

"Hang Socialists!" Says Catholic Priest in Toronto

In 1912 Rev. John L. Belford, a Catholic priest of Brooklyn, N. Y., thought that Socialists should be disposed of by a rain of bullets. This "holy father" is also the publisher of a monthly magazine called *The Mentor* and it was in this magazine that he wrote in May, 1912: "The Socialist is busy. He flaunts his red flag and openly preaches his doctrines. His great point of attack is religion. His power is an actual menace to our city. There seems to be no law to suppress or control him. He is more dangerous than cholera or smallpox—yes, he is the mad dog of society and should be silenced by a bullet."

As Catholics don't usually talk so indiscreetly that was, says *The New Leader* in recalling the incident, a stimulus to exciting comment back in 1912. It may be recognized by our readers as a characteristic expression of the spirit that animates Catholicism, which is the spirit of medievalism. Even so, there is room for a difference of opinion regarding the exact method of violence in putting down opponents of Catholic bigotry. Rev. Belford—now, it seems, Monsignor and of higher rank in the church (promoted, we presume, for his militant medievalism)—has changed his mind on this point. On February 4, 1931, Belford spoke in Toronto by arrangement of the Catholic Truth Society. One of the audience, at the conclusion of the address, inquired of the speaker as follows: "I was living in the state of New York nineteen years ago and at that time I remember a statement of the speaker's to the effect that Socialists were the mad dogs of society and, if

need be, should be silenced with a bullet. Ramsay MacDonald, a Socialist, is now Premier of Great Britain and many other prominent men are Socialists. Is the speaker still of the same opinion?"

As reported in the *Toronto Evening Telegram* of Feb. 5, Rev. Belford said: "There are various types of Socialists. As far as Ramsay MacDonald is concerned, he belongs to what we call the right kind of Socialists. But there is another kind who believe in the throwing of bombs and assassination. They are the mad dogs of society, and should be put out of society. I said use the bullet. Perhaps I should have said the rope. A bullet is of the same value, while a rope can be used over and over again."

Rev. Belford is amazingly ignorant or he was uttering a deliberate lie when he said that there are a kind of Socialists who believe in bomb throwing and in assassinations. We believe that it is quite in character with the man's violent attitude, unreasoning and vindictive, that he lied knowingly. For we understand well enough that what fills such Catholic bigots with hatred of Socialists, and with hatred of all who express modern ideas, is the malice which resents bitterly all differences of opinion. There is no need for denunciations of a philosophy of bomb throwing and assassinations. The real opposition which the Catholic church faces and which all oppressors of mankind fear is not in such violent propaganda. They fear the growing discussion of ideas and the propaganda of forthright intellectual and fact-dealing criticism which is directed against Catholicism and kindred forms of slavery. If

Rev. Belford wants to study bomb throwing, as a very concrete practice rather than as a philosophy, he can find it among the good Catholic gamblers of Chicago. He should look there rather than among Socialists and freethinkers, who use intellectual weapons—weapons, by the way, which these Catholic bigots cannot themselves use capably, wherefore they recommend the use of the bullet or the rope.

We may add that Toronto was a very well-chosen city for such an expression of murderous Catholic bigotry. No doubt there are decent, civilized people in Toronto who will condemn utterly such appeals to violence; but, as revealed recently in the attacks upon *The American Freeman* and E. Haldeman-Julius, the leading journals and the officials and the clergymen of Toronto are essentially in sympathy with the viewpoint, if not precisely the methods, advocated by this Catholic propagandist of the bullet and the rope. It will be noted that, while the Toronto chief constable would not guarantee free speech for E. Haldeman-Julius and while the newspapers and officials and leading citizens were horrified at the thought that Mr. Haldeman-Julius might lecture in their city, no objection was made against these vicious lies and threats by a Catholic enemy of civilization.

This is a vivid measure of Toronto's kind of civilization. It cannot tolerate the prospect of a speaker advocating the use of and familiarity with ideas. But it is an open city for the man who advocates the use of the bullet and the rope.

"Labor Fakers" Have Aided Conspiracy Against Mooney

By John W. Gunn

Capitalistic interests in San Francisco want Tom Mooney kept in prison, not because they believe he is guilty of the crime for which he has served fourteen years of unjust punishment, but because they hate his economic ideas and fear him as a dangerous agitator against their selfish interests. Nominally at the other extreme, yet in fact sympathetic with the capitalistic persecutors of Mooney, stand the San Francisco labor leaders: these leaders also fear Mooney because he has been a sincere and uncompromising fighter on behalf of the rank and file and because his activities have been annoying to these men who use the labor movement for their own selfish purposes.

"Labor fakers" is the familiar designation that is deserved by Paul Scharrenberg and other trade union politicians of San Francisco, who use the labor movement for scheming self-advancement, and by high officials in the American Federation of Labor, whose careers are guided by the motives of reactionary trade union politics. One who makes (to his own profit) alliances with the enemies of labor is a "labor faker." One who opposes the principles of militant labor action and who is more concerned with keeping radicalism out of the labor movement than with making the labor movement radically effective for the good of the workers is a "labor faker." One who seeks respectability and political jobs through the influence of the labor movement, which movement he has conspired to emasculate into a polite futility, is a "labor faker." One who is unwilling to fight when a clear issue is drawn between labor agitators and labor exploiters is a "labor faker."

Disagreement on Defense

On these counts, the San Francisco labor movement and a large part of the California labor movement seems to be extremely afflicted with "labor fakers." The rank and file have true sentiments, but they are continually betrayed, as Mooney has been betrayed, by those who occupy the false role of their leaders. It cannot be said, of course, that the average member of a labor union is genuinely a radical in the larger features of social-economic controversy nor that he is more than occasionally militant in his unionism; also the continuance of the "labor fakers" in power indicates that they are not fully condemned, or perhaps not fully understood, by the victims of their bad leadership. This much is true: no adequate and persistent exposure has been made, showing how the San Francisco "labor fakers" have deserted Tom Mooney to his fate and have treacherously connived at the confirmation of that fate.

When Marcell Haldeman-Julius was in San Francisco, it was the deliberate policy—and the sincere policy—of the Mooney Defense Committee, then under the management of Mary Gallagher, to

keep on good terms with the local leaders of the labor movement and to maintain an attitude of neutral and friendly expectancy toward Governor Young. Mrs. Haldeman-Julius, when she returned to Girard from her personal investigation of the Mooney case, candidly discussed with Mr. Haldeman-Julius and myself her misgivings as to the wisdom of this policy. It was never agreeable to Tom Mooney. He insisted that full and bold publicity should be given to all aspects of his case and Warren Billings' case, and this, as he firmly held, must include an exposure of the San Francisco "labor fakers" and a determined campaign against Governor Young both in the primary and (if he were nominated) in the general election. But Mary Gallagher and other friends and supporters of Mooney felt that, isolated as he was from the center of action, his judgment was doubtful and he might seriously injure his cause. They put faith in assurances, which had indeed reached them from near-official sources, that Mooney would be pardoned by Governor Young; and they also believed that Paul Scharrenberg and other San Francisco union politicians were willing to help Mooney and possibly would be helpful to him, at least within the limits of their conservative kind of action.

Mooney's Wishes Ignored

The facts set forth in the latest pamphlet of the reorganized Mooney Defense Committee—*Labor Leaders Betray Tom Mooney*—show how cruelly correct was Mooney's analysis of the situation and how badly advised his well-meaning advisers were. Governor Young's refusal of a pardon verified Mooney's distrust of the man and should have made emphatically clear to everyone connected with the Mooney defense that only a general and uncompromising fight, an exposure of all the interests and individuals standing in the way of justice for Mooney and Billings, would serve in this acute and outrageous extremity. But Mary Gallagher, then directing the Mooney Defense Committee, refused to follow Mooney's urgent instructions that Young should be opposed in the primary election and that he should be strongly and directly denounced to the union voters of California.

It was Mooney's wish that a *Baltimore Sun* editorial condemning Governor Young and a resolution of the Merced, California, Typographical Union calling upon the labor unions of California to defeat Young on the issue of Mooney's pardon should be printed in leaflet form and at once mailed to California voters. This wish was obstructed by Mary Gallagher who, it seems, from originally having been in true and close harmony with Mooney had been brought under the influence of the San Francisco "labor fakers"; yet it seems fair to conclude, from her notably loyal and useful work

in the Mooney defense—which, I am given to understand, involved much personal sacrifice and patient struggle against difficulties—that she was all along sincere in her dissent from Mooney's tactical ideas; that, at worst, her judgment and not her sincerity was at fault.

"Labor Fakers" Support Young

At that critical turn of events it was also Mooney's insistent wish to have a statement issued in his name, urging all his friends to work for the defeat of Governor Young. Amazingly, Mary Gallagher did just the opposite. She issued a statement that "Tom Mooney would prefer to see Governor Young reelected because of his long study and familiarity with the case, and that if a new Governor was elected, there would be another long delay until Governor Young's successor had studied all the evidence."

Five days after his refusal to pardon Tom Mooney, Young was endorsed for reelection as governor by Paul Scharrenberg, Michael Casey, John O'Connell, Frank McDonald, John McLaughlin, George Kidwell and other leading labor politicians of San Francisco. This one act would be sufficient to illustrate eloquently the truth of H. L. Mencken's statement, in a personal letter to Tom Mooney, that these San Francisco union officials are "all scabs at heart." While they have not dared, because of the sentiment for Mooney among the rank and file, to display an open, extreme, persistent antagonism to Mooney, they have in treacherous ways used their influence constantly against a pardon for Mooney. Paul Scharrenberg's friendship with Governor Young—who was Tom Mooney's official enemy—is partly explained by the fact that he held, by Young's appointment, a profitable sinecure as a member of the State Board of Harbor Commissioners. Political job-holding, political favoritism and political prestige are evidently stronger motives with the San Francisco "labor fakers" than any concern for the real interests of labor or for defenders of labor, true fighters and not fakers, who suffer as Mooney has suffered for his union activities.

Frameup Behind the Frameup

There could be imagined no more bitter, ironical triumph of treachery than the success of these "labor fakers," after what was apparently a long campaign of duplicity and false-friendly influence, in gaining substantial control over Mooney's own Defense Committee and its secretary, Mary Gallagher. The "scabs at heart" among San Francisco's labor leadership, who were Tom Mooney's worst enemies and betrayers, actually succeeded in dominating the policies of the Mooney Defense Committee against Tom Mooney's own strongest wishes and best interests. Justly indignant but not vindictive, Mooney today refers to Mary Gallagher as a "splendid woman" who was "evilily influenced by the degraded, corrupted and degenerated labor leaders." The evidence in *Labor Leaders Betray Tom Mooney* seems tragically conclusive as to this stage

in the betrayal of Mooney: and indeed it is the essence of unexpected and unbearable tragedy that Mooney's friend, Mooney's trusted representative in his defense, the woman who controlled Mooney's publicity and policies and thus his most crucial fate should have come to be guided by men who were stabbing Mooney in the back, who were pretending to be his friends yet secretly disguising their deep-seated dislike and enmity, who were denying that the Mooney case was a labor case and were privately opposing a pardon for Mooney and not publicly insisting upon a pardon, who were openly in political alliance with the governor who had refused Mooney a pardon. So changed had become this formerly active and able director of the Mooney defense that when she attended in September, 1930, the convention of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters in company with George Kidwell, one of the group of labor politicians in San Francisco who has been insidiously hostile to Tom Mooney, she did not ask the convention to contribute to the Mooney defense nor to pass resolutions demanding Mooney's pardon; yet she was then secretary-treasurer of the Mooney Defense Committee.

These facts are now made public by Tom Mooney not with a view to attacking Mary Gallagher personally, but rather to explain how she was used as an instrument by the San Francisco "labor fakers" to nullify and disrupt the work of the Mooney Defense Committee; not she but the influences scheming for the betrayal of Tom Mooney are vital in this narrative; and these influences were and are within the labor movement, where in decency and loyalty Mooney should have received sincere, steady, militant cooperation in his struggle against the frameup. There is clearly a frameup behind the frameup—a frameup in support of the frameup—and the guilty principals in this subsidiary frameup are labor politicians in San Francisco who, says H. L. Mencken, are "scabs at heart."

This series of articles is based upon the new *Mooney Defense Committee's* pamphlet, *Labor Leaders Betray Tom Mooney*. Another article will appear in next week's issue of *The Freeman*.

WE ARE NOT moved to sympathy and a flow of tears when we are told that Hoover as President has had "a pitiless succession of bad breaks." We think of the "bad breaks" the American people have had, and the stubbornness of Hoover in opposing a social-minded program of government aid for the American people, and so we are confirmed in our conviction that the American people deserve and need a great deal more sympathy than Hoover.

THE HYPOTHETICAL MAN (whoever he was) who would rather be right than be President—was never President.

ONE ITEM of sure knowledge is worth more than endless Bibles of myth, doctrine and speculation.

AN HONEST discussion is good for all minds.

Free, Says He

A statement from Einstein (*New York Times*, January 28) that he believes in determinism is accompanied by the assertion of Prof. Millikan, the California physicist, that he is a man of free choices and that, moreover, he just can't quite understand what anyone means by "determinism." The famous Einstein's deterministic view was disclosed in a letter to Dr. Abraham Geller of Brooklyn, N. Y., in reply to a specific query from Dr. Geller. Einstein wrote:

I am a convinced determinist. I said in my lecture that the latest theory of the quantum events is a substantially indeterministic theory, because it takes for granted that the latest laws are of a statistical nature. But I have added thereto that, in accordance with my conviction, this theoretical basis will be replaced later on by a deterministic one. Outside of that it is to be noted that the deterministic conception of life-events is not substantially influenced by the other theory.

In other words, Einstein recognizes that the apparent indeterminism made so much of by Eddington and Millikan and the emphasis upon the law of probabilities rather than completely understood determinism is essentially the statement of a lack of knowledge. In studying the electrons, physicists cannot entirely interpret their behavior; they seem to act inexplicably and freely, subject to no certain laws of determinism; and this means, simply enough, that the physicists are puzzled by the electrons. It is the peculiarity of Eddington and Millikan that they decorate this temporary puzzle with the colors of carelessly speculative mysticism.

In contrast, Einstein, reflecting upon the immense preponderance of facts showing the deterministic character of the life which we know, reasons quite soundly that the uncertainty of present knowledge concerning refinements of physical inquiry will develop into a certainty of knowledge which will turn out to be deterministic. As he says, we know very well that "life events" are deterministic, that free will is an illusion, and that men move unescapably within the limitations of circumstance and natural law. In effect, or apparently, man expands those limitations as he adds to his knowledge. The facts of progress do not indicate that the philosophy of determinism is erroneous; they mean that we are learning more and more about the laws which determine events and that we are placing ourselves more intelligently in cooperation with nature; for when we speak about controlling nature we speak loosely, since we control nature through cooperation with nature.

In asserting his possession of free will, Millikan is very naive and superficial. He knows what he likes and what he wants, etc., therefore he is a free moral agent. He fails to go the one step farther of inquiring whether he can independently determine what he likes and what he wants. When a man says that he can do what he wants to do, we at once ask what it is that makes him want to do this or that. Millikan's letter,

also addressed to Dr. Geller, is as follows:

I do not know what anybody means when he calls himself a "determinist." Least of all, in my mode of thinking, is it possible for a man to be a real determinist who, like Einstein, has a sense of "social responsibility" for the sense of responsibility means freedom of choice and self-condemnation as a result of wrong choices.

If a man means by saying that he is a determinist that, being a man, it is not in his power to act like an elephant, then, of course, we can all be determinists with him. If he means that he has no sense of freedom and hence no sense of responsibility, then I can only say that this is a position with which I cannot myself agree because I have that sense of freedom of choice and of responsibility for the kind of choices I make and it is my conviction that practically all reasonably normal human beings have the same sense of freedom and of responsibility which I have. The reconciliation between that sense of freedom which is a matter of direct knowledge and the principle of the conservation of energy I am not myself wise enough to be able to make, nor do I know of anybody who is wise enough; nor does this bother me seriously since it is only one of the many points at which I find I fail of "all wisdom."

I judge that from the foregoing you will conclude—and rightly—that I regard most discussions of determinism and free will as useless because resting upon the lack of definitions of terms and the failure of the contestants to use words in the same sense.

It is beside the point for Millikan to stress the "sense of freedom" which is felt by "all reasonably normal human beings." Certainly they have this sense—because they do not look far enough nor closely enough into the deterministic background of their actions. Neither Millikan nor any other man is an independent entity, thinking and feeling and acting arbitrarily without regard to his human fellows and the forces of nature and society. He has, to start with, a certain heredity; the first great contradiction of free will is that no man can choose his parents nor, therefore, the biological and psychological strain which is in him. And from the moment of birth every individual is ceaselessly molded, this way or that, by the influence of environment. The difference, let us say, between Al Capone and Millikan is not a mystical difference of free will, Capone having chosen to be a gangster and Millikan to be a physicist. The difference between them is to be found in a thousand forces that influenced their characters and careers in far removed ways. Neither can choose to act out of character unless some more powerful influence alters his character. Neither Millikan nor Capone could choose freely to behave like the other, because their standards and their desires have not been determined in the same way. Not only is it impossible for Millikan to act like an elephant; he cannot even act precisely like his human neighbor, albeit both are governed in the main by the same unalterable laws of nature.

As for the sense of social responsibility and the feeling of wrong-doing, these sentiments or convictions are determined by training imposed, of course, upon primary differences in character. Millikan didn't choose to have this feeling of social responsibility; he grew to have this feeling and this

feeling was determined by his particular set of natural sensibilities, by his heredity and training, and by the forces of environment that played upon him and made him what he is. Furthermore, the sense of social responsibility differs widely among men who have this sense: they disagree, that is, regarding ideas and actions which they believe to be socially good, bad or indifferent. Certainly this is not because of free will; it is because of differences in personality and in the interests that move men and in the training (including all the factors of environment) that makes men what they are.

Millikan has the sensation of doing what he wants; but that is only to say that his wants determine his actions, even as his wants have been determined by his life.

THE OTHER SIDE

A reader comments that Christianity is the only religion which has survived persecution. He refers to the persecution of the Christians under a few Roman emperors. Many Christians were killed—that is true—although a good many less than is claimed in Christian martyrology. But the main fact about Christianity and persecution is that this new official religion of the western world survived to persecute on its own account for centuries and centuries of terrible massacres, assassinations, trials and torturings. Christianity must be true, says our reader, because it survived persecution. Then what commentary on its truth is to be derived from its own persecution of heretics against Christianity? We are not exaggerating, but stating a simple and positively proved historical fact, when we say that millions have been killed by Christian bigots, victims of Christian persecution, witnesses to the terrorism (not the truth) of Christianity.

IF A GOD is said to punish men for thinking for themselves, we naturally want to inquire whether this alleged God is equally guilty. Does this alleged God think for himself? Or does he let the mythical Devil or some other non-existent supernatural personage do his thinking for him?

MOST HEROES of human history—those who, in the judgment of civilized historians and students, merit the title of the greatest heroes—have been persecuted for their ideas, while alive and have had their ideas distorted after they were dead.

WHEN A MAN learns that he has been holding an erroneous idea, he should not regret the loss of the error but should congratulate himself upon the discovery of truth.

AN IDEA may be interesting and not be proved; but if it cannot be proved, it is foolish to call it the truth and absurdly arrogant to call it the sacred truth.

A REALISTIC, paradoxical note on mysticism: The greatest wisdom is silent—that is to say, the unconscious, unutterable wisdom of death.

BOOTLEGGING SCIENCE

Isn't it a disgrace that in our modern civilization, in these United States with their boast of learning and progress, science must be bootlegged?

"We have twenty-six states," says Margaret Sanger, national leader of the birth control movement, "in which there is no restriction on giving or getting contraceptive information by anyone. In addition, we have eleven states which allow physicians to give such information (provided they already have such knowledge to give). Yet the federal laws make it a crime for the doctors in these same states to use the United States mails, or common carriers, for contraceptive supplies, books or pamphlets, which means that the doctor, in giving oral information, must 'bootleg' supplies for the use of his patients and 'boot-

leg' books or reports by which he could improve his knowledge." Of course this federal law against the mailing of birth control information should be abolished entirely. But at present the National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control is concentrating on a bill to remove this restriction from information mailed in or between the states which have no legislation against birth control. This would be a step in the direction of a civilized policy, although the full rights of spreading scientific knowledge should eventually be recognized. Birth control is a legitimate feature of modern science. It has great social importance and it is also a means of happier individual adjustment to the demands of modern life. Undoubtedly it is a symptom of America's backwardness that we should penalize the circulation of this knowledge and compel even doctors to bootleg it.

Great Geniuses of the Middle Ages

Joseph McCabe's Newest Historical Work Gives Readers New Light on 19 Vital and Creative Figures

Joseph McCabe, who is writing exclusively for Haldeman-Julius readers, now comes forward with three large volumes, containing 90,000 words, entitled *Great Geniuses of the Middle Ages*. Only a McCabe could make these complex characters understandable to the average reader. He discusses them authoritatively, simply and entertainingly. Not a dull page in this entire work of 192 large pages.

- CONTENTS OF "GREAT GENIUSES OF THE MIDDLE AGES"
1 Tai-Fung, Emperor of a Glorious China.
2 The Caliph Muavia, Founder of the Arab Civilization.
3 Liutprand, the Civilizer of North Italy.
4 Charlemagne, the Blond Giant Who Failed.
5 Abd-al-Rahman III, Most Brilliant of Moslem Caliphs.
6 Otto the Great, Inspirer of a Modest Renaissance.
7 Peter Abelard, Restorer of the Rights of Intellect.
8 Saladin, the Fearless Kurd.
9 Frederick the Second, the Wonder of the World.
10 Roger Bacon, Foyform Apostle of Science.
11 Dante, Symbol of the New Struggle.
12 Giotto, the Humanizer of Art.
13 Boccaccio, the Symbol of Lively Literature.
14 Gutenberg, the Megaphone of the Printed Word.
15 Lorenzo the Magnificent, Culture-Prince of Florence.
16 Leonardo da Vinci, the Universal Genius of the New Age.
17 Christopher Columbus, the Enlarger of the World.
18 Michael Angelo, Prince of Renaissance Art.
19 Copernicus, the Discoverer of the Heavens.

THIS FINE LIBERAL WORK FOR ONLY \$1 Think of getting 19 chapters, telling all about 19 important figures in the history of civilization, for only \$1. This work was first announced at \$1.50, but you can get your set, prepaid, for only \$1. As usual, McCabe brings home many lessons for freethinkers who would know the truth about the Middle Ages. This set of three volumes promises to become extremely popular and the world will discuss McCabe's findings for many years to come. Printed on good paper, bound in attractive stiff covers, 5 1/2 by 8 1/2 inches.

\$1 WILL BRING YOU "GREAT GENIUSES OF THE MIDDLE AGES"
Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas
Enclosed find \$1, which is payment in full for Joseph McCabe's Great Geniuses of the Middle Ages, in three volumes, carriage charges prepaid.
Name Address
City State

The Pope's Encyclical on Birth Control, Marriage, Divorce

With Analysis and Discussion by E. Haldeman-Julius
THE POPE'S LATEST ENCYCLICAL DECLARES

That birth control is murder and a mortal sin—
That marriage is a holy Catholic sacrament and that it is indissoluble, that "what God [the priest] hath joined together" no man should put asunder—
That divorce is forbidden under "the law of God" and that divorced and remarried persons, in the Catholic view, are no better than adulterers—
That the modern, rationalistic, humanitarian attitude toward these questions is all wrong and that medieval Catholic dogma should be supreme.

E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS DECLARES

That birth control is a scientific, humane method of improving the quality of life and solving the terrible problem of over-population—
That marriage is entirely a secular institution and that it should not be regarded as a final, irrevocable act—
That divorce is obviously intelligent and right, inasmuch as men and women should not be condemned for life to persist in a mistake—
That the modern attitude toward these questions is, quite rightly, based upon the philosophy that moral law is social law and that the happiness of men and women is the supreme good.
This book contains the complete text of Pope Pius' remarkable encyclical on marriage, divorce and birth control. Here is amazing evidence, in the Pope's own words, as to what are actually the beliefs and aims of the Roman Catholic Church. And Mr. Haldeman-Julius analyzes thoroughly the Pope's letter, discusses in plain words the meaning of Catholicism and its menace, and clearly contrasts the modern with the medieval point of view. THIS IS A LARGE BOOK, BOUND IN STIFF CARD COVERS, 8 1/2 BY 5 1/2 INCHES IN SIZE, 30,000 WORDS. THE PRICE IS ONLY 50 CENTS A COPY OR 5 COPIES FOR \$2.

ORDER BLANK FOR POPE'S ENCYCLICAL ON BIRTH CONTROL AND DISCUSSION BY E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS
Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas
Enclosed is \$..... for which send me, postpaid, copies of The Pope's Encyclical on Birth Control with Discussion by E. Haldeman-Julius. (50c a copy or 5 copies for \$2.)
Name Address
City State

Upton Sinclair Swipes a Line From His Critics

By E. Haldeman-Julius

Upton Sinclair thinks that I am not as constructive as I might be. Did Sinclair forget for the moment and quote his own critics? That is usually what is said about Sinclair; it is what is most frequently said about all exponents of unpopular ideas. "I cannot refrain," writes Sinclair, "from expressing my delight over the energy and humor you displayed in your relations with the city of Toronto. Often I quarrel with your anti-religious propaganda because it is so purely negative, and I am interested in what is true rather than what is not. But when the Chief of Police of Toronto says that you cannot say something, why then of course it becomes immediately necessary for you to say it, and as loud as possible."

It seems that Sinclair is appreciative of some usefulness in my exposure of the Toronto bigots, although that was the kind of journalism that is ordinarily characterized as "purely negative" and as being destructive, therefore wasted. I dislike to fall back upon a platitude and say that in destroying a foolish and oppressive attitude or in undermining such an attitude to whatever degree, the destructive critic is accomplishing concrete good; he is making it easier for an intelligent attitude to prevail; he is, inevitably as a part of his very destructive publicity, aiding to build such an attitude.

A campaign against bigotry, such as was developed with merry effectiveness through the Toronto incident, is certainly helpful in showing forth the superior sanity and manliness and interestingness of free speech. On the surface such a campaign may appear wholly destructive; yet it cannot, in the nature of things, be that—it must naturally include the presentation of an opposite, more civilized point of view—and that is in effect constructive, whatever the appearance or method may be.

It seems to me comparably true that all destructive criticism, if it be intelligently directed against ideas or institutions or customs that ought to be destroyed, is useful and indeed very necessary. Criticism is one of the important functions of man's intellectual life. Great movements have originated in criticism. And perhaps it may be said that while construction goes on in some activities and destruction is important in other fields, the critical spirit must be brought continuously to judge the whole span of human life; and that is, I grant, too large a territory for me but I try to cover as broad a stretch of interesting things as I possibly can; and I am confident of being on the liberal side of all issues and of hitting hard at error and putting on a lively show in advertisement of the truth as I see it. What particular features of my work are destructive and what are constructive is of less concern to me than that I shall be making intelligent comments on life and stimulating others to look at life more intelligently.

Although giving it a slightly different phrasing, Sinclair offers the old "destructive-constructive" formula and I don't see that he improves on it notably. "I am interested," he says, "in what is true rather than what is not." But can one discuss what is not true without, as a parallel and substantial course, saying a great deal about what is true? What one is doing, after all, is applying one's philosophy of life to the problems of life, to men and affairs, to current or past personalities and issues, to history and morals and religion and politics and many things under the sun. In criticizing a false philosophy, one is by implication—and even more, one is necessarily by direct statement and illustration—bringing to view a true philosophy. I am assuming of course that I have the right side and my intellectual opponents the wrong side; otherwise, I should change sides; and it is my job to show why I think as I do and why I regard myself as arguing on the right side. If attacks upon religion were only destructive, I should still say that they were essential to the work of civilization; which is indeed another way of saying that they are constructive. In opposing such ideas as God and im-

believing in the notion of "sin") may be presumed to lend a loutish, perverse pleasure to his surreptitious transgressions of his own trumpeted holy doctrine. Others enjoy themselves in a wholesome manner. They take life's delights and adventures and experiments frankly. This preacher cultivates a morbid passion for the darkness—for dark streets—for dark doors—for dark rooms.

This Elmer Gantryish caricature of humanity damns others in public for having beliefs and a code different from the preacher's—and he privately goes on his lying round of hypocritical assignations. He lets out an idiotic yelp in his pulpit, crying that the devil is taking the town because somebody is taking a drink of liquor—and he, the Elmer Gantry by another name, has a sub rosa yet commonly owned reputation as the town's leading libertine.

He condemns others for their "infidelity" in refusing to believe in his stupid religion—yet he is unfaithful to his own beliefs as he is unfaithful to the husbands of some of his most devoted feminine worshippers. He is, this preacher, a creature who lacks even the decency to despise himself. He is a type. He is also a person. He is also the actual, slinking embodiment and literal realization of the word "contemptible."

ILLUSION OF PEACE

There is no doubt that the future of civilization rests upon the ability of the nations to organize a peaceful world. It is equally clear that no such ability, indeed no such intention that can be genuinely recognized as such, has been shown by the nations. Although the Kellogg pact was celebrated with much diplomatic and journalistic fanfare; although the League of Nations still engages in its formal functions, which are neither international (in the sense that they include all nations), nor intelligently pacific in program; although the London naval conference of a year ago was an occasion for more talk of peace; in spite of all these things, the status of the world is alarmingly more warlike than it was in 1914.

LEST WE FORGET

"Contemptible" is a word. To give form and feeling to a word, we think of a man or an action that literally expresses or embodies the word in all its ugliness. Therefore when we wish to electrify the word "contemptible" into a living image we can succeed by thinking of— Well, why not take the pulpit hypocrite who speaks and lives in a lying sham and who unites to hypocrisy an indecent and vicious propensity for denouncing the morals—the private morals, the differences in taste, and by the same token perhaps the differences in culture—of other people? We refer to the preacher who sneaks along shaded streets and through darkened doors in violation of his own sanctimoniously professed code of holiness, while denouncing others who live frankly and freely according to their code.

We have in mind the clerical humbug who pretends to fill the peculiar office of a "saint"—yet who is, to use his own language, a "sinner" too cowardly to appear in his real character and who emphasizes his cowardice by diverting attention from his own "sins" to the alleged and exaggerated misbehavior of others. Beyond a doubt you are familiar with this preacher. He was well described in Sinclair Lewis' Elmer Gantry—but he is also well known in his more intimate person to those who can observe him directly, who can give him a name, and who can also put a name to his hypocrisies and his stealthy betrayals of his own code of holiness and virtue and his blatant attacks upon the morals of other people. And, inasmuch as his own life is a continual and contemptible lie, this preacher of course does not hesitate to lie about others. He has indeed a perverted, degenerate joy in lying about others, in attacking others falsely and in spitting forth upon his audience the swill of swinish sermons about persons and behavior that are definitely outside the range of his own concerns as they are impossible of honest comprehension by him.

This preacher does not understand honorable, brave, intelligent, unashamed freedom of conduct. He understands only dishonorable "sin," linked with slinking notions of mendacious hypocrisy. Moreover, his very theological belief in "sin" (granting his low mentality rather than his honesty

MAN AND NATURE

A preacher says that religion is greater than science because it (religion) has placed man above the rest of nature. If that were all, the statement would be meaningless. For science recognizes the superiority of man, mentally and in some features of physical ingenuity (but not in strength), to other living things. Certain aspects of man's superiority are obvious; others we have learned in close detail only through the investigations of science. Moreover, science has shown clearly the resemblance between man and other animals. It has demonstrated fully one great truth, namely, man's kinship with nature.

There is, however, more to the preacher's statement. He says that religion has placed man above the rest of nature and has therefore been of greater importance than science by emphasizing the

"immortal soul" of man. But that "immortal soul" has been a dogma of religion and not a real contribution of religion. It is not a demonstrable quality of man or a demonstrable thing that man possesses, therefore it could not have anything to do with proving his superiority.

The greatness of man rests upon qualities and achievements which science and history reliably prove. Religion has not given man a soul. It has merely talked about a soul; and through that talk it has influenced man to many fears and vagaries that have been detrimental to his study and application of his actual superiority. The fiction of the soul has not inspired man to accomplish more in life; rather it has tended to make him place a low valuation, theoretically or theologially at least, upon life.

INTOLERANCE is intellectual cowardice.

Joseph McCabe's Ancient Great Men Series

A New Masterpiece, Just Off the Press, Contains 18 Stirring Chapters on 18 of the Greatest Creative Forces of Ancient History

Lovers of sound reading and scientific history will greet warmly the announcement that we have issued Joseph McCabe's Ancient Great Men Series, in 90,000 words, 18 magnificent chapters, in three beautiful volumes. The simplest argument will be the best. We need only list the chapter headings to convince intelligent readers that here is an historical and biographical work that cannot be passed over. Ancient Great Men Series contains the following:

COMPLETE CONTENTS OF McCABE'S "ANCIENT GREAT MEN SERIES"

- 1 Hammurabi of Babylon, the Pioneer of Law.
2 Confucius, the Sage of China.
3 Buddha, the Light of Asia.
4 Cyrus, the Great King of Persia.
5 Mencius, the Chinese Democrat.
6 Asoka, the Royal Apostle of Buddhism.
7 Thales, the Founder of Natural Philosophy.
8 Pericles, the Leader of Creative Athens.
9 Pheidias, the Inaugurator of Hellenistic Art.
10 Plato, the Philosopher and Sociologist.
11 Aristotle, the First Encyclopedist.
12 Zeno, the Founder of Stoicism.
13 Epicurus, the Apostle of Sanity.
14 Ptolemy, the Splendid Patron of Science.
15 Julius Caesar, the Genius of Rome.
16 The Emperor Hadrian, the Royal Epicurean.
17 Galen, the Pioneer of Medical Science.
18 Theodoros, the Splendid Geth.

THIS GREAT WORK COSTS YOU ONLY \$1—A REAL BARGAIN!

Here we find Joseph McCabe, the world's greatest scholar, at his best. In these 18 brilliant chapters, written to entertain as well as inform, McCabe makes a magnificent survey of genius in the ancient world, including China and India as well as Greece and Rome. This fine work was issued to sell at \$1.50, but we are now offering it at the bargain price of \$1. This work is printed on good paper, bound neatly in stiff covers, 5 1/2 by 8 1/2 inches.

McCABE'S "ANCIENT GREAT MEN SERIES" FOR ONLY \$1
Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas
Enclosed find \$1, which is payment in full for Joseph McCabe's Ancient Great Men Series, in three volumes, carriage charges prepaid.
Name Address
City State

Mistakes of Moses

Robert G. Ingersoll's Wit, Eloquence and Logic at Its Best—An Inimitable Summary and Criticism of the Bible Story of Creation

A glorious iconoclasm of merrily mingled laughter and logic—that is what the reader will find in Robert G. Ingersoll's famous attack upon the Bible story of creation and the fall of man, entitled delightfully *Some Mistakes of Moses*. Wit, lively and clear, sparkles in every line. Ingersoll races along with his subject. He is in his best form, full of the joy and vigor of reason in smashing images of

bunk. He is the very ideal of intellectual virility as he rips open the sainted shams and lands his light, quick and powerful blows at myths and superstitions: Fundamentalism, today so widespread among classes that are numerous and vociferous, had no greater opponent than Colonel Ingersoll; and his *Mistakes of Moses* remains the best answer to the Fundamentalists. Just look at the chapter headings in the box printed above and you will appreciate, in anticipation, the thoroughness and joyousness with which Ingersoll performs his mighty sham-smashing job. He didn't overlook a thing. It is all here—all the errors and absurdities and grotesqueries and cruelties of the Mosaic account; and all is exposed to Colonel Ingersoll's civilized humor and scorn and debunked by the illumination of reason and common sense and real history and science. It is well known that Ingersoll was far more familiar with the Bible than were his preacher opponents; and *Mistakes of Moses* proves remarkably how well Ingersoll knew the Bible and, with this equipment of knowledge supported by his general knowledge of history and thought, he was able to make the perfect criticism of the Book of the Bigots.

This is a large book, 5 1/2 by 8 1/2 inches in size, bound in stiff card covers, selling at only 75 cents a copy or 4 copies for \$2.

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

ORDER BLANK FOR MISTAKES OF MOSES

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas
I am enclosing \$..... for which send me, postpaid, copies of Robert G. Ingersoll's Some Mistakes of Moses. (75c a copy or 4 copies for \$2.)
Name Address
City State

In the World of Books

Weekly Reviews and Other Literary Ruminations
Isaac Goldberg

INITIATION

Growing Up. By Karl de Schweinitz. New York. The Macmillan Co. \$1.75.

There is a constant demand for books that shall instruct parents how, in turn, they are to instruct their children in the phenomena of sex. No further proof of our general failure need be had than this selfsame perplexity that haunts even the most enlightened fathers and mothers. The so-called "conspiracy of silence" has bred ignorance and neurotic collapse. Only the bigoted remnants of the various churches still adhere to its insane policy, and their very adherence is a symptom of the disease which they presumptuously pretend to cure or, worse still, whose existence they deny.

It is not only the bigoted who face the difficulties of same sexual instruction. Most parents, however well-meaning, and however emancipated from theological inhibitions, yet need a technique for the more modern methods of training the young in the understanding of that process by which they came to life.

Over-poetizing the issue often proves to be but a symbolic avenue of escape. It may turn out to be as much a boomerang as is the gutter-method or, again, the system of terrorization that is adopted by certain colleges. Too great refinement, in this case, may be as harmful, because as inadequate, as too great coarseness. Excessive delicacy in matters of sex may sometimes favor the development of a child into a personality with a homo-sexual trend. If one had to choose, one might be wiser to prefer coarseness to exquisiteness. That way, at least, health lies.

Growing Up is neither coarse nor anemically delicate. It does not invest the subject with an atmosphere of holiness or mystery; it avoids these errors, which excite the child by surrounding the topic with a special air. Instead, it has an interesting story to tell, and tells it very plainly as such. It even employs words that, ordinarily avoided or pronounced with a special emphasis, carry a connotation of disproportionate excitement.

The book is short. It consists of seven well-illustrated chapters. It is addressed to the child directly, and judging from the numerous testimonials that have accumulated since the two or more years when it was first published, it appeals to youngsters as early as their seventh year. One eleven-year-old boy said to his father: "Dad, every question I had in

mind has been answered by this book." Perhaps this is an exaggeration; or again, the child was exceptionally bright. Bertrand Russell tells us that his class of ten-year-old children went through the pamphlet forms of *Wells' Science of Life* with juvenile glee. Maybe children are getting brighter than they were in my day.

There can be no question, however, of the truth beneath these endorsements. No single book perhaps can serve all such purposes as these, but certainly in these hundred and eleven pages there is the distillation of voluminous experience.

The author begins with the simple tale of the egg and of the fertilizing agent. He speaks of flowers and fishes and fowls and animals, thus leading up to man. He does not suddenly become mealy-mouthed when he approaches the mammals. Indeed, he goes straight on without letting the child catch, from tutorial nervousness, any hint that he has stepped upon dangerous or forbidden territory.

A baby, he points out, spends nine months in the body of its mother. An elephant spends twenty months, while a mouse spends 20 days and is ready to reproduce within a month and a half of its birth. For straightforwardness, simplicity, clean scientific accuracy and effectiveness, I recommend the closing paragraphs of the chapter on Pollen and Sperm:

"The dog, the lion, the horse, the pig place their sperms in the body of the mother in much the same way that the rooster does, but the sperms instead of going through an opening as they do with the rooster pass from these animals through a little pipe or tube that is on the outside of the body. This little pipe or tube is called the penis. When the male animal sends the sperms to the female he seems to be trying to climb on to her back. As he does this the penis fits into an opening in her body. This is the opening of what we call the vagina, and it is through the vagina of the mother that the sperms go when they leave the father.

"While the sperms are still living in the male animal they stay in two oval-shaped places called testicles. The testicles are held in a little bag outside the body and under the penis. It is also through the penis that the urine or waste water passes.

"The sperms of men, like those of the four-legged animals, live in two testicles in a little bag under the penis. The father places the sperms in the body of the mother in very much the same way that the four-legged animals do, only the mother and father can lie together facing each other. The penis then fits into the vagina of the mother which has its own opening underneath the opening for the urine or waste water.

"When the sperms leave the father they are in a liquid, called

semen, that is a little thicker than milk and that looks something like milk. The sperms are so tiny that hundreds of them can live in one drop of semen.

"As soon as the semen has entered the mother the sperms start swimming toward the egg as it comes from the ovary. The sperm that meets the egg joins it and together the sperm and the egg start growing to be a baby.

"This is the way that you began your life. The egg was not you and the sperm was not you. It was when they came together that you became alive. People everywhere begin their lives in this way. Like the fish and the birds and the beasts, we all start to be ourselves when the sperm joins the egg."

Only sick people, it seems to me, could take offense at such healthful simplicity, and it is just such sick people who have perpetuated that mental illness which characterizes our more active censors. Mr. De Schweinitz has done intelligent living and loving a service and his greatest reward should be the wide dissemination of his book. Already it is in its fifteenth printing and promises to become a classic in its genre.

SMILING STUPIDITIES

Boners. By Those Who Pulled Them. Compiled by Alexander Abingdon and illustrated by Dr. Seuss. N. Y. The Viking Press. \$1.

My own interest in boners began when I pulled a terrible one in High School. I had not studied the home lesson dealing with one of Milton's poems. I was quite sleepy during the examination. My answers were mechanical and utterly unrelated to the text at hand. So, when I saw the phrase "unlettered hind" (ignorant human herd) I promptly and confidently explained it as "unbranded cattle." Very properly I got the laugh and I have been careful ever since. Nevertheless, howlers will creep into the best of brains and I am quite sure that a book of boners could be compiled from exclusively standard sources.

Some of the boners in this collection wear a manufactured air. I can believe of no student that he would seriously write "geometry teaches us to bisect angels." However, most of the wild statements in these hundred and two pages bear the imprint of youthful wisdom. Here are a few samples:

"Louis XVI was gelatinized during the French Revolution."

"Queen Victoria was the longest queen on the throne."

"A lot of Englishmen were shut up in the black hole of Calcutta with one small widow. Only four got out alive."

"Poetry is when every line begins with a capital letter."

"Nearly at the bottom of Lake Michigan is Chicago."

"The inhabitants of Moscow are called Mosquitoes."

And, of course, that hoary one: "Homer was not written by Homer but by another man of that name."

THE FINAL BALANCE

The Autobiography of a Philosopher. By George Herbert Palmer. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Co. \$1.75.

Anyone who has been graduated from Harvard during the past few decades, even if he did not study directly under Palmer, usually came within the radius of his influence. He was christened after a noted poet whose works he later edited. One of his wives, Alice Freeman Palmer, became the first president of Radcliffe; he wrote her biography, and it is a salient document. Now Palmer himself, nearing ninety, gives us a too brief account of a life that has been devoted almost in its entirety to philosophy and scholarship.

Palmer came of bad physiological sources; spinal and cardiac weakness ran in his family; he was ill-built physically and for the first forty years suffered torture from headache. Yet care and perseverance triumphed over these handicaps until, at a time when most of humanity has achieved resignation to the ills of the flesh and the plagues of the mind, he had acquired poise of body and psyche.

One is surprised and at the same time pleased to learn that Palmer's prose translation of the *Odyssey*, made many years ago, has sold as many as 40,000 copies yearly even as late as the 1930s. When Palmer started as a teacher the various college curricula were not only under the heavy hand of theology but from any truly educational standpoint beneath serious consideration. He did much pioneer work in forming and reforming the philosophic courses.

Fire for Heretics, Threat of Spanish Mob of Catholics Led by Priest

A shocking illustration of the real spirit of Catholicism is given in a dispatch from the Reuter press agency to the London Daily Herald, under date of January 21, 1931. The dispatch follows:

A number of evangelists in Spain have had a narrow escape from being burnt as "heretics."

While the evangelists, among whom was a Scotsman named F. Gorban, were holding a meeting in a village inn near Almagro they heard a tremendous noise accompanied by the loud clanging of a church bell.

It was discovered that, headed by the local priest, the villagers had assembled en masse and were declaiming against the mission, threatening to put its members to death and to burn the inn unless the inn-keeper ordered them away.

The mayor of the village finally arrived with civil guards and prevented the furious crowd from dealing summarily with the "heretics."

"Death to heretics" is still the principle of Roman Catholic church law, which only lack of power prevents Rome from applying. That the Pope sympathizes in spirit with this priest-led Spanish mob is revealed by the arrogantly bigoted tone of his recent encyclicals and by his recent protests to Mussolini against "excessive liberty" enjoyed by Protestant missionaries in Rome. Catholicism is medievalism.

His ninth decade finds him well adjusted to the universe and as happy as man can be before the Sophoclean fate descends upon him. The proof of the philosophic pudding, we may conclude, is in the eating. But the eating in turn depends upon one's personal digestion. Philosophy is not so objective as some philosophers would deceive themselves into believing.

Thus, at the end of this book, I found myself thinking of a sentence from Walter Bagehot's *Physics and Politics*: "The greatest sage soon shares the opinion of the party with which he votes and the sect with which he worships." Palmer delivers himself at last into the arms of Jesus. . . . Once again, then, we find it possible to admire a personality without sharing in the least his beliefs.

OPEN MIND

Macmillan recently published a symposium entitled *Why I Am and Why I Am Not a Catholic*. (It sells for \$2, if you are interested; I am not.) A friend sends me the review of the book that appeared in the news letter sent out every month by The Catholic Book Club. Let me quote it without any other comment than italicization:

"It is the opinion of this writer that such a symposium as this is not the best kind of a book. *Truth and heresy do not make good book-companions*, especially when both are urged with high seriousness. A Catholic would naturally wish to buy a collection containing answers to the question: 'Why Am I a Catholic?' by Belloc, Sheila Kaye-Smith, Ronald Knox, C. C. Martindale, S. J. and others; but would he wish to be forced to buy, at the same time, the essays containing the reasons why other people, in whom he is not much interested, are not Catholics? *And if he was curious, would he be free to read them?* The writer has his definite opinion."

Come to think of it, I'll add one comment: the writer has not his definite opinion. It is an opinion that he has been ordered to have. Very evidently—nor can we become excited over it—the Catholic Book Club is a very minor branch of the Index Expurgatorius.

If KILLING murderers prevented murderers from killing, the crime of murder should have disappeared from human annals long ago. The truth is that education and improved social conditions are the only sound, permanent remedies for great social evils. It may be difficult to foresee a time when murders that spring from passionate impulses will not occur; but murders that spring from a bad environment, as so many do, can be stopped by providing a thoroughly civilized environment for all; and, on second thought, could not most murders of passion be described truly as springing from a bad environment?

Assurance
Trading in the Stock Market
How this is best obtained and how you can trade in 100 shares of stock for \$225 to \$250 is explained in our free booklet.
PAUL KAYE 11 W. 42nd St., New York City

Want to Invest in a National
Friendship Club
For Ladies of Civilization
Big List of Descriptions (FREE) Sent for One American Friendship Society
Dept. 22 Detroit, Mich.

HOOPER "SENSIBILITY"

In firmly opposing a government contribution of \$25,000,000 to the Red Cross for the relief of starving Americans who are unemployed through no fault of their own, Herbert Hoover expressed a broad, philosophic and tender-minded concern that the American people should not lose their "sensitivity to suffering." That was the substance of the Hoover message, and it was in those words that the Kansas City Star interpreted the presidential utterance.

The point immediately raised, in the mind of a sensible person, is whether sensibility to suffering is worth preserving at the price of perpetual suffering. It may also be suggested that a government which would absolutely prevent suffering, and a people who would insist that their government continuously maintain security and comfort among its citizens, would be obviously giving proof of a sensibility to suffering which was completely genuine and effective. Is sensibility to suffering indicated and is such sensibility strengthened and purified, in some mystical fashion, by watching the suffering of millions, and failing to remedy that suffering to the last degree? Nobody would be so stupid as to maintain that this is true. Yet it is essentially the idea that President Hoover has announced and laid solemn stress upon in resisting the humanitarian efforts to obtain extensive, immediate and ample government relief for the victims of Hooverism. In effect, Hoover says preposterously that sensibility to suffering is more truly signified in leaving that suffering to the chances of chaotic and uncertain relief—in doing far less than enough to stop the suffering—than in a tremendous program of government aid.

Local governments, says Hoover, should be responsible for the suffering in their jurisdiction. Then a logical case could be made against contributing to the Red Cross, because that is a national organization and interferes with individual and local initiative (so much praised by Hoover) and tends to undermine sensibility to suffering. It might just as logically be argued that even local governments are exceeding their responsibilities and depriving their citizens of sensibility by practicing relief measures.

It is, plainly enough, a question of whether relief should be organized or disorganized; whether it should be certain or uncertain; whether it should be prompt and complete or halting and inadequate. It is also a question of whether government, local and federal, is to be held responsible for the welfare of its citizens. Government relief of suffering on a national scale would be the very broadest and most efficient and therefore humanitarian form of relief. Those who really do have a sensibility to suffering would not quibble nor confuse the issue: government relief being the most certain and immense relief, it would follow in a sensitive and sensible view that government relief should be applied without further delay.

Following Hoover's style of reasoning, we might say that governments should not attempt to preserve the peace—because it is more important to preserve mankind's sensibility to the horrors of war.

The ideal of wealth and happiness for all is an insensitive ideal—because the greater value lies in preserving a heritage of sensibility to poverty and unhappiness. Knowledge should not be cul-

tivated and the arts should not adorn our social life—because it would be so beautiful to preserve our sensibility to the effects of ignorance and a cultureless, inartistic, unbeautified world.

Medical science and social sanitation should not be encouraged—because we should do so much better to preserve our sensibility to disease.

That is Hoover logic. That is the message of Hooverism to the American people. Unquestionably the man belongs in the White House, which has sheltered such a shameful succession of stupidities.

NAILING ANOTHER LIE

Our readers will readily recall what a howl was raised some months ago about the alleged disastrous effect of Russian "dumping" upon economic welfare in the United States. A very ordinary wheat deal by the Russian government was exaggerated to panicky proportions by Secretary of Agriculture Hyde; and Secretary Hyde and other Republican politicians, who were more interested in political bunk than in economic accuracy, harped persistently upon the said-to-be-alarming theme of Russian attacks upon American business. The purpose of this outcry was to suggest another alibi for the Hoover administration: we were being deluged with a vast flood of cheap Russian goods, it was said, and that accounted in great part for our business depression.

Now the figures of Russian and American trade in 1930 are given by the Department of Commerce; and these figures show that the cry of Russian "dumping" was dishonest in the extreme. In 1929 the United States purchased goods from Russia to the amount of \$21,520,000; in 1930 this country bought \$21,963,000 worth of goods from Russia. The difference of \$443,000 can hardly be described as "dumping." In contrast, American goods in the amount of \$81,500,000 were sold to Russia in 1929; and \$111,300,000 worth of American products were sold to Russia in 1930. These figures show how much more extensively Russia buys from America than it sells to America. We see that instead of Russian "dumping" there has been a considerable increase of Russian purchases from America; and so another political alibi of Hooverism turns out to have been merely a lie.

A PREACHER, trying unsuccessfully and indeed very awkwardly to reconcile the idea of a God with the problem of evil, says that God's will is unlimited in all non-human things; but that when confronting human will, the will of God is limited and is repeatedly beaten. This is to say, of course, that man is greater than God. It is just another reminder of the fog in which theology loses itself.

PATRIOTS AND "FOOLS"

This is not our juxtaposition of terms. The credit goes to Adolph Ochs, publisher of the New York Times, who recently said in an interview in Hawaii that the proposal of a soldiers' bonus (or increased loans on soldiers' insurance certificates) was unsound because, among other things, "A fool and his money are soon parted." Just think back a little. In 1917 and 1918 Mr. Ochs was using his powerful paper to whoop up enthusiasm for the war. An essential feature of that campaign was to refer touchingly to the American soldiers as heroes and patriots. They were, said Ochs' New York Times, nobly sacrificing all in a sublime cause. They were, declared Ochs' New York Times, bravely and of course intelligently devoted to the crusade for righteousness led by the Allied statesmen and by Woodrow Wilson. The fools then, according to Ochs' New York Times, were those who stood apart from the insanity of war and held fast to the civilized ideas of peace. The fools then, said Ochs' New York Times, were those who exposed the war aims as hypocritical and who perceived steadily the sordidness which underlay the terrible international struggle.

But now, a dozen years later, Mr. Ochs says that the World War heroes of 1917-18 are "fools." The questions one naturally asks are: Were these heroes "fools" at the time when Mr. Ochs and other journalists were eulogizing them for their nobility and heroism and intelligent defense of the right? Or have these heroes degenerated since the war and, once so grand and true, become "fools" in the years between? Or has Mr. Ochs been gifted, during these years, with a clearer and disillusioned vision of the mentality of the soldier boys who fought the war quite faithfully in accordance with the aims of the New York Times?

"A fool and his money are soon parted." This is what Mr. Ochs says today, referring to the World War veterans. Is it possible that Mr. Ochs means that he has contempt for men who would permit themselves to be led, inveigled or driven to the trenches by the New York Times kind of propaganda? Anyway, it is interesting to know that Mr. Ochs is on record as saying that the heroes who believed the propaganda of Woodrow Wilson and the New York Times in 1917-1918 are (and were?) "fools." Let Mr. Ochs or one of his New York Times editors explain.

WE BELIEVE that true morality is a matter of social progress, and the civilized reconciliation of many diverse tastes, rather than a matter of tyrannically imposing laws upon men to dictate their personal habits. When an action has no marked nor important social consequences, it should be left to personal taste.

Exposure of Hoover Before and After He Became President

Our readers will be glad to have, in compact and readily usable form, the complete record of Herbert Hoover. Five books tell the story of Hoover. There is L. M. Birkhead's book on *President Hoover and Quakerism*; Heinz Norden's book on *Herbert Hoover—the Man*; and three books by E. Haldeman-Julius, namely *Herbert Hoover—the Futuous Failure in the White House*, *Hoover's Record As President* and *Hoover's Record Before He Was President*.

A full-length critical analysis, like nothing that has ever been written about a President during his term of office, is contained in these books, especially in the three books by Mr. Haldeman-Julius. These three are naturally of most piquant interest, as they expose the failure of Hoover as President, debunk his ideas about politics and economics and—most sensational of all—tell the true story of how Herbert Hoover made millions and what was the real character and conduct of the man.

All together, these five books constitute an excellent list, for reading and reference and propaganda, of realistic as opposed to eulogistic and mythical studies of Hoover and of Hooverism. These five books may be said to comprise a sort of who's who and what's what of Hooverism.

In this special set of five books you have the story of the Chinese swindle in which Hoover was a leading agent thirty years ago—the story of Hoover's career as a Great Promoter (not a Great Engineer)—and the story of Hoover's disgraceful failure in the White House. Only 25 cents for this set of five books, all about Herbert Hoover.

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS

ORDER BLANK FOR FIVE BOOKS EXPOSING HOOVER
Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas
I am enclosing 25 cents, for which send me, postpaid, the set of five books giving the complete record of Herbert Hoover.
Name
Address
City State

On Liberty--A Vital, Liberal Classic

John Stuart Mill, Great English Rationalist of the Middle Nineteenth Century, Discussed with Classic Brilliance and Uncompromising Earnestness and Truth the Whole Subject of Freedom of Thought and Speech—Today His Masterly Work, ON LIBERTY, Remains the Ablest Statement of the Rights of Liberty and the Need of Free Intelligence in the Work of Social Progress—No Liberal Thinker Should Be Without This Splendid Masterpiece on the Rights of Man.

This is another important item in the Haldeman-Julius program of republishing in popular form the great classics of free thought, humanism and liberty—and this book may be said to be of key importance, a fundamental and definitive item in this program, inasmuch as it explains fully the philosophy of free thought and free speech. Mill wrote his *On Liberty* in a simple and eloquent language, in which a devotion to the rights of man shines forth and attracts the reader in unison with a power and precision of reasoning which are irresistible. There has never been such a clear statement of the rights of the individual, of the rights of minorities, and of the limitations upon the activity of states in controlling the behavior of their citizens. Mill shows what is the perfect balance, in right and reason, between the interests of society and the rights of the individual. He exposes the fallacies of the bigots and shows the kind of false philosophy and self-interest and prejudice which compose the groundwork and the entire meaning of intolerance. This rare tribute can be paid to Mill's *On Liberty*: that it leaves nothing to be said on its subject, but is at once the most thorough analysis of intolerance and the most convincing, complete defense of free thought and free speech.

This great classic of liberty is published in popular form—a large book, bound in stiff card covers, 8 1/2 by 5 1/2 inches in size, 45,000 words, priced at only 50 cents a copy or 5 copies for \$2.

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

ORDER BLANK FOR ON LIBERTY
Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas
I am enclosing \$..... for which send me, postpaid, copies of John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty*. (50 cents a copy or 5 copies for \$2.)
Name
Address
City State

"Patriotism" and Politics

Congress, which has had difficulty in agreeing on other relief measures, rushed through with a minimum of delay and debate the bill to increase to fifty percent the amount that can be borrowed by World War veterans on their government insurance certificates. These certificates were issued in 1924 by the government as an additional compensation or bonus to the soldiers; and the loans now increased are to be supplied by the government.

There are several objections to this legislation. It means of course the paying out of huge sums to a large number of World War veterans who are not in need, men who are self-supporting, men even who are considerably above the average level of prosperity. Lawyers, doctors, business executives and other well-to-do ex-soldiers who are making extraordinarily good incomes will be entitled to draw from this relief fund. This is not therefore entirely a genuine relief measure; it deserves the title only insofar as it applies to the minority of veterans who are actually in need.

Then, again, this is obviously legislation in favor of a restricted class. In this crisis the whole people should be considered. General relief measures should be adopted. The real duty of the government, as we have repeatedly insisted, is to do what private industry has failed to do; namely, run the factories and supply the people with work so that they can support themselves (as they are perfectly willing, indeed eager, to do). With the money that will be required to dispense this so-called relief, which for most of the veterans is not genuine, needed relief, a system of unemployment insurance could be established which would be of lasting economic value to all of the workers.

It is certainly not right that in a time of general suffering such favored legislation should be given to a special class. World War veterans who are really in need deserve relief as much as other workers and no more. But the ex-soldiers' bill was "patriotic" legislation and the politicians in Congress hustled one another for conspicuous places on the band wagon. "Patriotism" is always a good campaign slogan. Congressmen voted for the inaccurately named veterans' relief; and they will in turn appeal for the grateful votes of the veterans.

In his opposition to the bill, Hoover has been correct but not from motives that we can admire. He is against any adequate relief for the people. He opposed the contribution by the government of \$25,000,000 to the Red Cross for general relief. He opposed the granting of loans to farmers that they might buy food for themselves, insisting that only food for animals and seed for the next crop should be bought with such loans. He has objected to any program of important government relief for the unemployed workers in the cities. In short, Hoover's objection to the veterans' bill is derived from an unwillingness that the government should help any of the people; it is dictated not by a policy of high-principled belief in relief and equal justice for all, but by a policy of government refusal to deal adequately with this crisis.

The argument in popular use, that the veterans sacrificed their economic welfare and endangered their lives for the country and that now they should have their reward, has obvious and serious faults. Millions of dollars have already been given to the soldiers, by the federal government and by the state governments. This plea of rewarding the veterans becomes, after a time, a mere political slogan and an excuse for a vast scheme of favoritism (or a succession of such schemes) based upon an appeal which is nationally dangerous: namely, the appeal of patriotism, which includes necessarily the appeal of militarism, and which is linked with the self-seeking appeal of politics.

Undoubtedly a monstrous injustice was done to the soldiers when they were forced into the army, when they were bound helplessly to the war machine, and when they were forced to work and fight in the service of special interests of imperialism rather than the alleged national safety (for America never was in danger). It must be remembered, however, that many of the soldiers reached out willing, even eager, arms to embrace this injustice; that they easily were enthused into becoming loud patriots and believers in the war, helping to crush down

the sentiments of peace and real national welfare.

But the great injustice of the war will not be remedied by granting endless bonuses, compensations and special favors to the veterans. The remedy for that injustice is to use constructive efforts for the abolition of the evil principle of war and the principle of belligerent, narrowly national patriotism upon which it is based and still more the exploitive, competitive private interests of capitalism which lead to the supreme tragedy of war. And plainly one of the most serious obstacles to progress for peace is a large body of war veterans successfully maintaining a tradition of narrow patriotism and a policy of favoritism with a patriotic, flag-waving and militaristic spirit which confuses and indeed corrupts the real and greater issues of national welfare.

We are for equal justice, and no more, to the war veterans as workers and citizens; but we are not for special favors to them as a militaristic class. The best reward that can be given to the ex-soldiers, as to all others, is that of economic justice and full social opportunity in a peaceful, progressive world.

CATHOLICS AND TAXES

It seems palpably and undeniably fair that churches should pay taxes—that, in other words, the state should not contribute in any way to the propaganda of religion. What arguments can be adduced in favor of church tax exemption? The following, written by a Catholic in the New York Telegram, is an example:

In Greater New York [the Catholic church] has built four or five hundred schools to teach some 150,000 children, without any help from the city or state, provided textbooks, maintained the schools at a high standard, built homes for working girls, clubs for boys, homes for aged men and women, hospitals (two in Jamaica) where at least twenty-five percent of the cases are charity cases, orphan asylums and day nurseries to care for the widows' children while she is working, and all of this branches out from the church (the hub), for the church is the foundation of all the good work accomplished by its various branches.

The Catholic family is taxed twice, once for the public schools and then for the building and maintenance of the parochial schools.

It is quite ridiculous to argue that Catholic schools furnish a reason for tax exemption. These schools are obviously maintained for the purposes of priestly propaganda. There is no necessity for Catholicism to maintain schools. Catholic children are welcome in the public schools. They will receive in those schools a very adequate education. What they will not receive is education in Catholic superstition; and it is to supply this kind of education, very improperly so-called, that the Catholic church keeps up its parochial schools.

It cannot be said that any Catholic family is taxed for these parochial schools. They voluntarily contribute to these superstition mills; if they are so foolish as to part with their money for this sort of thing, they cannot reasonably invoke it as a virtue and claim consideration from the state for their private, religious expenditures.

The homes for working girls, clubs for boys, and similar social centers must likewise be regarded as propaganda institutions for Catholicism. Exempting such institutions from taxation is equivalent to the support of Catholic superstition by the state; and this is intolerable.

A better argument, obviously, can be made for the exemption of genuine charitable institutions, insofar as they are charitable. For instance, if a Catholic hospital has charity cases to the extent of 25 percent, then we might agree that it should be exempted from taxation to the extent of twenty-five percent. This would leave the greater part of Catholic church property fairly and fully taxable.

We shall of course add our conviction that it is a wrong and dangerous principle for charity to be left in the hands of private agencies, religious or otherwise. In fact, the idea of charity is wrong; we should have in its place a broad conception of social justice. It is the duty of the state to provide for its citizens and to secure them employment, decent conditions of living and insurance against accidents, sickness and old age. European nations follow this policy to a remarkable degree. It is the shame of the United States that we do not.

But the fact remains that char-

ity is a minor feature of the activities of the Catholic church. The greater part of its activities are of a propagand nature. It is unjust that they should be exempted from taxation.

BUT AREN'T WE ALL?

A letter from Dr. Robert H. MacNair, Kansas City, to whom we paid courteously our compliments in the last issue of The Freeman, again illustrates the queer thinking that goes on in the fantastic inner crevices of orthodox brains. We are apt to forget how childish these people are in their attempts at reasoning; so now and then a reminder is not amiss. Dr. MacNair actually argues against our conception of free speech by citing analogies in men's belief in freedom to get drunk, to murder and to rob. Now, really, should that sort of thing be dignified by a deliberate reply? Joseph McCabe says that he could have packed a great deal more proof into *The True Story of the Roman Catholic Church*—but that any reader who is unconvinced by the immense proof that he has packed into that twelve-volume work would not be convinced by any amount of proof. Similarly, we must remark that any reader who could not, unaided, see the absurdity of Dr. MacNair's comparisons would not be enlightened by any comment of ours. It is obvious. Intellectually speaking, the doctor has been guilty of a pitiable extreme of "indecent exposure."

This defender of what he thinks is Americanism (and if he is right, so much the worse for Americanism) says that he is very suspicious of E. Haldeman-Julius' ancestry: he is probably, says the doctor, "an alien or descended from same." Isn't that an amusing coincidence? It happens that the doctor's name reminds us of things alien. MacNair—that doesn't sound truly, genuinely American. Scotch? Probably that's it. It is beyond a doubt that Dr. MacNair need only turn back a few generations to perceive his own connection with and descent from aliens. The same is true of all inhabitants of this country excepting the Indians. A very small minority of American citizens can trace their ancestry back to three hundred years on American soil; none can go farther back without jumping the ocean and landing on the alien soil of the British Isles or Europe; and most of them—does this include Dr. MacNair?—are more recently descended from aliens.

This truth reappears: whatever pride or advantage there may be in identifying oneself as an American, it does not include necessarily the ability to reason sensibly.

INGERSOLL'S DEATH

A reader of The Freeman asks that we state the facts concerning the death of Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll and his alleged recantation of his agnosticism when dying. This lie is still repeated, it seems, by ignorant or unscrupulous evangelists and in the lowest type of religious literature. The lie is sufficiently refuted by the fact that Colonel Ingersoll died suddenly, as the result of an apoplectic stroke, and therefore could not possibly have changed his views "on his deathbed" even had he wished to do so.

When this story was spread abroad after Ingersoll's death—invented deliberately by liars for the glory of religious propaganda—it was explicitly and completely denied by Mrs. Ingersoll. The ideas of the great agnostic did not change. He was not a coward nor did he become weak-minded in his last years. Until the day of his death he remained true to the convictions of a lifetime. And, as we say, his sudden death would have made a recantation impossible.

It is a contemptible type of person, however, who will circulate such a story; if he circulates such a story ignorantly, believing in its truth, he exhibits an inability, which is mentally most wretched, to appreciate the sincere and fearless character of freethinkers. This story does not dishonor Ingersoll, as it is too silly and too easily disproved; but it dishonors those who repeat it, some of them knowing it to be false and others evidently not caring to investigate the accuracy of a story which therefore they repeat unscrupulously.

It should be interesting to find another man in disagreement with one's ideas—granting, to be sure, that the other man's disagreement is expressed intelligently and tolerantly.

BONES AND LEGEND

An example of carelessness or worse in putting forward a friendly word for a religious legend is seen in a news item from Rome printed in the New York World. Digging the foundations of new buildings in Vatican City, ancient Roman graves and the bones of pagans long forgotten and now of course unidentified were discovered—so the story goes. But the headline says, "Tradition of Peter's Crucifixion Supported," and the last paragraph of the story says: "The discovery is thought to account for Peter's burial in the Vatican Hill, where tradition says he was crucified head downward and where the first basilica was erected in his name. It is regarded as supporting the popular tradition as to his burial place."

One of the most useful and wholly false legends of the Roman Catholic church is that the Apostle Peter founded that church in Rome and was martyred in Rome. Absolutely no evidence exists in support of this claim. It is merely a tradition; or, worse, a fabrication by ancient Catholic impostors in support of their authority. Obviously this discovery of a graveyard and of unknown bones under Vatican City does not lend the least support to that "popular tradition" or that priestly fabrication of Peter's presence and martyrdom in Rome.

But religious legends are dealt with favorably by a "respectable" press which is not too scrupulous in its attitude toward truth. This hollow piece of bunk should, however, deceive no one.

BILLY SUNDAY AGAIN

We are amused—and at the same time we are disgusted—by the report of a Billy Sunday sermon in which the clown-evangelist is quoted as yawning about "the futility of seeking after worldly things. The best things in life are not made with hands, nor can they be bought with money, he said, insisting that no one can buy his way into Heaven." This is amusing, because it is so notoriously insincere. Billy Sunday has made a fortune out of his obscene evangelism. He is the last man who can consistently condemn the seeking after worldly things.

And such a statement, coming from such a source, is of course disgusting for the sheer brazen hypocrisy that it displays. But greedy persons and persistent seekers after material rewards, such as Billy Sunday, are apt to be eloquent in denouncing materialism. It is supposed to be the proper line for preachers. Do many of their followers really swallow this nonsense without gagging? Or do they sometimes reflect on the incongruity, the sickening cant, involved in a denunciation of materialism and worldly goods by a preacher who is out for all the lucre he can grab?

And pardon us, dear readers, if we seem to have taken Billy Sunday too seriously. Low as he is, he can at least furnish us with a lesson in hypocrisy.

"WE MUST defend the civilization of the plow," says "Alfalfa Bill" Murray, Democratic governor of Oklahoma. It seems that "Alfalfa Bill," true to his name, lives reminiscently in the days of agricultural simplicity and primitive field-and-cabin economics. He speaks not only for the civilization of the plow but that of the horse and buggy and the kerosene lamp and the wood stove and homespun clothes and rural isolation. Realistically, we must solve today the problems of the civilization of the tractor, of great electrical machinery, of large-scale operations on farms and in factories. The farmers, like other workers, must look to the collective rather than the individualistic solution of their problems.

THE BELIEVER in free will should demonstrate the soundness of his theory by willing triumphantly to be rich or to be wise or to be happy. We can, it is true, seek these and other qualities or conditions more or less intelligently, more or less successfully; we can make good use of circumstances when circumstances are favorable, including the circumstances of our judgment in making use of circumstances; but none of us can illustrate the operations of a perfect will superior to circumstances.

WHEN an earthquake occurred recently in Oaxaca, Mexico, the roof of the church building fell and fifty-one worshippers were killed. This ought to furnish preachers with the material for sermons on "The Wrath of God" and "A Warning to Sinners."

The Story of the Human Race A Biographical History of the World

By Henry Thomas, Ph. D.

Advance Orders for Pre-Publication Bargain Offer Now Accepted—Orders Placed Now, While this Great Masterpiece is Being Printed, Will Enjoy Special Bargain Price of \$1.50; the Regular Price Will Be \$3

We are hard at work printing and binding a new work from the pen of Henry Thomas, Ph.D., an author who will most certainly make countless thousands of enthusiastic friends among Haldeman-Julius readers. The title is *The Story of the Human Race*. This gigantic work of scholarship, written in popular style for the masses instead of the dull pedants, contains 150,000 words, in five charming, entertaining and instructive books. This historical and biographical production is being printed on a good grade of paper, bound in attractive, artistic, stiff covers, 5½ by 8½ inches.

Persons who order this magnificent work after it is ready for distribution will have to pay \$3, but those who place their order NOW need pay only \$1.50, a rare bargain and a real opportunity to be among the very first to read this new and significant work as soon as it is ready for mailing. You will save \$1.50 and assure yourself the pleasure of being ahead of the ordinary readers!

Says the author, Henry Thomas, Ph.D., who has finished reading the final proofs, "I have aimed at two things above all—honesty and simplicity. I have tried in this series of books to tell the truth about human history, and to present it in such a manner that the ordinary reader will get at my meaning with the least amount of effort on his part. I have tried to make the style vivid, forceful, epigrammatic, interesting, and above all, absolutely simple. I do not believe in writing a book for the admiration of the pundits. I believe in writing it for the understanding of the masses.

"In the treatment of my historical characters I have tried to follow the advice of Spinoza—not to criticize, execrate, or condemn, but to understand. I have tried to show the good side of the so-called bad men and the shady side of the so-called saints. I have no quarrel with men, but I have a very decided quarrel with some of their ideas. You will note that I have handled with no silk gloves the two most inexcusable crimes of history—religion and war."

Here Are the Contents of These Five Tremendous Books by Henry Thomas, Ph. D.

- Book 1. The Childhood of the Human Race. (The Story of the Early Fighters, Priests and Prophets.)**
- 1 A Brief Survey of Early History.
 - 2 Moses, the Prince Who Became a Rebel.
 - 3 Jeremiah, the First Pacifist in History.
 - 4 Buddha, the Atheist Who Became a God.
 - 5 Confucius, the Spiritual Godfather of Christ.
 - 6 Cyrus, Who Built an Empire and Destroyed a Civilization.
 - 7 Pericles, the Popular Democrat of Athens.
 - 8 Plato, Who Dreamed of a Better World.
- Book 2. The Parade of the Sword and the Cross. (A Catalogue of Kings, Philosophers, Quakers and Cut-throats.)**
- 1 Alexander, Who Tried to Divide the World between God and Himself.
 - 2 Epicurus, the Smiling Pessimist.
 - 3 Hannibal, the Carthaginian Prince of Hatred.
 - 4 Cato, the Champion Hypocrite of the World.
 - 5 Caesar, the Man Who Tried to Become a God.
 - 6 Jesus, the Jewish Vagabond of Nazareth.
 - 7 Nero, the Emperor Who Murdered His Mother.
 - 8 Marcus Aurelius, the Emperor-Philosopher.
 - 9 Constantine the Great, Who Murdered His Son and Became a Christian.
 - 10 Mohammed, the Prophet of the Sword.
- Book 3. The Savagery of the Middle Ages. (A Book of Holy Crusades and Religious Massacres.)**
- 1 Charlemagne, Who Rescued a Pope and Became an Emperor.
 - 2 Peter the Hermit, Who Slaughtered the Jews for the Love of Jesus.
 - 3 Saint Francis of Assisi, a Catholic Anarchist.
- Book 4. The Awakening of Humanity. (Man Gradually Lifts the Fogs of Obscurantism.)**
- 1 Martin Luther, the Peasant Who Defied the Pope.
 - 2 Machiavelli, the Devil's Disciple.
 - 3 Shakespeare, the Creator of a New World.
 - 4 Louis XIV, Most Famous of the French Kings.
 - 5 George Fox, an Aggressive Fighter for Peace.
 - 6 Spinoza, the Quiet Little Jew of Amsterdam.
 - 7 Voltaire, the "Black Sheep" of the Human Family.
 - 8 Napoleon, Who Conquered the World and Died in Exile.
- Book 5. The Beginning of Real Civilization. (Estimates of Goethe, Mazzini, Marx, Bismarck, Darwin, Lincoln, Tolstoy, Emperor William II, Lenin and Gandhi.)**
- 1 Goethe—There Goes a Man!
 - 2 Mazzini, Italian Prophet of a United Europe.
 - 3 Karl Marx, the Father of Socialism.
 - 4 Bismarck, the Backward-Looking Chancellor of Prussia.
 - 5 Charles Darwin, Who Introduced Us to Our Ancestors.
 - 6 Abraham Lincoln, the Savior of the Black Race.
 - 7 Tolstoy, Prophet of a World Without Hate.
 - 8 Emperor William II, Last of the Kaisers.
 - 9 Lenin and Gandhi, the Fore-Runners of a New Age.

"The Story of the Human Race" is a Liberal Education

The above gives you only the merest hint of the contents of this gigantic historical and biographical work, for all through this massive library of 150,000 words will be found literally thousands of references to historical events and characters who contributed either to the advancement of the race or its retardation.

The Story of the Human Race is a liberal education, the equal of a fine university course. We are proud to have exclusive publishing rights to this vital expression of sound scholarship. We are hurrying production and plan to have the entire work ready in the very near future. There will be no delay. Everything will be done to make delivery as soon as possible. And by getting your name down for a set in advance of publication you will save some real money and have the satisfaction of knowing that you will be among the first to study the story of the human race's colorful and dramatic history.

Send only \$1.50 today—that is all. There will be no further charges. When the books are ready, which will be real soon, the set will be shipped carriage charges prepaid by us. Your payment of \$1.50 today will be your first and last payment. If you delay sending your order we will be forced to make you pay twice this amount—\$3. We are sure many thousands of sets will be sold later on at \$3, for this great, original, exclusive work is easily worth far more than \$3. But why pay \$3 when here is your chance to become the owner of a set at half-price—only \$1.50? Do the sensible thing—save money and be among the early readers by sending your order in NOW while we are printing this set. Please use the order blank below.

Send Me "The Story of the Human Race" at Pre-Publication Bargain Rate of \$1.50

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I want a complete set of Henry Thomas' *The Story of the Human Race*, which is now on your presses and will soon be ready for distribution. In view of the fact that I am sending you my order NOW I am enclosing only \$1.50, which is payment in full for a complete set of this new set of books. You are to prepay all carriage charges. I am aware that the regular price will be \$3, but I want to put in my order in ADVANCE so I am sending only \$1.50 as full payment.

Name Address

City State