

**\$1.68**

The Goose-Step

*The Goose-Step*, by Upton Sinclair, is an exposure of the propaganda that U. S. colleges and universities are obliged to teach because of the influence and control exerted over them by capital (wealth). 486 pages. \$1.68 postpaid (was \$2).

**49c**

Valley of Democracy

*The Valley of Democracy*, by Meredith Nicholson. A shrewd and sound study of the middle West. You will enjoy this entertaining and instructive work. A fine, clothbound volume. Was \$2.50, now only 49 cents.

**35c**

Life of Grover Cleveland

*Grover Cleveland*. A valuable biography, full of new material. Was originally published to sell at \$1.50, but our price is only 35c. This is a great bargain.

**\$2.85**

The Big American Parade

*The Big American Parade*, by E. Haldeman-Julius, a liberal's honest survey of American life. Know your own country by reading this big, beautiful, well-written, important book. Over 400 pages, attractive jacket in colors, 125,000 words. Be sure to read this thought-provoking book about America. Now only \$2.85.

**\$1.65**

Life of Oliver Cromwell

*Life of Oliver Cromwell*, in two beautiful volumes. A masterpiece of original research and scholarship. The original price of this two-volume set was \$7.50, but our bargain sale price is only \$1.65 for both volumes.

**\$2.25**

Nelson's India Paper Bible

*Nelson's Edition of the Bible*. A beautiful edition, in India paper, leatherbound, stamped in gold. The finest edition ever issued to sell at \$7.50, now only \$2.25.

Use This Bargain blank before Jan. 30

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Dept. R-7,  
Girard, Kansas

I have checked the books I want, in the list at the right, and I enclose \$..... herewith, remittance in full for all the books ordered. You are to prepay the postage in full to my address below.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State.....

..... Sexual Apathy and Coldness in Women \$2.39  
..... Strictly Private \$2.49  
..... The Crazy Fool \$1.28  
..... Outline of Bunk \$2.98  
..... Dust, clothbound, \$1.35  
..... Story of a Terrible Life \$2.48  
..... Cleopatra's Private Diary \$1.89  
..... Oil! and 3 Quarterlies containing Money Writes! \$1.79  
..... Jesus Myth \$1.36  
..... History and Practice of Sexual Psychanalysis \$2.29  
..... Sex and Society \$1.33  
..... Mysterious Glands \$1.19  
..... Goose-Step \$1.68  
..... The Big American Parade \$2.85  
..... The First Hundred Million \$1.98  
..... Grover Cleveland 35c  
..... Life of Cromwell, 2 vols., \$1.65  
..... Valley of Democracy 49 cents  
..... New Lives for Old 49 cents  
..... Nelson's Bible \$2.25  
..... Laws of Sex \$2.72