

Editor  
E. Haldeman-Julius  
Assistant Editor  
John W. Gunn

# The American Freeman

Published Every Saturday For Those Who Dare the Risk of Knowing

Published weekly at 329 E. Forest Ave., Girard, Kans. Single copies 5c; by the year \$1 (\$1.50 Canadian and foreign). Entered as second-class matter at the Girard, Kans., postoffice.

The Fighting Paper  
The Freeman Army

NUMBER 1827

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS

December 6, 1930

## Crusading Extraordinary in Two Great Special Editions!

### Strong Atheist Special Edition

ON DECEMBER 27

An Atheist Special Edition! That is our next exciting plan of action for The Freeman Army. Having vigorously exposed the economic and political charlatanism of the Hoover administration in a Special Edition, we are now in the midst of preparing a campaign on another battle front—an exposure in full, an exposure bold and relentless, of religious charlatanism. The Freeman dated December 27 will be known as our Atheist Special Edition. It will be the most fearless, virile, emancipated and completely definitive review of religion and its associated ideas that has ever appeared in any American publication. It will contain in powerful quantity the most atheistic, realistic, intellectually free and modern propaganda that was ever offered to the reading public.

Our readers know that The Freeman has consistently opposed the bunk of religion and that no week passes without some timely and challenging expression of our views on religion. The regular readers of The Freeman are familiar with our viewpoint and they understand, with a fairly accurate comprehension, what our ideas are about this historical subject which has so intrigued, excited and confused the human mind. We want to go a long step farther. We want to reach a large, special class of readers—a large army of new readers who, among ourselves, we can agree are quite in need of debunking—with a concentration of atheistic propaganda in one dramatic, carefully prepared Special Edition. By a quick, daring, sensational movement, we want to carry our propaganda against religious bunk into a wider territory, bringing to thousands of Americans the challenge of free, iconoclastic thought on this misunderstood subject.

This will be the largest single atheistic propaganda enterprise in the history of American journalism. We shall debunk every phase of religion in our Atheist Special Edition on December 27. We shall give full and revealing attention to the history of religion. What has religion done? What has its effect been upon the life of mankind? What has been its position with regard to the great issues of social life? What has been the history, the origin and aim and the actual influence of religious beliefs? Such historical questions, answered candidly, are blows at the very basis of religion. We shall define the position of religion, both as a force of theological dogma and as a force of political action, with regard to moral questions; with regard to political freedom; with regard to economic issues; with regard to freedom of thought and the interests of sound, emancipated discussion. We shall relentlessly debunk the ideas of religion (both the old-fashioned religion and the newer brands of religion which masquerade as "Modernism"). We shall analyze both the theoretical and the actual effects of religious beliefs upon the conduct of men and women. We shall smash into the bunk of religion with a magnificent vigor and variety of simultaneous blows, all in this one big Atheist Special Edition.

We urge The Freeman Army to back us up in this big, spectacular, highly useful debunking of religion in our Atheist Special Edition of December 27. Use the well-known methods of propaganda: *Method No. 1*, which means that you order a bundle of copies of the Atheist Special Edition, minimum order 50 copies, at 2c a copy. Or *Method No. 2*, which means that you send us 50 or more names to whom we shall send the Atheist Special Edition, at 2c a copy. Or *Method No. 3*, which means that you order us to send 50 or more copies of the Atheist Special Edition to good names in our possession, at the rate of 2c a copy. By using one or all three of these methods, promptly and vigorously, you can do the greatest work you have ever dreamed of in the intellectual, humanitarian, radically progressive attack upon religious bunk.

### "Strike Hard at Superstition"

The American Freeman, Girard, Kansas

I am enthusiastic over the idea of an uncompromising, hard-hitting Atheist Special Edition of December 27. I am joining in this big fight and am using the method marked below.

*Method No. 1.* Send me a bundle of ..... copies of the Atheist Special Edition, at 2c per copy, minimum order 50 copies, for which I am enclosing \$.....

*Method No. 2.* Send ..... copies of the Atheist Special Edition to the enclosed names and addresses, for which I am enclosing \$....., which pays for the papers and the mailing at the rate of 2c a copy.

*Method No. 3.* I am enclosing \$....., which is to pay for your mailing copies of the Atheist Special Edition to good names in your possession, said copies being paid for at the rate of 2c a copy.

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

### WORSE THAN SPY

The muckheap of dishonor in which politicians wallow as their natural home is "honored" by having among its squirming mass the squat, bulky figure of "Charley" Curtis, Vice-President of the United States. Politicians have amply shown that they have no sense of honor where public interests are concerned. But some may have applied to them the old (though not so true) saying about "honor among thieves," supposing that in personal relations these gentry perhaps still observe a faint, technical pretense of honor or a gentlemanly code.

Not so—at least not "Charley" Curtis. Here is what Curtis did and admits having done: He introduced to his fellow members of the Senate and of Congress a man whom he passed as his friend, as a man unofficial and trustworthy, simply a friendly looker-on at the doings of Congress. This fellow was given unsuspiciously the entree of the capitol, its cloak-rooms and restaurants and so on.

Naturally the gentlemen of Congress thought of no concealment before the fellow but accepted him, in a manner of speaking, as one of themselves. Hadn't he been recommended by good old "Charley"? True, "Charley" had been wearing a high hat since his elevation to that pedestal of political nonentities, the Vice-Presidency. But it was assumed that "Charley" had yet a little sense of honor. He might fool the people but he wouldn't, so they thought, betray his own personal and political colleagues in the capitol building.

It was discovered, however, that the fellow introduced by Curtis was none other than a Prohibition spy, an agent of the government, whom "Charley" had deliberately introduced to his congressional friends under a false guise so that he could report to the Department of Justice on drinking in the capitol building, among the members of Congress.

That doesn't surprise us very much. We never were so childish as to look for any kind of honor among political shysters and charlatans. It seems to us that Curtis' behavior is entirely in character. Others, who may have retained some little illusion about the character of politicians, will be given by this episode a realization of the slimy depths of ignoble trickery to which, personally as well as politically, these gentry have descended.

We wonder why "Charley" didn't perform the spy act himself, while he was about it; it would have been no worse, surely, than introducing the spy among his friends. And let us add, too, that we don't particularly sympathize with the congressmen who vote dry and drink wet. They have such low standards of honor that they are, after all, not fairly entitled to complain at the dishonorable sneakiness of "Charley" Curtis. They should have known, furthermore, that "Charley," being of the same company and atmosphere as themselves, was not to be trusted.

It's a wonderful government we have—a government composed of spies, sneaks, quacks, grafters and liars.

### MORROW MAKES A "POINT"

One of the most curiously child-like arguments we have ever encountered in the infantile field of political oratory was advanced by the Hon. Dwight W. Morrow in a radio address. It would be useless, he declared, to cast a vote against Republican policies by supporting the Democratic candidates for Congress. With that statement we agree. Our reason is that both the Democratic and the Republican candidates stand for the same system of "economic individualism." There is no real nor broad space of separation between their policies into which an intelligent hope for popular welfare could be conveyed with room for assurance or action.

But the reason given by Morrow was unbelievably amusing. The next Congress will not go into regular session until Decem-

ber, 1931. So why vote for the Democrats? asks Morrow. And, we might add, why vote for the Republicans? Why vote for anybody? Why have an election at all? Why have Morrow and others taxing their vocal cords with speech after speech after speech?

If Morrow could have proved that there would never be any session of Congress, or that Congress itself was merely a myth, that might have been interesting and it undoubtedly should have had a bearing upon the action of the voters. But since there will be a new Congress, even though it doesn't get to work until a year from now, the American voters have divided opinions as to whether it should be a Democratic or a Republican Congress.

It is funny that Morrow should argue that a man who firmly believed in Democratic policies, such as they are, should nevertheless have voted for Republican candidates and Republican policies for the sole reason that Congress won't be in session until twelve months later. Morrow was running for United States Senator from New Jersey. And his Democratic opponent might have appealed to the voters with Morrow's own "logic." He might have told the New Jersey voters that it was useless to support Morrow because he wouldn't take his seat in the Senate until December, 1931.

Why vote at all? And why, indeed, listen to speeches by Morrow?

### MORE STUPID HOOVERISM

Everything that Hoover or his lieutenants say or do seems just a bit more stupid than their past record, which has been pitiful in its general failure not simply to inaugurate helpful action in this crisis but even to recognize or admit the plain facts of the situation. Hoover's economics are not merely wrong; they are childish. Consider as an example of the economic wisdom of the Great Engineer the recent slogan, "Buy now!" This is supposed by the Hoover "prosperity" brigade to be an encouragement to the return of better conditions. Yet it is founded upon a refusal to see and understand the simple fact that the buying power of the country will not enable it to absorb the surplus of commodities which is described technically as "over-production."

Nor is that all: for several years before the crash in October, 1929, the country had been carried along heedlessly in a rush of excessive spending, reckless investments, gambling and an artificial "prosperity" mania. Inflation was the rule of the hour and so there came the inevitable shock of deflation (inevitable under an economic system which makes it impossible for the workers to buy back the products of their labor). Inflation, under capitalistic conditions, caused the present panic; and now the Hoover "prosperity" ballyhoos say that the remedy for the disease is to return stupidly to the conditions of the disease by another orgy of senseless (and, as a matter of fact, impossible) spending.

We realize that Hoover and his lieutenants are looking desperately for some kind of chatter that will strike the country as plausible advice, something to say if not to do that will create an impression of helpful and sound guidance in Washington. But surely nothing less plausible, nothing more futile, could have been hit upon by the Hoover "prosperity" cheer leaders. It sounds very simple to say that if the people would only spend a great deal more, trade would be stimulated: if—that's the big little word that causes all the trouble. What is really significant is the economic status of the masses of the people: their access, on terms of fair consumption, to the wealth which they produce; their real buying power, which cannot be magically increased by any slogan from the Hoover cheer leaders.

From out all the details of economic analysis there stands one clear, centrally defining fact:

namely, that the workers cannot buy what they produce; that, in short, the workers are exploited and there is an inevitable capitalistic surplus. This of course is not a surplus over what the people need and could, under just conditions, consume: it is a surplus over what the private owners of industry and trade can sell at a profit. Hoover and his lieutenants could talk from now until world's end but they could not, within the crippling system of "economic individualism" which they defend, change the status of the workers as exploited masses who are powerless to absorb the unjust, artificial surplus of agriculture, industry and trade.

"Buy now" is a wretched, stupid, mocking slogan to be offered the masses who, in so-called good times even as more spectacularly in bad times, are economically underpaid and below the level of fair, continuous absorption of the wealth which they produce. This is merely another stupid Hooverism and a vain effort to conceal the essential, fundamental, mathematical failure of "economic individualism."

### "FREE MOONEY," UPTON SINCLAIR URGES ROLPH

The first duty of James Rolph, recently elected as governor of California, should be to pardon Tom Mooney and use his strongest influence for a reconsideration of the case of Warren Billings. (Billings, equally innocent with Mooney, cannot be pardoned without a recommendation from the state supreme court.) Upton Sinclair, who polled an unusually large vote as Socialist candidate for governor of California, telegraphed Governor-elect Rolph as follows:

Congratulations upon your large vote. The fifty thousand citizens of California who voted for me would appreciate it if you would celebrate your victory by an act of magnanimity. Will you not announce immediately that you will pardon Tom Mooney upon the day of assuming office, and that you will do your utmost to obtain justice for Billings? The continued persecution of these two innocent men will constitute an enduring blot upon your administration.

The Los Angeles *Examiner* commented as follows upon Sinclair's vote: "A surprising result was the relatively large vote cast for Upton Sinclair, Socialist candidate for governor. It is indicated that his total will run not less than 50,000, which is about five times the Socialist registration."

WE BELIEVE that science should (as we know it can) furnish the strong, superior, clear guidance for the management of life. Government should be scientific, our economic system should be scientific, our attitude toward ideas should be scientific, our general conduct of the business of living should be scientific. This is only to say, in simpler words, that the best knowledge we have should be applied to the handling of all our interests. A higher civilization, and one that is securely based upon the greatest common welfare, can be achieved only through the scientific solution of all our problems.

ALL OF the preachers claim to know the nature of God pretty well and yet they are split into a thousand curious disagreements about the nature of God. Let us whisper a secret: "the nature of God" is only a professional phrase in use among the preachers and they don't really know what they are talking about. If this is impolite, we are not a bit sorry.

A FULL program of social justice demands that men and women shall broaden their ideas beyond the bounds of individualism, beyond the bounds of class, and beyond the bounds of country so as to acknowledge the greater interests of humanity.

THE ART of debunking expresses itself in the sharpest kind of logic—the logic that cuts through surfaces of sham and exposes the absurdities which lie just below these surfaces.

### Hoover Scandal Special Edition

ON JANUARY 3

As we go to press we have made a quick and important decision—we shall issue on January 3, 1931, a second Special Edition which we are calling the Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition. We have obtained a great deal of amazing and, in the strictest and most serious sense of the word, scandalous material regarding the past life and dealings of Herbert Hoover. This is, we assure you solemnly, the biggest scandal ever discovered concerning a President of the United States and will in certain flagrant features outrank the very rank oil scandal of the Harding administration. Let us further explain, without going into detail at this time, that we are not preparing a merely personal, petty, moral scandal against President Hoover. The story—indeed the stories—we shall have to tell in the Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition bear vitally upon the fitness of Hoover to be President; these are revelations of the utmost public importance; they strike at the fundamental questions of Hoover's honor, trustworthiness and real character.

This Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition will explain why President Hoover has shown himself so utterly incompetent in his dealing with American interests and it will explain why President Hoover is so fully the friend of the power trust and other financial-industrial schemes of exploitation and, by the same token, the deliberate enemy of the American people. As we shall reveal Hoover's past in the Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition, it will be shown convincingly that Herbert Hoover has always been the selfish, grasping, scheming, dollar-juggling friend of moneyed interests; and that, considering his peculiar training, he is a more dangerous man than Harding to sit in the White House as the executive head of the American government. Had the American people known in 1928 the facts which we shall publish in our Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition, Herbert Hoover could not have been elected President of the United States. And, if the facts are published widely enough, it is not impossible that Herbert Hoover may be impeached before his present term of office would ordinarily be finished. We declare in all seriousness that we have the facts which will justify such an impeachment; and we shall fearlessly print these facts in our Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition of January 3, 1931. Remember the date—January 3, 1931—the next issue following our Atheist Special Edition. This is our second Special Edition devoted to Herbert Hoover and it will be far more sensational than our first Hoover Special Edition.

And let us say that the swift and spectacular success of our first Hoover Special Edition, which is still being sent in multiplying bundles through the mails, proves that we have selected for our heaviest propaganda artillery the one issue which has leading importance in the minds of the American people. There is no doubt that our Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition will be more popular than our first Hoover Special Edition—indeed it will contain such tremendous, challenging, exciting material that we are unable to imagine a limit to the possible circulation of this Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition of January 3.

Step quickly into action, you loyal members of The Freeman Army, and circulate the Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition of January 3. Use the well-known methods: *Method No. 1* means that you order a bundle of 50 or more copies of the Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition, at the rate of 2c a copy. *Method No. 2* means that you send us 50 or more names to whom we shall mail the Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition, at the rate of 2c a copy. *Method No. 3* means that you will order us to send 50 or more copies of the Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition, at the rate of 2c a copy, to good names in our possession. Order today for a speedy exposure of Herbert Hoover's past!

### "Expose Herbert Hoover's Past"

The American Freeman, Girard, Kansas

I am with you in the determination to expose Herbert Hoover's past. I want to help get these amazing facts to the American people. I am using the method marked below.

*Method No. 1.* Send me a bundle of ..... copies of the Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition, at 2c a copy, minimum order 50 copies, for which I am enclosing \$.....

*Method No. 2.* Send ..... copies of the Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition to the enclosed names and addresses, for which I am enclosing \$....., which pays for the papers and the mailing at the rate of 2c a copy.

*Method No. 3.* I am enclosing \$....., which is to pay for your mailing copies of the Hoover SCANDAL Special Edition to good names in your possession, said copies being paid for at the rate of 2c a copy.

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



# Upton Sinclair Exposes "Red" Commission Tricky Tactics

By Upton Sinclair

I have a rule, which I seldom break, not to make puns on a man's name; but it seems to me impossible not to make puns about the Fish Commission. It has been fishing for two days in a court room of the Federal building in Los Angeles, and I dropped in on a couple of the sessions.

I heard the head of our so-called "Red Squad," also a District Attorney, and various employees of the Better America Federation, an organization subsidized by the big business interests of southern California to make propaganda against every form of liberal ideas on social questions. It was a great opportunity for these patrioters to earn their salaries, and to collect new contributions from the wealthy ladies and gentlemen on their "sucker list." They had been working for weeks, preparing elaborate reports and recommendations, and they sat and read them into the record; and meantime the five congressmen sat and purred with satisfaction, and patted the various witnesses, figuratively speaking, upon the backs, and told them they were wise statesmen and patriotic citizens and everything noble and fine.

The whole thing went through like a perfectly stage-managed scene in a talkie. Shoot, said the chairman, and the actors leaped into action, and the cameraman, in this case a stenographer, began vigorously to turn the crank of his camera, in this case a pencil. In the course of two full-day sessions there was produced a perfect picture of America being saved from the machinations of Moscow, as represented by such "subsidiary organizations" as the American Civil Liberties Union and the League against Capital Punishment. There were few statements too false to be accepted, and no nonsense too extreme to be purged over.

It was not until after six o'clock of the second and last day that a hitch occurred. Several representatives of the American Civil Liberties Union had the temerity to demand a hearing in order to testify that this organization is not a piece of Communist camouflage, but a group of old-fashioned Americans who believe in the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, and are endeavoring to make it effective.

The first witness was the Rev. Clinton J. Taft, a former Congregational clergyman, for the past seven years director of the southern California branch of the American Civil Liberties Union. Dr. Taft had naturally assumed that since employees of the Better America Federation were given unlimited time in which to lie about the Civil Liberties Union, the Union would be given time in which to refute those lies, and produce evidence. Dr. Taft is a very mild-mannered gentleman, who got his training for some twenty years in the pastorates of various Christian churches in Boston, in New York state, and in Los Angeles. He has not the training of a lawyer, neither has he ever had any practice on a football field, and so he was completely taken aback by the sudden rush of Chairman Fish, of the commission.

It has been many years since I watched football practice, and I had forgotten the manners and morals which prevail on the field. I was almost as much shocked as Dr. Taft himself by the way the ex-quarterback from Harvard rushed at him, kicked him up, threw him over his shoulder, ran him all the way back to the chairman's own line, and threw him down for a "safety." Dr. Taft was somewhat groggy from the experience, but picked up the ball again and got out on the field with it. His persistence, during an hour of continuous punishment, must have been surprising to the ex-quarterback. He scored several goals, but they were not credited.

## Aristocratic Hamilton Fish, Jr., in Action

I should estimate that Hamilton Fish, Jr., millionaire of the New York aristocracy, is about six feet two inches in height and built in proportion. He is dark, handsome if you think only about the body, and nothing about the mind or the more sensitive expressions of personality. He was there to ridicule and humiliate and embarrass a defender of constitutional rights; he was there to see that his opponent got into the record nothing of any real value or significance, and to trip him up with trick questions every time he tried to make a start. As football tactics, his work was masterful; as a proceeding in a public hearing supposed to elucidate the truth about an important question, it was one of the most disgraceful scenes I have ever witnessed. I have watched district attorneys dealing with suspected murderers and bandits, trying to "rattle" them and throw them off their balance; but I have never seen one go further than did this supposed-to-be elegant young man of fashion, trained at Harvard University and the Harvard law school.

Dr. Taft tried again and again to state the purposes of the American Civil Liberties Union, and was met with remarks such as these: "We are not interested in all that." "We have got all that into the record." "What's the use in giving us those things?" "I want to know what you know about Communists in Los Angeles." "We know about the committee of the Civil Liberties Union." "Haven't you got William Z. Foster on the committee?" "Do you know that he is a Communist?" "Are you proud of persons like that on your committee?" "How many Communists are there on your committee?" "Don't you know the political beliefs of your committee?" "Do you believe in the right to advocate murder?" "Do you believe in the right to advocate the killing of the President of the United States?" "Do you believe in the right of a man to advocate the overthrow of the government of the United States by force and violence?" "Would you defend men who advocate such things?"

Of course a clergyman of Christ does not want to say that he defends the advocacy of murder; he wants to discuss such a question, to qualify his statements, to explain his point of view. He wants to ask what kind of murder you mean, whether murder from personal motives, or political assassinations. If it is the latter that is intended, he wants to point out that many murders of tyrants have been committed, and are justified by history, that our ancestors committed murder at the battle of Lexington and Concord, and would have been tried and hung for it if the British had had their way. The advocacy of murders such as those is one of the glories of our American Revolutionary tradition. But nothing like that was going to get into the record if quarter-back "Ham" Fish could prevent it.

"Answer me yes or no." "Why won't you give me a plain answer to my question?" "What is your reason for trying to evade my question?" "If you won't answer that question yes or no, the

committee will order you from the stand." Of course I have not the record as I write, and I cannot quote the exact words. He may have said, "the committee will refuse to hear you any further." But that is the substance of it; either Dr. Taft must make a flat and unequal statement which the Better America Federation could use against him for the balance of his life, or else the commission would go to its dinner.

At Dr. Taft's repeated insistence, the commission consented to hear Dr. Peters, a dentist, who, from his office window a few feet above the melee, had stood and witnessed the smashing by the police of Communists attempting to make a peaceable demonstration against unemployment. Dr. Peters is an old-fashioned American, and I should judge he got his training in the rough and tumble of life, and not in a Christian church. So he was much better prepared for Congressman Fish's football tactics, indeed he proved more than a match for the team work of the whole commission. Dr. Peters is large and jolly, with a good round voice, and no slightest trace of shyness or fear; he was ready for every tackle, and even when the whole line formed a "V" and charged him, he was not swept off his feet.

## Describes Police Brutality

"How do I know that the Communists were not resisting? Because I saw them with my own eyes." "How do I know that the policeman hit the man with a club from behind? Because I was as close to him as I am to you." "How do I know that the man did nothing but toss leaflets into the air? Because I watched him do it." "How do I know the policeman held him and pounded him while he was flat on his face? Because I was looking down on the scene from above. I had a grand stand seat for the show." "Why didn't the blow with the club kill the man? I thought it had killed him, but as it didn't kill him, I suppose the reason was because it wasn't hard enough." "Yes, I saw two policemen hold another man while a third pounded him over the head with a pair of handcuffs." "Yes, they were iron handcuffs." "I don't know why that man wasn't killed. I thought the police were trying to kill him." "I have told you that I saw five men attacked, one after another, and none of them had made any resistance to the police before they were attacked. Nor did they make the slightest resistance while they were being attacked." "No, I don't know why the men stood it, because I do not understand their ideas. I have told you that I am not a Communist, and don't know anything about it. I suppose they stood it because they have some idea that they thought worth while to stand it for." "Yes, I saw men, not resisting arrest in any way, smashed again and again in the face with fists, and pounded again and again with clubs. If I had a club here I could show exactly where they were hit, and how they were hit." Needless to say, neither the captain of the football team, nor any member of its squad, cared to go on with this particular test.

Next, the Fish commission called upon John Beardsley, chairman of the Executive Committee of our southern California branch of the American Civil Liberties Union. I do not know whether my friend, John Beardsley, ever played football, but he looks as if he had, and being a lawyer, he is able to take care of himself on his feet. He arose now and said in substance as follows: "No, thank you, I do not care to testify before this commission. Having witnessed the heckling of Dr. Taft, I understand clearly that you do not care anything about the truth, and you want only one side brought out. I will certainly not subject myself to your indignities."

## John Beardsley Testifies

It was interesting to observe the effect of this upon the commission. The aggressive football players were suddenly discovered to be toy balloons stuck by a pin, they popped one after another. Said Chairman Fish hastily to the stenographer: "Do not take these remarks, he is not under oath." There followed a discussion in which the committee heard from an old-fashioned gentleman who believes in the whole of the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights. Finally they came to a deadlock, and it was only at my personal request that John Beardsley took the stand and explained that while it is true that there are two Communists on the National Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union, there are sixty-five non-Communists, and he didn't consider this an undue proportion in view of the fact that the Communists are the most persecuted group in America. He explained that we defend any and all persons who are persecuted for their political ideas. We defended the Ku Klux Klan against Mayor Curley in Boston, and the Black Shirts in Georgia in their right to public assemblage there. In Los Angeles we have defended the Negroes in their civil rights, and the Salvation Army in its right to hold meetings on the street, and so on through a list so which the chastened committee listened with decency. They even went so far as to ask John Beardsley, who has prevented the Department of Immigration from deporting about a score of Communists, to tell them—"not as a lawyer, but as a citizen"—how he did it!

## Upton Sinclair Takes the Stand

At the conclusion of his talk—it was now half past seven—John Beardsley said, "If I may have a minute or two more of time, I would like to give it to Mr. Upton Sinclair, who was the founder of the southern California branch of the Civil Liberties Union." Said Mr. Fish, with a smile, "If he will promise to get through in a minute or two." I said, as I arose from my seat, "I will do so"—but I hope my failure to keep the promise may be excused on the ground that I was not yet under oath. I talked for about half an hour, and if I "got by," it was because I had had the chance of watching the football squad for an hour and a half, and had learned all its trick plays and signals. I knew what was coming each time, and when and how. I will summarize as nearly as I can what I said to the committee:

"Gentlemen: As the person who started this branch of the Civil Liberties Union, I know why it was done. As a person who has lived here for fifteen years and has known hundreds of Communists, and written many books about them, I can tell you exactly how Communists are being made in America. I can also tell you how you can put a stop to the making of Communists. Since you tell me that that is the purpose of your committee, you will find my remarks directly to the point.

"This branch of the Civil Liberties Union was founded as a

direct result of what happened in May of 1923, during a strike of the longshoremen at the harbor. Several hundred of these men were arrested in one night for the offense of walking up and down the street singing their strike songs. With a group of friends, I interviewed the mayor of Los Angeles and told him we wished to conduct a free-speech meeting at the harbor, and we obtained his consent for this meeting. When we presented ourselves to the chief of police at the harbor, we were told that if we held the meeting we would be arrested. We told him that we had the mayor's permission, and his answer was: 'The mayor is not running this affair, it is the district attorney.' (The harbor is part of the city of Los Angeles.) The chief was drunk, and his breath smelled like a bar-room. We told him that we were going to try to read the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, and he told us that made no difference. We went upon private property, and there attempted to read the Constitution aloud, and four of us in turn were arrested, taken to jail and held incommunicado for eighteen hours, with no one able to find out what had become of us. When we were released we were without redress, because under the law in Los Angeles, you cannot sue the city for the illegal acts of policemen, and the policemen are not bonded."

Said Chairman Fish: "All this is very interesting to you, Mr. Sinclair, and has given you an opportunity to state that you are the Socialist candidate for Governor of California. But what has it got to do with the making of Communists here?"

Said I: "I would already have got to that point if you had not interrupted me. After this arrest I gave my entire time for months to the fight for free speech for the strikers. I met hundreds of them, and I talked with them and argued with them, and I know that hundreds of violent enemies of the United States government were made by the police of Los Angeles during that strike. I have heard men say, not once, but hundreds of times, that the police pay no attention to the law and the big corporations pay no attention to the law, and the working man is a fool who does not learn from them. That has been the argument I have heard all my life, when I have tried to make Communists or Anarchists or I. W. W.'s into Socialists, and I can tell you that so far as America is concerned, it is the violence of public authorities which has made the Reds."

Said one of the congressmen, I think the Democratic gentleman from Virginia: "We have been told, Mr. Sinclair, that most of the Communists have come from abroad."

"Then you have been told what is not true."

"But practically all our testimony shows that 90 percent of the Communists are foreign born."

"Quite so, but they came to this country when young, and had no political ideas."

"Then you mean that it is life in America that has made them into Communists?" I noted a tone of real interest in this question. Evidently it was a brand new idea to the congressman.

"That is absolutely right," I said. "There are very few full-fledged Communists who have migrated to America, and the talk about their being sent wholesale from Moscow is not true."

"And what would you have us do about this? Congress has no way to control actions of the police in Los Angeles."

## Sinclair Offers a Remedy

"I beg your pardon, gentlemen, you have a way if you want to use it. The Constitution grants certain civil rights to everyone in the country, and you can pass a Federal law with teeth in it, providing for the arrest and imprisonment of any police officer or public official anywhere in the United States who deprives any one, whether a citizen or an alien, of his civil rights."

"And you mean that the Federal government could come into Los Angeles and interfere with the police administration?"

"There has been before congress for many years an anti-lynching bill, providing for Federal punishment of mobs which kill black men, and if such a law is valid, there is no reason why the protection should not be granted to white men as well. That is the thing that you must do if you want to stop teaching aliens disrespect for the American government."

"Do you yourself believe that a person can rightfully advocate the violent overthrow of the United States government?"

"I think that any one who advocates that is making a blunder. We have our political methods of procedure, and we should learn to use them, both to protect our liberties and to get social justice."

That closed the hearing. The Fish commission is on its way back to Washington, and two months from now its members will be in congress advocating such measures as in their wisdom they may decide upon. There will be a fight in Washington, and a hard fight, to put through congress measures such as those recommended by the Better America Federation of California. I specify two of these measures which I heard actually advocated before the committee: first, the registering and finger-printing of all aliens, and deporting of all those who engage in "pernicious activities"; second, a constitutional amendment, providing that treason against the United States government may be committed in time of peace as well as in war.

What these measures would mean in the way of riveting the chains of slavery upon the American people, I do not need to emphasize. I am telling this story for the benefit of the little group of progressive senators and congressmen who will have to fight the Fish Commission in Washington. I think it might help them to know exactly how the data had been gathered, and what value it has so far as concerns Los Angeles.

I earnestly urge that liberals and friends of the liberal cause should save this article until the fight begins in Washington this winter, and then see that full use is made, upon the floor of congress, of the testimony of the Los Angeles dentist, Dr. Peters, as to how Communists are being made by the police force of Los Angeles. And when you read the testimony of Lieutenant Hynes, head of the "Red Squad," make note of the fact that it was Hynes who led this raid, and has led scores of similar raids, and so you will know exactly how much value to give to his testimony. And remember that it is the Better America Federation which backs Hynes and keeps him in power. And make note of the words of the Fish Commission at the close of Hynes' testimony, that his was the best evidence and the best report which had been offered to the commission anywhere in the course of its work!

Post-Dispatch and The Nation, and he lost no time in announcing that Hoover's statement of July 24 was about as false as it could well have been. The construction of the cruisers mentioned had not been interfered with—no order for suspension or delay had been given—by the President nor anybody else in authority. The navy department had gone right ahead with the work on these cruisers, just as if the Hoover statement had never been issued.

Moreover, Hoover was wrong in saying that "the actual keels would, in the ordinary course, be laid down some time this fall." The fact was that the keels could not have been laid down until the following spring and the navy department was proceeding and did

## MORALS OF A BISHOP

Let us contemplate the morals to be drawn from the exposure of the morals of a bishop. One extraordinarily pleasant advantage which at once was derived from the unmasking of Bishop James Cannon's hypocrisy was that the bishop's mouth was shut. Faced with the embarrassingly circumstantial and well-evidenced tale of his fondly frisky "friendship" with widow Helen McCallum (far from the side of his own good Methodist wife), Bishop Cannon revealed a sudden and unusual love for silence. Until that moment he had been a stormy and virulent critic of the morals of his fellow Americans. He had howled for punitive reforms. He had exhibited a special aptitude for the career of a cantankerous, snooping, bigoted nuisance. But when his "sins found him out"—especially his "sin" of amorous straying from his home sanctity—the bishop had virtually nothing to say. For several months America has been spared the loud outcries of scolding, threatening, vindictive virtue that Cannon erstwhile was industrious in vociferating. So much for one great blessing that followed promptly upon the exposure of a Methodist bishop's "whited sepulcher" of double life.

There is another moral which soothes with wholesome reassurance our view of the fate of human nature. We refer to the proof, given so opportunely by Bishop Cannon, that sex is not a dying nor a seriously threatened interest of men and women. Faintly, at moments, we had feared that all the Christian agitation of the Cannons and their kind might drive sex, along with other interesting features of human nature, into unpopularity or sad abeyance or forlorn and even fatal exile. Would sex be finally ostracized and outlawed? we asked ourselves. And it was in just such a mood of depression that we heard the favorable news that Bishop Cannon had been discovered to be quite sportively on the side of sex. And we decided at once that, with bishops thus voting in the affirmative (even though their vote was secret and had to be exposed by special humanitarian investigation), sex was still popular and was not in danger of immediate total suppression. It may sound paradoxical, but we confess that Bishop Cannon has in a measure restored our faith in human nature.

We wish to point another moral. Before his exposure and suddenly subsequent silence, Bishop Cannon was vindictive in his castigation of "sinners" and in his attempts forcibly to thrust a narrow, moral, Christian code upon men and women. It was, so to say, his professional, pious job to damn men and women for behavior that was contrary to the bishop's code (not, as it was to appear, contrary to the bishop's own conduct). Contrast the sweet reasonableness and humanity of The Freeman's attitude toward Bishop Cannon. We have not condemned the bishop personally for his taste in femininity nor for his human desires and promptings. We have not presumed to lay heavy demands of moral behavior upon the bishop: not only because, charitably, we realize he couldn't meet these demands but also because our convictions are genuinely on the side of freedom. The Freeman's policy has been consistently that of exposing a hypocrite and pointing out the wiles and menaces of this sort of Cannoning, punitive, moral hypocrisy. We have sought to make the broadest use of the Cannon saga for the purpose of illuminating the humane, tolerant, precious principle of honesty and freedom in social and intellectual life.

Cannon's morals are not personally important. They are important in these greater morals, these greater principles, which they serve to clarify in the public mind.

RELIGIOUS people often flatter themselves that they are proving their goodness by the strength they put into denunciations of people whom they call bad.

AN ATHEIST is one who denies that anybody has proved the existence of a God. And isn't the atheist right? Has anybody proved the existence of a God?

THE BEST way to get the church out of politics is to get church ideas out of the minds of the people.

## HOOVER MISREPRESENTED A SHIP-BUILDING PROGRAM

What is the difference between lying and creating a false impression? It is a fine point and, as a rule, is not of the first importance. Official statements, for example, may have all the degrees of shadiness possible through juggling of words and figures, through vagueness, through wrong emphasis, through deliberate misinformation or through what are often too mildly called the "mistakes" of officials.

Under the Hoover administration the task of creating misleading impressions in the public mind has been a heavy one and it has been diligently, if not always cleverly, carried on. Principally

the official effort has been directed toward "reassuring" (in other and plainer words, misleading) the public about the industrial situation and about unemployment. Let us remind our readers of another bit of deception which was presented to America and the world in the shape of a White House statement on July 24, 1929. Wishing to create a nice feeling in the public mind, in anticipation of the London naval conference, President Hoover issued the following statement:

Mr. MacDonald has indicated the good will and positive intention of the British government by suspension of construction of certain portions of this year's British naval program. It is the desire of the United States to show equal good will in our approach to the problem.

We have three cruisers in this year's construction program which have been undertaken in the government navy yards, the detailed drawings for which are now in the course of preparation. The actual keels would, in the ordinary course, be laid down some time this fall. Generally speaking, the British cruiser strength considerably exceeds American strength at the present time, and the actual construction of these three cruisers would not be likely in themselves to produce inequality in the final results. We do not wish, however, to have any misunderstanding of our actions, and, therefore, we shall not lay these keels until there has been an opportunity for full consideration of their effect upon the final agreement for parity which we expect to reach, although our hopes of relief from construction of these cruisers in the latter years of the program under the law of 1928.

That sounded at the time like good will, not merely in words

but in deeds. It was undoubtedly meant to portray the Great Engineer as definitely working in behalf of peace and naval reduction. Premier MacDonald and his colleagues in the British government would read that Hoover statement and feel convinced of the good intentions of the American administration. Peace-loving Americans would be given more confidence in Hoover's proposed handling of the naval question.

But the big defect of that Hoover statement was that it was senseless, untrue and utterly misleading. Several months later, in December, 1928, a Washington correspondent who combined curiosity with honesty discovered the truth: that reporter was Paul X. Anderson, of the St. Louis



# An Important Letter to Governor-Elect James Rolph of California

Hon. James Rolph, Governor-elect, San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Mr. Rolph:

We are sending you a copy of *The Amazing Frameup of Mooney and Billings*, by Marcet Haldeman-Julius, which tells fairly and completely the story of the great injustice which has made California an object of severest criticism throughout America and in far corners of the world. Will you please read this book carefully between now and the day of your inauguration as Governor of California? It seems to us that you cannot read this record of medieval methods in a modern state (YOUR state)—read it with a humane, unprejudiced regard for truth and justice—without realizing that

the state of California owes profoundly an immediate and full pardon to Thomas J. Mooney and Warren K. Billings. We are not assuming that you are ignorant of this internationally infamous case. You should be, and no doubt you are, familiar with its main and monstrous features. But a perusal of Marcet-Haldeman-Julius' story should bring home to you forcibly the position which the Mooney-Billings case holds in the view of the world, as well as in the view of many thousands of your fellow citizens of California. It should quicken in you, if you do not already have, a feeling of the world sense of outrage in regarding the corrupt and malignant persecution of these two innocent workmen by officers of the law who betrayed and basely misused the machinery of law for private, political and class ends. Long

ago the case against Mooney and Billings has been exposed and dramatically turned into a case against the authorities of California. In *The Amazing Frameup of Mooney and Billings*, which is based upon the official and undisputed records of the trials and the subsequent confession and exposure of the leading witnesses, the motives and mechanics of the frameup are made perfectly clear. We urge you to read this story by Marcet Haldeman-Julius—and we invite you to verify her story by a correlative study of the records—and make it your first act as Governor of California to set in motion the quickest and most decisive train of action for the liberation of Mooney and Billings. Sincerely,

THE AMERICAN FREEMAN.

## Rev. Cadman Says He Won't Debate with E. Haldeman-Julius--Why Not?

Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, New York City pulpit and oracle of an "ask-me-and-I'll-tell-you" column in the newspapers, says that he will not debate the subject of theism with E. Haldeman-Julius. This word comes indirectly, through John D. McInerney of Nebraska, a reader of *The Freeman* who wrote to Rev. Cadman inquiring about his probable response to the challenge issued by Mr. Haldeman-Julius. The preacher gave a very short and unsatisfactory answer, as follows: "I have not the slightest intention of meeting Mr. Haldeman-Julius or anyone else in a debate as to the logicity of theism. Those who conclude because of this decision that the position of theism is weak must be foolish people."

What is the alternative conclusion that we are to derive from Rev. Cadman's briefly dismissive note? Perhaps we are meant to gather the idea that theism is so very strong that it is not debatable. The truth, logic, grandeur, and blub-blub of the idea of God are so overpoweringly obvious that it is an act of folly to question this "logicity" of theism (to use Rev. Cadman's awkwardly pseudo-impressive word) and a fool should be—not answered but ignored according to his folly: is this the spirit in which Rev. Cadman disposes, so far as he personally is concerned, of Mr. Haldeman-Julius' challenge?

We must say that this clerical gentleman doesn't show a good temper, nor a clear attitude in his rejection of the challenge to a debate. It would have been simple and courteous for him to say that he is too busy—but then it would reasonably follow that some time he would not be so busy and then he would have time for such a debate. Or he could have said that he is not a good debater or that he is not fond of debating—but then a debater ought to be as good as his subject and, as for the second point, we know that Rev. Cadman continually engages in debates through the medium of his newspaper column; he debates piecemeal with his readers about the various features of theism, so why not have a comprehensive debate about the subject as a whole or about the fundamentals which distinguish theism as a philosophy of life?

Perhaps Rev. Cadman has a personal distaste for a debate with Mr. Haldeman-Julius or for a debate with an uncompromising atheist or for a debate with the kind of man who would be so presumptuous as to challenge him, the Rev. Dr. Cadman, to a debate. But Rev. Cadman says that he will not debate with any one on the subject of theism. Is the subject not debatable? The preacher says: "Those who conclude because of this decision that the position of theism is weak must be foolish people." Rev. Cadman is away behind in his statement of our mental processes. Long before Rev. Cadman announced this brusque and unexplained decision of refraining from debate on the subject which is his special and professional in-

terest—long before this we had concluded that the position of theism is very, very weak indeed. At most, Rev. Cadman's latest statement would merely confirm us in our conclusion, reached far earlier, in fact as early as our first mature, considerate scrutiny of the assumptions of theism and our comparison of those assumptions with the realities of life and a reasonable outline of man's knowledge, means of knowledge and aims and qualities of knowledge.

Perhaps—he has on more than one occasion indicated such an opinion—Rev. Cadman believes that those who question, not his own reasons for refraining from debate (reasons which one must conjecture) but the reasons for theism, are "foolish people." We seem to detect, indeed, in the preacher's short, rejecting note a strain of the old superior bigotry as contained in the ancient dictum: "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." But of course this is the very question that Mr. Haldeman-Julius would fairly debate with Rev. Cadman: *Are theists or atheists the "foolish people"?*

Mr. Haldeman-Julius has studied the position of theism and he has found it weak. He has engaged in a number of debates, spoken and written, on this subject; and he is still looking for an intelligent and convincing defense of the position of theism—and he candidly declares that he is skeptical of the possibility of such a defense. His challenge to Rev. Cadman and other leading preachers of America was a fair, clear, uncompromising challenge for them or one of them to produce the arguments, the facts or the brilliant "intuitions" that will bring out satisfactorily the alleged strength of the theistic position. In refusing that challenge, Rev. Cadman does admit that he is not the man to strengthen theism in the public mind by means of a debate that would be widely read and that would, granting his sincerity and faith in himself as a God champion, advance the cause of his "Master" (if Rev. Cadman can show the truth and righteousness of that cause—or just the truth of it, that's all).

Rev. Cadman contents himself with saying that only "foolish people" will conclude that the position of theism is weak. But is it weak? Is it—can it be shown to be—strong? Precisely that is the question which Mr. Haldeman-Julius would debate with Rev. Cadman or his illustrious brother ministers. Many will regard it as a confession of weakness that Rev. Cadman dismisses this challenge with a slight, superior air without giving the shadow of a reason, assuming that it is foolish to question theism yet not producing a single good argument in favor of theism. Meanwhile Rev. Cadman will continue telling his readers what is "true" about theism, he being not in the position of a debater but of an oracle whose word is law and who can set arbitrarily and trickily the terms of his readers' questioning (so far as notice in his column

goes) and his own pontifical answering.

However, Mr. Haldeman-Julius is not hopelessly cast down by Rev. Cadman's refusal nor is he yet ready to classify himself among the "foolish people." He will continue to expose the weakness of theism and to point out that if the Cadmans are not willing to debate fairly and attempt to show the strength of theism, that in itself is an eloquent confession of weakness. And finally Mr. Haldeman-Julius will be a good sport and send Rev. Cadman the very first printed copy of the *Atheist Special Edition* of *The American Freeman*. Thus Rev. Cadman, although unwilling to debate, will have something to denounce; and as denunciation and assertion are characteristic talents of the clergy, he ought to have the necessary time and talent for that enterprise; then he can be, not arguing, but telling somebody.

### On the Firing Line with The Freeman Army

James Ellis, N. J., orders a bundle of the Hoover Special Edition. He won't be disappointed. The American Freeman can grow. It is growing. Here is a typical letter from Reuben Getz, N. C.: "Your paper, *The American Freeman*, has been called to my attention, and I am interested to say the least. Therefore, I am enclosing \$1 for your year's subscription, and also 20 cents for ten copies of the Hoover Special Edition, which I believe I can use to advantage. Might use more later." Every member of the Army should be continually active in getting new readers.

G. H. Jones, Calif., sends in a bundle order for the Hoover Special Edition. Of course, all you readers, if you want to hear the story of a "Great Engineer,"

Andrew Dahlsten, Neb., protests against Hooverism in the most direct, effective manner by sending a dollar for the distribution of the Hoover Special Edition under Method No. 3.

Orville C. Bucks, Pa., uses good old Method No. 3—the handy propaganda method—for his share in circulating the Hoover Special Edition.

Hoover is certainly in the public's eye, but that isn't saying what's in Hoover's eye. Mrs. J. P. Waynard sharply raps the "Great Engineering" eye with a bundle order for the Hoover Special Edition.

Adolf Korn, Fla., helps to spread the truth about Hooverism by ordering a bundle of the Hoover Special Edition.

W. H. Brear, Mo., sends us a substantial order for Little Blue Books, pays up to date his subscription to *The Freeman*, orders a bundle of the Hoover Special Edition and pays for another bundle to be sent to good names in our possession.

Miss Helen Petoskey, Mich., brings a wave of enthusiasm into our office with an order for \$5 worth of H.-J. trade coupons.

B. N. Freeman, Ill., helps our educational enterprise intelligently, helps himself with a \$5 order for the new trade coupons.

Harry N. Cole, Mich., takes advantage of our trade coupon offer in a big way by ordering \$10 worth. Remember, these coupons give you a 10 percent bonus and are very urgently needed in helping the Haldeman-Julius Publications through the present business crisis.

Thos. C. Henry, Ky., comes bounding in from the heart of the hematic Blue Grass state with an order for 50 copies of the Hoover Special Edition. Reader Henry is against Hoover, Prohibition and the exemption of church property from taxation.

J. Mandl, Kans., sends a dollar for a bundle of the Hoover Special and a dollar for four year's subscription, three of the sub cards to be used for extending the subscriptions of out-of-work readers.

C. H. Mansell, S. Dak., sends \$2 for mailing the Hoover Special to a hundred of his fellow citizens. Methods No. 1 and No. 2 are overwhelmingly popular in the circulation of the Hoover Special. The readers have a personal interest in seeing that the papers get into the hands of particular persons.

Harry Ford, Md., is among those who do special, personal work against Hooverism by ordering and distributing a bundle of the Hoover Special.

Stephen Barnes, N. J., orders a bundle of the Hoover Special, which he will use for the education and enlightenment of his neighbors.

Wm. McClymont, La., comes along with a bundle order for the Hoover Special—another indication that the south, like the rest of the country, is disgusted with Hoover.

A. M. Holden, Pa., pays his commitments to Herbie, the "Great Engineer," with a bundle order for the Hoover Special.

bunk of Hooverism with a bundle order for the celebrated Hoover Special. Geo. H. La Point, Conn., is a sign painter whose business envelope advertises "Tell the World with Signs." He also tells a number of his fellow Americans with a bundle of the Hoover Special.

Louis Rovedatti, N. J., expresses his attitude toward Hooverism in no uncertain terms by ordering a bundle of the Hoover Special.

E. F. Moore, W. Va., functions with double efficiency in the cause of debunking by ordering a bundle of the Hoover Special and a set of Joseph McCabe's *The Rise and Fall of the Gods* in six volumes.

Tom Burns, Ore., is vigorously in the front ranks of the anti-Hoover crusade with an order for 100 copies of the Hoover Special. The truth hurts only the schemers of falsehood.

J. P. Reed, Idaho, sends a dollar and the names of 50 of his fellow citizens who are to receive the Hoover Special. They will have some lively reading, what!

Raymond Swartley, Calif., proves his friendliness for our educational work by ordering \$5 worth of the new H.-J. trade coupons with 10 percent bonus.

Harry De Haes, Calif., sends a \$5 order for H.-J. trade coupons and thus helps us at a time when such help is most critically needed.

Robt. Knox, Ill., assists in the exposure of Hooverism by ordering a bundle of the Hoover Special.

B. V. Burns, Ore., is among the majority of our readers who insist upon personally spreading bundles of the Hoover Special.

Harold Bunge, Ill., appears with timely support in the shape of a \$10 order for the new H.-J. trade coupons.

M. E. Bever, Calif., shows his intelligent propaganda zeal by sending \$2 and a list of 100 names who are to get the Hoover Special.

M. D. Cram, Mo., sends \$1 and a list of 50 Miscellaneous who are to read the Hoover Special.

Harry Cohen, N. Y., takes advantage of our trade coupon offer, with 10 percent bonus, by sending in a \$10 order.

## Is Bishop Cannon Above the Law?

The Freeman unequivocally joins in the demand made by Congressman Tinkham of Massachusetts that Bishop James Cannon, Jr., be made the subject of immediate action, with a view to criminal prosecution, by Attorney General Mitchell. Cannon got \$65,300 from E. C. Jameson, a New York capitalist, for use in the 1928 political campaign. The bishop reported the receipt of only \$17,000 of the fund, completely ignored the \$48,300 and refused to explain before the Senate lobby committee what he did with the money. Congressman Tinkham points out that Bishop Cannon was a violator of the federal corrupt practices act and he adds, significantly, that the statute of limitation will soon expire, so that unless Attorney General Mitchell moves immediately against the churchman he will be out of the law's reach. Not to prosecute the bishop or institute prompt measures for a thorough investigation of his case is in effect to grant a special immunity to this pious lobbyist and hypocrite. Congressman Tinkham says in his letter to the Attorney General:

Unless the evidence is placed before a federal grand jury shortly, the operation of the statute of limitation will bar action against Bishop Cannon and he will be granted immunity by you from the penalty of a gross violation of a criminal statute and of conduct wholly lawless.

Therefore, there arises for your determination the question whether this officer, Bishop Cannon, and other officers of ecclesiastical organizations may indulge in political activities in contravention of the Constitution and of the traditions of our country and be regarded nevertheless as immune from the operation of criminal statutes.

In other words, is a leading church bigot above the law? It is nothing less than a scandal.

I WANT SONG POEMS. Free and constructive criticism. Ask for my new pamphlet: "Advice to the Song Writer." It contains much valuable information for the amateur and costs you nothing. RICHARD BROUGHTON, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

You are invited to join a National Friendship Club

For Ladies & Gentlemen

Write for Descriptions (FREE) Send for One

American Friendship Society

Dept. 22 Detroit, Mich.

and a very serious one, that the government has taken no step against Bishop Cannon.

Other charges are being pressed against Bishop Cannon by ministers of his own church—charges which present the bishop in the role of a "sinner" against his own sexual code, a hypocrite, a double-faced charlatan who posed as vindictively righteous in his public activities but was in private a philandering gay boy who paid sweet calls on the snappy widow, Mrs. Helen McCallum, while his wife lay dying in Washington. Later the hypocritical bishop, evidently somewhat spry and spicy for his sixties, took Helen on a tour of the Holy Land (as his secretary) and wound up his adventure with a sudden marriage in London. It is charged, however, that the bishop's marriage was a belated afterthought.

Fellow churchmen will also be called upon to try Bishop Cannon on the charge of gambling with an illegal bucket shop (stock brokerage concern) in New York City and with hoarding 650 barrels of flour in 1917, thus violating the wartime food law. The bishop is shown up as a greedy gambler, a political trickster, a food hoarder (presumably a food profiteer) and a sneaky violator of the virtuous Christian code which he has been so pestiferously busy in foisting upon others.

The American people should be glad that one more hypocrite has been exposed and hope that his exposure will proceed to a fitting climax. When you hear the rantings of bigots and fanatics, remember Bishop Cannon.

### CIRCUS OF PARADOXES

Government in these days, in the United States particularly, is a howling circus of paradoxes. We realize, to be sure, that government has always had a strong admixture of folly and that its varieties of bunk, charlatanism, contradictoriness and perversity are incalculable by a mere mortal mind. As there is no immortal, infinite mind to do the job, we suppose the full tale of governmental nonsense will never be recorded and certainly it must defy even the most ironical resources of art or journalism.

But at least we can call attention to absurdities that are extra flagrant. And what adventure of governmental folly has presented absurdities more extensively than Prohibition? There is the fact that the government, while branding the liquor traffic as a crime, has also been very insistent that bootleggers should come across with their income taxes. With one hand the government prosecutes this crime, while with the other hand it reaches for its split in the profits of the crime.

Consider, for another bright example, the hootingly paradoxical case of the California grape industry. The grape business has grown wonderfully in California since Prohibition. It is a leading enterprise which is solicitously regarded far beyond the borders of California; yes, indeed, for these grapes are in eager demand for the making of wine. And in no quarter is a more touching solicitude for the California grape business shown than in the United States Department of Commerce. This department of government cooperates most heartily with the grape growers. It lends paternal aid and counsel in helping the crops of grapes to be moved across the country. It helps, more plainly, to get the grapes from the hands of the growers into the hands of the wine makers. And this government department even explains, for the benefit of patrons of the grape industry, how the fruit ferments and produces the pleasant effects of wine. All the while another government department, the Department of Justice, is supposed to be enforcing the Prohibition law which brands the use of grapes for wine-making as illegal. Isn't that as ludicrously and dizzily upside-

down an incident as you will find related in *Alice in Wonderland*?

Another touch of chortling humor is added by the fact that Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt, formerly among the most zealous of Prohibition enforcers in the Department of Justice, is now serving just as zealously in the role of friendly, helpful legal counsel for the California grape growers.

Prohibition is a fairy tale for those who want to fly as far as possible away from the premises of reason. A quick trip to Paradox Land is offered by the situation in Washington, the national capital. Recently the Crusaders, a zealous dry organization, drew a map of Washington liquor joints or places where illegal drinks were known to have been served. It was a generously spotted map, showing that Washington residents have no need to go thirsty. Moreover, speakeasies were located right in the neighborhood of the White House, several were within a stone's throw (or a bottle's throw) from the Department of Justice offices, and the black identifying spots were displayed conveniently around the Capitol building. Washington is the stronghold of dry legislation and wet custom.

Here is something else. This is the most absurd feature of Prohibition we have thus far observed, but we wouldn't be so rash as to say that absurdity can go no farther—on the contrary,

it almost certainly will. Meanwhile the limit to date has been reached in the circumstance that one speakeasy in Washington is located in a piece of government property; this speakeasy has been raided a couple of times; yet the customary procedure of the law—padding—has not been followed with regard to this property. The government is in a funny fix: it would seem ridiculous for it to padlock its own property; and it would seem ridiculous in another way for it to apply the padlock. Uncertain in its embarrassment what to do, the government does nothing.

If Alice thought she had reason to be surprised in Wonderland, she ought to have waited a bit longer and astonished herself with a trip through the Paradox Land of the dry-wet-what-how circus in the United States.

THE MOTTO of many who call themselves liberal religionists seems to be: "We can't believe all the bunk, but we'll believe as much as we can."

TRUTH is unmannerly. Truth is bold and forceful. Truth has a dashing wit. It is falsehood that cultivates polite gestures meant to deceive.

WHEN A MAN appeals to tradition, we suspect that he is unable to appeal to reason.

ONE FACT is worth more than all the dogmas ever invented.

## Hoover Edition Goes Over Big! Don't Let It Stop!

It's a Big Hit! The Hoover Special Edition of November 29 is the most popular ever issued by The American Freeman. As we predicted in our early announcements of this Special Edition, it has proved to be the finest opportunity for social and political propaganda which has ever been offered to The Freeman Army. Orders are still coming in. In fact, after our readers have seen the Special Edition there has been a greatly increased enthusiasm and a quickening of the stream of bundle orders (*Method No. 1*), lists of names (*Method No. 2*) and blanket orders for us to mail copies to good names in our possession (*Method No. 3*). This Special Edition is mailed at the rate of 2c a copy, minimum order 50 copies for \$1.

The issue of Hooverism has demonstrated itself to be the most dramatic medium through which we can present our ideas to the American people. It has seized the popular attention at once. Many who have never read *The Freeman* are writing to say, "I have heard of your Hoover Special Edition or have seen a copy—send me . . . . . copies of this Special Edition." Others have been so impressed by the Special Edition that they have sent us yearly subscriptions—thus we are getting new readers through this brilliantly and dramatically popular Special Edition.

We are sure that the loyal, active, enthusiastic members of The Freeman Army will agree with us that this opportunity is too important to be neglected or to be handled in a small way. We have the right idea and the right issue for great popular effectiveness. Let us carry forward our advantage, let us emphasize and extraordinarily circulate this popular issue, so that we will make it effective to the farthest possible limit of publicity. Let the members of The Freeman Army keep on circulating the Hoover Special Edition. IT'S OUR BIGGEST TRIUMPH. IT'S OUR GREATEST OPPORTUNITY. We have saved the plates of this Special Edition and can print as many copies as the Army will order. Send individual orders. Club together and send in larger orders. Tell everybody about the Hoover Special Edition and see that everybody reads this brilliant and devastating exposure of "the Great Engineer." Keep the big press powerfully at work and tell us to print, print, print extra copies of the Hoover Special Edition of November 29. Use the order blank NOW.

### Order Blank for Hoover Special Edition of November 29

The American Freeman, Girard, Kansas

The Hoover Special Edition of November 29 is great and I hope you keep printing the extra copies until Christmas. Here is my additional order to keep the big press going on this popular issue. I am using the method marked below.

Method No. 1. Send me a bundle of . . . . . copies of the Hoover Special Edition of November 29, at 2c per copy, minimum order 50 copies, for which I am enclosing \$ . . . . .

Method No. 2. Send . . . . . copies of the Hoover Special Edition of November 29 to the enclosed names and addresses, for which I am enclosing \$ . . . . ., which pays for the papers and the mailing at the rate of 2c a copy.

Method No. 3. I am enclosing \$ . . . . ., which is to pay for your mailing copies of the Hoover Special Edition of November 29 to good names in your possession, said copies being paid for at the rate of 2c a copy.

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

## The Mooney-Billings Frameup

How two labor leaders—Thomas Mooney and Warren Billings—were railroaded to prison by corrupt officials of San Francisco and how they have been kept in prison by labor-hating California politicians is told fully and dramatically in the large book by Marcet Haldeman-Julius, entitled *The Amazing Mooney-Billings Frameup*. Every American should read this story. It is more than the complete, damning story of one frameup conspiracy. It is a blasting exposure of the frameup system. It is a drama of economic injustice, class war, political dishonesty and cruelty. Marcet Haldeman-Julius conducted a special investigation in California and her book is based upon the impregnable proofs of the conspiracy. It will stand as the greatest record of this amazing plot, which was so successful that Mooney and Billings remain today in the prison cells where they were unjustly placed. This is a large book, 5½ by 8½ inches, and is priced at only 50c a copy or 5 copies for \$2.

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS



## In the World of Books

Weekly Reviews and Other  
Literary Ruminations

Isaac Goldberg

### LIGHTS AND SHADOWS IN NEW YORK CITY

Everywhere you go in New York you see long faces and hear tragic tales about hard times. There are bread lines, and, although at first the patrons were old, decrepit men, there is a gradual appearance of much younger ones—brain and brawn going to waste because this country has produced too many articles and too much food. It is a paradoxical fact that we have hunger because we have a surplus of food and that we have poverty because we have a surplus of goods. It sounds insane, and I have no doubt that the enlightened minds of the future will regard us with amused incredulity.

Everywhere you go in New York you also see happy faces. The movies and the theaters are crowded. Excellent pictures and plays abound. People are paying high premiums for seats to such productions as "Once in a Lifetime" and "Girl Crazy." Very evidently some people are making money. In the offices of book publishers there are no block parties. Perhaps a couple of lean years confront this gentry. For the moment, at least, the day of large advance sales is over, and what kind of Christmas season is in store nobody dares to predict. There may be pleasant surprises.

There is a story that on one book, six salesmen representing the firm of Knopf brought back a combined advance sale of fewer than 300 copies. The success of the dollar book venture is still dubious.

During a week's stay in Gotham I encountered a veritable mob of authors, took in four plays (these were, in addition to the ones already named, "Roar China" and Molly Picon's new Jewish musical comedy), saw two talkies ("The Big Trail" and "Billy the Kid") and in one restaurant which shall go unnamed I nearly got poisoned.

A kaleidoscope of names: George and Ira Gershwin, preparing for

their invasion of Hollywood. "Girl Crazy" is a solid hit, with words and music by the brothers Gershwin that are far above the vaudeville antics of the book. "Roar China" is a Russian propaganda play in which the Anglo-Saxons stand out as ogres against the lamblike innocence of the Chinese proletariat. The production, however, and the acting of a large Chinese company, make the performance eminently worth while.

"Once in a Lifetime" is a satire against moviedom. You laugh with it from beginning to end. I was inclined, for all my enjoyment of the spectacle, to consider it overdone, as farce usually and legitimately overdoes its topics. Some stories that I heard next day, however, convinced me that, if anything, the farce was underdone. The world of the movie is not altogether sane; or let us put it this way: it is more insane—much more—than the rest of the world. I heard a pretty story from Jed Harris, producer of "Broadway," "The Front Page" and "Uncle Vanya." It seems that when Louis Bromfield was hired by Paramount (if that's the name of the company) it was his name that was wanted. "You won't have to do anything around here," he was told by an official. "We've got plenty of authors on the lot. All we wanted was your name, Mr. Bromberg." The official didn't even know the name of the man whose name the company had purchased. From Gilbert Seldes I got even more amusing data on the stupidity of the big business men who run this celluloid universe. Oh yes, "Once in a Lifetime" was very much underdone.

George Jean Nathan was not very optimistic about the theatrical season as a whole. He seemed to sense a marked depression among theatergoers that had not been noticeable for years. Already he, himself, though the season was still young, felt weary. He had interesting comments to make upon Mencken's marriage and said that before taking the plunge himself—if ever—he would watch how Henry made out with his bride. (Sara Haardt, now Mrs. Mencken, used to contribute to the Haldeman-Julius Publications; it was there that I first saw her name.) As to Nathan and Lillian Gish, all I can say at the moment is that their marriage

would not surprise me, although I have no reason at the time of writing for believing that it is scheduled to take place.

At a very respectable party which broke up at 2 a. m. I was happy to meet Paul Eldridge again, and his wife. Eldridge's book of poems, "Cobwebs and Cosmos," I mentioned here a few weeks ago; "Salome," which Eldridge and George Sylvester Viereck wrote together, has been a best seller since publication. It deserves to be; from what I have read of it so far I should say that it is more interesting than "My First 2,000 Years," and this is rare indeed in the case of a sequel.

Gilbert Seldes I met for the first time; it was a hurried conversation in the lobby of The Lexington. He was en route to pressing duties at home and I was checking out. I have always regarded him as one of the finest critical minds in America. He writes with equal ease for high-brow and lowbrow; he was a steady contributor to the deceased *Dial* and his name is found frequently in the pages of *The Saturday Evening Post*; he is a staff writer on *The Graphic* (one of New York's wildest tabloids) and signs such excellent monographs as the one on The Movies and The Talkies in Lippincott's One Hour series; his book on "The Seven Lively Arts" was a pioneer work, making history and serving as a source for future writers upon our national contribution to song, dance, comic strip and cinema. Seldes' lone novel did not receive the attention that it merited; but there is salve—and royalties—for him in the great success that has been met by his version of "Lysistrata."

In the office of *The American Mercury*, I had a chat with Charlie Angoff, who is Mencken's right-hand man on the magazine. Angoff has just completed a two-volume work which he calls "A Literary History of the American People." (I understand that Ludwig Lewisohn is hard at work upon a similar project, which his friends describe as monumental.) I expect to be reading in proof the first volume of Angoff's history, and shall be letting you know more about it as soon as I do.

It didn't look much like hard times in the crowded auditorium of Molly Picon's Folk Theater. (It is the old home of Maurice Schwartz's Yiddish Art Theater.) Molly, by now, is a formula, going through her regulation mimicry to the vast pleasure of a tireless multitude.

A word about "The Big Trail" at Roxy's. As a picture, it is bad, and full of hokum. But it uses a screen more than twice the regular width and achieves marvelous panoramic effects without losing any of the qualities of the small screen. I should not be surprised if there were at first a great many objections to it, and if in the long run it were to do away completely with the type of screen that we now know. It will be excellent for large scale productions such as opera and musical comedy; it will do away with the necessity of crowding the choruses; it opens up long vistas; all that it requires is what the talkies in their present stage require: directors with imagination.

### Dust Unto Dust

[Stanzas from "The Nature of Things," by Lucretius, Roman poet of the first century B. C.]

So when that wedlock of the flesh and mind,  
Which makes us what we are, shall cease to bind,  
And mind and flesh, being mind and flesh no more,  
Powdered to dust go whistling down the wind,  
Even as our past was shall our future be.  
Others may start and tremble, but not we,  
Though heaven with the disbanded dust of earth  
Be dark, or earth be drowned beneath the sea.

Why then torment ourselves, and shrink aghast  
Like timorous children from the great At Last?  
For though the Future holds its face averse,  
See that hid face reflected in the past.

For I, if still you are haunted by the fear  
Of Hell, have one more secret for your ear.  
Hell is indeed no fable; but, my friends,  
Hell and its torments are not there, but here.

No Tantalus down below with craven head  
Covers from the hovering rock: but here instead  
A Tantalus lives in each fond wretch who fears  
An angry God, and views the heavens with dread.

## Have It My Own Way

By John W. Gunn

### SOME EVANGELISTIC HEADLINES

An evangelist has just concluded a whirlwind—at any rate, a windy—series of performances in Girard. Yes, right in the shadow of this rationalistic fortress, or only a few blocks away, messages of state were delivered by an ambassador of God to the subjects of the Celestial King. This wandering Bible-whacker's credentials were given in this statement on a leaflet distributed around town, referring to his success in some other bailiwick: "With scarcely a dissenting vote the audience agreed that Evangelist Boothby had preached the truth of God." What better testimonial could the fellow have, short of being able to prove that either he or his audience *knew* the truth of God?

Evangelist Boothby's home is in Kalamazoo, Mich. If there is a zoo in Kalamazoo, Boothby should have a special cage. Figuratively speaking, he takes along his cage on these evangelistic tours: that is to say, he erects his own tabernacle and delivers sermons with music and chalk drawings thrown in for extra entertainment and elucidation. Concerning the chalk drawings—on the leaflet the following questions were asked: "Is Satan a Real Being? What Does He Look Like? Where Does He Live?" I wonder if Boothby drew a chalk picture of Satan and his living quarters.

Don't tell me I could have found out the answer by going to the tabernacle. My interest in Satan is always very low in November. Besides, I didn't really need to see Boothby from the Kalamazoo perform personally in his tabernacle-cage. I had his list of sermon titles, printed on the leaflet aforesaid. They were chiefly in the form of questions. The obvious suggestion was that Boothby had the answers. I could make a stagger at answering the questions myself.

"Why Doesn't An All-Powerful God Destroy the Devil? Why Didn't God Create Man So That He Couldn't Sin?" My guess—and it's as good as Boothby's—is that God hasn't the power to destroy the Devil or that, on the other hand, he doesn't wish to destroy the Devil. Following a similar line of reasoning, my opinion is that God forgot to create man so that he couldn't sin; or that he didn't understand his work fully and didn't realize that he was making man so that he could sin; or that he wanted man to sin. Whatever Boothby may have said, he couldn't—I am sure he couldn't—put these questions in a more intelligible light. I have the advantage of Boothby because I know that these are foolish questions. Once in a while foolishness is diverting when it is taken a degree or so less than seriously.

"Is the World Becoming Immoral or Are Standards Just Changing?" This is another of Boothby's interrogative sermon titles. The evangelist was rather careless in asking whether the world is becoming immoral. He ought to know that the world (meaning, to be sure, the people in the world) always *was* immoral. By this I mean that, whatever the standards in any age, the people in considerable numbers have violated those standards and therefore were technically immoral. I don't know Boothby's opinion, but I'll say that standards are changing and this means, roughly speaking, that people who were once immoral are now moral and people who were once moral are now immoral: a change in standards naturally brings a new kind of morality and a new kind of immorality. I have a feeling that Boothby didn't answer this question in quite this way. But great minds haven't a monopoly on the right to differ.

"Is the Bible God's Book or Is It the Best Book That Men Could Write About God? Is the Old Book Out of Date for These Modern Times?" My answer to the first question would be that the Bible is anybody's book who wants to claim it and can prove his claim, and it has never been brought to my notice in the shape of reliable information that God has put in a claim. Boothbys from various zoos have talked for several thousand years but God, so far as the record shows, has been absolutely silent. Probably the Bible is as good a book as could be written about God from the standpoint of complete ignorance of the subject.

Answering the second question, I am minded to say casually that the Bible is out of date for those who are up to date but that it

is up to date for those who are behind the times.

"When God Chains the Devil for One Thousand Years, Will Bootleggers, Infidels, and Sinners Be Converted?" A careful answer would be: Wait and see. This chaining of the Devil is highly problematical and, as I understand it, the question depends on that dramatic incident. If Boothby could himself chain the Devil, for an experimental period, he could approach the solution of his question. I shall be reckless, however, and venture the statement, entirely as a personal opinion, that bootleggers and infidels and sinners will not be converted excepting under certain circumstances, to wit: Bootleggers will be converted to other jobs when Prohibition passes. Infidels will cease to doubt when their doubts are set at rest by something they will be minded to accept as proof. Sinners will do something else when they find something else to do that is more fun.

Of course my answers are only tentative. There are a good many questions—perhaps even Boothby could ask them—which I wouldn't try to answer. Boothby is rather showy at questioning, but I don't know how good he is at answering. Presumably he isn't perfect in the role, as he denies this perfection even to God. One of his sermons is entitled: "A Question That God Can't Answer."

I suspect that Boothby, if he didn't answer it, hinted where God might look for the answer. But maybe not. Maybe Boothby and God were both licked on that one.

## Sunday Movies in Pious Kansas

One of the interesting features of the late election in Kansas was a special vote in Wichita, the leading city of Kansas, on the question of Sunday movies. With about 35,000 voting, there was a clear majority of 1,494 in favor of open theaters seven days a week. Despite the high pressure atmosphere of clericalism in Kansas, the residents of the state's most important city followed the promptings of common sense and a self-respecting interest in demanding their sane, wholesome, obvious rights. If Wichita now goes ahead successfully with Sunday movies—if, that is to say, there is no interference on the ground of the state Sunday labor law—the result will be a more interesting city on Sundays and a rightfully enlarged opportunity of pleasure for the workers on their one day of leisure and recreation.

Indications are that a fight may ensue, regardless of the substantial preference of the majority as shown in the election. The county attorney has said that he will prosecute the theater owners. He admits, however, that to follow the law strictly he would also have to prosecute all proprietors of filling stations, tobacco and news stands and other "unnecessary" enterprises that are maintained on Sundays as on week days. In short, a real application of the foolish Sunday law would leave Wichita people nothing to do but attend church or stay home—or put in enough gas and oil on Saturday nights to take them safely out of Wichita and Sedgwick county: outside of that jurisdiction, in other Kansas towns and counties which will perhaps not try to enforce the law, they may be able to purchase more gas and oil and some cigars and even an illegal drink of lemonade or milkshake.

But whatever action is taken by the authorities, the significant fact is that the citizens of Wichita voted for Sunday movies; and it is outrageous tyranny that a state law, which originated in Christian dogma and not in any demonstrable necessity of public welfare, can enforce an alien and irksome code upon the people of Wichita. The Freeman is especially interested in the situation in Wichita, because in June of this year E. Haldeman-Julius, editor of The Freeman, in a spectacular address before the Wichita Kiwanis Club attacked the folly and intolerance of the closed Sunday regime and urged that Wichitans should assert their rights. A great deal of publicity in Wichita and over the state was given to Mr. Haldeman-Julius' remarks. A special edition of the *Wichita Beacon* was devoted to his address; and since then, if not before, the issue of Sunday movies (and of an open Sunday generally) has been a leading one in Wichita.

Of course the real movement of freedom should be a demand for the repeal of the tyrannical state

law, which has no justification whatsoever in common sense nor in social needs nor in the principles of free government. The law is nothing more than an expression of Christian bigotry: an enforcement of the dogma that Sunday is a sacred day. The state should have no power to say whether cities and towns shall or shall not have Sunday movies: in fact, the state should be expressly and entirely forbidden to interfere with this Sunday amusement in any city or town.

The situation in Kansas at present is very uncertain and inconsistent. A number of towns have Sunday movies, while the majority of towns submit to the blue law. Many towns have oscillated between open and closed Sundays and have changed their policy several times within the past few years. Wichita, the leading city of the state, votes for open Sundays and the authorities announce that they will proceed nevertheless to enforce the state law. Kansas should have a clear and statewide policy of freedom; but its people must first emancipate themselves mentally and emotionally from the tyranny of the churches.

PROHIBITION has failed to keep people from drinking liquor but it has succeeded in teaching them how to make their own liquor.

"BATTLE Reds in Boston." Not another tea party?

## The Gods Are Dumb

Even if there lurk behind some veil of sky  
The fabled Maker, the immortal Spy,  
Ready to torture each poor life he made.  
Thou canst do more than God can—thou canst die.

Will not the thunders of thy God be dumb  
When thou-art deaf for ever? Can the sum  
Of all things bruise what is not? Nay—take heart;  
For where thou goest, thither no God can come.

Rest, brother, rest. Have you done ill or well,  
Rest, rest. There is no God, no Gods, who dwell  
Crowded with avenging righteousness on high,  
Nor frowning ministers of their hate in Hell.

None shall accuse thee, none shall judge: for lo,  
Those others have forgotten long ago:

And all thy sullied drifts of memory  
Shall lie as snow, shall lie as cold as snow:

And no vain hungering for the joys of yore  
Gone with the vanished sunsets, nor the sore  
Torn in your heart by all the ills you did,

Nor even the smart of those poor ills you bore.

THE MOST abject slave is the man who is afraid to think.

# 7 Famous Americans

## Send You An Important Message

Why do these seven great men urge you to read Joseph Lewis' startling book about Voltaire? You know these men—authors, educators, scientists. You respect their opinions and ideas. Read their enthusiastic comments which tell you, better than anything we might say, what this book has in store for you. Joseph Lewis' fascinating book is written with a sparkle and snap that makes reading it one long thrill. From the first page it grips your attention, and holds you spellbound to the last line. Read this amazing book if you want intelligent pleasure, crammed full and running over with facts that astound and delight.

### This Thrilling Book—Only One Dollar

Joseph Lewis tells you why Voltaire is famous as the world's most heroic champion of human freedom. Perhaps you know Voltaire best as an author of keen-witted stories, and mirth-provoking comedies. But Mr. Lewis, in his fascinating book, takes you back of the scenes and shows you the purpose Voltaire had in all his writings. You learn, perhaps for the first time, that more than any other man before and since, Voltaire has helped to free the world from mental slavery and degradation. Alone, he dared to fight the double tyranny of king and priest. In an age of bigotry, while screaming victims still were being burned at the fires of the inquisition, Voltaire defended the victims regardless of their beliefs. For nearly seventy years he fought for human rights. And when he died, he saw a world that looked up to him with thanks.

That is the dramatic, masterful story that Joseph Lewis portrays in his new book. That is why Seven Great Americans—eminent in their particular fields of thought—hail Voltaire, the *Incomparable Infidel*, as a classic.

Send for this amazing book. It is printed on special antique paper, beautifully bound in royal purple cloth, with gold-stamped title and contains two full-page photographs. Get the book now at the low introductory price of only \$1. Mail the coupon for YOUR copy at once, and let it inspire your heart, stimulate your mind, and set your nerves atingle with thrilling surprises.

## What The American Hebrew Says of "Voltaire, the Incomparable Infidel"

It is a source of sincere regret that the author confined this fascinating work to a mere one hundred pages. It is surely deserving of at least five hundred. He presents an unforgettable picture of conditions prevailing in the Church in France in the 17th and 18th centuries—conditions which called forth Voltaire's activities, satires, and attacks. The author speaks as cleverly as did Mark Twain in his "Connecticut Yankee" many of the ignorant acts, superstitious persecutions, and intolerable bigotry of the Church of the 18th Century.

The sketch of Voltaire's teachings is succinct and inspiring. . . . The chapter in which the author portrays Voltaire's denunciation of all war waged for religious or national purposes is a classic. . . . Regarding Mozart's gross and bigoted remark about Voltaire's death, the author states: "A man may be a great musician and still be a bigot and utterly ignorant of the very fundamentals of human freedom." The description of Voltaire's death-bed scene is unusually effective.

### Use This Order Blank and Send Only \$1

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I enclose remittance for \$1. Please send me by return mail prepaid, one copy of Joseph Lewis' thrilling book, "VOLTAIRE, the Incomparable Infidel," printed in Caslon type, containing 100 pages printed on extra quality book paper and bound in royal purple cloth, with the title stamped in gold.

Name .....

Address .....

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

## Extraordinary Book Bargains

We have only a few copies of each book listed below. This offer will never be repeated. Rush your order today while we still have these remainders in stock. Only a small quantity of this circular is being printed owing to the fact that our stock is so low. Look over the list of book bargains at once and check off the books you want.

The Goose-Step, Upton Sinclair. Was \$2.25, now.....	\$1.21
The Valley of Democracy, Meredith Nicholson. Was \$3, now.....	.74c
Key to Etiquette. Was \$3.50, now.....	.95c
Preparing for Womanhood. Was \$1.85, now.....	.65c
Peg O' My Heart. Was \$3, now.....	.65c
Booth Tarkington's Works in 4 vols. Was \$7.50, now.....	\$2.85
Daveport's Perilous Adventures. Was \$3.50, now.....	.75c
Life of Lincoln, Stephenson. Was \$3.50, now.....	\$1.45
To Have and to Hold. Was \$2.50, now.....	.75c
The Christian. Was \$2, now.....	.65c
The Laws of Sex. Was \$5, now.....	\$1.75
Thelma. Was \$2, now.....	.55c
Your Baby. Was \$1.25, now.....	.55c
Sex and Society, Thomas. Was \$5, now.....	\$1.75
Heaven of the Old House, Harold Bell Wright. Was \$2, now.....	.65c
New Lives for Old. Was \$2.50, now.....	.44c
Bettina's Best Desserts. Was \$2, now.....	.65c
Home Library of Law. Was \$10, now.....	\$2.25
Nelson's Leatherbound Bible. Was \$6, now.....	\$2.85
Great Short Stories of the World. Was \$5, now.....	\$2.25
One Hundred Best Books. Was \$1.25, now.....	.89c
The Big American Parade, E. Haldeman-Julius. Was \$3.50, now.....	\$2.20
King Henry the 8th, Clement Wood. Was \$4, now.....	\$1.75
Boston. Novel by Upton Sinclair. 2 vols. Boxed. Was \$5.25, now.....	\$2.85
Oil. Novel. Upton Sinclair. Was \$2, now.....	.75c
Infidels and Heretics, Clarence Darrow. Was \$3, now.....	\$1.98
The First Hundred Million, E. Haldeman-Julius. Was \$3, now.....	\$1.45
Science, Truth, Religion and Ethics, Gordin. Was \$3, now.....	.85c
Masterpieces of Mystery. 4 vols. Was \$6.50, now.....	\$2.25
Masterpieces of Adventure. 4 vols. Was \$6.50, now.....	\$2.25
Shakespeare Identified. Was \$5, now.....	\$1.75
Mammontart, Upton Sinclair. Was \$2.25, now.....	\$1.10
Life of Paul Jones. Was \$2.75, now.....	.65c
Life of Perry. Was \$2.75, now.....	.65c
Life of Cromwell. 2 vols. Was \$6.50, now.....	.95c
Samuel the Seeker, Upton Sinclair. Was \$2.25, now.....	\$1.10
Hans Brinker. Novel. Was \$2.25, now.....	.64c
Care of Infants and Small Children. Was \$1.50, now.....	.29c
Beauty Culture. Was \$2, now.....	\$1.10
Love Story of a Movie Star. Was \$2.25, now.....	.65c
The Goslings, Upton Sinclair. Was \$2.25, now.....	\$1.10
Your Mysterious Glands. Was \$3, now.....	.74c
Some Personal War Impressions, Jonsescu. Was \$5, now.....	\$1.34
Riddles and Conundrums. Was \$2, now.....	.65c
Man's Unconscious Passion, Lay. Was \$3, now.....	\$1.25
Grover Cleveland's Life. Was \$1, now.....	.32c
Ibsen's Doll's House and Other Plays. Was \$1, now.....	.55c
Literature and Dogma, Matthew Arnold. Was \$1.25, now.....	.55c
Life of Mahomet, Irving. Was \$1.25, now.....	.55c
Marriage and Morals, Bertrand Russell. Was \$3.50, now.....	\$1.75
Black Beauty. Was \$1.25, now.....	.55c
Cranford, Gaskell. Was \$1.25, now.....	.55c
Morte D'Arthur. Was \$1.25, now.....	.55c
Peppy's Diary. 2 vols. Was \$3, now.....	\$1.10
Plays of Sheridan. Was \$1.25, now.....	.55c
Twice Told Tales, Hawthorne. Was \$1.25, now.....	.55c
The Wild Ass' Skin. Was \$1.25, now.....	.55c

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS