

E. Haldeman-Julius in Letter Presents Specific Review of Free Speech and The Debunker to Canada Censor

Upon receiving official notice from the Canadian customs department that The Debunker, a Haldeman-Julius monthly publication, had been forbidden the Canadian mails, E. Haldeman-Julius wrote to ask that the matter be reconsidered. He was, he said, quite in the dark as to the particulars in which The Debunker had offended, or as to who exactly had been offended. In general, of course, he could understand how The Debunker was regarded by intolerant authorities as an offensive publication; but the case should be discussed clearly; reasons should be given, offenses specified and proved—that is to say, it should be proved why such alleged offenses should be censored—and arguments fairly exchanged. In reply Mr. Haldeman-Julius has a letter from Mr. J. T. Rae, Examiner of Publications for Commissioner of Customs, Ottawa, Canada, which reads as follows: "Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 12th instant, also copy of The Debunker, March number. If you will forward consecutive issues, up to and including the May number, the Department will then be able to inform you if the publication may again be imported into Canada. Please mark the parcel containing the sample publications for the attention of the Examiner of Publications." This letter, it will be observed, does not explain the action against The Debunker nor seek to defend reasonably the policy of censorship in Canada. It does reopen the case and, for the sake of clearness and emphasis and to illustrate fully the case of free speech against censorship, Mr. Haldeman-Julius has mailed Mr. Rae a copy of the April number of The Debunker with the following letter:

Mr. J. T. Rae, Examiner of Publications for the Commissioner of Customs, Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir:

I am sending you under separate cover a copy of the April number of The Debunker, which you say you will examine to determine its mailability in Canada. Your letter seems to imply that The Debunker will be admitted or barred, from one month to another, at the whim or prejudice or personal taste or whatever it may be of (as I suppose) yourself as official Examiner of Publications. You will say, no doubt, that you are governed by the law: but there are laws and there are interpretations of laws: and your Canadian censorship law, which I have no doubt is amazing to begin with, is apparently subject to amazing interpretations. Censorship laws are nothing more nor less than the triumph of certain prejudices and they are a forcible application of the whims and prejudices and personal tastes of certain groups, even of certain individuals.

Precedents in Outrage

The policy of censorship is indeed not without precedent. It has its historic background. Those precedents are, however, not defensible from an enlightened viewpoint nor is the background admirable, including as it does the lurid and fanatical and, even so, fantastic sweep of suppressive legislation and arbitrary trampling upon the rights of the human intellect. Intelligent people judge a period, a government, a society by its attitude toward the circulation of ideas. It is agreed (and it is indeed obvious) that the brightest, most admirable, most soundly progressive periods have been those in which ideals were permitted freely to circulate. Those governments have been the most worthy of respect which have encouraged free speech. Those societies have been most adorned with beauty, wit and philosophy which have placed no fetters upon the expressions of the human mind. In contrast, we observe that the records of intolerance, suppression, censorship—that all the historic instances, sadly plentiful, of tyrannical official war upon the expression of ideas—are execrated by the enlightened modern conscience of mankind.

The test of a civilized person and of a civilized government is: Does that person or that government favor freedom of thought and speech? This necessarily involves freedom to express ideas which are unpleasant, offensive and alarming to many people. This is true because of the wide difference in opinions. There is no idea which is agreeable to all who may hear or read it; to speak at all is to give offense; to think aloud and in print is to violate someone's notion of truth or propriety. Obviously the only fair course—for a government which aims to be democratic and civilized—is to leave the field open for the expression of all shades of opinion and to let persuasion rather than force decide the issues. If all ideas are not expressed freely, how can the people judge what is right and true? How can democratic government exist and how can civilization maintain itself in spirit and in truth? No government has the wisdom nor the right to decree arbitrarily what is truth nor what is right to be said or wrong to be said nor what is fit to be expressed in plain view and completeness for the general consideration. No idea, no set of ideas, is worthy of respect or confidence that seeks to maintain its authority by governmental fiat or force. In the light of history, in the light of social good, in the light of personal liberty, in the light of intellectual decency and dignity and in the light of common sense a policy of censorship condemns itself. Not only is a system of censorship open to abuses: it is inevitably, and completely, in its very nature, a system of abusive intellectual tyranny.

This is a straightforward declaration of my conviction in this matter of free speech. Now, to proceed

from the general to the particular, I shall call your attention fully to the character of each article in the April number of The Debunker and analyze each article with reference to this broad principle of free speech. My purpose is to show that each and every one of these articles in the April number of The Debunker is or should be mailable without the slightest question in any civilized country; that each and every one of these articles is a legitimate, a useful, an interesting expression of opinion or review of events or analysis of our social life in this modern world; that each and every one of these articles is rightfully readable by any Canadian citizen who wishes to subscribe to The Debunker—while, as I may remind you, no Canadian citizen is compelled to subscribe for or to read The Debunker against his will.

I ask you to consider carefully this letter and to read carefully, with this letter in mind, the articles in the April number of The Debunker. Furthermore, I believe I have the right to ask that you explain to me what, if any, points in these articles are unfit to be read by Canadian citizens or are not entitled to circulation in a civilized country.

Offending Narrow Minds

It happens that the importance of intellectual freedom in behalf of the widest culture is well illustrated by the first article in The Debunker for April—THE AIM OF MY WORK, by Joseph McCabe. You will see there outlined a program of enlightenment which is superbly in contrast with the theory of censorship. The very freest dissemination of knowledge and ideas is essential to the broad vision of culture which McCabe explains as having been his guiding inspiration in all of his scholarly work. A short time ago, as history is counted, this article by McCabe would have been suppressed by the authorities of Church and State and McCabe himself would have been personally in danger. Today in all modern nations McCabe's works circulate freely. They are undoubtedly offensive—and the viewpoint of this leading article in The Debunker is offensive—to the narrowly and bitterly orthodox. It is the personal misfortune of the latter to be offended by an intelligent article, and it is not the duty nor rightfully the power of a government to protect them from such offense. Is not McCabe's scholarly article fit matter to be circulated in Canada?

I do not see what possible objection can be made against the second article in the April number of The Debunker—DIVORCE IN SOUTH CAROLINA, by Robert F. Hester. This article is a criticism of an unjust law in an American state, setting forth the facts and illustrating the difficulties and burdens which are outrageously placed upon the citizens of that state. The information in this article is interesting; it is important; and Canadian readers, I believe, have a right to know these facts. The point of view is favorable to divorce. Is that objectionable to the Canadian censorship?

Spotlight on a Hypocrite

I do not see how a plausible case for censorship can be made against Leon N. Hatfield's article, FATHER TAYLOR GETS ALL HOT AND BOTHERED. This is simply a true account of an incident in which, unhappily, a Catholic priest figured as a home-wrecker. It is written in a light, satirical vein—but I trust that the Canadian government does not presume to dictate questions of literary style. Father Taylor, as Mr. Hatfield tells, ran away with the wife of one of his good Catholic parishioners. The priest was caught in suspicious circumstances. This is, I am certain, a most useful exposure of hypocrisy. It may be distasteful to some Catholics—but is the Canadian government going to profess openly that it forbids the circulation of literature which Catholics do not like? Besides, let me suggest that good Catholics should approve of the exposure of a hypocritical priest. Even they should regard it as a favor.

The article by T. S. Gunn Harding on THE VARIOUS TYPES OF VENEREAL DISEASES AND THEIR TREATMENT is strictly educational. It is a careful, scientific, honest report of conditions which should be of the utmost concern to every citizen. This article could be attacked only on the plea that ignorance is better than knowledge; that a false modesty should be considered as more important than the public health; that facts, admittedly of the most weighty and vital description, should not be given to readers of The Debunker. Mr. Harding has in this article given what I regard as the most comprehensive and illuminating survey of the actual nature and prevalence and proper treatment of venereal diseases. It is written for the public good and to suppress it would be a public injury.

I don't know what you personally will think of

Virgil MacMickle's article entitled INQUEST ON JEHOVAH. But the point is: Why should anyone be prevented from reading this article? It is a very shrewd and thoughtful analysis of the changing ideas about religion which have issued from the expanding knowledge of man. Its central theme, as you will readily perceive, is that theism has been narrowed and discredited, step by step, as man has learned more about the universe. The title is of course flippant—yet it literally expresses what the author does in the article—and the tone is one of good-natured irony; but again, I suggest that government should not censor style. Mr. MacMickle's article is—whether you agree with its thought or not—a very thoughtful, soundly conceived and intellectually entertaining article.

I am proud to recommend to you a fine piece of sociological reporting in Daniel Webster Delano's article, THE Y. M. C. A. ENTERS BIG BUSINESS. Mr. Delano describes minutely, albeit critically and even sarcastically, the social-commercial-religious activities that go on in a big Y. M. C. A. hotel in Chicago. He offers a very realistic description not only of the external features and methods of this Christian hostility but of the spirit that is back of it, the atmosphere and the social sidelights. It is a study of commercialism in religion. It is a description of a certain segment of life in a great American metropolis. The article is very amusing too—and I trust that is not a feature which the Canadian government will regard as calling for suppression.

HOKUM DE LUXE, by A Former Editorial Writer, is a frank confession of the capitalistic conservatism and the intellectual emptiness of the average newspaper editorial policy. It is a glimpse behind the editor's desk—and into the mind of one disillusioned, cynical editorial writer. This article is a reminder of the standardized methods by which the reading public is deluged with hollow, hypocritical hokum and cheated out of honesty and intelligence in the discussion of current events. It debunks one phase of modern journalism—and does the Canadian government think that journalism does not need debunking or should not be debunked? HOKUM DE LUXE is a valuable guide to the reading of newspaper editorials. It is a lively piece of writing too—let that be to its credit. Are not Canadian readers entitled to enjoy their reading and to read truth with a smile?

History---Terrible But True

AN AUDIT OF PAPAL MURDERS, by Frank Vincent Waddy, is an article of clear historical value. It summarizes the leading crimes of leading Popes. It shows what was the nature of the Catholic hierarchy in the days of its greatest power. Perhaps you will not think it a pleasant article—but is the truth to be suppressed because it happens to be unpleasant? Again, are not Canadian citizens entitled to have the facts, whereby they can judge the traditions and character of a powerful institution such as the Roman Catholic Church? I am sure that Mr. Waddy's article will offend most Catholic readers. But the only thing which is really relevant is that Mr. Waddy has set down the facts—facts of sound and authentic history—facts which you can verify, if you wish, by looking up the original authorities. Is true history permitted in Canada? Mr. Waddy's article is a denunciation of the Roman Catholic Church. Is such a denunciation, supported by immense historical material, forbidden in Canada?

Both Catholic and Protestant religious methods are exposed satirically in F. A. Ocampo's article, BUNKSHOOTING IN THE SUNNY PHILIPPINES. This article has two special points: it shows the technique of religion as a trade—the money-getting methods of the clerical fraternity—and it presents illustrations of the wretched kind of evangelism that is conspicuously practiced in the Philippines. This article is frankly an indictment of the fanaticism and ignorance which supply the grist for the mills of popular evangelism. It is not at all respectful to religion—but does an article have to be respectful to religion in order to be mailable in Canada?

I do not believe that Canadian readers should be denied the opportunity of acquainting themselves with the amazing true story told by Leon N. Hatfield in his article, GOD VS. THE BOARD OF HEALTH AT CARROLLTON. This relates how a preacher in a Missouri town, supported by a fanatical group of church-members, resisted the order of the local board of health that all public meetings should be abandoned during a serious epidemic. The preacher declared that he would take orders only from God. Followers (though not a majority of the church members) backed him up in his crazy attitude. This is an interesting story and, moreover, warns of the lengths to which religious fanaticism tempts weak and credulous minds. Common sense won

against superstition in Carrollton, Mo. I trust that common sense will assure you of the mailability of this article in Canada.

In THE KLAN ADOPTS KHRIST, C. Samuel Campbell offers a sharp criticism—again in the tone of satire, which is much favored in The Debunker articles—of the propaganda cant which masks the hate-stirring aims of American Ku Kluxery under the name of Jesus. The K. K. K. is moribund in the United States. I do not think it is powerful in Canada. Yet such movements of hate recur from time to time; and it is well to have their methods debunked; Mr. Campbell's article may be regarded as a curious analysis of Klan psychology and as a warning against the menace of such movements in the future.

I venture to say that you will find nothing objectionable in Isaac Goldberg's department of literary criticism—IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS. Even the most vigilant and suspicious and desperately zealous censor could, I am sure, find no trace of offense in Goldberg's urbane, intelligent reviews of recent books. To be sure, he says in one of these reviews that introducing a religious note into musical commentary is BUNK—but isn't that a minor offense and won't Mr. Goldberg be permitted, this once, to express such an opinion or whim or whatever is it?

If Canadian readers are temporarily tired of reading about gangdom in Chicago—that is to say, Capone gangdom—perhaps they will be interested to learn the details of a different kind of racketeering. At least it seems to me that "racketeering" is a permissible, pat expression with regard to the city missionary business as described by Daniel Webster Delano in SAVING SOULS IN STATE STREET. Some readers may look upon the antics of Chicago downtown evangelism as matter for amusing ribaldry; others may be depressed or disgusted that such spectacles of superstition and clownish credulity should be witnessed in the streets of a great American city. But at any rate, don't you believe that Canadian readers should be permitted to learn of this side of the night life of Chicago?

SOME HIGH LIGHTS ON THE MARYVILLE MOB, by Leon N. Hatfield, is an article of vital social significance—a story which represents the spirit of the mob in action. It tells fully and unsparingly the details of the lynching of a Negro in the town of Maryville, Mo. It pictures the extreme of savagery to which a Christian community can drive itself suddenly; the breakdown of law—and the connivance of law officers; the unwillingness—the cowardly unwillingness—of the Missouri state authorities to investigate the outrage and uphold the dignity of the law. I am sure that no rational ground can be cited for denying to Canadian readers this tale of a lynching—it was, let me add, a most barbarous, brutal burning.

I am almost ashamed to say that Maynard Shipley's article, AMOS 'N' ANDY—WHY THE FRESH AIR TAXICAB HAS BEATEN THE TRAFFIC, is absolutely harmless. I know it won't lead a solitary "soul" astray from the path of "righteousness." It will not, I assure you, upset any Canadian's system of beliefs. That is not complimentary to the article—but, even so, it is a very ingenious, entertaining analysis of the psychology which has led the masses of radio listeners to follow so rapidly the misfortunes of Amos 'n' Andy. It is a study in popular feeling. It is the dissection, as

it were, of a complex state of mind. Personally, I think it is a good deal more interesting than its subject, if you know what I mean.

I am pretty sure that Ernest A. Dewey's article, THE KANSAS CITY STAR AND BRINKLEY, will also pass the Canadian censorship. I mention it only to make the review complete. It is not an attack upon any religious or political or moral fetish. It is simply a critical account of a most remarkable conflict that recently occurred in Kansas between "Dr." John R. Brinkley, goat gland surgeon of Milford, Kans., and the Kansas City (Mo.) Star and the medical doctors of the state of Kansas. Mr. Dewey shows what an insensate—almost insane—bitterness and excessiveness of attack was displayed by the Star; and how, from at first apparently proving Brinkley to be a quack, it went on to enlist popular sympathy with the man by its columns and columns, daily, of anti-Brinkley crusading. The trial of Brinkley before the state medical board is amply and closely reviewed. The merits, possible or probable or potential, of Brinkley's gland transplantation are discussed. Interesting comments are made on Brinkley's sensational race for the governorship of Kansas, which he lost by a small margin. Mr. Dewey's article is a close-up of one section and one moment of the American parade—amusing and critical and usefully repertorial—but it, too, will leave the faith and morals of Canadian readers unaffected.

I do you the kindness of assuming that in reading Leon N. Hatfield's story, OLD MAN FARRIS BEHAVES LIKE A

The issue of free speech becomes crystal-clear to every sensible person when it is presented in terms of concrete cases and particular instances. Isn't it right that this thing should be spoken? Isn't it important that these utterances should be free? Thus brought down to cases, as in this letter by E. Haldeman-Julius to the Canadian censor, free speech is recognized as necessary.

HUMAN BEING, you will quite share the author's point of view concerning that vicious association of cruelty and virtue which was exhibited in the behavior of old man Farris toward his daughter. Here again is an object lesson in the dangers of religious and moral fanaticism, although I do not believe that most Christians would be so cruelly "righteous" as this Missouri Fundamentalist. Mr. Hatfield's story, by the way, is entirely true. It really happened. I am sure that Canadian readers are entitled to this story and its moral.

Completing this list of the contents of the April number of The Debunker, I commend to your thoughtful reading the article by Samuel Untermyer on THE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL FOLLIES OF AMERICA. This article points to some of the leading evils of plutocratic misgovernment in the United States. It is a plea, in the main, for industrial and social democracy and as well for a scientific treatment of modern developments in organization. Is there anything in Mr. Untermyer's

er's article which makes it unfit for circulation in Canada? I think not. I am sure not.

And that, Mr. Rae, is a conscientious and candid summary of the contents of the April number of The Debunker, article by article. You will of course—I trust—read these articles carefully and see for yourself what is their nature. It is probable that you will agree with my opinion as to the right of Canadian readers to see certain of these articles. Concerning other articles there is no doubt that you will judge them to be mailable. A few may be debatable in your mind—but please consider thoughtfully what I have had to say in explanation and in defense of these articles. Or should I use the word "defense"? It would be more fitting to say that I strongly and confidently assert the right of these articles in the April number of The Debunker—each and every one of them—to be read by any Canadian citizen who wishes to read them. I assert that the April number of The Debunker should be mailable, without a moment's question, in any civilized country. Of course I go much further—I assert the same as regards The Debunker twelve months in the year.

For I believe utterly in freedom of thought and speech. I believe quite simply in the right of one man to offend another man with his ideas. I believe thoroughly in the right of satire, exposure, denunciation, persuasion and all other methods of attacking ideas and institutions which seem to me wrong. I believe profoundly in the right of destructive as well as constructive literature (to use a distinction which is so often loosely or arbitrarily made). I believe, always and at all times, in violations of what is called good taste when by such means a more striking attention can be won for important ideas, for useful essays in debunking and for indictments of the mental and moral slavery which is typified by the conventional formula of good taste. I believe in free speech, without limitation or reservation. I believe, as a concrete example, in the kind of free expression which is shown in the April number of The Debunker and in The Debunker all the year round.

And in closing may I congratulate you on being numbered, for a time at least, among the readers of The Debunker? I trust that you will not be selfish—that you will not keep a good thing to yourself merely because of the accident of official privilege—but that you will permit your fellow citizens in Canada to continue reading The Debunker. What is more important, I hope that the time is not far distant when Canadian citizens, who may be trusted to protect and choose and weigh their own beliefs in comparison with others' beliefs, may steadily read The Debunker without asking your permission or anyone else's permission. My struggle for the right of free speech will continue as long as I have breath to speak or energy to write and publish. I am sure that thousands of intelligent Canadians, who have that fundamental self-respect which consists in a valuation of their personal freedom of thinking and reading, will support me in my demand for civilized rights in Canada. Sincerely,

E. Haldeman-Julius

Spurts from an Interrupted Pen

In this Book of Sketches Marcet Haldeman-Julius Writes Intimately and Charmingly of People, Ideas and Things.

THE TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. A New Account. 2. Black Minorcas. 3. Boys. 4. A Weighty Question. 5. Biography Versus Fiction. 6. The Present of Childhood. 7. Crossword Puzzles. 8. Jazz. 9. On Cooking. 10. John W. Gunn—An Impressionistic Talker. 11. Magic Casements. 12. Jane Haldeman-Julius. 13. "I Want a Buckle." 14. The Covered Wagon. 15. Helicopters. 16. On Drinking. 17. A Reason. 18. To Banbury Cross and Home Again. 19. Introvert vs. Extrovert. 20. Alice's Wish. 21. A Letter from Alice. 22. Ruthie Bob. 23. Anna Louise Strong—An Interpreter of the New Russia. 24. Alice Journeys Alone. 25. The Funeral of Eugene V. Debs. 26. Negroes in Kansas Colleges (1927). 27. Fred Bair. 28. Ties. 29. Radio. 30. Oysters on the Half Shell. 31. The Lure of the Air. 32. Profits in Oil (Cod Liver). 33. Is Arkansas Civilized? 34. Rear Admiral John Weston—A Man of Action.

Sympathetic and Humorous and Tender and Wise, This Book Will Add to Marcet Haldeman-Julius' Wide Circle of Friends.

There is no formality in this book of personal, humanistic, reminiscent sketches by Marcet Haldeman-Julius. The readers of The Freeman know how Marcet brings out the sympathetic life in every person or thing or idea that she discusses. She is at her best in *Spurts from an Interrupted Pen*, talking of the daily ebb and flow of interesting life around her; giving vivid close-ups of charming people who have sojourned at the Haldeman-Julius farm; revealing, through the many little episodes of a busy, urbane and observant life, what is the wisdom of practical conduct; and, above all, throughout these very human sketches Marcet wins the reader to an appreciation of her own rare personality. The gift of understanding is the touchstone of simple greatness in this book. There are episodes of the most amusing nature, mingled with reflections of true insight on the drama of life and with character portraits that are delightfully vivid and complete.

Spurts from an Interrupted Pen is a large book of 137 pages, 5½ by 8½ inches in size, printed in large clear type. 75,000 words. Only 75c a copy or 4 copies for \$2.

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

ORDER BLANK FOR SPURTS OF INTERRUPTED PEN

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I am enclosing 75c for a copy, postage prepaid, of Marcet Haldeman-Julius' latest book of sketches, *Spurts from an Interrupted Pen*.

Name

Address

City State

Free Thought Issue Arouses Liberal Readers of Canada

As a direct result of the publication of our Canadian Free Speech Edition of The Freeman, developments have occurred in Canada which may be of great significance. The issue of free speech may be raised on the floor of the Canadian House of Commons. A friend of the Haldeman-Julius Publications, working for the government and therefore forced for the present to remain anonymous, informs us that lovers of liberty hope for a parliamentary struggle to modernize thoroughly the Canadian laws regarding free speech and to remove the restrictions which now are placed upon the printed word. Thus the publicity given by The Freeman to the bigotry of the Toronto authorities and newspapers and its protest against the exclusion of The Debunker promises to have the very widest effectiveness in bringing into the limelight a new, national issue of free speech in Canada.

Newspapers in Canada are not unanimous in advocating the suppression of ideas which may be disliked by the majority. Encouragingly in contrast to the wild fulminations of the Toronto *Globe* and the Toronto *Evening Telegram* is an editorial appearing in the Ottawa *Evening Citizen*, an editorial which, as the readers will observe, was inspired directly by the Canadian Free Speech Edition of The Freeman. This newspaper, published in the capital of Canada, expresses itself as follows:

TWO BANNED PUBLICATIONS
In an article entitled "Justifiable Censorship," the Winnipeg *Tribune* applauds the decision of the Department of National Revenue not to admit a book called *The Life of Al Capone* into Canada. The book has been classified by the department as "objectionable matter."

The Citizen admits that if ever censorship were justifiable, it is in

this case. But what puzzles us deeply is why the book is banned and yet the newspapers remain loaded with a cheap book dealing with the same gentleman in illustrated magazine form. We have seen the magazine in question, and it is a ghastly affair, being embellished with photographs of the bloody and prostrate victims of gang warfare in Chicago.

The banning of the Al Capone book, we repeat, is justifiable if censorship is justifiable. But another publication has been banned, and regarding this proscription, we have different ideas. The publication in question is The Debunker, published by Haldeman-Julius in Girard, Kans.

The news of the fact comes in a Canadian Free Speech edition of The American Freeman, a weekly published by Haldeman-Julius. No doubt it is being sent to every newspaper in Canada.

Now everybody knows that Haldeman-Julius is a professional atheist, and that his Debunker is largely given over to attacking orthodox religious views. To most persons this is annoying, but it does not do them harm. Nor is it yet illegal to advance views which attack orthodox religion. To prohibit the entry of The Debunker into Canada is an attack on ideas, and for that reason is to be condemned. It is time that the Department of National Revenue stopped treating Canadians as if they were a nation of 13-year-olds. The Capone books are merely sensational and nasty. The Haldeman-Julius publication is on a different footing, and its censorship is just another official act curtailing the right of free speech in this country. It is an act of cowardice, too.

This is an opinion that will find sympathetic adherents throughout Canada. Certainly there are many liberals in that country who resent the injustice which would deny them the right to have literature agreeable to their ideas and tastes; and many even who, disagreeing with the policy of The Debunker and The Freeman, will nevertheless insist that these publications have a right to be circulated. Quite properly the Ottawa *Evening Citizen* calls attention to the central feature of this

situation: namely, that this action against The Debunker and the threatened action against The Freeman is an intolerant war upon a certain kind of ideas. This is the most vicious and dangerous form of censorship, and it is the form which censorship naturally takes; originally it may be proposed for moral purposes, but it soon becomes a method of obscurantism in the interests of political and religious reactionism.

We are glad to note that the Ottawa *Evening Citizen* does not admit that censorship is at all justifiable. Evidently it realizes the dangers of censorship even when the theory of it is stated in the most plausible form. It will be—

—it must by its nature be—used against ideas.

The Ottawa *Evening Citizen* is intelligent enough to recognize that the atheistic or other radical ideas in The Debunker and The Freeman can do no one harm. No Canadian citizen is compelled to read these publications. The readers of these publications are not compelled to agree with the ideas appearing therein. Ideas harm neither the man who rejects them nor the man who accepts them; the latter must find them good or he would not accept them. The notion that certain ideas are harmful is derived simply from the bigots who believe that it is wicked for anyone to disagree with them. It is significant that no man thinks his own ideas are harmful. It is always the other fellow's ideas that are harmful.

Canadian readers of The Debunker and The Freeman do not believe that these publications are harmful to honest men; although they are positively full of dynamite against charlatans and bigots and Mussolinis. Protests are being made by our Canadian readers. Our friend in the Canadian government informs us that an Ottawa subscriber to The Debunker has asked the authorities for explanations of the following points:

Candide---Iconoclastic Satire

Voltaire Wrote This Amusing, Sharp-Styled Yarn to Debunk the Notion That "All Is for the Best in the Best of All Possible Worlds"—Candide, in Memorable Adventures, Learns the Ups and Downs of Life's Tragi-Comedy

Candide, Voltaire's great satire, is one of the most useful liberal classics and has an enduring place in the enlightened literature of humanity. It is brilliantly worthy of the place we have given it in the Haldeman-Julius program of popular publication of the liberal classics of the ages. And of all the liberal classics none is more readable, more vivaciously a delight in every line. *Candide* is, aside from all else, an interesting and amusing and surprising story. It is Voltaire the story-teller and Voltaire the philosophic debunker gloriously combined in one masterpiece.

The story is that of a boy, Candide, who is taught by a pious fellow, Dr. Pangloss, that "All is for the best in the best of all possible worlds." Pangloss has a superficially optimistic explanation for all the evils, injustices and grotesque wrongs and inequalities of the world; and what he cannot explain, he ignores or denies. But Candide, through a series of remarkable adventures in traveling about the world, discovers for himself what life is really like. It does not take him long to find that old Pangloss was very limited and illogical in his explanations of the human scene. In short, being knocked about from pillar to post, witnessing man's inhumanity to man, seeing at first hand the follies and injustices of many countries, Candide is given a thorough training in realism.

This is a swift-moving, fascinating tale—one strange adventure piled on another—and throughout it is enlivened by the wit and criticism of the great Voltaire. No other work can impress so characteristically and deeply upon the reader the iconoclastic, yet without scholarly, style of Voltaire. The story is a superb philosophic masterpiece. Voltaire was not afraid to write a story that pointed a moral—what an intelligent moral and how sharply were its points designed by the clever mind of Voltaire! This book belongs in every library of liberal classics. We are publishing it in a large book, bound in stiff card covers, 5½ by 8½ inches in size. The price is only 50 cents a copy or 5 copies for \$2.

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

ORDER BLANK FOR VOLTAIRE'S CANDIDE

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I am enclosing \$..... for copies, prepaid, of Voltaire's famous satire, *Candide*. (50 cents a copy or 5 copies for \$2.)

Name

Address

City State

[Please turn to page four]

Union Reactionism Is a Strong Influence Against Tom Mooney

By John W. Gunn

In her story of *The Amazing Frameup of Mooney and Billings*, which ran as a series of articles in *The Freeman* and is now in book form, Marcet Haldeman-Julius explained the radical character of Tom Mooney's activities in the labor movement and indicated briefly how he was disliked and opposed by conservative leaders of the labor movement. As an agitator in the field, actually working for labor instead of managing labor politics for personal ends, Mooney was considered a trouble-maker by the union bosses. Notably in a strike of the boot and shoe workers and in a strike of Pacific Gas and Electric Company employees, Mooney as a militant leader of the workers aroused the hostility of the hierarchy that dominated the official councils of labor.

The strike of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company employees was deliberately repudiated by P. H. McCarthy, who was then president of the Electrical Union and president of the San Francisco Trades Council. "More than that," says Mrs. Haldeman-Julius, "he went so far as to give union cards to scabs and to those entitled to hold them for inside electrical work so that they could take the place of outside electrical workers who were striking." This McCarthy, as president of the State Building Trades Council, in 1917 prevented that powerful union from recognizing the Mooney-Billings case, which was then, as it has always been, plainly a labor case of the first importance.

In 1923 McCarthy, using his influence in the labor movement for the purpose, assisted mainly in defeating a constitutional amendment which would have enabled the state of California to supply electricity through the development, as a public measure, of water power. Just before the election McCarthy caused to appear in the official paper of the State Building Trades Council an editorial urging workers to vote against the amendment—which was thus defeated. That was the end of McCarthy as a labor leader, as it was revealed soon afterward that he had been bribed by the Pacific Gas and Electric

Company, who paid him \$10,000 for misleading the workers on this issue.

Selfish Labor Politics

What of the other labor leaders in San Francisco? If they have not been bribed with money, none the less they have betrayed Mooney and Billings for reasons of selfish labor politics—politics not in the interests of the workers but designed to protect their positions as labor leaders, to assure the smooth functioning of the unions as sources of easy and undisturbed revenue for these leaders, and to facilitate their maneuvering for political jobs. There is a familiar type of labor official (one could scarcely call him a leader but rather an obstructer of real leadership) who wants nothing more than that the unions should proceed quietly with the paying of dues, so that offices can be maintained, and that he and his fellows should be continued in their sinecures and in their seats of authority. This type of labor official regards a labor union as a business through which he can enjoy profit and power. He is proud of being on intimate terms with politicians, employers of labor, Chamber of Commerce dignitaries; and he desires that he shall always be considered respectable. Naturally he regards a strike as a major calamity, not so much to labor as to the tame, respectable, profitable operation of the machine which he controls so favorably to himself. Strikes endanger his prestige with the business and political gangs. He abhors militant unionism quite as much as do the open and declared foes of labor. "All quiet" is the ideal situation.

Paul Scharrenberg, the big boss of the San Francisco labor movement, represents this type of union official. And Tom Mooney, in his active days and now as uncompromisingly in principle although behind prison bars, represented the ideal of militancy in behalf of the real interests of labor. He was an agitator—and there was plenty of reason for agitation in San Francisco, where conditions among the workers, both organized and unorganized, were radically in need of improvement. San Francisco was under the brutal rule of corporate grafters. The open shop

movement was strong and defiant. Inevitably this would inspire a militant movement among the workers. Tom Mooney was a leader in this movement, while the conservative labor officials—in a word, the labor politicians—were more eager to denounce radicalism than to advance the cause of organized labor.

Scharrenberg's Hostile Role

There might have been a sincere difference in tactics between Scharrenberg and Mooney, if Scharrenberg had been conservative from principle rather than from political policy. But Scharrenberg's character as a "labor faker" is shown clearly by his attitude toward the Mooney-Billings case. If he were honest, if he were a man of true principle and loyalty to the labor movement, he would not have let tactical differences with Mooney stand in the way of fidelity to a persecuted and framed labor agitator. He would have taken up the fight, not so much in behalf of Mooney the individual as in behalf of the rights of labor, and of men closely identified with the labor movement, to just treatment in the courts. There was never the slightest doubt that Mooney and Billings were dishonestly tried and convicted solely because of their zeal in advocating the cause of labor. They were and are victims of class hate. And Scharrenberg, with others like him in the San Francisco union hierarchy, has served in his own way the aims of the capitalistic haters and persecutors of Mooney and Billings.

There is really only one fact needed to prove the disloyalty of Scharrenberg to labor agitators victimized by the corporation interests against which Scharrenberg is supposed to represent the workers. This fact is that during all the years of Mooney's imprisonment Scharrenberg has not been for one moment openly, actively and earnestly engaged in the fight to free Mooney and Billings. He has not protested against the imprisonment of these labor agitators. He has not identified himself with the friends and defendants of these victims of class hate. If this negative record were all, Scharrenberg would be sufficiently damned as a betrayer of the labor movement in which locally he is a principal—and political—figure.

But Scharrenberg has done more. He supported Governor Young for reelection after Young had refused to pardon Tom Mooney. Two unions controlled by him, the Seamen's Union of the Pacific and the San Francisco Waterfront Employees' Association, have never given a dollar to the Mooney defense. The latter organization, by the way, was a scab company union which Scharrenberg subsequently sponsored and maneuvered into the State Federation and the San Francisco Labor Council; but it is not affiliated with the International Longshoremen's Association; perhaps one reason for Scharrenberg's peculiar interest in this base-born union is that with its votes and the votes of the Seamen's Union he is able to control the California State Federation of Labor. *The Pacific Coast Seamen's Journal*, official publication of the Seamen's Union whose policy is dictated by Scharrenberg, has virtually ignored the Mooney-Billings case: only eleven lines about the case have appeared in that journal within the past three years.

A Treacherous Attack

At the 1930 convention of the California State Federation of Labor, Scharrenberg attacked the Mooney Defense Committee on the hypocritical plea that no accounting of the committee's funds had been made; this was an entirely unjustified attack, inasmuch as no contributor to the Mooney defense has ever questioned the integrity of the committee nor suggested that the funds were being used other than quite legitimately and wholly for the most vital defense publicity. Scharrenberg's own unions have never given a cent to the defense of Mooney and Billings. Scharrenberg has never been active in their defense. This attack of Scharrenberg's was therefore dishonest and treacherous: it was an attack upon the Mooney defense, in a juncture when that defense needed friends more than ever it had needed them, by a double-dealing labor politician who had never been associated with

the Mooney defense nor friendly nor helpful to that defense. Not to satisfy Scharrenberg, but to show up Scharrenberg, a complete report of the Mooney defense fund will be made.

When the American Federation of Labor held its convention in Los Angeles in 1927 it did not pass a resolution on the Mooney-Billings case. That convention ignored this most notorious labor frameup, concerning which the shameful and tragic facts were fully known, which was sensationally the leading labor issue in the state where its convention was held. What were Scharrenberg and the other labor leaders of San Francisco doing to help Mooney and Billings at that convention? Scharrenberg's attitude was shown by his sneering remark, a number of times during that convention, to Tom Mooney's friend Edward Nockels, secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor: "Well, did you 'spring' your friend, Tom Mooney, yet?"

Scharrenberg has been an enemy of Mooney and this enmity has been characterized by his suggestion of a parole rather than a pardon for Mooney. This was what Governor Young suggested and it was echoed by Scharrenberg, a political creature of Young. A parole would not only mean that Mooney's innocence would not be admitted—that he would continue legally to bear the stigma of a crime he did not commit—but it would mean that Mooney would be released from prison but not given his freedom. He would be continually under the surveillance and the control of the state authorities; he could be recalled to prison at any time, charged with violating his parole; he could not engage in labor activities without the ever-present threat hanging over him that the capitalistic foes of labor would use political pressure (and little enough they would need to use) for his re-imprisonment. A parole also would mean that Mooney could not be an agitator against the "labor fakers" who betray the labor movement, who use this movement for the collection of dues and the furthering of their personal profit and ambition, and who are in close friendly alliance with the political system that keeps Mooney and Billings in jail.

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*.

CALIFORNIA AGAIN

We are accustomed to hearing bad news from California. No state in the union is more thoroughly under capitalist domination. No state is so hospitable to charlatans and so hostile to liberal thinkers. Its continued incarceration of Tom Mooney and Warren Billings shows the triumph of injustice in that playground of spook-chasers and red-baiters.

Now California gives another characteristic touch to its reputation—or promises to do so—in a contemplated bill against "undesirable aliens." It is described by the *Illustrated Daily News* (Los Angeles) as "an emergency measure to relieve the existing problem of unemployment." That is pure hypocrisy. The real purpose of the bill is revealed in the *News'* statement that it "provides for the punishment and deportation of undesirable, forbids them from engaging in any business or seeking employment within the confines of the state." That isn't all. The bill "also makes it a misdemeanor to give employment or enter into a business partnership with such illegal residents."

This means simply that the capitalistic interests in California and the elements of prejudice that support them want another club with which to hit liberals, radicals, all dissidents from the orthodox political and economic gospel according to the plutocratic Better America Federation of California. Aliens who are content to be unprejudiced, submissively exploited wage slaves will be desirable. Aliens who act like independent men and women, who have some concern for the conditions under which they live, and who utter thoughts that the bosses in California do not like—these aliens will be branded and bounced as undesirable.

Next we look to see California pass a law barring American citizens from other states unless they sign a statement declaring that they will hold no opinions contrary to the editorial policy of the *Los Angeles Times*.

The finest inspirations are the desire to know truth and to serve humanity.

Atheist Students in Toronto? O! Wow!

Atheism continues to be an exciting issue in Toronto, Canada. Unfortunately the issue is not whether atheism is true—that would be a commendable proof of healthy intellectual activity—but whether atheism should be suppressed: and the conservative moguls in authority seem agreed that such ideas should be denied, damned and destroyed by force—that these ideas should be prohibited by the machine of authority which is, of course, backed by force. Not even the suggestion of atheism is to be tolerated, it seems, by the Toronto authorities of church, state and school which in that city are apparently in a conspiracy of obscurantism.

The latest fit thrown by the bigots in charge of Toronto's law and order and education and morals was precipitated by an editorial in *The Varsity*, student publication at the University of Toronto. This editorial declared that the majority of the students in the university were "practical atheists." Explaining, the editorial said: "A practical atheist is one who to all intents and purposes in his daily living and attitude toward the concept of God, denies the existence of a Deity." Then came the howls of indignation. It wasn't true, yelled the heads of the colleges which compose the university. Swiftly the university board of governors held a meeting and, of course, denied the allegation in *The Varsity* editorial. E. F. Allen, editor-in-chief of *The Varsity*, was threatened with punishment: i. e., expulsion from the university for a period.

One of the members of the university board of governors is Canon H. J. Cody—a cleric, who naturally would rush into bigoted action. It is symptomatic of Toronto's medievalism that a pulpit bunk-shooter should be among those ruling over the university. Imagine clericalism setting the tone for education! It is, deplorably, all too easy to imagine this being done and to see how actually it is done. Pulpit discipline, under the guise of education, is brought into action to punish the man who says the university students are "practical atheists." Another member of the university board of governors is Eric Armour, crown attorney, who expressed the opinion recently that *The Freeman* could not be distributed in Toronto. Heads of some of the colleges at the university, and men in leading positions in these colleges, are clerical bigots; some of the colleges have definite church connections; yet the university is given state funds. Every liberal citizen of Toronto should be deeply ashamed that church and state and school are thus bound together in a league against true learning and intellectual freedom and reasonable, civilized culture.

It is noticeable that no calm, reliable inquiry is being made into the truth of *The Varsity's* statement that the majority of the university students are atheists. *The Varsity* also stated that many professors at the university teach "practical atheism." The authorities deny this; and they threaten punishment for the mere statement of this condition—call it a report or an opinion, yet what is the sensible attitude that should be taken? Obviously a scientific survey could be taken; the students could be asked to sign (anonymously for the sake of guaranteeing their honest answers) questionnaires setting forth their opinions and their reactions toward the idea of God and the subject of religion; then these answers could be summed up and interpreted. That might not finally settle the question—for interpretations have a way of disagreeing—but it would at least make the situation clearer. It would indicate how much or how little foundation there is for the statement in *The Varsity*.

But the authorities at once deny, absolutely, that atheism exists as a serious or considerable belief at the university. But do they deny—can they deny—that there are any atheists at the university? Do they know—can they say—how many atheists there are at the university? Are they prepared to discuss degrees of atheism and varieties of its manifestation? No—that is not the way of bigots. They deny and they denounce; and they move rapidly to suppress the mention of atheism. From their antics, one is warranted in drawing the inference that they are worried about atheism. They should be worried—that is to say,

there should be a steady supply of atheistic propaganda to worry them. Atheism should be talked in Toronto until all its citizens are familiar with the idea. It should be discussed from every logical angle. It should be discussed philosophically, humanistically, historically. Its discussion should be insisted upon as a right of Toronto citizens. Atheism at the University of Toronto should take a militant form, if only as a matter of protest in the cause of mental freedom and integrity.

The university board of governors, the professors, and the other authorities who support them in their threat of punishment against the editor of *The Varsity* again show us what cowards and bullies the bigots are. Just reflect that *The Varsity* is recognized as a student publication and not in any way representing the official policies of the university. The University authorities can deny (as they have denied) that *The Varsity's* statements are true. These authorities have ample space at their command in the conservative daily press. They are better equipped in this way—they can reach a larger audience—than the editor of *The Varsity*. They could go further and debate the question thoroughly with the editor of *The Varsity*, and they could carry on a survey such as we have suggested. They are not misrepresenting.

sent nor taken unfair advantage of by *The Varsity*—but on the contrary they have more than equal advantages in a public controversy. This makes it completely clear that the university authorities are punishing *The Varsity* editor, not with any valid or honorable excuse, but merely because they are angry and intolerant and intensely dislike the opinions expressed by *The Varsity* editor.

It is the spirit of Torquemada that animates the Toronto bigots, bullies and cowards. It is fortunate that modern conditions prevent them from going quite to the extreme of Torquemada in action.

"POLITICS is fate," said Napoleon. We might add that climate is fate; that geography is fate; that geology is fate; that biology is fate; that psychology is fate. Fate is the sum of all things, and it is the supreme task of science to bring us a clearer and, let us hope, eventually a full understanding of our fate.

FOR THE errors of our ancestors we pay in the pain and difficulty of learning the truth. And then we discover that the truth, after all, is the most interesting reward of a mentally honest life.

NOTIONS of sin, theologically speaking, are the symbols assumed by fear in the minds of ignorant people.

The Debunker Is Untamed! It WILL Be Free!

The Canadian censorship has decreed that *The Debunker* is not proper reading matter for the citizens of that country. This means for all citizens of Canada and the United States who believe in intellectual freedom and in fearless comment and criticism. We assure you that *The Debunker* will not surrender to the demands of any censorship. The policy of this sham-smashing magazine will be free-minded. Our ideas are important—they are not dictated by any government nor any organization nor any orthodox nor conventional group or interest—and we shall persistently and unrepentantly express these ideas in every issue of *The Debunker*.

You should get this lively debunking magazine regularly. It is exciting. It is amusing. It is a laughing, fighting, dashing iconoclastic magazine. *The Debunker* is published once a month. It is 5½ by 8½ inches in size, printed in large clear type, and making in all 96 full pages of the most virile, vivid and vivacious reading you ever saw. The articles are short and snappy and full of fun and fight. The price is \$2.50 for a yearly subscription (\$3 Canada and foreign).

ORDER BLANK FOR THE DEBUNKER

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I want to read your sham-smashing magazine every month. Please enter me on your subscription list for the enclosed payment of \$2.50 (\$3 Canada and foreign).

Name

Address

City State

Zadig and Micromegas

Two Great Philosophic Tales by Voltaire—Wisdom in the Most Fascinating Form—Exciting Adventures of Action and Thought

What a versatile genius was Voltaire! He wrote histories, criticisms, philosophic essays, fighting pamphlets, plans, poems, theological arguments, and satires in which story and idea were curiously combined. And Voltaire never wrote a line idly nor purposelessly. All of his works contributed brilliantly to the enlightenment of mankind.

Voltaire's satirical, philosophic narratives are among the best of his works. *Zadig* and *Micromegas*—two remarkable works in one volume—show what a lively imagination Voltaire had, what a colorful and enchanting style he could command, and how excellently he could bring together the interestingness of adventurous action, of the marvellous and the fantastic, and the realism of critical philosophy. *Zadig* and *Micromegas* can be read as stories or they can be read as illustrative lessons in a sane philosophy of life; the mature reader will enjoy them for both qualities. Certainly these tales by the great Voltaire should be found on every liberal bookshelf.

Zadig is a story which illustrates the practical uses of human reasoning. It is a shrewd blow at all metaphysics and far-fetched speculations that have little or no basis in reality. It shows at once how charming and how useful wisdom is: a masterpiece of debunking, lively and apposite today as when it was first written.

Micromegas is a prodigiously satirical exposure of the follies and pettinesses of humanity as Voltaire observed them. And who shall deny that his observations refer as truthfully as ever to many features of human life in our own time? *Micromegas*, the fantastic hero of the tale, is a giant who bestrides the little planet earth and looks critically, with the aid of a magic magnifying glass, at the activities of men. Oceans are merely little mud puddles to this giant observer of the human scene. He picks up a ship in one hand, holds it lightly and inspects with his magnifying glass the ship and the men on board. What curious antics these humans perform, thinks Micromegas—and through his observations and reflections a series of mighty debunking blows are delivered. This is a large book, bound in stiff card covers, clearly printed, 5½ by 8½ inches in size. 50 cents a copy or 5 copies for \$2.

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

ORDER BLANK FOR ZADIG AND MICROMEGAS

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I am enclosing \$..... for copies of *Zadig* and *Micromegas* (two great Voltaire satires in one volume). Postage prepaid. 50 cents a copy or 5 copies for \$2.

Name

Address

City State

Story of the Human Race

A Biographical History of the World by Henry Thomas, Ph.D., in Five Volumes of Colossal and Colorful Narrative—Regular Price Will Be \$3, BUT ADVANCE ORDERS WILL BE SOLD NOW FOR ONLY \$1.50 FOR THE SET OF FIVE VOLUMES!

This is history with a difference! It is daring, unconventional, charming, witty and withal profoundly penetrating in its scholarship. Henry Thomas wrote that delightful work of imaginative historical analysis, *Cleopatra's Diary*. His style is at its best in these five volumes of *The Story of the Human Race*; and his material is immense and superb. Just look at the following list of contents:

BOOK 1. *THE CHILDHOOD OF THE HUMAN RACE* (*The Story of the Early Fighters, Priests and Prophets*). A Brief Survey of Early History. Moses. Jeremiah. Buddha. Confucius. Cyrus. Pericles. Plato. BOOK 2. *THE PARADE OF THE SWORD AND THE CROSS*. (*A Catalogue of Kings, Philosophers, Conquerors and Cut-throats*). Alexander. Epicurus. Hannibal. Cato. Caesar. Jesus. Nero. Marcus Aurelius. Constantine the Great. Mohammed. BOOK 3. *THE SAVAGERY OF THE MIDDLE AGES*. (*A Book of Holy Crusades and Religious Massacres*). Charlemagne. Peter the Hermit. Saint Francis of Assisi. Dante Allighieri. Marco Polo. Petrarch. Johannes Huss and John Ball. Joan of Arc. Torquemada. Columbus. BOOK 4. *THE AWAKENING OF HUMANITY*. (*Man Gradually Lifts the Fogs of Obscurantism*). Martin Luther. Machiavelli. Shakespeare. Louis XIV. George Fox. Spinoza. Voltaire. Napoleon. BOOK 5. *THE BEGINNING OF REAL CIVILIZATION*. Goethe. Mazzini. Karl Marx. Bismarck. Charles Darwin. Abraham Lincoln. Tolstoy. Emperor William II. Lenin and Gandhi.

This is a great, thrilling procession of important personalities and events—true history, brought close in vital action to the reader—and a kind of history that smashes idols and sets up new ideals for humanity. Each volume contains 30,000 words. There are 150,000 words in all, making this a truly gigantic work and FOR THE SMALL PRICE—IF YOU SEND IN YOUR ORDER NOW—OF ONLY \$1.50. We plan to sell this work at \$3 for the set of five volumes. But orders sent in advance of publication will be filled at the special pre-publication price of only \$1.50. These are large books, 5½ by 8½ inches in size, printed in large clear type. Please use the following order blank immediately.

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

Order Blank for Story of Human Race

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I am ordering in advance a complete set of Henry Thomas' *The Story of the Human Race*. You are to prepay all carriage charges. As I am sending my order in ADVANCE, I understand that I am to receive the five volumes for only \$1.50.

Name

Address

City State

"PRACTICAL ATHEISM"

What is "practical atheism"? We believe our readers will be interested in this distinction which is made and, we think, reasonably made, by *The Varsity*, student publication of the University of Toronto. This same publication suggests a distinction between a non-theist and an anti-theist. The non-theist does not believe in a God but the question does not much concern him. He has dismissed the idea of a God and virtually forgotten about it and does not care to discuss it and certainly spends no energy in opposing it. The anti-theist is one who not only rejects the idea of a God but attacks that idea with persistence and intellectual earnestness. We might put it this way: the non-theist forms his own opinion about the God idea and has no further interest in it; the anti-theist is concerned not only with forming his own opinion but with influencing the opinion of others.

We find, on the other hand, a good deal of "practical atheism" where there is not even a conscious position of non-theism. This description may be applied fairly to that large number of men and women who conduct their lives entirely without reference to the idea of a God: who, that is to say, act as if there were no God. The "practical atheist" does not have any feeling of worship toward a supposed God. He does not depend on a God. He does not really use the idea of a God to explain anything. He does not think about a God. His activities, his interests, his thoughts and emotions are entirely secular, confined to the realities of the world about him.

Such a person may say that he believes in the idea of a God. Granted that he is quite sincere. He makes this affirmation honestly. But does it really mean anything to him? Is he a theist in the practical sense that the idea of a God affects his life and is familiar to his thinking and conduct as a measure of things? That is to be judged by what he does, not by what he says; and, thus judged, we see that such a person can be correctly described as a "practical atheist." A "practical atheist" is one who, as the theologians might put it, is "a man without God." His life is guided by non-theistic reasons and motives. The idea of God has no more meaning in his life, no more influence upon his actions, than it has in the case of the most convinced and deliberate atheist.

"Practical atheism" is very common and is quite understandable. A few centuries ago—even a century ago—it was thought that a God was needed to explain the

universe. The direct, everyday life of man was complex with immediate mysteries, seemingly to be accounted for only with the assumption of a God. Moreover, life was crude and unattractive; and in their disappointment the masses of men were more readily interested in the idea of a God and of a heaven. Now, while life is still sufficiently mysterious, that sense of mystery is not so immediate and insistent. In our direct dealings with nature we have (or the scientists have for us) given us understanding and power; so that life today is far more efficient, more ordered and in practical terms explicable, than it was a hundred years ago. Additionally, the expanding interests of life have removed the old incentive for men to think so much about a God and a future life; though we should insist that the incentive to think about these chimeras was persistently cultivated and indeed commanded by the church hierarchies.

So people today think less about a God and, in practical terms, have less genuine and moving belief in a God. The average man does not trouble himself with problems of philosophy. He does not think very much about the idea of God—that of course is just the point we have been stressing—and he finds it easier to give a conventional assent to the idea. Yes, he believes in God—so he says—and then he proceeds immediately to forget about this God and to behave in every way as if no God exists. This is "practical atheism," and it is what exasperates and alarms the preachers into delivering so many sermons about the modern indifference to religion.

AN ENGLISH writer, Mr. Gerald Gould, easily wins the prize for the perfect comment on Sir James Jeans' *The Mysterious Universe*, as follows: "Sir James Jeans, it appears, has been suggesting that the universe is probably an idea in the mind of a mathematician called God. It seems fair to retort that this God is certainly an idea in the mind of a mathematician called Sir James Jeans."

"THINKING," says the Columbus (Ohio) *Dispatch*, "is about the only inalienable right left to humanity." Then it adds that unconventional thinking by college youth is a "smart Alec" pose. Does the *Dispatch* regard the right of thinking as an inalienable right that should not be used?

"A PARTISAN organization is a dangerous thing." Who do you think delivered this remarkable statement? A Missouri Republican partisan politician!

TRUTH is sometimes found at the bottom of an ink well.

Reverend Blah-Blah

When Sinclair Lewis wrote his great novel of life among the gay pulpsters and Bible-pounders, he described a type that is known too well to most of us—the all-round hypocrite and snooper who is determined to pry into everybody's affairs but whose own life does not prove him to be a sincere disciple of the Jesus he is supposed to exemplify. We all know the type, and there is nothing more sickening.

Most communities can boast of a holy parasite who uses his pulpit for personal attacks on residents in his town. Let someone take a drink and it is only a question of time before this pious hypocrite and ignoramus will hint broadly who the "criminal" is and how he is sending himself and the rest of the town to hell and damnation.

Let someone run a movie show on Sunday and Rev. Blah-Blah yells that the town is surrendering to Satan. Let someone put a two-dollar bet on a dog race and Rev. Blah-Blah turns verbal somersaults of sanctified indignation. Let someone teach a group of school children a few steps of a simple folk dance and Rev. Blah-Blah jumps all over his pulpit in a frenzy of fanatical horror. Let someone organize a social center, with dancing and other amusements, for the young people and Rev. Blah-Blah jabbars in jealousy of the World, the Flesh and the Devil.

This particular Blah-Blah may not take a drink, nor does it matter a lot. So in this he is above hypocrisy, though his motives are millions of miles short of Christian "love" and "charity." But it is common knowledge that Rev. Blah-Blah is very fond of females—too fond of them to be able to preach sincerely against violators of his sexual code. Many a neglected female parishioner has been made to see more color and romance in life because of his holy and pious ministrations. Many a comely wife has been known to bring her emotional troubles to him and go away feeling better all round. Yes, this saintly Blah-Blah believes in the gospel of love, and practices it on the sly. But let someone else imitate him in this and the blasts of hell belch forth to scorch the sinner.

Poor creature! We pity the whelp. Full of masculine impulses—surrendering to them with fear and trembling—and yowling how naughty we sinful unbelievers are. Of course, we all could go into a number of details, for the most competent gossips in Blah-Blah's town can give one the low-down on this Rev. Blah-Blah, but why bother? The poor imbecile has to make a living, and preaching against others (the only thing he knows how to do) brings him a living he couldn't make in any other racket. But respect him? That, of course, is impossible.

E. Haldeman-Julius

Free Thought Issue Arouses

Concluded from page two

On what grounds The Debunker has been debarred entry to Canada; at whose instigation or on whose complaint action was taken; under what authority this action was taken; whether any opportunity was given for supporters of the magazine to state their case, before it was decided to bar the publication.

The notification which Mr. Haldeman-Julius received did not specify the complaint against The Debunker. It was merely an arbitrary order that this magazine had been judged unfit for circulation in Canada. The cowardly injustice of the Canadian censorship is shown by its secret operations. It is a system of stabbing in the dark at free speech. No hearing is given to Canadian readers of any magazine or publication that is banned. Apparently Canadian readers have no rights that the tyrants of censorship feel bound to respect. But Canadian readers of The Debunker and The Freeman are demanding and should unceasingly demand their rights. We repeat the urgent advice that all of our Canadian readers send protests to their members of Parliament and to their local newspapers. We have friends even in the government. Liberalism in Canada is not dead; but it must prove that it is alive now by making a determined and very public fight against the censorship.

Our immediate objective, of course, is to win the right for The Debunker to circulate in Canada and to prevent the debarring of The Freeman from that country. But our greater objective is to attack the entire principle and system of censorship, and in this objective our Canadian readers and all Canadian liberals should interest themselves through an extensive program of positive, progressive action. We are in the fight to stay. We count upon the help of every lover of freedom.

CANADA'S DISTINCTION

The dominion of Canada has the unpleasant distinction of being the most intolerant country—or of having the most intolerant government—in modern democratic civilization. In no country having a parliamentary form of government, pretending to be democratic, is there such a vicious and extreme censorship as obtains in Canada. In the United States, in England, in France, in Germany—in all of these countries, far as they are from the ideal of democ-

racy, freedom of speech exists to a considerably greater degree than in Canada.

The situation in Canada is such as we should expect to find in Italy under the rule of Mussolini or in Spain under its successive dictatorships or in the terrorized, monarchical Balkans. It is shocking to observe such a bigoted censorship in a country that flourishes the forms, while it viciously violates the spirit, of democracy.

We are of course not at all naive about the pretenses of democracy nor about its present development even in the countries where it is most advanced and most respected. It is simply a fact that Canada, among modern democratic countries, is the most medieval and anti-democratic in its suppression of speech and thought. Our disgust measures Canada's shame.

FOR THE POWER TRUST

Actions speak louder than words; and no disclaimer of power-trust favoritism by President Hoover is convincing in the face of his vetoing the bill for government operation of the vast power plant and dam at Muscle Shoals in Alabama. Mr. Hoover may not be bribed by the power trust. He may not have been "fixed" by the power trust directly. These suspicions and charges are irrelevant. What is important is that he has actively aided the power trust by refusing to approve of the use for the public good of this great potential source of electric energy at Muscle Shoals.

In effect Mr. Hoover has said that the private power companies can exploit the American people without limit—that the government will not furnish cheap power to the people. It is more disgracefully a case of letting a mighty power equipment lie idle—of letting the government Muscle Shoals plant, erected at a tremendous cost, be unproductive—so that the private power companies can have a free hand.

This furnishes new proof that Herbert Hoover is a capitalistic President, the protector of private profits, the supporter of monopoly and exploitation—and that he is not in the least respect a friend of the American people. Hoover believes that the government should protect the grafting of the people by the corporations. Does it matter that he sincerely believes this policy to be correct? So do the grafters, whom Hoover protects, believe sincerely in this policy.

The veto of the Muscle Shoals bill is but another of Hoover's brazen exhibitions showing that

he is the President of the privileged few. It is, however, the most undisguisable and shameful of these acts. But what else could be expected from the Great Promoter?

REVOLT, NOT COMIC

Affecting a tone of tolerance—with-condescension, the Columbus (Ohio) *Dispatch* says that no alarm need be felt at the report that atheism is prevalent among students at the University of Toronto, Canada. It is a symptom of "immature minds" and even, intimates the *Dispatch*, a healthy symptom. But the *Dispatch* continues:

Fed from birth by the conventional ethical, political, philosophical and theological codes, it is the most natural thing in the world for youth to stage a sort of comic opera revolt against them about the time it arrives at the show-off stage of development. This, we believe, accounts for the appearance on every campus and even in high school halls of small, smart Alec groups who enjoy their pose of ultra-sophistication before their more conservative fellows.

Is revolt against conventional notions "comic opera"? A good way to settle that question is to glance at history. Thus we are reminded that revolt against conventionalism in ethical, political, philosophical and theological codes has been the method of progress in civilization. Such revolts have appeared not only in colleges and

not only among youths but among the most eminent and mature thinkers of the race. There was nothing "comic opera" about the revolt of Voltaire, Diderot and the French encyclopedists of the eighteenth century. There was nothing "comic opera" about the widespread revolt among libertarians and rationalists in the nineteenth century—a revolt which laid the foundations of modern democracy, which opened the doors of scientific research in every field of life, and which stimulated the freedom and flowering of culture.

These revolts are successful. The conventional codes change. There is a great difference between the conventional ethical, political, philosophical and theological codes of today and the codes of a hundred years ago. In every one of these fields—in the ethical field, in the political field, in the philosophical field and in the theological field—the codes of a century ago have been radically altered. These alterations are serious and fundamental marks of progress; they reflect clearly and broadly the advancement of culture through revolt. "Comic opera" revolt? Temporary and unimportant revolt? The history of ideas is one long and impressive rebuttal of the shallow opinion expressed by the Ohio paper.

"YES AND NO"

Our readers will remember the debate between E. Haldeman-Julius and Gilbert K. Chesterton in The Freeman, Mr. Chesterton affirming that the world is returning to religion and Mr. Haldeman-Julius presenting facts to show the falsity of this claim. It appears now that Chesterton does not always believe this statement: one day he says religion is triumphant, the next day he admits that religion is now in a decline but that it will recover and win. Recently in a debate with Clarence Darrow in New York, Chesterton said:

The present drift is away from religion. This tendency began in the time of Voltaire and has continued intermittently through the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but in the future there will be a great movement, on the one hand toward Catholicism, and on the other toward a greater amalgamation of other creeds, perhaps drawing its source from Christian Science, spiritualism or some other ism.

We are not a bit interested in Chesterton's prophecies concerning the future, when we see that his observations and statements concerning the present are so unreliable, inconsistent and suspiciously shifting. The man contradicts his own statements. We need only report his contradictions.

THOUGHT is the highest faculty of man; but not all men aim so high.

A Simple Plan to Bring Light to Ten "Saved Souls"

Editing The American Freeman, these lively and crazy days, is no end of a picnic. Things keep popping so fast we never get time to feel bored. What with exposing the fakirs, kidding the hypocrites, bawling out the usurpers and yelling hell and blazes at the suppressors of opinion, we find our job as exciting as a bull fight.

It seems that The American Freeman never lacks for ammunition. Always, something hot turns up to shock the gang into action. And when the papers go out to our thousands of readers, we hear shouts of approval, roars of laughter—and, truth to tell, yowls and gasps from the "good people," the "pure," the "saved," the "righteous."

We haven't space to describe their reactions, but it all adds to the fun of being alive. And in order to get our readers into the game of having a lot of fun, we have hit on the following plan:

We want our readers to become members of our "shock troops." That is to say, we want them to bring the shocking Freeman to the attention of the "saved souls." That is the purpose of our present little drive, and we hope to see it work, for the sake of more fun and laughter.

Do you know at least ten "saved souls"? We mean virtuous school teachers, pure-minded Sunday School leaders, pious preachers, solemn Babbitts, shyster lawyers and other such tripe? Why not invest ten cents on each of them? For only \$1 you can put ten such animals on the subscription list of The American Freeman. Each will get this shocking instrument of Satan during ten long weeks. No one will know about your perfidy. But the fun of it all! Think of getting them to receive from the postoffice ten hot and sizzling issues of The American Freeman! Besides, some may surprise you—they may be waiting for such intellectual fodder. Funnier things than that have happened. You never can tell.

And while you are at it, include several of your friends in this club of ten subs at only 10c each—fellows who are not afraid to look a full-sized idea in the face.

Here is a blank, so that you can go right ahead with your hell-bent conspiracy to bring pain and havoc to ten "pure and saved souls." Use this blank today. Pile on a lot of new subscriptions for The American Freeman. We guarantee you that if they are pure and pious we'll shock hell out of 'em before long. A good, sound, first-rate shock will be good for them. That's what a lot of "pure, saved souls" need. Use this blank today, please, and watch for the fun.

Here Are Ten "Pure Souls"—Shock 'Em with Ten Weeks of The Freeman at Ten Cents Each

The American Freeman, Girard, Kansas

I'm on. Count me in. I want to see the fun. So here's my club of 10 "pure souls" who are each to receive The American Freeman for 10 weeks. I am enclosing \$1 to pay for these 10 subscriptions. Be sure to let loose some especially hot fireworks, because these "pure souls" need a good dose of the kind of medicine The American Freeman serves weekly.

1 Name	Address
City	State
2 Name	Address
City	State
3 Name	Address
City	State
4 Name	Address
City	State
5 Name	Address
City	State
6 Name	Address
City	State
7 Name	Address
City	State
8 Name	Address
City	State
9 Name	Address
City	State
10 Name	Address
City	State
Name of Sender	Address
City	State

If you want to send more than 10 names, go right ahead. Remit for them at the rate of 10c each.

Nathan the Wise

This Great Drama of Toleration Was Written in the 18th Century as a Challenge to the Censorship—"I Will See," Said the German Lessing, "Whether They" (the Bigots of Church and State) "Will Let Me Preach Undisturbed From My Old Pulpit, the Stage!"

Nathan the Wise is a noble and challenging drama written by the free-minded German critic and dramatist, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, who was one of the leading spirits in the movement of enlightenment in the eighteenth century. He was misunderstood, of course; he was made the victim of authoritarian persecution; his works were censored. But Lessing would not be suppressed. He triumphed over the bigoted moguls of Church and State and his magnificent play, *Nathan the Wise*, lives on through the centuries.

This drama—the best-known work of Lessing, among literary students, yet not sufficiently known among general readers—is a plea for toleration of all ideas and creeds. It was a particularly daring work for its age, inasmuch as Lessing bravely spoke in defense of the Mohammedans and the Jews; and these were despised and persecuted as "accursed infidels" by the Christian bigots of Europe. Monarchy and church intolerance were strong and relentless when Lessing lived and wrote his fearless works. He was a pioneer of freedom. His name is honored by freethinkers; and his drama of *Nathan the Wise* has a deserved place among the enduring liberal classics, which make up the vigorous and many-sided library of man's intellectual emancipation.

At the same time, *Nathan the Wise* is a work of literature. It is written in an impressive, resounding style. It is dramatic. It stirs the imagination. It quickens the conscience and expresses vividly the necessity of toleration in a civilized point of view.

As the message of toleration has not been thoroughly learned—far from it indeed—*Nathan the Wise* is still a book of active usefulness in liberal propaganda. Here is wisdom in a convincing and an attractive form. A reading of this work will strengthen the reader's devotion to the noble life of large ideas and sympathetic vision. This work is also a reminder of the struggles of the past to advance the cause of intellectual freedom. This is a large book, 5½ by 8½ inches in size, bound in stiff card covers, attractively printed in large clear type. Only 50 cents a copy.

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

ORDER BLANK FOR NATHAN THE WISE

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I am enclosing 50 cents for Lessing's great drama of toleration, *Nathan the Wise*—postage prepaid.

Name

Address

City

State