

October 11, 1928

John W. Davis on Religious Tolerance

Introduction

John W. Davis, Democratic candidate for president in 1924, in a radio address broadcast from 32 stations in a nation-wide hookup on Thursday, October 11, 1928, appealed to all true Americans to remain faithful to the nation's birthright, religious liberty and civic equality.

In reaction to a growing anti-Catholic sentiment, propagated by tracts, pamphlets and other publications distributed throughout the country which warned American Protestants against electing a Catholic President, Mr. Davis came to the defense of members of the Catholic church, citing instances of patriotic Catholics who have served and supported the United States of America. The Davis address was broadcast from 32 stations in a nation-wide hookup.

A New York dispatch, published in American newspapers on October 11th and 12th, announced that a fund of \$150,000 had been pledged to carry on a campaign against religious bigotry, as well as to educate the public to the truth about Catholicism. The fund was to be administered by a committee headed by Ralph Adams Cram, distinguished architect of the Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine. Members of the committee included George Gordon Battle; Prof. Carlton J. H. Hays of Columbia university; Ofen Johnson, writer; Philip Kates, attorney; Major General Robert Lee Bullard; Prof. David A. McCabe of Princeton university; Nelson O'Shaughnessy; Archibald F. C. Fiske and Judge Martin T. Manton. (Additional names of those associated with the campaign can be found under the "References" section.)

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia university, in a letter to the committee said:

"No more subtle and direct attack upon the foundations of our government and social order has ever been made. It shocks me beyond words to find men and women taking vigorous part in this movement who persist in

calling themselves Christians while denying and turning their backs upon the examples and the teachings of Christ.

"The attack is chiefly upon the oldest and largest branch of the Church Catholic today; it may be upon the Jews, the Unitarians, the Quakers, the Mormons, the Christian Scientists, the Lutherans or the Presbyterians tomorrow. It is incumbent upon every love of his country and every follower of the religion of Christ to stamp it out ruthlessly."

Ralph Adam Cram, said in a letter that he was "very glad to accept membership on the committee."

"I do this, however, chiefly to express my own disgust at the ignorance and superstition now rampant and in order that I may go on record as another of those who, though not Roman Catholics, are nevertheless Americans and are outraged by this recrudescence of blatant bigotry, operating through the most cowardly and contemptible methods.

"During the past 40 years, I have had the privilege not only of traveling but of living for considerable period of time, in many Catholic countries, notably in Spain, the most Catholic of them all, not even excepting Ireland, Belgium and Mexico. In Spain I found the most democratic society, the greatest liberty of action and the most evangelical religion of all the countries I know. I believe my experience will be endorsed by others who have had the same opportunities. The campaign against Catholicism emanate from those who know little or nothing through personal experience, either of Catholic countries or of Catholics."

Congressman John S. Schafer, speaking at a noon meeting at the Geuder-Paeschke and Frey plant on the 11th, pleaded for religious tolerance and endorsed Herbert Hoover.

"No vote should be asked for, cast for, asked against, or cast against, any candidate for public office on religious grounds.

"There is one point upon which I can agree with Herbert Hoover and Alfred E. Smith, and that is the fearless position which they have taken against religious intolerance and bigotry. The citizenship of America is composed of persons of all racial extractions and religions, welded into a truly great mass.

"Whispering bigots, no matter what candidate they are supporting, should

be treated with scorn."

Mr. Davis' address was not without its critics. Among those who opposed some of Davis' claims, were Dr. Hubert Work, national campaign manager for Herbert Hoover and Henry J. Allen, director of publicity of the Republican national committee.

Work, speaking against Davis' "attack" on Mabel Walker Willebrandt, said that she was a "sacrificial victim of an unfair, unchivalrous attack on the part of democratic leaders." He further stated that he was "amazed how a big man like John W. Davis could attack a woman like Mrs. Willebrandt."

Henry J. Allen said that he had been warned the Democrats were preparing to publish full-page advertisements "to make it appear we are appealing to religious intolerance."

"In view of the known intention of the Democratic leaders to carry forward this type of campaign with increasing intensity," said Allen, "it might be wise for the public to be on its guard against the unrestrained indecencies of those whose fury has become desperate." He further stated that a "dozen reckless leaders" and a "long list of less known assailants" had given to themselves the task of utterly unwarranted personal attacks on Mr. Hoover.

Regarding Mr. Davis' speech, the Providence News had the following to say:

"Mr. Davis keeps on a lofty plane throughout the whole address but he does not fail to make it a real campaign speech instead of a mere expression of political philosophy. The political philosophy is there, to be sure, but it is applied to the actual facts of the day. We have little hesitation in believing that long after the present campaign is over, this truly magnificent utterance will be still remembered and still treasured as one of the noblest orations ever delivered in a country which is justly proud of itself as the mother of many great orators."

Full Text of Speech

I am to deal tonight with the subject of religion and politics. In doing so I wish to use restraint and moderation but to speak nevertheless with all the frankness at my command. Now if ever the time demands plain speaking.

One hundred and fifty years ago a statute was enacted from which I wish presently to read a few sentences. They are directly applicable to present problems.

"Well aware," this statute announces in its preamble, "that the opinions and beliefs of men depend not on their own will, but follow involuntarily the evidence proposed to their minds; that almighty God hath created the mind free and manifested his will that free it shall remain by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint; - - - that our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions any more than our opinions in physics and geometry; that therefore proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emoluments unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which in common with his fellow citizens he has a natural right."

Then it goes on to declare that "all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or effect their civil capacities."

I am quoting from the Virginia statute of religious freedom, and its author, Thomas Jefferson, made his authorship one of his claims to the enduring remembrance of his countrymen.

In 1789 the constitution of the United States was adopted with its express provision that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust under the United States. One by one the constitutions of all the States have followed suit, until today there is not a foot of American soil where this wholesome doctrine does not prevail, not a citizen under the American flag but has the right to rely on it.

Religious liberty and civic equality are the American birthright -- the birthright of Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, Christian and non-Christian alike. Woe to him who denies it!

Looking back into history we can read the long story of bloody religious wars and persecutions and thank God that no such terrors can haunt us here. Reviewing the lives of our own ancestors, we can rejoice that the personal and political proscriptions they underwent on religious grounds can never be our lot. And today we view with mingled pity and reproach the fierce controversies in our sister nations to which in this day and time religious differences have given rise.

For it is the unhappy quality of religious disputes that they are always fierce. For some reason that lies too deep to fathom, men contend more desperately over the road to heaven, which they cannot see, than over their visible walk on earth. Perhaps this follows from the fact that if one feels at all on religious matters he must feel too deeply.

Faith, if it is faith at all, stretches from the past and stirs all chords of love and memory that vibrate in the heart. It sustains the believer in the trials and temptations of his daily life. It lights up the future with that hope of immortality which is the deepest craving of the human heart. no wonder men are quick to anger and hot in their resentment when the faith that they have chosen is challenged or decried.

We have recognized in America that things as sensitive as these lie beyond the sphere of political action or control. We have covenanted with one another in the most binding fashion not to bring them into the domain of political dispute. For our mutual comfort, well being and happiness we have solemnly bound ourselves not to test any man's capacity for office by the religious faith he holds; and we have boasted in the sight of men and of angels of the examples we have set in this regard to all the world.

It is worthwhile to recall that this religious liberty was not won for us without a struggle. The colonial history of America is filled with examples of religious oppression and intolerance. Quakers, for instance, were whipped, mutilated, hanged and exiled in New England and New York; in Virginia and elsewhere Catholics were deprived of their citizenship, forbidden to buy or to inherit land, and priests were threatened with life imprisonment for celebrating the mass, while Baptists were cruelly scourged in Massachusetts and driven like pariahs and outcasts from one place to another.

One can only blush for his country as he reads the history of those cruel days. Yet it was precisely these persecuted creeds that led the way to religious toleration in America.

It was the Catholic of Maryland under George Calvert, Lord Baltimore; the

Baptists of Rhode Island under Roger Williams, and the Quakers of Pennsylvania under William Penn who first wrote toleration into their organic laws and sowed the seed of a tree of liberty so mighty that all Americans can now find shelter beneath its branches.

It is a rare piece of historic justice that a Catholic and a Quaker should be contending this year for the highest office in the gift of their countrymen. Can it be possible that there are Baptists who have forgotten in this day of strength the noble service of their church in its hour of weakness to the cause of toleration?

How painful it is to discover nevertheless that there are Americans who do not accept these principles, who do not at heart believe in religious toleration, political equality and the eternal separation of the church and State, for whom the solemn covenant their fathers made has no binding force; and who are willing, for personal or sectarian or political purposes, to fan into flame the ashes of religious warfare and arouse all the dark passions of prejudice and intolerance. The nomination of a Roman Catholic as a candidate for the presidency has furnished the occasion, and the exigencies of a political campaign have supplied the temptation to set on foot what has all the appearances of a widespread, organized and deliberate effort to poison the mind and pervert the reason of the American people on this vital question.

Not all who are engaged in this unholy effort are in the open to be called by name. There are always those who are willing to spur others on to things they dare not do themselves. Some no doubt are contented to furnish funds while others perform the labor. But the roll of those openly engaged is long enough to show the nation-wide extent of the enterprise. Voice and pen and printing press are busy at the work.

The public has long since grown accustomed to the rantings of certain publications that make an unwholesome living as peddlers of religious hatred, but the numbers in which they are printed and circulated at this time indicates some new-found source of financial supplies. They have been imitated for the occasion by fugitive periodicals springing up throughout the country, and, sad to say, they do not lack for allies among journals that fly the flag of organized Christianity. Denominational papers, published under church auspices, in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Arkansas, Texas and elsewhere have bent their energies to the task.

The country is strewn with cards and pamphlets, in many cases of a scurrilous and unmalleable character. Lurid posters are distributed illustrating the bodily

tortures which Protestants may expect at Catholic hands. The bogus oath of the Knights of Columbus has been resurrected from the tomb in which a congressional committee of investigation has laid it and put to another ghost dance to frighten the unthinking.

A broadcasting station in the city of New York issues an appeal for funds to help put this destructive gospel on the air. The National Lutheran Editorial Association commits its members by formal resolution to the undertaking.

The American Issue, published by the Anti-Saloon league in Westervelt, Ohio, appeals for "Anglo-Saxon Protestant domination" and bishops and minor clergy of Protestant churches, adopting the methods they would be first to condemn in others, give the cue to their followers by joining in the hue and cry.

What do they say? Some one thing and some another. Some speak out boldly, others by sly hint and innuendo; but the burden of the song of all of them is the same -- that no member of the Roman Catholic church should be elected President of the United States.

What reason do they give for a declaration so at variance with American traditions and American laws; what are the grounds on which these ultra-nullificationists seek to nullify the constitution of the United States?

I dislike to mention such pitiful nonsense as that the Pope is preparing to move to America; or that fortresses are being erected outside Washington to mount the papal guns; or that no Protestant can hope to hold office under a Catholic President; and yet such fantastic stories and others like them are scattered about. I am equally unmoved by an appeal to subscribe to one of the journals I have in mind, accompanies though it is by the frantic warning that "Protestant Americanism will be destroyed if we do not act quickly."

I had not supposed that Protestant Americanism, or American Protestantism, either one, stood on such tottering foundations. If they do, I can find places where a dollar will go farther to save them than in the pocket of that particular editor.

But the reason assigned by those who pretend to reason at all in support of this crusade is that a member, any member, every member of the Roman Catholic church, as part of his creed and profession, rejects the American doctrine of the separation of church and State, and so believing he cannot in good faith and conscience take the required oath to support, protect and defend the constitution of the United States; or, as one hysterical speaker puts it, to elect a

Catholic would be "to surrender our country to a foreign foe."

Surely those who make so grave a charge are ignorant themselves of American history or they seek to prey on the ignorance of others. A long procession of justices and judges, diplomats and governors, Senators and Congressmen, admirals and generals of the Catholic faith have taken that oath as they entered the service of their country: and on every battlefield and every ocean Catholics have sealed their oaths of fidelity to the republic with their blood. From the pages of history and from their sacred graves by land and sea they cry out against such an imputation.

If the testimony of their lives is not convincing, let us stop to call witnesses who are entitled to speak in their defense. I begin with one greatly beloved and respected while he lived and honored when dead, Archbishop John England of Charleston, S.C., who wrote:

"Let the Pope and cardinals and all the powers of the Catholic world united make the least encroachment on the constitution, we will protect it with our lives. Summon a general council -- let that council interfere in the mode of our electing but an assistant to a turnkey of a prison -- we deny its right: we reject its usurpation. Let that council lay a tax of one cent on any of our churches: we will not pay it. I can be faithful to the Pope and to the government under which I live, I care not whether that government be administered by a Papist, by a Protestant, by a Jew, by a Mohammedan, or by a pagan."

Again he declares:

"God never gave to St. Peter any temporal power, any authority to depose kings, any authority to interfere with political concerns. And rights which his successors might claim for any of those purposes must be derived from some other source. A Roman Catholic has no further connection with the Pope than that he succeeds St. Peter. Peter had none of these rights -- as a Roman Catholic. I know nothing of them in the Pope. He is equally a Pope with or without them."

In 1855, the first plenary council of Baltimore, speaking to American Catholics, admonished them that "attachment to the civil institutions under which you live has ever marked your conduct as citizens. We cannot, however, deem it altogether unnecessary to exhort you ever to discharge your civil duties from the higher motives which religion suggests. Obey the public authorities, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. Show your attachment to the institutions of

our beloved country by prompt compliance with all their requirements."

That great American Catholic, who earned the intimate respect and affection of every President through whose term he served as cardinal archbishop of Baltimore – James Cardinal Gibbons – in an article written in 1909 declared:

"Suppose it is said that the Pope were to issue commands in purely civil matters, should not the Catholics be bound to yield him obedience?"

"The Pope will take no such act, we know -- but were he to do so, he would stand self-condemned, a transgressor of the law he himself promulgates. He would be offending not only against civil society, but against God, and violating an authority as truly from God as his own. Any Catholic who clearly understands this would not be bound to obey the Pope."

And, speaking of the union between church and state, he goes on to say:

"American Catholics rejoice in our separation of Church and State, and I can conceive of no combination of circumstances, likely to arise, which would make a union desirable to either Church or State."

And again:

"For my part, I much prefer the system which prevails in this country. I heartily pray that religious intolerance may never take root in our favored land. May the only king to force our conscience, be the King of Kings; may the only prison erected among us for the sin of unbelief be the prison of a troubled conscience and may our only motive for embracing truth be not fear of men, but the love of truth and of God."

Quotations might be multiplied. I add one from John Ireland, archbishop of St. Paul, who said:

"To priest, to bishop or to Pope, who should attempt to rule in matters political or civil, to influence the citizens beyond the range of their own orbit of jurisdiction, that of the things of God, the answer is quickly made; 'Back to your own sphere of rights and duties: back to the things of God.'"

But for the shortness of human memory it would not be necessary to recall the action taken by the archbishops of the Catholic church of the United States at their annual meeting 12 days after the declaration of war in 1917.

In a letter addressed to the President of the United States, they declared in moving language:

"Standing firmly upon our solid Catholic tradition and history, from the very foundation of this nation. We affirm in this hour of stress and trial our most sacred and sincere loyalty and patriotism toward our country, our government and our flag.

"Acknowledging gladly the gratitude that we have always felt for the protection of our spiritual liberty and the freedom of our Catholic institutions, under the flag, we pledge our devotion and our strength in the maintenance of our country's glorious leadership, in those possessions and principles which have been America's proudest boast. . . .Our people, as ever, will rise as one man to serve the nation.

"We are all true Americans, ready as our age, our ability and our condition permit, to do whatever is in us to do for the preservation, the progress and triumph of our beloved country."

To this message President Wilson replied:

"The very remarkable resolutions unanimously adopted by the archbishops of the United States at their annual meeting in the Catholic University on April 18, last, a copy of which you were kind enough to send me, warms my heart and makes me very proud indeed that men of such large influence should act in so large a sense of patriotism and so admirable a spirit of devotion to our common country."

How nobly the pledge made by their archbishops was kept by American Catholics in the World war, the story of those trying years will show.

And finally I call the witness who of all others has the right to be listened to at this time. In his justly famous letter to the Atlantic Monthly last April, Gov. Smith, in language Thomas Jefferson himself would not have altered and could not have improved, stated his creed as an American Catholic.

Summarizing his position he declared:

"I recognize no power in the institutions of my church to interfere with the operations of the constitution of the United States or the enforcement of the law of the land.

"I believe in absolute separation of Church and State and in the strict enforcement of the provisions of the constitution that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

"I believe that no tribunal of any church has any power to make any decree of any force in the law of the land, other than to establish the status of its own communicants within its own church.

"I believe in the support of the public school as one of the corner stones of American liberty.

"I believe in the right of every parent to choose whether his child shall be educated in the public school or in a religious school supported by those of his own faith.

"I believe in the principle of non-interference by this country in the internal affairs of other nations and that we should stand steadfastly against any such interference by whomsoever it may be urged.

"And I believe in the common brotherhood of man under the common fatherhood of God.

"In this spirit I join with fellow Americans of all creeds in a fervent prayer that never again in this land will any public servant be challenged because of the faith in which he has tried to walk humbly with his God."

What American can refuse to join him in the recital of that creed. I for one am not willing to insult my own intelligence by doubting his sincerity or the sincerity of his fellow Catholics. In this I stand with one whose militant protestantism will not be questioned.

Said William J. Bryan in 1915:

"Those who have come into intimate acquaintance with representative Catholics did not need to be informed that they do not concede to the church authorities the right to direct their course in political matters, but many Protestants, lacking this knowledge which comes with personal acquaintance, have been misled."

Whether all the muddy deluge of literature and propaganda let loose on the

country is directed by some central mind or financed from a common source, is, after all, a secondary matter. I for one am quite prepared to believe that it is not. At bottom, the matter is and must remain a question of individual responsibility; the responsibility of the citizen in dealing with them on the other.

I speak as a Protestant, none of whose kinsmen by blood or marriage, so far as he is aware, has ever embraced the Roman Catholic faith since the days of Calvin and John Knox. I speak also as a private citizen of the United States; and as a Protestant and a citizen I ask myself with deep concern what duty, if any, does this crusade impose on me and others like me who accept the guarantees of religious liberty at their full face value.

Let me make it clear at once that I am not talking in terms of votes. Gov. Smith has proclaimed in his usual unmistakable fashion that he neither seeks, solicits nor desires the vote of any Catholic because of that faith, while at the same time he vigorously denies the justice of any vote cast against him for that reason. He holds that it is unworthy to vote for as to vote against a candidate because of his religion. Mr. Hoover has expressed the same sentiment. All true Americans will thank them for these utterances.

The issue goes far beyond candidates or parties or the outcome of the present campaign. It transcends in importance, as I believe, any question that has confronted the American people since the abolition of human slavery.

Once more we are brought face to face with the question whether this nation can endure part slave and part free; five-sixths made up of those whose religion forms no barrier to political progress and one-sixth of those excluded by their faith from the highest service to the State. Because the constitution was silent, the long debate over slavery was ended by four years of bloody war. The constitution has spoken on religious liberty and proclaimed it throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof. There should be no debate.

And yet when this sacred right is broadly challenged, how can any man be silent? I have slight patience with the effort in some quarters to make it appear that those who speak for toleration are provoking the discussion. Such reproaches remind one of the famous notice in a Continental menagerie: "This animal is very ugly; when it is attacked it defends itself." It ill becomes madmen who light forest fires to complain of those who try to put them out.

Nor can Protestants afford to leave all reply to the Roman Catholics themselves, on the theory that theirs is the faith whose political equality has been assailed and theirs the burden of assuming its defense. I think I can understand how that

suggestion would appeal to a Catholic -- how deeply wounding to his pride must be the mere hint that the constitution of his country can mean one thing to him and a different thing to his neighbor; with what scorn he would refuse to defend that which he feels needs no defense; and how sternly he would decline to appear as a claimant arguing for rights that are his beyond all dispute.

With deep conviction I protest that this is not a Roman Catholic question. Whether all their members or all their clergy are ready to believe it, it concerns quite as much every Methodist, every Baptist, every Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Unitarian, Lutheran or Jew. It is quite as much a question for those Americans who, like Jefferson or like Lincoln, are, for reasons of their own, communicants of no organized church.

If a member of one faith is to be excluded today from any civil right or opportunity or privilege, is to be declared by reason of his creed unfit or unsafe for public place or honor, what faith may not be trodden down tomorrow. "He only is free," says the maxim, "who lives among free men."

It seems to me that every man who loves his country must devoutly pray that God long forbid that we should ever see in America political parties divided along religious lines. God forbid that we should ever see religious bodies divided along political lines; that we should ever see any political party dominated by any religious sect or denomination; that we should ever see any religious sect or denomination bodily embraced within the borders of any political party; or that the clergy of any church should ever attempt, or succeed in the attempt when made to lead its membership into any political fold.

This is the head and front of the offending in the speeches of Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt which have rightly shocked the country. It is not that she, an officer of the government, should speak for prohibition or against it, but that she should urge on church councils and clergymen that they use their clerical influence to muster all their members in support of a given party or its candidate. Public opinion waits with eagerness for a rebuke of her action by her official superior, the President of the United States, or by the candidate in whose name she speaks.

Recently a leading magazine presented a series of articles and speeches on the question, "Will there be a Roman Catholic party in the United States?" I mean no reflection on the magazine or on the able gentlemen who engaged in that debate when I say I think it was a wholly futile, if not a harmful, discussion -- futile, because I see no possibility of such a misfortune either to the country or to the Roman Catholic church; harmful, because merely to discuss such a

contingency gives it a color of possibility to which it is not entitled.

But if there is any man in this country who wishes for the coming of a Roman Catholic party I can give him an infallible recipe by which it can be brought about. Men do not cohere for long periods simply from sentiment or in the hope of common advantage. Ambitions and desires and hopes change too rapidly for that. But there is a force that will tie them together with hoops of steel – a force whose binding power is beyond all human strength to loosen. It is the stern and bitter force of a common grievance based on the denial of a common right.

As the Catholic mother bends above the cradle of her new-born son, think if you can what emotions will stir her breast when she is told that if she wishes him to rise to the highest place in the service of his country she must first teach him to forswear the faith in which he was born.

It is such considerations as these which in my judgment forbid silence at his hour. It is a time when every man and woman should be willing to stand up and be counted for or against the principles of liberty on which this nation was founded, principles which have made her great and strong and free among the nations of the earth; united and happy at home, and respected abroad. The voice of public opinion should be lifted in such volume that no doubt can remain at home or abroad that America stands where she always stood and where, please God, she will always stand on this great question.

As a humble unit in that mighty chorus, I denounce for my part, the assertion that a Catholic is disqualified for the presidency or any other office in the gift of his countrymen as a gratuitous insult to 18,000,000, more or less, of free born Americans. I denounce it as a falsification of American history, a betrayal of American ideals, a deep disloyalty to American institutions.

I beseech my fellow countrymen, standing not in the darkness of the Middle Ages but in the sunlight of the 20th century, to put to themselves the question whether religious liberty and civic equality are to remain the birthright of all Americans, and their children's children after them, or the privilege of a chosen few. To put the question is to answer it.

References:

October 11, 1928

The Telegraph-Herald and Times-Journal

October 12, 1928

Lewiston Morning Tribune

The Milwaukee Sentinel

Providence News

The Rock Hill Herald

The Telegraph-Herald and Times-Journal

October 22, 1928

The Rock Hill Herald

Campaign against religious bigotry

Those in attendance of the meeting included:

Dr. John Gibbons ~ John F. McCormick ~ Daniel Sargent
Maurice Sherman (editor of the Hartford Courant)
Robert S. Shriver ~ R. Dana Skinner ~ William H. Todd
Col. Campbell Turner

Among those pledging support to the movement:

Frederick Hobbes Allen ~ General Lincoln C. Andrews
Dr. Thomas Baker ~ Nicholas F. Brady
Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler (president of Columbia university)
Howard S. Cullman ~ Haney Fiske ~ William M. Forrest
Raymond B. Fosdick ~ Norman Hapsgood ~ Julian Harris
Prof. John H. Latene ~ Dr. Frederick B. Robinson
Charles H. Sabin ~ William F. Sands
Dr. Henry van Dyke ~ Louis Wiley

Coming Soon:

Lost in the Ether

Long-Forgotten Radio Speeches of the 20s and 30s

Look for it at: <http://www.cafepress.com/sheeppee>

Researched by Vicki Robison

Blog: <http://sheeppee.wordpress.com/>