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Foreword

The month of February, 1911, witnessed two remarkable meetings in the history of the Socialist movement in Massachusetts. Sunday evening, February 5, in Ford Hall, Father Thomas I. Gasson, S. J., President of Boston College, essayed to point out what was to him probable dangers in the application of the Socialist theory to government. Monday evening, February 27, James F. Carey, of Haverhill, a member of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of the United States, and State Secretary of the Massachusetts section of that organization, delivered an address in Faneuil Hall, Boston, in reply to Father Gasson. Both meetings were to houses packed to the doors, both were orderly to a degree, and incidentally many things were cleared up.

In newspapers and in magazines, in books and in pamphlets, in sermons and in speeches, in prose and in poetry, it has been iterated, and reiterated that the Catholic Church stands as a barrier against the onward march of the Socialist host, but notwithstanding the asseverations of many of the spokesmen of the Catholic Church, declaring its unyielding opposition, it is apparent to all acquainted with the real facts that a constantly growing proportion of the population, without in any way affecting their religious affiliations, have come to look upon the government ownership and democratic management of railroads, mines, factories, etc., as the only righteous system of industrial arrangement, and many Catholics are among its most ardent advocates.

If any one that attended Father Gasson's meeting expected to hear an official pronunciamento that a person could not be a Catholic and a Socialist at the same time, they were doomed to disappointment. That there are divisions in society, and that the divisions are economic, can no longer be concealed. The Catholic manufacturer is no more considerate of the welfare of his workmen than the manufacturer of other religions, or of no religion, and the Catholic capitalist will combine with other capitalists to resist the demands of Catholic workmen combined with other workmen for shorter hours, better conditions, more wages, etc. Into this struggle the Socialist movement comes as the expression of working class interests, and it is inevitable that it will attract to its banner workingmen and working women of every race and creed, as well as other persons that realize the correctness of its position and the righteousness of its cause.
Fr. Gasson Replies to Socialist Questions

VOlLEY OF QUESTIONS AS TO EFFECT OF SOCIALISM ON FAMILY LIFE, MARRIAGE, DIVORCE AND MORALS ANSWERED BY BOSTON COLLEGE PRESIDENT—FORD HALL CROWDED TO DOORS AT THE MEETING—HELD UNDER AUSPICES OF BAPTIST SOCIAL UNION—SPEAKER DECLARES SOCIALISM A MENACE TO PUBLIC.

Calmly and interestingly the Rev. Thomas I. Gasson, S. J., pointed out the probable ill effects of Socialism on domestic, personal and national integrity in his address in Ford Hall last evening. He spoke for one hour, and then spent another hour in answering questions fired at him by Socialists from the floor and balconies.

Bitter arraignment of the Roman Catholic church and its attitude of opposition to the doctrine of Socialism was conveyed in some of the questions. They were all met with a friendly smile and an unhesitating answer, however, by the sombre garbed priest, who stood all the while with one arm leaning easily upon the reading desk and his face turned toward the questioner.

The hall was packed to the doors, scores of persons standing in the aisles and in the rear of the hall. Thousands were unable to gain admittance and blocked Ashburton place and Bowdoin street in front of the entrances to the building.

Although the meeting did not begin until 7.30 o'clock the hall was filled at 6.30, so great was the interest, and by 7 o'clock printed signs were hung on the doors saying: "No More Admitted." Fully one-third, and perhaps one-half, of the audience were Socialists.

It was a very quiet, well-behaved crowd, and although many evidently did not agree with what Father Gasson said there was no hissing or other audible tokens of disapproval. The priest was frequently applauded, and there was also outbursts of hand-clapping when different Socialists put to him a particular difficult or searching query.

The scene had many unique features. In the first place, here was a Jesuit priest, the president of the most prominent Roman Catholic institution of learning in New England—Boston College—speaking at a meeting held under the auspices of a Baptist organization—the Baptist Social Union. Then the topic of the evening, "The Dangers of Socialism," was significant in that the speaker was a clergyman of the Roman Catholic Church, known as the foe of Socialism.

George W. Coleman presided, and before the address there were musical selections by Russell B. Kingman, violoncello, and Mrs. Kingman, accompanist. The entire audience also stood up and sang America. When the Rev. Father Gasson arrived, about 7.35 o'clock, and walked upon the crowded platform to the seat awaiting him, there was enthusiastic applause.

A few minutes later, when the presiding officer introduced Fr. Gasson as "one of the most able and public spirited citizens of Boston," there was even louder applause. Fr. Gasson spoke in
an easy, conversational way that made a pleasant impression upon
friends and opponents alike.

In beginning he caused some amusement and laughter by de-
claring jokingly: "I assure you that this morning I was offered
a double-barreled revolver, because it was thought that I might
need it for action before the close of this meeting. Now I am will-
ing to become a martyr to the cause, so if any of you have a
steady hand I will present my breast to it."

Then entering upon the serious discussion of the topic for the
evening, he said: "We all feel that something is wrong in society
at present." He realized, he said, that Socialism aimed to relieve,
if not permanently cure, poverty and suffering. This was a matter
in which he was deeply interested himself. The religious order
to which he belonged had always been interested. Its members
worked without pay and whatever gifts they received were always
given away again to the needy.

He quoted from Karl Marx to prove his claim that Socialism
stood for doctrines such as free love, the abolition of private
property, State ownership and other things that if they were
adopted would endanger the moral integrity of the individual, of
the home and of the nation.

When he finished his address about 8.45 o'clock the audience
applauded. There was an intermission for a few minutes, and
then Chairman Coleman announced that Fr. Gasson would be will-
ing to answer any questions. Men and women jumped to their
feet in all parts of the hall. Some had questions all written out
on paper which they flourished in the air, others had them on the
tips of their tongues.

Only two questions were allowed from each person. It was
nearly 10 o'clock before the last question was answered. Fr. Gas-
son then in a few closing words said: "I see that all of you are
interested in improving society, and I hope and feel that all of
us are for improving this nation and the national life."

Then, after more applause for the speaker, the meeting ad-
journed and the audience filed out quietly. At the doors were
Socialists who handed everyone circulars in which certain clergy-
men were quoted as favoring Socialism.

Father Gasson's Address

Speaks of a Socialism Which Wishes to Place the Ownership of All
Goods on the State.

Father Gasson said in part: "It is indeed a pleasure to come
before a body of men and women who are interested in what is
one of the most vital questions of the day.

"The subject upon which I have been asked to speak and the
side I shall try to maintain is, of course, one of great interest to
the world at large at the present time. We are all interested in
the welfare of our fellow-beings. We all feel that there is some-
thing wrong in society at the present time.

"There are colossal fortunes and there are depths of poverty.
There are those who know not what to do with their wealth and
those who have to cry out for a mere pittance only to keep body
and soul together.

"Consequently, when Socialism comes to us and states that its
great aim is to benefit humanity, to lessen poverty, to make life
brighter and more full of sunshine, we must every one of us say
that with their aim and object we are in hearty accord.

"Therefore I would not have anyone understand I want to
speak of the dangers of Socialism or that for a moment I am not
deply interested in the welfare of humanity. My whole life has
been spent for others."
"I belong to one of the religious orders of the church, and we receive nothing for our services. Therefore I am in hearty sympathy with that aim of Socialism. Then again Socialism is rather a shifting name. It may be that the Socialism that some of you follow is not the Socialism the dangers of which I am speaking about.

"I beg all to understand that when I speak of the dangers of Socialism I am speaking of what occurs to me and others as the positive dangers of a specified form known as Socialism. The Socialism of which I speak is that economic social theory which wishes to place the ownership, production and distribution of all goods in the hands of one body, the State. The great authors of the system of Socialism of which I speak are Karl Marx, Engles and others.

"There is need of reform at the present time, but this reform should come through legitimate channels and not in ways which would overturn society.

"Socialism as propounded by certain of its teachers, contains principles which are subversive of personal integrity, domestic integrity and national integrity.

"Even suppose these dangers did not exist, Socialism would be an impracticable system for our everyday interests. The life, the vigor of the nation depends in its ultimate analysis upon the vigor and the integrity of the individual. If the men and women of the nation are all right, if they are just, if they possess all that range of virtues which goes to make up personal integrity, the nation would be strong and would endure.

"Personal integrity depends upon two things, namely, the view of life and the laws of morality. If we propound the view that there is nothing in life except what is material, if a man is nothing but a combination of chemical atoms, if back of this body I see there is no undying spirit, what is the view of life? If there is nothing but matter, then the battle must be between matter and matter, and might must be the victor.

"If beyond this life there is no future life, if there is no settling up, no bringing to the bar of inflexible justice, then why should a man repent of crime?

"I say, since personal integrity depends upon the entire view and that view must always be that there is something in man which is not material, that back of what we see with our eyes there is an undying spirit, and that the dignity of man depends upon the growth of that spirit and the power and influence of that spirit, and that the dignity of man rests entirely upon the supremacy of that spirit, and where the dignity is supreme and covers the body, I say where the spirit is keen and holds the body in check, then we have personal integrity.

"Now, if we take the writings of the Socialists of whom I speak, we shall find that they do teach this doctrine, which, as I have said, is subversive of personal integrity. The theory as advocated by Engles and others seems to be: 'Every form of being is material. Motion is the mode of being of matter. Beyond life there is nothing and in life there is nothing except matter.'

"While that seems a simple sentence, you can see how from that germ-thought there can spring the whole forming of a man's character, and, therefore, I say the first great danger we detect in the Socialist theories as propounded by certain authors is the danger to personal integrity.

"Now, the second danger which I would detect in Socialism comes from the danger to the family. The strength of a nation lies first of all in the integrity of its citizens, but it lies also and almost in greater measure in the integrity of the family, in domestic integrity.

"Unless family life in the nation is safeguarded, unless the
bond of marriage is regarded as sacred, unless child life is respected, and unless citizens regard as the greatest treasure of the nation, the child, and consider it as the most important obligation of a nation to take that child and train that character, the nation will inevitably go to pieces. The nations all safeguard the family, woman must be safeguarded and the child must be safeguarded.

"According to the general idea of socialism, when we have marriage, if there is not a suitable tie, what is the inevitable result? That, all nations have shown us, where the marriage tie has not been regarded as something higher and beyond a mere natural compact.

"Now, if we take the teachings of many of the Socialists, what do we find? The marriage bond? We find that many of them advocate more or less temporary relations between men and women—a sort of legalized free love.

"Consequently, a theory which would advocate such a change in society, which would be brought about by temporary relations, or free love, would constitute a grave danger to the republic. What would become of the child under these conditions? You may say that the child would be taken over by the state, but the naturally constituted trainers of the child are the parents.

"Therefore the second danger comes from the fact that according to the teaching of many Socialists family life would be disrupted and that family care would be denied the child—and that is a danger to the nation's life. If we are to accept the materialistic evolution of Socialism, then the great familiar law of justice is lost, and where you lose justice, where justice fades out of a nation's life, there you make the grave of that nation.

"Taking the teachings of the leaders of many of the socialistic programmes, who teach that except in mathematics that all laws are changeable, that teaching is dangerous to the nation.

"Socialism practicable? If every man and woman was perfectly made and every man and woman of the highest character and intended to live for others then we might possibly come to a socialistic world. But we have got to take them as they are and you cannot change people's dispositions by making laws.

"Socialists are fond of talking of the equality of all men. This is a beautiful phrase and in many senses true. We are all one before the law and in the sight of the Almighty, but are we all equal in regard to strength of body, of mind? Do we all have the same attractive manner or possess agility?

"I am not saying that the present evils should not be held down by legislation, but I am saying that as long as men and women are constituted as they are there must be evils. Then again remember that supposing that we were to banish all private ownership, and that men and women worked for a common state, you take away the great incentive of human energy, the fact that by our energy we gladly become owners in this or that property. So, even supposing there were no dangers, it would be impractical to carry out the theories of Socialism."

Questions and Answers

For an Hour it Was Give and Take Between the Priest and His Audience.

At the conclusion of Father Gasson's remarks, the following questions were asked and answered by him:

Q.—If orphanage asylums provide the proper care and love for the child, why could not the State do it? A.—If the objector were familiar with the ordinary police courts and knew their method of handling children, I hardly think he would feel like trusting his own to State officers.

Q.—Do not careful Socialists today deny the principles which
the speaker has justly denounced? A.—The Socialists I was speaking of are the Socialists who propounded these principles.

Q.—Why cannot Catholics and Protestants alike unite on a common subject, as for instance temperance? A.—I think we are united, as the Chairman said we met on a common platform in our effort to improve the South End.

Q.—Has the speaker ever seen or heard of any Socialistic programme which meant to alter or change marriage customs? A.—I was intending to read citations from several Socialistic authors, but unfortunately my eyesight is bad. (Father Gasson had the works of several Socialistic authors on the desk.)

Q.—Since the Socialistic movement has accomplished so much for the working class in Germany, why should Socialism be considered a danger to those whom it seeks to benefit? A.—I rather anticipated that question when I said that all were interested in the great aims and the object of Socialism. I tried to dwell with some force on not allowing labor to be treated as a bale of merchandise. In the early part of the reign of Pope Leo XIII., he said that no capitalist should fail to give the toiler a wage which would enable the toiler to live in decent circumstances. It is a matter of history that the clergy, as a rule, have championed the cause of labor.

Q.—Will the speaker give an explanation or definition of free love? A.—Any system which would advocate transferring from one woman to another of that love which he gives to one and which she claims is that love which would enable him to make her his wife.

Q.—What reason have you to believe that Socialism would bring more hardship to family life than the present economic pressure? A.—Because the principles of Socialism if carried out would result in tyranny more severe than anything from which we suffer at present. I don’t think we have any right to attribute to economic pressure all the evils under which we labor. In New York 37 cents a head a day is spent in one community for liquor, and that money would do much to abolish some evils.

Q.—How is it that France, for generations a Catholic country, had a death rate higher than the birth rate, while now an infidel country the birth rate is higher than the death rate? A.—There are very few parts of France where that holds good. I believe, because in a recent article written on “The Peaceful Conquest of France by Germany,” it showed that owing to the low birth rate in France, Germans were marching in quietly and settling there. The teachings of the Catholic Church carried out would abolish race suicide. Her teaching is that no man can, even in thought, contemplate wrecking or destroying the life of an unborn child without endangering his soul.

Q.—Why do seven-eighths of the other churches believe that Socialism is Christianity? A.—I don’t think they do consider it in that light. The only true socialists, anyway, are members of religious orders of the Catholic church.

Q.—How is it that those who have been exponents of the materialistic theory so often outshine in virtues those who hold to the other theory? A.—I do not think that is true. I think that if you will take the lives of men and compare them you will find far stronger virtues among those who adopted the spiritualistic theory.

Q.—Are not the present conditions as bad as those the speaker fears would prevail under Socialism? A.—I said in my words at the start that there is something wrong with the present conditions. I said also that a man was bound to get a fair wage, but I believe that much can be brought about by legislation.

Q.—If a worker believes that equality will come with Socialism why should not a worker become a socialist? A.—Because we
have got to go by principles. If Socialism advocates principles subversive to society we should not follow their principles.

Q.—Is your attitude your own or that of the church? A.—Both. I am bound by a pledge of obedience, but it reads “in all things, except what is sin.” I would not stand for anything that was not right.

Q.—Did Marx or Engels ever write or speak of the home as pictured by the speaker? A.—Not exactly as pictured, but if their principles were carried out they would lead to the picture I have drawn.

Q.—If Socialism were rightly understood, would it not be a benefit to mankind? The propounder of this question put on his hat and went out, so there was no answer.

Q.—If the sale of liquor were stopped would the trusts not still control all the necessities of life? A.—I believe that if the liquor evil were wiped out a great part of the difficulties would be solved.

Q.—When a movement carries 10,000,000 votes is it not unfair to take the view of an ex-Socialist? A.—I did not draw all my inspiration from Goldstein. I got the most of it from Karl Marx, the leader of the Socialists.

Q.—Isn’t it true that the Socialist party is the only one that wants to give the working man a home? A.—There are a great many societies which are to enable the working men to own their own homes.

Q.—Haven’t the same charges been made against the great reformers, such as Martin Luther? A.—It is true they were maligncd, but what I am trying to bring out is that the teachings of Socialism would bring about the downfall of the nation.

Q.—As the Republicans and Democrats have been legislating for years and have done nothing for the workingman, why not try the Socialists? A.—Socialism is not only politics. It comes into the domain of morality and when you reach the question of morality you are in the province of the Catholic Church.

Q.—Why is it that the most ignorant people in the world, the Russians, are the most religious? A.—I don’t think they are.

Q.—What incentive do capitalists offer the workingman? A.—They do not offer many, but there is the incentive of seeing your work well done.

Q.—Are not Catholic countries such as Spain, Portugal and Mexico backward in civilization, containing many illiterates? A.—There are parts of Kentucky in which the inhabitants display greater illiteracy than in any part of the world.

Q.—Do you believe that any other incentive other than material gain could be supplied to those not in religious orders? A.—I don’t believe that you can get the majority of the people to work for that incentive.

Q.—If Socialism is against capitalism, and capitalism is money and money is the root of all evil, why is the Catholic church against Socialism? A.—Because she wishes to safeguard humanity.

Q.—Is it legitimate to suppose that behind the reverend gentleman’s speech is the spirit of economy for the property of the Catholic church? A.—The church never considers property or wealth when the question of a home, a woman or a child is before it. It stands, as it always has stood, by the cradle, by the wife and by the grave.

Q.—Is not free love existing at the present time in our heresies selling themselves to nobility? A.—There are certainly many American women who don’t sell themselves. It is the abuse of modern society which leads to these things.

Q.—Can the speaker point out one place in Karl Marx’s “Das Capital” in which he advocates free love and the bringing up of the child by the State? A.—By following out his teachings both these things would come to pass.
Q.—Should not a Catholic priest, speaking of Socialism, differentiate between the different brands? A.—I think it would be helpful to all of us if there was a general clearing up of the term which goes with the principles I have indicated.

Q.—If I should come to you in confession next month and tell you that I was a Socialist, would you refuse me absolution? A.—I should require an investigation into the special brand of socialism you favor.

Q.—Would the Catholic church object to one of its clergymen becoming a Socialist? A.—I am inclined to think it would.

Q.—If the government sold liquor at cost, would that not do away with it in the end? A.—I believe it would in a great measure reduce the evil.

Q.—What particular kind of Socialism does the speaker agree with? A.—I was never accused of being a Socialist before. I'm afraid I don't belong to any of the brands.

Address of James F. Carey

Those of you who listened to the Rev. Father Gasson's lecture on "The Dangers of Socialism," and those of you who read the reports published in the papers, may have been struck by the fact (and I consider it the great fact, the dominant note in it all), that for the first time on the part of those who are opposed to Socialism, the Socialist movement was treated with courtesy, that even though the reverend gentlemen did not agree with us, he at least did treat us with the courtesy, which we as men and women deserve; that he did not indulge in that violent and wholesale denunciation which unfortunately has been the characteristic of many clergymen of the Catholic church and others, that does no credit to them, nor does it injure us. I wish to say as an individual Socialist, and I think I can say it for all other Socialists, that we thank him publicly for his courteous, kindly and manly treatment of us; he lifted the discussion of the subject up out of those narrow, bigoted, and vicious levels on which some would force it, up to a courteous and manly plane, which is to his credit—his everlasting credit.

It is quite possible that some of us are mistaken, and if we are to arrive at the truth of a thing we can best do so by discussing it with the least degree of passion and with an absence of denunciation.

The primary criticism, the criticism which is perhaps the one that first of all should be made concerning Father Gasson's lecture is that it carried with it the impression that there are many brands of Socialism, that there are a number of kinds of Socialism. That, if it be true, would necessarily make the discussion difficult. You know some people have fallen into the habit of saying that there are fifty-seven varieties of Socialism, but I have not the time to discuss the fifty-seven varieties even if they existed.
A question was propounded to the reverend gentleman by a member of his own congregation, a man of mature years who is one of the original members of the Socialist movement, and is today a consistent member of the Catholic church. He asked Father Gasson, "if knowing him to be a member of the Socialist party would he, as his father confessor, grant him absolution when he went, as is his custom frequently, to confession," and the Rev. Father Gasson said, "I would first want to inquire into the brand of Socialism that you believe in." I say that this is the most important thing, because if he is to discuss a brand of Socialism with which I have nothing to do, and I am to discuss another brand of Socialism with which he did not deal, then we do not get anywhere at all.

The mistake of the gentleman, which is common with many who discuss the Socialism movement, is to assume that there are many brands of Socialism. I submit that that position is not warranted by the facts. It is said that there are three hundred and sixty different kinds of religion in the world, but if you wanted to discuss the Catholic religion you would not go off and discuss some form of religion that may exist somewhere at the end of the world. Not at all. If there be fifty-seven different kinds of Socialism, as has humorously been stated by other than the Rev. Father Gasson, IF THERE BE MANY BRANDS OF SOCIALISM, THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT OF THE WORLD IS CONCERNED ONLY WITH ONE SPECIFIC BRAND. And we insist that it is the duty of those who oppose us, not to confuse the subject by talking about any other brand which they may assume exists.

In every country in the world, called civilized, there is a Socialist movement, and that Socialist movement is distinguished from all other movements by a certain specific declaration. You can go where you please, to the Japanese Socialist, or the Chinese Socialist, or the Irish Socialist, or the Scotch, or the English, or Australian, or German, or French, or Italian, or Servian, or whatever they may be, of all races of all creeds, and of all colors, you can go to them all, and the distinguishing feature is a certain declaration. I submit it to you. If every possible demand and every possible vagary of the human brain was included in a declaration of principles by any body of human beings, that did not contain the declaration that SOCIETY SHOULD OWN AND OPERATE DEMOCRATICALLY THE SOCIAL TOOLS OF PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION, that would not be a Socialist declaration; and if a declaration is issued carrying with it nothing else but the simple demand for the social ownership and demo-
cratic management of the social tools of production and distribution, just those words, that would be and is the Socialist declaration.

Now, there are things that are Socialistic. What are they? They are those things that tend in that direction, and nothing else. When men talk about various other subjects and declare them to be socialistic, in spite of the fact that the distinguishing feature of the Socialist movement of every country is the declaration for the social ownership and democratic management of the social tools of production and distribution, either they are misinformed, or uninformed, or engaged in malicious misrepresentation. I have no desire to defend the various things that some say is Socialism. Not at all. I have no desire to defend the personal views of individual Socialists on other subjects. Not at all. And it is not fair for individuals who are opposed to Socialism, or organizations that may be opposed at present to Socialism, to pick here and there out of the great army, and the growing army, of the Socialist movement an isolated or scattered statement of an individual, and hold the whole Socialist movement responsible. So that in the discussion of Socialism I say as a member of the Socialist party that the distinguishing feature of the movement that calls itself Socialist is the declaration of principles that we have announced. If the Catholic church is opposed to it, that is their affair; if any other church is opposed to it, that is their affair. They have a perfect right to be opposed to it. I do not question the right of any individual or any body of individuals to disagree with my political or economic views, or the political or economic views of the Socialist movement. They have just as much right to their opinions on that subject as I have, but we have a right to have our position considered, and fairly considered, and no amount of evasion will prevent the ultimate consideration of our position on the part of the people of the earth. We are patient; the working class have waited a thousand years in the hope of emancipation from oppression; we can, if we must, wait a thousand years longer.

Now, then, I want to say that so far as I know, if a member of the Catholic church, either of the clergy or the laity, opposes the Socialist movement, either courteously, like Father Gasson, or violently like some others; if they oppose it and we ask whence their authority comes for opposing it, they give a more or less vague reply. Do they, when they oppose Socialism, speak for the Catholic church? Is the Catholic church opposed to Socialism? Many clergymen of the Catholic church are; and I want
to say to you that I know Catholic priests that vote the Socialist ticket, and there are very many more that will. But that is not the question. They may be wrong. Does the Catholic church as a church oppose the demand of the Socialist movement for the social ownership and operation of the social tools of production and distribution? I defy any man to show me in any authoritative statement of the church that they have ever said they are opposed to that. They have never said so. Individual Catholic priests may, archbishops may, cardinals may, and the Pope may issue advisory letters or encyclicals. Let me call your attention to what Pope Leo said in his encyclical concerning the condition of labor. Just two quotations. I trust that I will not lift them out of the page, or out of the context:

"Thus it is clear that the main tenet of socialism, the community of goods, must be utterly rejected for it would injure those whom it is intended to benefit."

Then he quotes from St. Thomas Aquinas, with approval, the following:

"Man should not consider his material possessions as his own, but as common to all."

Now, what are you going to make out of that? Here is the encyclical of the Pope declaring against community of goods, and quoting with approval one who freely affirms it. But in any case, that is not Socialism. The Socialists do not affirm community of goods. The Socialists are not Communists. There are some orders of the Catholic church, like the order to which the Rev. Father Gasson belongs, that are in a sense communistic societies where no member of it owns or has private property. You might give to the Rev. Father Gasson the wealth of the world, and according to his vows he must hand it over to the society of which he is a member. They have community of goods, and yet you are denounced if you wish the same thing. But the Socialist movement does not stand for community of goods. So that if the Holy Father denounces community of goods, so do I; and I denounce it as a Socialist. I do not think it would work. I can give better arguments, or as good arguments, against it as I ever read from anybody else, and there we are. There is the difficulty. Clergymen and laymen quoting from the Pope as the authoritative head of the Catholic church, quote that statement: that the main tenet of the Socialist, community of goods, must be utterly rejected, and I say if that is the main tenet of the Socialist, it should be re-

*Encyclical on Labor, page 408, Catholic Socialism, by Francesco Nitti, professor of political economy at University of Naples.*
jected. The difficulty is that men are confused over the term. I repeat again, that the Socialist movement of the world— that is, the distinguishing feature of it, whether it is Mohammedan or Pagan, Catholic or Protestant, or Infidel, in every country, in every country in the world where the capitalist system exists, the distinguishing feature of the Socialist movement is the demand, not for community of goods, but for the collective ownership of the social tools of production and distribution.

But, the gentlemen say, some speaking more or less for the Catholic church, some for other churches, and for no church, the Socialist movement is anti-religious, believes in free love and a few other things. Now, I am not a free lover, and I am not anti-religious, and even if I were, that has nothing to do with my demand for the social ownership of industry. One might be led to believe that in order to love your wife, you'd have to starve to death together. They say, "Why, your leaders are Atheists!" I do not know whether they are or not. Some of them may be, some of them are not. Some of them may be Infidels; quite likely some of them are this, and that, and something else. I am not in the Socialist movement because someone is an atheist or anything else. I might suggest at this juncture that the president of this republic, William Taft, is a Unitarian, and that is so dangerously near being an atheist that it takes a microscope to see the difference, and that he, this Unitarian, the leader of the Republican party, was supported by high prelates of the Catholic church, and by many members of that church. Now, if you want to judge a man or a party because of a leader that is an infidel, how can they explain when President Taft denies the trinity, denies the immaculate conception, denies the apostolic succession, denies transubstantiation, denies the divinity of Jesus Christ, and yet is elected as the leader of the Republican party and in a measure by their votes. If we had put up such a man, they'd point to him as an atheist. "There's your leader! There's your leader!! Denies the trinity, denies it all;" and then we'd have to get around and explain that we are not responsible for the private views of individuals who may be in the community, and who may be members of the party.

Then they say, "Well, that may be all very true, but your party distributes literature which defends anti-religion." Our party is in a peculiar position so far as literature is concerned. First of all, we have no power or authority and no desire to restrict people writing, or to restrict people reading, anything they please. The Social-
ist movement cannot put any Socialist book on the *index
ex-purgatoris*. If people want to read it, they read it, so far
as we are concerned. There are many things written by
Socialists with which I absolutely disagree. But what
they said was their individual opinions. For example,
Bebel, a leader, at least of the Socialist party of Germany,
as clean a man as ever lived, declared that out of all the
turmoil of events the future society would establish a sort
of free relation between the sexes without restriction so
far as society or other institutions were concerned. It
was his personal opinion. I disagree with him. Will I
be expelled from the party for disagreeing with him? Not
at all. What we stand for is declared in our platform, and
this declaration does not and never will stand for that
position in my judgment. And I say it, as I have said it
before, and said it in the highest councils of the party,
that that declaration of Bebel's is not only not Socialist,
but anti-Socialistic. I believe that society is tending more
and more firmly, in this growth of the Socialist move-
ment, toward the monogamous family, the single pair; that
the family relations, the marriage relations, will be lifted
up and purified and made more permanent. I say we have
a right to be judged by our platform. I might declare
that on the back part of the moon men lived who had
feathers instead of hair. Then some persons would run
up and down the street and say, "This is what the Social-
ists believe; they believe that men have feathers instead
of hair." You can see the injustice of that. Some of you
have had a copy of our platform. That is our declaration
adopted by a national convention of the party, and ap-
proved by practically the entire membership of the party,
as we run our affairs democratically. The only reference
made to the subjects against which they urge their oppo-
sition is this; that we declare religion to be a private
matter. Let me read you the exact words:

"The Socialist party is primarily an economic and po-
litical movement. It is not concerned with matters of
religious belief."

Now you may say that we have adopted this as a policy
to deceive somebody. I was on the committee that considered
that matter, the platform committee. In the committee I
opposed having this in the platform, for the reason that I
said that it was not required in this country. In this coun-
try we have a free state and a free church. That is the
demand of the Socialists in every European country; just
what we have here. And I said that it had no place in
the platform, but others thought it should be put in, and
there was a discussion, and some wise and otherwise state-
ments were made, and it was finally passed, and there you are. Now is that a peculiar situation so far as our attitude is concerned? Let me show you. Here is a book by Liebknecht. You notice that he has whiskers, so did Marx, so has Bebel. I have none—therefore I suppose some people would say I am not in good standing. In order to be absolutely right, I suppose I should follow them in the matter of hirsute appendages.

Now here is what Liebknecht says, speaking on the original platform adopted by the Socialists of Germany in 1875, possibly the first authoritative declaration so far as a platform of the organization was concerned, ever issued in the world, and followed by the platform adopted at the convention at Erfurt, October 20, 1891. He says this as a summary:

"Our end is the free democracy with equal economic and political rights. The free society of associated labor, the welfare of all is for us the one need of the state and society."

Now the platform, the Erfurter platform, as well as the platform of Gotha, declares practically as we declare in the matter of religion. It declares that "Religion is a private matter." Can anything be more certain than that? That is what we declare for: a free church in a free state. This has been obtained here. For that reason, such declarations are not needed in the platform in this country. They are needed there. They even demand secular education in the platform, and public schools. In support of these demands Liebknecht says as follows. Now, mark you, this is the German Social Democracy as it is called in Germany, the German Socialist movement; this is its platform, and its leader, or rather its spokesman, stating the reasons for having that in the platform. He says:

†"The following paragraphs have given us much trouble in their formulation. To meet the difficulty it was moved to accept the democratic demands of the Eisenacher platform: Separation of the church from the school and the state. That was quite right in its time, but at present it does not comprehend all that we would and must say. In the earlier formulation the church is regarded as an institution equal in rank with the state. This is not our idea. We go much further; according to our view the church is simply a private association, which is controlled by its own laws, as all other private associations are. That is the meaning of the absolute equality to which we have here given expression. Therefore we say: The ecclesiastical and religious bodies are to be regarded as private associations."

By Wilhelm Liebknecht.

†"Socialism," By Wilhelm Liebknecht.
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may not be able to say that we wish to offer them vio-

cence we have added: ‘Associations which order their

affairs independently?’’

In relation to secular or public schools, Liebknecht con-
tinues:

“You know how the Social Democracy is represented

as a red specter, how the ecclesiastical associations say

of us that we are a party of atheists and that the Social

Democrats would forcibly take religion from every one

and violently crush the church. In order to take the foun-
dation from and to break the point of these demagogical

slanders and pious falsehoods, we state here that the regu-
lation of religious matters lies with each individual, and

we declare religion to be a private matter. I admit that

I struggled for some time against taking up those prac-
tical considerations, since their meaning seemed so self-
evident in the declaration of the platform. The Social

Democracy as such has absolutely nothing to do with

religion. Every man has the right to think and believe

what he will, and no one has the right to molest anoth-

er in his thoughts or beliefs, or to allow any one’s opinions
to be a disadvantage to him in any way. Opinions and

beliefs can only be proceeded against when they become
converted into pernicious and unlawful acts. But the

opinions and beliefs in themselves must be free. We, as

Social Democrats, must respect them, and those Social

Democrats who respect the genuineness and worth of their

fellow-men will also avoid scoffing at them. But if it

were our duty to state that we will not rob any one of his

religion or hinder him in the exercise thereof, we do not

offer the church any handle by which it can come into the

schools, and therefore we say ‘Compulsory attendance at

public national schools.’ Every child must be sent by its

parents or relatives to these secular schools, but by virtue

of the fundamental statement that religion is a private mat-

ter, it remains for the parents themselves to teach their

children, or allow them to be taught, in the religion which

they choose. At first we thought to expressly state this

in the platform, but we found that such a practical com-

mentary did not belong there.”

In the foregoing Liebknecht declares for the separa-
tion of the church from the school and the state. In this

country this does not apply, for here the public schools

are not controlled by any church, and in this country also

the church and state have been separated—a condition

agreed to practically by all the people. If there are those

that would like to see church and state re-unite they have

the privilege of seeking to have it done, but against such

a proposition most people, including many Catholics, would

object.

As to the schools the position is clear, in the matter

of church control of the schools—meaning by that the

public schools. Liebknecht declares that no church should

control them, but he affirms and defends the right of

parents to teach their children such religion as they, the

parents, may wish, and to select such religious teachers as
they may determine. The consistency of the German Socialist movement in this particular may be seen by the following facts:

The German Emperor—the Monarchy—is Protestant. Some years ago the German government ordered the expulsion of the members of the Society of Jesus, the Catholic order of which the Rev. Father Gasson is a member. The Centre Party (the Catholic party) naturally sought to remove the ban of expulsion, and in every instance the Socialist members of the German Parliament have supported this demand, because the Socialists affirm religion to be a private matter, and the state should not prevent any religious body from having such religious teachers as they may desire.

In the matter of compulsory secular education there was some difficulty in this country a few years ago, but the matter appears to have been happily adjusted. The state maintains a standard of secular education for public schools, which obtains in the private and parochial schools, whether they be Catholics, Episcopalian, Lutheran, or any other; so that I feel I am correct in saying that in the two particulars just treated, the German demand is essentially for the establishment of the relations between the church, the state, and the schools which has obtained here.

It was stated by the Rev. Father Gasson that Socialism would result in impairing the integrity of the individual and of the family and of society. What does integrity mean? Integrity has two meanings. Let me read you the definition of the word given by a professor of Oxford University:

"The condition of having no part or element taken away or wanting. Undivided—or unbroken, A complete thing, etc."
"In a moral sense—unimpaired moral state, etc."

So that integrity covers these two things. When any man speaks of integrity, he speaks of a general sense and also of a moral sense. We all assume that he meant it in both senses.

Would the integrity of the individual be impaired by Socialism? Perhaps it would be by the kind of Socialism that Father Gasson had in mind. I do not know. But would it be impaired by a social condition in which the social tools of industry belonged to the whole people and were operated by them democratically? What would be the effect on the individual? Now, mark you, Socialism does not offer a perfect solution, in which all men would be perfect if they got it. Socialism merely presents its premise. It is to be the next step in the economic prog-
ress of the race. It does not assume that under Socialism we will all be pure, like Royal Baking Powder. It declares that we will be lifted up above the present animal struggle which now tends to degrade us.

Now, what of the integrity of the individual under this system, moral or otherwise? What of the integrity of a man in business? What is he to do in order to sustain himself against his competitors? Can a man today in competitive industry sustain himself by being absolutely truthful, and absolutely honest, and absolutely generous and charitable? Can he do it? Do you know any man, any place where you buy anything—tobacco, or beer, or tall hats, or chickens, or eggs, or anything else—do you know any man that tells you exactly the truth concerning the things that he sells you? No, there is nobody. There is none. He doesn't tell you that that chicken has been dead for years. He doesn't tell you that that beer that you drank is a chemical preparation. He doesn't tell you that the ten-year-old whiskey was made yesterday. He doesn't tell you that the all-wool suit is made out of shoddy. No, he can't afford to. All you have to do to get the standard of morals of the average business man is to read the advertisements. One declares he sells the best goods at the lowest prices in this city. The next fellow in the next column says he sells the best goods at the lowest prices in this city. Now the two of them can't do that. One of them must lie. Then, what of capitalists that are in the trusts? Can they be held up as standards of moral integrity? Not successfully. No one, not even themselves, believe they are. Do you think that an industrial system that gives to an individual the control of mountains of wealth tends to his moral integrity? Read the reports from society, the daily reports, how they riot in licentious luxury; read of King Leopold; read of King Edward; read about the New York and Pittsburg millionaires; read of all of them. They riot with a mountain of wealth and an excess of luxury, and the excess of luxury breeds other excesses.

Then read of individuals under this system. The individual working girl, the individual working man. What of their integrity? The Rev. Mr. Myers, a Protestant clergyman in Tremont Temple, made certain remarks the other day that you may have read. He denounced the present conditions and pointed out that it meant the ruin of thousands of young girls. Eight years ago I made the same statement in this hall and was denounced in every newspaper.

I read in a paper published by the American Suffragist
movement—not a Socialist paper in any sense—and it said that there were three hundred thousand girls required for the white slave traffic. That was the number needed in the white slave business. The average life was five years; that means sixty thousand girls had to be taken every year from the loins of the working class and thrust down into hell in order to feed the present capitalist system.

What of the moral integrity of the individual under this system—the individual working man. All you have to do is to see him when he applies for a job—this free born American working man, hat in hand and with a back looking like the letter "C." I worked for many years in the factory. Sometimes I stood up straight and looked my boss in the eye, sometimes I did not. Sometimes you don’t. Do you think that it improves your moral integrity to know that this fellow over you holds the bread and butter of yourself and your old mother and father, and your wife and your children? If you try to look him in the eye and say you are a man, he will take the bread out of the mouths of those dear to you.

And the family! What of the family today? Let me say to you, and say it calmly, and I trust that none will take offence. If they do I can’t help it. I have many friends, close friends and dear friends, who are members of the Knights of Columbus—the flower of the youth of the Catholic Church. Some of them are Socialists, a few of them at least. Some of them are not. They are still my friends, because a man can differ from another and still have a little respect for him, even though they may be wide apart on many subjects. Let me suggest to you, when you may meet the official statistician of that society, ask him to ascertain the percentage of its members—and its membership is made up of men who are qualified by years and by health to be fathers of families—ask them "What percentage are married and have children?" Ask them that. They speak of themselves as the "Bachelor Club." There is one Council that I know of that has three hundred members. Three of the members are Socialists. All of the Socialists are married, and they have a total of twenty-six children. Sixty-three per cent. of the other members of that council are not married, although they are old enough, and are men of health, and brain, and years. Talk about breaking up the home! Who broke up their homes? I tell you it’s the present industrial system with its small wages and want of economic security.

There is a society here—the Boston Young Men’s Catholic Association. They hope to increase their membership, and I trust they do, because every member of any
church should aid the church organizations. Take the statistics of how many of them are married, and how many of them have children. Now, who broke up their homes? Who broke up the homes of those hundreds of thousands of women that are going down into the dark, some tonight, upon these streets here in Boston. Who broke up their homes? Who broke up the homes of the two million married women who are working for wages in the mills and factories and shops of this country? Who broke up their homes? Who breaks up the homes of that great army of children, two million children under sixteen years of age, working for wages? Who broke up their homes?

But they say, “I read in the papers where some prominent Socialist, a leader, was getting a divorce, or being sued in a breach of promise case.” “A leading Socialist.” I suggest to you that if any of you are unknown and want to get into the lime light, get a divorce or get sued for breach of promise, and even though nobody ever heard of you before, you are a leader of the Socialist movement. In the last ten years there have been one million divorces in this country—one million! The papers the other day accounted for one of them. What about the nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand others? What of them? And mark you, that is breaking up the home legally, as they say—it is done in accordance with law. It is in accordance with the laws of this state and of the other states that these couples are separated. Now I am not an anarchist. I believe in obedience to law. We obey the law. So do you. But who passed the law to make it possible for individuals to be separated in such quantities and for every sort of cause, from cold feet to incompatibility? Who passed that law? The Socialists? Did we pass the law? No. Who did? The Democrat and Republican parties. And yet they denounce us for breaking up the home. They urge upon their faithful followers that they vote for those parties that have enacted the law by which a million homes have been legally broken up in this land in ten years. I suggest it as a subject to talk over among yourselves. I did not pass the divorce laws of this land, neither did the Socialist movement; and yet they blame us for it. When you have an industrial condition such as we now have, where there is the constant competition of the married man and the unmarried man of the working class, there are great tendencies that operate to break up the home. Lack of employment; the man goes off to look for a job; he may never return; he may be beaten down to the level of a tramp. His family works along the best they
can, and are finally absorbed in the night of the working class. Look at Lawrence, Lowell, Fall River, and every city. See the homes. See the great increase in tenement houses, the lunch counter and the lodging house. You don't need to go there. Here in Boston the question of families has become a joke upon the stage. All you have to do is to go to any theatre and you can hear the home spoken of in the most insulting manner, and you sit there and applaud. The most miserable and insulting jokes, insulting of the relations that ought to exist properly between man and woman.

Then, too, I might suggest that if you go down to the cafes and the hotels, "respectable" and otherwise, tonight, tomorrow night, next night, Saturday night, and see the young girls, the young men—I do not want to describe it. You know where the places are. You pass them. I trust you do not go in them, but you pass them. If you don't know where they are, somebody can tell you. There is always somebody ready to tell you. How do these places exist? How do they exist, down in the South End, on Hayward Place, on Beach street, on Avery Place, the North End, the West End, all those places? How do they exist there? By the law. Who made the law? Democrat and Republican voters. I defy any man, clergyman or other, to produce a single man that owns, controls or holds a lease of any of those hell holes, to produce a single one that is a Socialist. I further defy them to produce a single unfortunate girl that goes in there that is a Socialist. And that is not mere belief. That is true. They had better look to themselves. (A voice: "What about the men?") What about the men who go in? Socialists don't go in. There are not enough Socialists to pay for the light. If every Socialist in this city were to frequent those places, the total income from them would not pay the rent. I would be very glad to have a census taken of those who frequent these places. I have looked into these places and I have never seen a Socialist there. If they do go in, it is to their shame. But this is true, that many people go in there, for these places thrive, and these places are there because the Democrat and Republican parties put them there. And there you are. Integrity of the family! These gigantic dens of iniquity that exist under their eyes—and they denounce us. They say that far off in the future sometime, we threaten to disturb the proper relations of the sexes, and they look far off over what is going on before their eyes, and see it not.

Then, as to the integrity of society. What of the integrity of society today? Society as a moral affair or a
physical thing. What of it? Today society is torn into contending factions. Men may try to evade it, but it is true. Down at the bottom of it is the great fundamental division between the working class and the capitalist class. The Socialists alone regard that division as against the best interests of society. Everybody else says it is there, but you should not pay any attention to it. Socialists point out the fact, and offer a remedy. Already there is the great fundamental division; also there are great factions.Capitalist society today is torn into these factions which fight each other and war on each other. The dominant faction consists of those that can get possession of power. For example, the railroads seek the power to establish higher rates. The men who are interested to have their goods carried cheaply fight against the power of the railroads to prevent the railroads from using the social power to raise rates. Society is torn into myriad factions. Society lacks that unity which alone can make society what it should be. Capitalism rends it into warring classes and factions. The Socialist movement comes to that society, torn by warring classes and factions, and says there is a basis upon which unity is possible. That basis is the collective ownership and operation of the tools of industry. Once that is established, the fundamental division into classes disappears; once that is established, the struggles of different groups of capitalists for possession of the social energy disappear also, and society assumes its integrity as a whole, as an entity, by reason of the fact that the cause of the division into factions and classes has been removed. The greatest proposition, the only proposition for the restoration of the integrity of society is that made by the Socialist movement. You can denounce until the crack of doom; you can denounce classes, you can denounce the unhappy conditions, but unless you strike at the cause, all your attempts to cure the effects will in the end prove fruitless and useless. We point out the fact that the factions and the classes that exist in society and that have made all the social fret and turmoil of the world are at the base caused by the economic conditions, and by making the necessary change, that turmoil and war and division will pass away and society will assume its integrity as a whole.

Then, again, the Rev. Father Gasson says that the best Socialists are to be found in the orders of the Catholic church. Very good. There are many good Socialists in the orders of the Catholic church, and I hope their numbers will increase. And when I say Socialists, I mean my
kind, the only kind. There are not fifty-seven varieties. There is but one.

Then further he points out, and this is a philosophic discussion, that we are based upon materialism; that is, he declares that we affirm materialism. Now there are two kinds of materialism. There is the materialism that declares that the earth and universe are made up of matter, and that the matter contains inherent force, and that there is nothing outside of these forces or things. Now this is not Socialism. For heaven's sake don't say I said that it is. This is what is called scientific materialism, that which a lot of philosophers talk about among themselves, sometimes write books about, and I am not responsible for them. Now that kind of materialism is anti-religious in the sense of the spiritual, because it affirms a universal, material force in which there is no room for spiritual existence. All is force and matter. The Socialist position when it affirms the material phase, the economic interpretation of history—that does not deal with the question as to whether there is a God or not, but deals only with the facts of human development and points out that the economic conditions that surround the people in any country, and in any period of the world's history, affect them; that it is one of the factors that determine their character. The means by which they get their living, their economic environment, tends to make their character. That is economic interpretation of history. That was called the materialistic conception of history, but that is not materialism in the religious sense, and yet religious men deliberately twist the phrase and charge us with denying the possibility of the existence of a spiritual power. There are some Socialists that are materialists, no doubt. I am not to blame for their opinions, any more than they are to blame for mine. But the Socialist movement does not stand for that. If it did it would say so. You can be sure that the Socialists of today and of yesterday do not hope to get Socialism surreptitiously. We do not hold up a little toy and say, "Here it is," and thus lure you into some place you don't want to go. That is what the old parties do. You judge us by the standards that you have followed. They hold up a little toy in one hand, and it says on it, "Friends of labor," and with the other they make a big club to come down on your head at the first strike.

I am not a materialist in the religious sense, but I do recognize the economic facts that the economic condition at any period of time does affect men. Now whether it is the sole factor or not, is not the question. I don't think
it is. And that is the Socialist materialism. For example, take the war of the Revolution. In so far as we could understand, it was to some extent made possible by reason of the different economic interests of the king and his supporters and the American colonies. John Hancock and some other Americans were engaged in the tea business. The English government wanted to get the profit. John Hancock used to smuggle in tea. The English government sent over a cargo of tea, and called off the smugglers, and so the smugglers started a war, and that is all there is to it, as far as they were concerned. Some others fought for principle. And so you could go down through the history of this country, and you can find evidence that economic conditions of society in this country have affected the people. You can find it in the Civil War and conditions before the Civil War. The first vessel that carried slaves sailed out of New England. It was called the "Mary and Jesus." And religious people and the clergy were in the slave business. But after a time slavery in the North was not as profitable as what was called free labor, so northern slave owners sold their slaves to the South, which had also brought in other slaves, and then after a time the North went down and took that whole business away from them, and declared a great moral revolution. You can understand the Civil War better, the Revolutionary War better, all great events in American history better, if you understand the economic conditions that obtained at each period. And that is what the Socialists mean when they talk about historical materialism. But the gentlemen on the other side persist in declaring we mean materialism in the sense of the philosophers, the old German philosophers, and some others who talked about force and matter till your hair stood on end.

There is much more that I could say. I trust that you grasp this simple idea that I have framed out, that however many brands of Socialism may exist in the mind of any gentleman, to the mind of the Socialist there is but one brand, and upon that brand we invite criticism, and that brand is simply this: the demand for the social ownership and operation of the social tools of production and distribution. That is Socialism beyond question, and that alone; and that is the distinguishing feature of the Socialist movement of the world. If you say it means the abolition of private property, I say to you that it doesn't mean it to me. And when in the Pope's encyclical he affirms the value of private property, the necessity of private property, I would say to him, "I am a Socialist because I want to be the owner of private property." The present
industrial system, the capitalist system, so far as the great mass of the working class are concerned, denies this right of private property to the working class. The fundamental right to private property is based upon labor. A man first of all should have the right to the equivalent of the value his labor produces. Deny a man the right to what he produces, and you have denied the first principle of the right of private property. I believe in private property, and recognize that under this system it is for us simply to work to get on Saturday night enough to feed us for the next week in order that our energies may be restored, that on the next week we may work again. But private property for us does not exist. A few rags, a wretched house, a little furniture on the instalment plan, and a wooden box when we die. I want private property; I want a home and I want a right to live, and I recognize that in order to get these things I must own the means of getting them. I cannot produce property alone, for the means by which property and wealth are produced, by which I could produce property and wealth, are useless so far as I am individually concerned. I cannot operate them alone. And thus I join with my brothers. I say to them, let us collectively own these things and collectively operate them in order that wealth may be increased and wealth be returned to us in proportion as we have produced it, in order that we may have private property. This is essentially the position of the Socialist movement. I am not misrepresenting it, and I trust that sooner or later the world will discuss that demand. I know it will, and I know that whether it does or not, it will not deter us from advocating it. If we were reduced to one, if in all the world there were but one of us, that one would keep that standard of the Socialist movement floating in the face of the world. Though he walk in sorrow, alone, despised, misrepresented, assailed, spat upon, to an unknown grave, he would walk to that grave and he would uphold the standard and affirm his belief in the final emancipation of the working class. The Socialist movement of the world has entered the arena of human affairs, and has planted the standard of the emancipation of our class from class rule and the ending of the exploitation of man by man. And though defeat follows defeat, though our masters and our masters' defenders assail us from every side and every vantage point, though our numbers are reduced to the minimum, still we shall fight on, for within us is the faith that removes mountains. We have within us a conviction that is as irresistible as the rising sun, that the time will come—come in our days let us hope, or in the days of our chil-
dren's children, when this human society shall not be as now torn into classes and contending factions, but will be clasped, regardless of race or creed or color, in everlasting and universal solidarity.

Questions

Q.—In your opinion would it improve the moral integrity of society if the divorce law was abolished, and if so, why? A.—The Socialist Party has never taken any position upon the question of divorce, and anything that I might say is simply my personal view. I am married, and my wife and I do not believe in divorce from each other, but there are cases where divorce would serve the best interests of all concerned. In such cases they should be granted.

Q.—What is the position of the Socialist Party as to the taxation of bachelors? A.—Our position is that it is best to remove the economic conditions that serve to prevent people from getting married.

Q.—Does the Socialist Party stand for the popular election of United States Senators? A.—The Socialist Party is in favor of one national body instead of two. However, if we are to have a United States Senate the Socialists stand for the election of its members by popular vote, but it would be better to abolish that body.

Q.—Would not the Pope, elected as he is, naturally be a monarchist? A.—That is not the affair of the Socialist Party. Any organization has the right to select its officers in any manner it consents to, whether democratically or otherwise. It's a mere matter of a private association ordering its affairs in the manner deemed best for its purposes, and I have no complaint to make.

Q.—Does the Socialist Party stand for equal pay to all? A.—No. We stand for the social ownership and democratic management of the tools of industry that are socially used. Society in the ownership and operation of these things will arrange the details as they arise consistent with the facts. I do not think that as men are today, and as they will be when Socialism arrives, that there will be a stated wage for all; that all men will receive the same remuneration. There will be the questions of the ease or laboriousness of the work, the length of the day, the danger; all these things should be considered.

Q.—If people received different wages would not conditions be just as bad as now? A.—Not at all. It is quite possible that one will perform more service than another. If so, we should expect him to get a greater
return. Suppose that under Socialism you get $60 a week and I get $40. The additional amount that you get will not give you any advantage over me, except that you have $20 with which you can travel, or buy books, or furniture, or other things; but you cannot invest that $20 in industry, and by the ownership of industry rob me of aught that I produce; so that if you get $60 a week and I get $40 and we both earn that amount, it will not injure me. There may be a difference in the amount that people receive under Socialism, but that difference cannot be accumulated as a weapon to oppress and exploit other workers.

Q.—As a Socialist, could you suggest how the workers of the world could be remunerated for their labor? A.—They could be remunerated as at present. By dollars, gold, silver, and paper, only the dollars would be more frequent. The workers of the world then, as now, would produce the wealth of the world. Now in return they get wages, pieces of gold and silver and paper, called money; the amount they get now only represents a part of the value their labor produces. Under Socialism they would get the representative of the full value of their labor.

Q.—What do you mean by “The social tools of industry?” A.—I mean instruments used in industry that require associated labor to operate—the labor of many persons. Take, for instance, the difference between a railroad and a wheelbarrow as a means of transportation. Alone and unaidered, one man could carry a package of freight from here to Worcester; to carry the same package on the railroad many workers must co-operate. Thus the wheelbarrow is an individual implement or tool, while the railroad is a social tool. What is true of railroads is equally true of factories, mines, etc. Because of their social character, we declare that they should be socially owned, the property of Society.

Q.—Under Socialism what will become of the property of the Catholic church? A.—All property held by the Catholic Church, or any Church, required for religious purposes, would remain in its possession. All men have the right to hold such religious opinions as they choose; also they have the right to such property as is needed for the exercise and teaching of their religion; but should they own stocks and bonds in railroads, mines, oil wells, factories or any other socially used industrial tools, such ownership would cease, as these things are socially required and should be socially owned.

Q.—Wherever the Catholic religion has taken root it has left bad effects. Are not those bad effects greater
than the worst possible effects of Socialism? A.—I don’t think there is any basis for that declaration, at all. The Catholic church came up under conditions of society that were of a low order. Humanity today is better than it was in the days of the founding of the Christian religion. There is a higher standard of life held up. To say that the result of the Catholic church has been bad, I do not think is fair to that body; and to say that these results have been worse than the results of Socialism could be, is not a fair comparison. A man with the tools of Society of 1000 or 2000 years ago could not produce as much as a man with the tools of today. The early Christian did the best he could under the circumstances. We are working with further developed means for getting a living. We have hospitals and better schools, which were not possible a good many years ago.

Q.—Did not the Catholic Church prevent the public schools from coming into existence? A.—No. There could not be schools such as we have now until the printing press was invented. To get books enough for all children was an impossibility. The nations were not sufficiently established. The human race did not accumulate the knowledge, did not accumulate the means by which a general system of education could be utilized. You can’t charge that against the Catholic church, or the Jewish church. The public schools was a development, and it is advisable whether men are Christian or anti-Christian to be fair as possible.

Socialist Party Platform

Adopted by National Convention, May 1908 and by Membership Referendum August 8th, 1908. Amended by Referendum September 7th, 1909.

Principles

Human life depends upon food, clothing and shelter. Only with these assured are freedom, culture and higher human development possible. To produce food, clothing or shelter, land and machinery are needed. Land alone does not satisfy human needs. Human labor creates machinery and applies it to the land for the production of raw materials and food. Whoever has control of land and machinery creates human labor, and with it human life and liberty.

Today the machinery and the land used for industrial purposes are owned by a rapidly decreasing minority. So long as machinery is simple and easily handled by one man, its owner cannot dominate the sources of life of others. But when machinery becomes more complex and expensive, and requires for its effective operation the organized effort of many workers, its influence reaches over wide circles of life. The owners of such machinery become the dominant class.
In proportion as the number of such machine owners compared to all other classes decreases, their power in the nation and in the world increases. They bring ever larger masses of working people under their control, reducing them to the point where muscle and brain are their only productive property. Millions of formerly self-employing workers thus become the helpless wage slaves of the industrial masters.

As the economic power of the ruling class grows it becomes less useful in the life of the nation. All the useful work of the nation falls upon the shoulders of the class whose only property is its manual and mental labor power—the wage worker—or of the class who have but little land and little effective machinery outside of their labor power—small traders and small farmers. The ruling minority is steadily becoming useless and parasitic.

A bitter struggle over the division of the products of labor is waged between the exploiting property classes on the one hand and the exploited propertyless class on the other. In this struggle the wage-working class cannot expect adequate relief from any reform of the present order at the hands of the dominant class.

The wage workers are therefore the most determined and irreconcilable antagonists of the ruling class. They suffer most from the curse of class rule. The fact that a few capitalists are permitted to control all the country's industrial resources and social tools for their individual profit, and to make the production of the necessities of life the object of competitive private enterprise and speculation is at the bottom of all the social evils of our time.

In spite of the organization of trusts, pools and combinations, the capitalists are powerless to regulate production for social ends. Industries are largely conducted in a planless manner. Through periods of feverish activity the strength and health of the workers are mercilessly used up, and during periods of enforced idleness the workers are frequently reduced to starvation.

The climaxes of this system of production are the regularly recurring industrial depressions and crises which paralyze the nation every fifteen or twenty years.

The capitalist class, in its mad race for profits, is bound to exploit the workers to the very limit of their endurance and to sacrifice their physical, moral and mental welfare to its own insatiable greed. Capitalism keeps the masses of workingmen in poverty, destitution, physical exhaustion and ignorance. It drags their wives from their homes to the mill and factory. It snatches their children from the playgrounds and schools and grinds their slender bodies and unformed minds into cold dollars. It disfigures, maims and kills hundreds of thousands of workingmen annually in mines, on railroads and in factories. It drives millions of workers into the ranks of the unemployed and forces large numbers of them into beggary, vagrancy and all forms of crime and vice.

To maintain their rule over their fellow men, the capitalists must keep in their pay all organs of the public powers, public mind and public conscience. They control the dominant parties and, through them, the elected public officials. They select the executives, bribe the legislatures and corrupt the courts of justice. They own and censor the press. They dominate the educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually just as they own it industrially.

The struggle between wage workers and capitalists grows ever fiercer, and has now become the only vital issue before the American people. The wage-working class, therefore, has the most direct interest in abolishing the capitalist system. But in abolishing the present system, the workingmen will free not only their own class but also all other classes of modern society. The small farmer, who is today exploited by large capital more indirectly but not less effectively than is the wage laborer; the small
manufacturer and trader, who is engaged in a desperate and losing struggle for economic independence in the face of the all-conquering power of concentrated capital; and even the capitalist himself, who is the slave of his wealth rather than its master. The struggle of the working class against the capitalist class, while it is a class struggle, is thus at the same time a struggle for the abolition of all classes and class privileges.

The private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation, is the rock upon which class rule is built: political government is its indispensable instrument. The wage-workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power and substituting collective for private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation.

The basis for such transformation is rapidly developing within present capitalist society. The factory system, with its complex machinery and minute division of labor, is rapidly destroying all vestiges of individual production in manufacture. Modern production is already very largely a collective and social process. The great trusts and monopolies which have sprung up in recent years have organized the work and management of the principal industries on a national scale, and have fitted them for collective use and operation.

There can be no absolute private title to land. All private titles, whether called fee simple or otherwise, are and must be subordinate to the public title. The Socialist Party strives to prevent land from being used for the purpose of exploitation and speculation. It demands the collective possession, control or management of land to whatever extent may be necessary to attain that end. It is not opposed to the occupation and possession of land by those using it in a useful and bona fide manner without exploitation.

The Socialist Party is primarily an economic and political movement. It is not concerned with matters of religious belief.

In the struggle for freedom the interests of all modern workers are identical. The struggle is not only national but international. It embraces the world and will be carried to ultimate victory by the united workers of the world.

To unite the workers of the nation and their allies and sympathizers of all other classes to this end, is the mission of the Socialist Party. In this battle for freedom the Socialist Party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but by working class victory, to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man.

Program

As measures calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of this ultimate aim, and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following program:

GENERAL DEMANDS.

1.—The immediate government relief for the unemployed workers by building schools, by reforesting of cutover and waste lands, by reclamation of arid tracts, and the building of canals, and by extending all other useful public works. All persons employed on such works shall be employed directly by the government under an eight-hour work-day and at the prevailing union wages. The government shall also loan money to states and municipalities without interest for the purpose of carrying on public works. It shall contribute to the funds of labor organizations for the purpose of assisting their unemployed members, and shall take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread
misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class.

2—The collective ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamboat lines and all other means of social transportation and communication.

3—The collective ownership of all industries which are organized on a national scale and in which competition has virtually ceased to exist.

4—The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water power.

5—The scientific reforestation of timber lands, and the reclamation of swamp lands. The land so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain.

6—The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage.

INDUSTRIAL DEMANDS.

7—The improvement of the industrial condition of the workers.
   (a) By shortening the workday in keeping with the increased productiveness of machinery.
   (b) By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.
   (c) By securing a more effective inspection of workshops and factories.
   (d) By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age.
   (e) By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict labor and of all un inspected factories.
   (f) By abolishing official charity and substituting in its place compulsory insurance against unemployment, illness, accidents, invalidism, old age and death.

POLITICAL DEMANDS.

8—The extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the amount of the bequests and to the nearness of kin.

9—A graduated income tax

10—Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction.

11—The initiative and referendum, proportional representation and the right of recall.

12—The abolition of the senate.

13—The abolition of the power usurped by the supreme court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed or abrogated only by act of Congress or by a referendum of the whole people.

14—That the constitution be made amendable by majority vote.

15—The enactment of further measures for general education and for the conservation of health. The bureau of education to be made a department. The creation of a department of public health.

16—The separation of the present bureau of labor from the department of commerce and labor, and the establishment of a department of labor.

17—That all judges be elected by the people for short terms, and that the power to issue injunctions shall be curbed by immediate legislation.

18—The free administration of justice.

Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole power of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry and thus come to their rightful inheritance.