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Resolution adopted by Socialist Party of Springfield after a lecture by David Goldstein, in which he attacked Socialism as being opposed to Christianity:

Monday, Nov. 17, 1913.

Whereas, David Goldstein, acting under the auspices of the A. O. H. Societies in Springfield, has made a rabid attack upon the Socialist Party of Springfield and of the country and the world, placing it in a false light, and misrepresenting its aims and party principles, and never once referring to its constitution or its platforms; and

Whereas, Said David Goldstein, instead of resigning from the Socialist Party as he stated, was in reality expelled from the party, be it here

Resolved, That we, members of the Socialist Party of the City of Springfield, do hereby re-
quest said David Goldstein to meet us in a public
debate, said debate to take place at such time as
can be conveniently arranged by both parties, in
a hall furnished by the Socialists; the subject of
said debate to be: "Resolved, that the prin-
ciples of Socialism are not opposed to Christian-
ity".

(Signed) SOCIALIST PARTY CLUB,

Wm. A. King, Sec'y.
78 Prospect Street,


MR. W. A. KING,

Socialist Party Club of Springfield.

Dear Sir: Enclosed please find copy of reso-
lutions passed by Div. 18, A. O. H. Lecture Com-
mittee, anent your resolutions concerning Mr.
Goldstein's lecture.

Awaiting an early reply, we remain,

DIV. 18, A. O. H. LECTURE COMMITTEE,

Arthur H. Hancock, Secretary.
The following resolutions were adopted by Div. 18, A. O. H. Lecture Committee at a meeting held last evening in Hibernian Hall:

Springfield, Mass., Nov. 21, 1913.

Whereas, Div. 18, A. O. H., has conducted a public lecture on the subject: "Socialism versus Christianity" with Mr. David Goldstein, a true Christian gentleman, as the speaker; and

Whereas, In a set of resolutions adopted by the Socialist Party Club of Springfield immediately after the lecture, and published in the daily press of Monday, Nov. 17, Mr. Goldstein’s personal integrity has been assailed, the matter of his address brought into question, and a challenge issued to him to meet a representative of said Socialist Party Club of Springfield in public debate upon the subject: "Resolved, that the principles of Socialism are not opposed to Christianity"; and

Whereas, In a letter to us under date of Nov. 18, 1913, and hereunto appended, Mr. Goldstein willingly accepts the challenge of said Socialist Party Club of Springfield upon the one only condition that the discussion be based primarily upon the writings of the foremost Socialists—
upon the books officially circulated by the Socialist Party—which condition we consider fair and just:

Therefore be it Resolved, That we, the Lecture Committee of Div. 18, A. O. H., assume full management of proposed debate, pay all expenses attached thereto, make it one of the series of public meetings now being held by us in the Auditorium, and set aside Sunday, Dec. 28, for that purpose; the debate to be divided into three periods, each speaker being allowed forty minutes in the first period, thirty minutes in the second and ten minutes in the third.

Resolved, That we hereby invite said Socialist Party Club of Springfield to name their representative in the debate and that our organization assure that representative fair and courteous treatment to the utmost of our power, on the basis of equality with Mr. Goldstein.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the said Socialist Party Club of Springfield, to Mr. Goldstein, and to each of the daily papers.

DIV. 18, A. O. H. LECTURE COMMITTEE,
Edward J. McCarthy, Chairman.
Arthur H. Hancock, Secretary.
COPY OF MR. GOLDSTEIN'S LETTER.)

Boston, Mass., Nov. 18, 1913.

DIVISION 18, A. O. H.,
Springfield, Mass.

Gentlemen and Friends: From your daily press of Monday, the morning after the Auditorium meeting, I learn that the local Socialists gathered at their headquarters and passed resolutions offering to debate with me the following subject: "Resolved, that the principles of Socialism are not opposed to Christianity".

I shall be glad to accept the challenge and it is my hope that your organization will undertake the management and conduct the debate under its own auspices. As my opponent, I should prefer the leading Socialist of your own locality. But one only condition need be insisted upon, namely, that the discussion shall be based primarily upon the writings of the foremost Socialists—upon those books officially circulated by the Socialist Party. I am sure that no fault can be found with this condition.

The Socialist resolutions make the assertion that I was expelled from the Socialist Party. To quote: "Said David Goldstein, instead of re-
signing from the Socialist Party, in reality was expelled from the party”. This is utterly false. Though to be expelled from the Socialist Party is not necessarily a disgrace. In the recent case of the Rev. Edward Ellis Carr, editor of the “Christian Socialist”, it certainly was to his credit, as he was expelled from the Socialist Party for exposing the immorality which was rampant in the National Headquarters of the Socialist Party. However, generally speaking, to be expelled from an organization does tell against a man. But as a matter of fact I was not expelled from the party, but resigned at a time when I was holding the highest offices in the party’s gift, both in the Commonwealth and in the City of Boston. My resignation was in May, 1903. This I have evidence to prove, from the Socialist and the daily press, and from personal letters. I stand ready to wager one hundred dollars ($100.00) with the Socialist Party of Springfield, or any one of its members, that I was not expelled from the Socialist Party.

Should the Socialists refuse to accept this wager, it will be proof to all fair-minded men that they have no evidence to substantiate their assertion.
Hoping you will take up the matter in defense of our Catholic cause, I am

Sincerely,

(Signed) DAVID GOLDSTEIN.

Springfield, Mass., Nov. 25, 1913.

MR. ARTHUR H. HANCOCK,

Sec’y Div. 18, A. O. H. Lecture Committee,
78 Prospect St., City.

Dear Sir: We beg herewith to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of Nov. 21st, 1913, with reference to our challenge to Mr. David Goldstein to debate the following resolution: “Resolved, that the principles of Socialism are not opposed to Christianity”.

We note with interest that Mr. Goldstein “willingly accepts the challenge of said Socialist Party Club of Springfield upon the one only condition that the discussion be based primarily upon the writings of the foremost Socialists—upon the books officially circulated by the Socialist Party”. We also observe your addendum attached thereto which says: “Which condition we consider fair and just”.

In view of Mr. Goldstein’s arrogant attitude
we are surprised to learn that he would condescend to stipulate any condition with reference to what should, or should not, be the basis of the discussion.

If Mr. Goldstein's "one only condition" is based upon the fear on his part that any evidence he might wish to submit would be ruled out of order, we hasten to assure him that we concede Mr. Goldstein the right to quote freely from any book or books, records or documents, to make such deductions therefrom as he may see fit, and produce any evidence at his command, limited only by the time allotted him by the regulations of the debate; all of which we claim as the right of our representative in the contest.

But any attempt on the part of Mr. Goldstein, or any one concerned, to exclude from the discussion any document, platform, constitution or other matter which may, or may not be in the nature of an expression or declaration of policy or principle (and so being could be construed as being excluded from the "writings of foremost Socialists"), or any attempt to give preferment or undue weight to any given line of evidence or argument, by virtue of any pre-arranged agreement, will not be conceded.
We hold that the regulations which usually govern debates should prevail in this case, viz: that the discussion should be based upon the free and unlimited use of any and all argument which either participant shall deem necessary to prove his point.

In every detail of the occasion we demand the absolute fairness and impartiality characteristic of a court of justice.

With reference to Mr. Goldstein's "one only condition", which, you state, you consider just and fair, we beg to submit the following:

If it is affirmed by one that books on the subject of Socialism have been written by Atheists, and from an Atheist's point of view, and these books are circulated by the Socialist Party (all of which is conceded), does this circumstance commit the Socialist Party to the principles of Atheism? And if it is affirmed by another, that books on the subject of Socialism have been written by a Christian, and from a Christian's point of view, and these books are circulated by the Socialist Party (all of which we allege to be true), does this circumstance commit the Socialist Party to the principles of Christianity?

We submit, and on further consideration we
believe you will agree, that any controversy con-
fined to the narrow lines as are suggested by Mr. 
Goldstein's "one only condition" will but tend to 
confuse an audience rather than enlighten it.

We regret to state that we must decline to take 
any part in a debate under the sole auspices of 
your Committee as suggested in your letter of the 
21st inst. This, we most earnestly hope, will not 
be construed to mean that we for a moment call 
into question the integrity of your Committee, or 
its desire for fair and square dealing, but in con-
sideration of the high import of the subject before 
us, which in substance is to establish whether or 
not the ethics of Socialism and the ethics of 
Christianity are and of necessity must be incomp-
atible with each other, we feel as a sense of duty 
to the cause we represent that we in part should 
control the situation, that we may safeguard the 
same from any error or oversight.

Therefore, in order that we may contribute our 
part toward the realization of the subject which 
we have mutually before us, we submit the follow-
ing general and tentative plan of procedure as a 
counter proposition.

We suggest that the Lecture Committee of Div. 
18, A. O. H., and this Committee of the Socialist
Party Club of Springfield meet jointly for the purpose of making plans and devising ways and means whereby the prospective debate may be held jointly. That the plans so devised shall be acceptable to both Committees separately and endorsed by their constituents, if it is so desired by either party. We suggest the following details to the general plan:

That the Auditorium be secured for the debate on a date convenient to both parties.

That free tickets of admission be printed equal in number to the seating capacity of said Auditorium and that these tickets be divided equally between both parties to be distributed as they see fit.

That the chairman of the meeting shall be a neutral factor, one who by precept and association shall be removed as far as possible from the sentiments of either faction, a representative citizen of the City of Springfield, reputable for his intelligence, fearlessness and integrity. That he be neither a member of the Socialist Club nor of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and that he be neither a Socialist politically nor a Roman Catholic religiously.

That all expenses in excess of the collection
shall be assumed equally, or if the collection exceeds the expenses the balance shall be divided equally. Or, if it may be so agreed, each party shall pay all the expenses of their representative in the debate independent of the other and all other disbursements shall be made as above stated.

That if music is furnished for the occasion, no selections shall be rendered which may appeal to the peculiar passions or emotions of the people. There should be no revolutionary selections such as "Le Marseillaise" or any of the historic battle hymns of revolt, or any selections which would appeal to religious sentiment.

That all parties concerned shall contribute their part toward the tranquility of the occasion, to promote general good will among the people to the end that all, without malice or prejudice, may discern the true from the false and that the interest of humanity may best be served.

A copy of this reply shall be sent to the Lecture Committee of Div. 18, A. O. H., and to the daily papers of Springfield.

We await communication from you or some authorized member of your organization.

SOCIALIST PARTY CLUB DEBATE COM.,

William A. King, Sec’y.

MR. W. A. KING,
Secretary Socialist Party Club,
Springfield, Mass.

Dear Sir: Your communication of Nov. 25th has been received and contents noted. In answer we beg to say that we see no reason for modifying our original proposals.

The facts in the matter are these: Div. 18, A. O. H. Lecture Committee invited Mr. David Goldstein, a representative Catholic layman, to present to the Springfield public the Catholic point of view on the subject of Socialism. This he did to our entire satisfaction.

In your original letter to us you take issue with his strictures upon your movement, asserting that Mr. Goldstein has maliciously misrepresented your position, and asking us to be fair enough to see that some action be taken to give you a chance to place your side of the matter before the people of Springfield. Our organization willingly offered you such an opportunity under conditions which we believe would assure "the absolute fairness and impartiality of a court of justice". which you demand.

We shall, then, await with pleasure the name of
your representative up to Dec. 10th. Failing to hear from you by that date, we shall consider all negotiations relative to the debate at an end.

Furthermore, in your original resolutions you cast reflections upon our management by assailing Mr. Goldstein’s personal integrity, asserting his expulsion from the Socialist Party. This charge you now see fit to drop out of consideration entirely; but we submit, with Mr. Goldstein, that honorable dealing requires that you should either advance the proofs of your assertion, or offer a public apology to the effect that you have no such proofs.

Sincerely yours,

DIV. 18, A. O. H. LECTURE COMMITTEE,
Arthur H. Hancock, Secretary.

Springfield, Mass., Dec. 6, 1913.

LECTURE COMMITTEE DIV. 18, A. O. H.,
Mr. Arthur Hancock, Secretary,
78 Prospect St., City.

Dear Sir: Your letter of Dec. 2nd received, and we regret to note that your Committee has decided to decline our proposition to conduct the debate with Mr. Goldstein under the joint management of both Committees.
However, we do not doubt, nor have we at any time doubted, but that your Committee would conduct the affair with absolute fairness and impartiality.

Our suggestion of joint management was based only upon the interest that we would naturally have in the matter, and not upon any suspicion of the integrity of your Committee.

If, by the exchange of our communications, anything has been said that has allowed you to believe that we questioned the honor of your Committee, we hasten to take advantage of this occasion to state that such is not the case.

In your previous communication we note that Mr. Goldstein concedes the right of either party to the debate to submit any evidence they see fit, without any limitation whatsoever, and inasmuch as it is your Committee that is making the arrangements and not Mr. Goldstein, we understand that the Committee in question agrees to the same conditions.

It is with this understanding that we gladly accept your invitation to have our representative meet Mr. Goldstein at the Springfield Auditorium on Sunday evening, Dec. 28th, to debate the fol-
following resolution: “Resolved, that the principles of Socialism are not opposed to Christianity”.

With reference to your request that we name our representative for the debate, we beg to state that we are receiving daily applications from different Socialists who are anxious to have us select them as our representative to meet Mr. Goldstein.

We propose to close the opportunity for making application at an early date and will proceed immediately to make our choice and forward the name of our representative directly thereafter. Of course, as Mr. Goldstein boldly welcomes any Socialist to meet him on the subject, it is a matter of indifference to him who our choice may be.

Furthermore, inasmuch as our communications with our prospective representatives have been based upon the suggestion that the debate might be conducted jointly by your Committee and a Committee of the Socialist Party, which we hoped it might be, we have been obliged to re-state the case as to the conditions upon which the debate was to be held, viz: under your exclusive management. This correspondence, we think you will agree, takes time.

However, we believe that we will be able to
inform you of the name of our representative in the near future, and we agree, and we understand that by you it is agreed, that, in case of sickness or other unavoidable causes, a substitute may be furnished.

Regarding our charge that Mr. Goldstein was expelled from the Socialist Party, with reference to which you demand either proofs or a public apology, you say to us in your letter of Dec. 2nd: ‘This charge you now see fit to drop out of consideration entirely’.

In this, permit us to say that you are entirely at error. We have no intention of dropping the matter out of consideration, but on the contrary we propose, at some near future date, to submit for your consideration a statement in detail, covering the matter in full.

But it is our opinion that in order to avoid confusion these issues should be worked out separately. If the principles of Socialism and the principles of Christianity are, and of necessity must be incompatible, they are so not because of any of the characteristics, qualifications or conduct of Mr. Goldstein.

On the other hand, whatever the character of
Mr. Goldstein may be, it is what it is without any regard to the issue of the debate.

We are anxious to contribute our part toward a clear understanding of the issue in behalf of the public and we believe they are entitled to this consideration.

Kindly advise at your earliest convenience if the above is agreeable to your Committee.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM A. KING, Sec.

Springfield, Dec. 12, 1913.

SOCIALIST PARTY CLUB DEBATE COMMITTEE,

W. A. King, Secretary.

Gentlemen: Your letter of Dec. 6th at hand and contents noted. Out of consideration for the interest which the general public has manifested in the debate, we shall extend the time from Dec. 10 to Dec. 18, in which you are asked to name your representative. If you wish to name an alternate you may do so, not later than the same date, Dec. 18.

We consider that this is not alone eminently
fair, but that it is truly generous of Mr. Goldstein to consent to such an arrangement.

Yours very truly,

DIV. 18, A. O. H. LECTURE COMMITTEE,  
Arthur H. Hancock, Secretary.

Dec. 17, 1913.

MR. ARTHUR H. HANCOCK, Sec.,  
Div. 18, A. O. H. Lecture Committee,  
78 Prospect St., City.

Dear Sir: Your favor of Dec. 12th, 1913, wherein you request that we name our representative in the debate with Mr. Goldstein to take place at the Auditorium Dec. 28th, 1913, at hand.

In complying therewith we are pleased to state that we have chosen as our representative Mr. George Spiess, Jr., 235 Asylum street, Hartford, Conn.

As our alternate, we name Mr. S. J. McBride, of Watertown, Mass. Our representatives to take the affirmative upon the following resolution: "Resolved, that the principles of Socialism are not opposed to Christianity".

Respectfully,

WM. A. KING,  
Sec. Socialist Party Club Debate Com.

MR. W. A. KING,
Sec'y Socialist Party Club Debate Com.

Dear Sir: Your communication of Dec. 17 received and contents noted. Our chairman will await with pleasure the arrival of your representative in the ante-room west of the Auditorium stage on the evening of Dec. 28, in time for the debate to begin promptly at 8 o'clock.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR H. HANCOCK,
Sec. Div. 18, A. O. H. Lecture Com.
THE DEBATE

Chairman,
WILLIAM G. McKECHNIE
of Springfield.

First period, 40 minutes each
Second period, 30 minutes each
Last period, 10 minutes each

Chairman William G. McKechnie introduced Mr. George Spiess, Jr., of Hartford.

MR. SPIESS.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: As the chairman has announced, the subject for debate this evening reads as follows: "Resolved, that the principles of Socialism are not opposed to Christianity". I am permitted in this discussion to use any argument that may tend to prove this proposition. If, therefore, I shall prove to you conclusively that the principles of Socialism have no more to do with Christianity than the whistling of the wind has to do with the price of coal, then I have proven my proposition. I shall prove
to you, friends, beyond the shadow of doubt, that the principles of Socialism have nothing whatever to do with Christianity, Judaism or any other form of religious worship.

I define Christianity as a system of doctrine which concerns itself primarily with the worship of a Supreme Being and with love of man for man. I define Socialism as a phase of human civilization, as a stage in the process of industrial evolution in which form of society the industries, the means of life, the factories, the mills, the railroads and all other means of production and distribution of wealth will be owned publicly, will be owned collectively by the people and managed by the people in the interest of all the people [applause]; which phase of civilization is the natural, the logical and the inevitable product of industrial evolution [applause].

The word principle, friends, comes from the Latin principum which means a foundation, a beginning, a commencement. Webster's dictionary defines the word "principle" as a fundamental truth. The principles of Socialism, then, the foundations of Socialism, are these: first, that Socialism is a phase of civilization; secondly, that in that form of society the industries will be
owned publicly and managed by the people in the interest of the people; and thirdly, that that form of civilization is the natural, logical and inevitable product of industrial evolution.

The writings of certain Socialists, in which perhaps they may try to show how religious thought may be affected by material conditions, or how the status of woman and the family may possibly be affected by economic changes; these writings, friends, are only so much theory, so much speculation, so much personal opinion of individual Socialists. I can reject them if I wish now! Reject all those theories, and the Socialist Party dare not, cannot, expel me from membership [applause]. Where the enemies of Socialism make a great mistake (like, for instance, Mr. Goldstein) is that they regard Socialism as a theory, as a doctrine, as a philosophy. Socialism is not a teaching; it is not a theory; it is not a philosophy. Socialism is a phase of human civilization; the natural, the logical and the inevitable product of industrial evolution.

Now, I know, friends, how Mr. Goldstein will answer this statement of mine. He probably has already taken note of it. I might as well tell you this for him and save him the trouble of saying it.
He is going to tell you, or he intends to, that up to this moment there were fifty-seven varieties of Socialism and now there are fifty-eight since Mr. Spiess has added a new brand. No, Mr. Goldstein! There are not fifty-eight varieties of Socialism. There are fifty-nine varieties. Fifty-eight of these exist in the imaginations of the opponents of Socialism [applause]. The fifty-ninth is the one and only true Socialism that I shall speak to you about to-night. This is the Socialism that all great thinkers from Karl Marx down to the present time have pointed to when they showed how the industrial evolution must inevitably end in public ownership of industry with popular management. You see public ownership of the telephone and telegraph discussed, and these things are going to be publicly owned. You see the parcel post publicly owned, taking away the business of the express companies. This, friends, is a phase of Socialism, and you are the unconscious factors in bringing about that evolution.

Now, if Mr. Goldstein insists that I have invented this definition—if he would flatter me to such an extent as to say that I could present to you such a scientific definition, I call on him to refute the argument which I am now going to
give you proving that my definition of Socialism is correct.

I do not ask him to accept this definition as true. I do not ask you to believe that what I tell you is true. I do not ask you to believe anything that I say. I am not good enough to ask of you that you should believe what I tell you. I am going to prove to you that this definition of Socialism is correct.

In order to do that, my friends, I am going to trace for you the industrial evolution. I shall not take you back into the days of savagery and barbarism and show you how industry has developed down through all the ages to the present day. That would take too long. I will take you back only one hundred years, and shall not ask you to leave this country.

One hundred years ago in this country the working people did not labor in great big factories and mills as they do to-day; they worked in little shops or in their own homes; and the working-man owned his own tools and received the full value of his product. That was the age of individual production. Now, what do I mean by that? I mean that when a workman produced a commodity he always made a finished article.
To illustrate: A shoemaker always made a complete shoe. To-day we do not produce individually; to-day we produce collectively in great big factories and mills where thousands of people work together. And how do they make shoes to-day? In this manner: A working-man takes a few pieces of leather and he sews them by steam-driven machinery, then he passes that article on to a second man; the second man adds a little more labor and passes it on to the third; the third adds a little more labor and passes it on to the fourth; and after this article has passed through, possibly, a hundred hands, finally it comes out of the factory completed. That is collective production.

Now, what was it that brought about this great change, this great industrial revolution, this change from the mode of individual production to the collective method? It was the introduction of steam-driven machinery. When the steam engine came into general use the people should have been intelligent enough to then and there have adjusted themselves to the industrial evolution; they should at once have proceeded to establish public ownership of the industries. But they did not understand the significance of that indus-
trial revolution, and they even tried to smash those machines. And because the people were not intelligent enough to adjust themselves to this new condition of affairs the course of industrial revolution rolled on blindly till the period of corporation competition arrived and finally the period of trust production, in which we to-day live. Let me show you how this happened.

At first individual capitalists bought steam-driven machines. They built small factories. But they soon found that greater and more improved machines came upon the market. To take advantage of those wonderful inventions it was necessary to establish great, big factories and mills in order to meet the growing demand of the great markets of the world. It was necessary to go into production on a great scale. But in order to do that, enormous capital was necessary and there were no great capitalists at that time,—no millionaires. Therefore a number of small capitalists, say a dozen or a few dozen, had to combine their capital and form stock companies and incorporate; and in this manner, the monster, the beast, the conscienceless, heartless corporation came into existence; not as the product of the wicked schemes of wicked men but as the natural,
logical and inevitable product of the industrial evolution. Corporations kept increasing beyond the necessary number to supply the demand. The more corporations came into existence the more keen became the competition between them, and competition, friends, is industrial war. It is a struggle for existence. It was soon discovered that in this fierce struggle for existence only the fittest could survive, and it therefore became necessary for a number of corporations to combine their capital in order to meet the new conditions, just as formerly individual capitalists had to combine their capital to meet the changed conditions. In this manner came into existence the modern trust, not as the product of the wicked schemes of wicked men but as the natural, the logical and the inevitable product of the course of industrial evolution. And now the trusts are with us, and they have grown to be a menace to society; they have become lords and masters of our very lives and the lives and happiness of our wives and children; and everywhere we hear people talking about the possible or probable solution of the trust question. You hear a group of people say we must smash the trusts and go back to competition, and another group say we must regulate
the trusts. And yet another group, who understand the nature of the industrial evolution, demand that we establish collective ownership of the trusts, in order to make the mode of ownership accord with the mode of production. To-day we produce collectively; therefore we must own the trust industries collectively in order that the worker may get the full value of his product just as in the days of individual production the worker owned the tools and individually used them to get the full value of his product. The mode of ownership must harmonize with the mode of production, otherwise the working people are slaves and they will never have justice, never receive the value of their product. Now, the third group are the Socialists.

I am going to prove to you that you cannot smash the trusts; then I will prove to you that you cannot regulate them; and therefore there will be only one solution left—Socialism. That is all.

Now, friends, follow me closely. I say you cannot dissolve the trusts. Let me prove that. All the wealth of this country is rapidly concentrating into fewer and fewer hands, into the ownership and more particularly into the control of fewer people.
Mr. John Moody, a noted authority in Wall Street, in a publication entitled "The Truth About the Trusts", in 1904, said that there is a trust power in this country of $20,000,000,000 controlled by just seventy-six men, and that these seventy-six men held 1600 directorships in these trusts. The late Senator Ingalls in a speech which he delivered in the United States Senate on January 14, 1891, read a table which at that time was published in a magazine and received wide attention and discussion throughout the country, showing how the wealth of the country was distributed. I am going to give that to you as far as I can remember it. It said there were two hundred persons in this country who owned on the average $20,000,000 each. Four hundred persons owned on the average $10,000,000 each. One thousand people owned on the average $5,000,000 each. Two thousand persons owned on an average $2,500,000 each. Six thousand owned on an average $1,000,000 each; and fifteen thousand owned on an average a half-million dollars each. Making a total of 31,100 persons who owned a total wealth of $36,250,000,000. That was more than twenty years ago. To-day conditions are far worse. Why, friends, Mr. John D. Rockefeller in 1889
owned only about $100,000,000. He has now a yearly income of $100,000,000. In 1906 Henry Lawrence Call made a statement that John D. Rockefeller's possessions amounted to between two and three billions of dollars. And the same authority, Henry Lawrence Call, in a paper he read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in Columbia University, in 1906, made the statement, which was never refuted, that one per cent of the population of this country in that year owned not less than ninety per cent of the national wealth. My friends, did you ever stop to think what Mr. Rockefeller and the other millionaires and billionaires do with their yearly incomes, amounting to millions and millions of dollars? What do they do with it? They invest it in stocks and bonds of railroads and this and that commercial and industrial establishment. Those millionaires are investing their moneys in restaurant, cigar stores and grocery stores, yes, even 5 and 10 cent stores. Why, they are buying up the whole country, and it is only a question of a few years before John D. Rockefeller and a handful of millionaires will own you body and soul.

In the light of these facts how ridiculous was
the policy of the Government under the Taft administration in trying to dissolve the Standard Oil and the American Tobacco trusts. Why, when the Supreme Court of the United States issued the order that the Standard Oil trust must dissolve, Mr. Rockefeller was at home in his mansion and when the news reached him he burst out laughing. He nearly split his sides laughing, to think what little babies there are in Washington, who call themselves the Supreme Court of the United States. What does Rockefeller care if the United States Supreme Court should break up the Standard Oil trust into a thousand pieces if he owns all the pieces? And how ridiculous is the present policy of trying to dissolve the trusts. If you owned a controlling interest in two railroads the Government would say you must withdraw your capital from one of the two. What would you do? You would withdraw it and re-invest it in another railroad or in some mercantile or industrial establishment. You would re-invest it somewhere. You would have to. Friends, you cannot dissolve the trusts. You cannot check the concentration of wealth into fewer and fewer hands. You cannot reverse the wheel of progress. You cannot stem the tide of industrial evolution.
You cannot drive the chicken back into the egg. You cannot do it!

Now, let me prove to you that you cannot regulate the trusts. The efforts of the United States Government and the governments of the several states to regulate the trusts and the railroads have made us the laughing stock of the world. In 1890 the Congress of the United States enacted the famous Sherman Anti-trust Law. The purpose of this law was to prevent the growth of monopolies. It is a glaring fact that since that law was enacted most of the great monster trusts have come into existence. What a farce! And the efforts of the several states to regulate the trusts have been equally a failure. In the State of Missouri they have an anti-trust law that is very sweeping. Some years ago the Beef trust violated the law and in 1903 the State of Missouri began to prosecute the Beef trust and fined each of the firms implicated $10,000. The Beef trust appealed the case. The Supreme Court sustained the decision of the lower court. In the courtroom were present, when the decision was handed down, all the representatives of the constituent firms of the trust. It was ten o'clock in the morning when the Supreme Court handed down
the decision, and the constituent firms of the Beef trust paid their fines, $10,000 apiece, spot cash. That was ten o'clock in the morning. At eleven o'clock, just one hour later, the Beef trust had raised the price of beef, and before the sun went down that day it had recovered all the money spent in the morning paying out fines. And the poor, innocent people paid the fines.

There are some people who maintain that we must regulate by establishing an industrial commission. Well, we have been "regulating" already, friends, for about thirty years and what a miserable failure the effort has been. The Interstate Commerce Commission has itself admitted that its effort to regulate is a failure, and that the evils of private railroad management cannot be ascertained. The railroads set aside the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission by appealing to the courts, and the courts are always the bulwark of the corporations.

In the State of Wisconsin they have a Railroad Commission, and the people of Milwaukee five years ago petitioned that Commission to reduce the fare on the street cars in Milwaukee from five to three cents. That was five years ago; and that Commission is at the present time still "investi-
gating”. I will tell you what this regulating by commission amounts to. Simply this: It means endless “investigation” that costs enormous sums of money, and after volumes upon volumes of facts and figures have been accumulated then the Commission “recommends” that something should be done, which is, as a rule, never done.

Let me give you one more argument to prove to you absolutely that you cannot regulate the trusts. Every political party in existence that is a real political party is an organization, a machine, that represents the economic interests of a certain class in society; the Socialist Party, for instance, to which I belong, is a machine that is controlled by the working class. The Republican Party is a machine owned and controlled by a certain group of trusts. The Democratic Party which, in theory, is supposed to represent the small business man, the small-capitalist class, is also controlled by Wall Street, by a certain group of trusts. The Progressive Party is hardly worth mentioning, but they got their campaign funds from George W. Perkins, from Wall Street, in the last campaign. Now, the Republican Party may make a move against a certain group of trusts protected by the Demo-
crats, but it always protects its own. The Democratic Party may make a move against certain trusts that the Republican Party is protecting, but it will protect its own. It makes no difference which of these three political parties gets into power; the trusts win and the people lose.

In the light of these facts I want you people—all of you, I know, are intelligent—I want you to answer this question to yourselves to-night: How in the name of common sense can the Government regulate the trusts when the trusts regulate the Government? [applause].

I have proven to you that you cannot dissolve the trusts and that you cannot regulate them. Therefore, whether you will or not, you must accept Socialism, public ownership, as the only solution. Therefore Socialism is the inevitable product of the industrial evolution.

I have proved my proposition, friends, I have proved to you that Socialism is not a theory but a phase of social evolution; and having proved that, I have proved that it has nothing to do with Christianity and, therefore, cannot be opposed to it.

Now, friends, Mr. Goldstein will answer this way: I know he has something to say about the
concentration of wealth. I can smell it, almost. But I will answer it. He will say, furthermore, that "if Socialism is inevitable why don't you Socialists sit down and wait till it comes"? Let me show you that that is nonsense. One hundred years ago when the great industrial revolution took place, when the steam-driven machines came into use, the people did not understand the nature of the industrial revolution. They should have then established public ownership of the industries to make the mode of ownership accord with the mode of production. We Socialists are here to-day to educate the people, to educate the working class, so they will know that they must now adjust themselves to that industrial development. Socialism is indeed inevitable, but it can be retarded. If the people are not intelligent enough to adjust themselves to the industrial development of to-day, then society will be dragged through a period of industrial despotism the worst that this world has ever seen, and there will be strikes and lock-outs and there will be violence and bloodshed. Finally there will be a great revolution and at last they will learn the lesson I am trying to teach you to-night: that they must adjust themselves to industrial devel-
opment; that they must establish collective ownership in order to make the mode of ownership accord with the mode of production. The people will finally learn the lesson. In fact they are learning it fast. Socialism is inevitable. It must come. We can hasten its coming by being intelligent to adjust ourselves to the industrial development.

I am about to close, friends. Mr. Goldstein will tell you that Socialism is not what I said it was; that it is not a phase of civilization; that it is a philosophy. He will quote probably a number of Socialist writers by means of which quotations he will try to show you that Socialism is a most wicked philosophy; that it teaches Atheism; that it is destructive of religion and morality. He will tell you that Socialism teaches free love and the breaking up of the home, and he will paint as black a picture as can possibly be imagined. Get ready for it. He is going to say some pretty vile things about Socialism. But remember this, friends, I have another say. And understand that these theories which he refers to, whether the Church can endorse them or not, these theories are only personal opinions of individual Socialists. These theories are not Socialism. There are
theories advanced by these same Socialists, Karl Marx, Engels and others that I do not accept.

Now, friends, I want to say further that all through this discussion—I wanted to say it at the beginning but I forgot it—I wish this to be a fair, honest, gentlemanly discussion. You notice that although I have referred to Mr. Goldstein in the argument I have not attacked him, and I refuse to attack the individual. It is the system, it is capitalism I am attacking.

I have another half-minute but I am willing to give that to Mr. Goldstein [great applause].

Chairman McKechnie introduced Mr. David Goldstein of Boston.

MR. GOLDSTEIN

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very grateful to my opponent for having given me an extra half-minute. I only regret that he did not keep it to speak upon the subject. He reminds me very much of a colored preacher I heard, who told the way he worked: ‘First, I take my text. Second, I leave it; and third, I never return to it again’. The speaker on the affirmative took his text, stated it correctly, left it and never returned to it all the time; all the rest of his forty minutes
being occupied in chasing John D. Rockefeller around the country [laughter and applause].

I have looked forward for over ten years for an opportunity of this kind, ever since I resigned from the Socialist Party of this country, and when I was asked would I meet in debate Mr. Carey and a half-dozen others I replied in the public press: "Yes, I would meet any one of them". I thought the moment had come when I would have a chance to meet face to face some representative of the Socialist Party of the State of Massachusetts, but after a long delay they had to go outside the border of the state and get a professor of oratory to meet a cigarmaker upon the public platform.

"I have not attacked him". I have set down his closing words. I recognize the fact that he did not attack me personally, and I have no intention of attacking you personally either. But I wish the men who stood on that platform would be the embodiment of those expressions themselves: John S. Sullivan of Northampton and Patrick O'Brien of Chicopee, and the rest of the people who have been slandering me in the press ever since I spoke upon this platform four or five weeks ago.
I am here to discuss the question: "Resolved, that the principles of Socialism are not opposed to Christianity", and I do not mean merely to assert that I am here to educate the people, but I am going to prove by my words to-night that I mean to keep to the subject of the evening, which I think is the first principle. But I will say a word about the trusts so as to sweep that aside.

My opponent says that the trusts came into existence as the result of improved machinery, and he cites the wonderful advancement and development in the making of shoes, the great shoe machinery used to-day compared to the hand-tool of a hundred years ago. Why, we have the most wonderful shoe machinery. It takes from sixty to one hundred men to make a pair of shoes where one man made them years ago. But still with all that there is no trust in the shoe industry of the world, and the shoe-maker to-day, with the new machinery and greater production, is better off a thousand fold than the man, the cobbler, who used to sit alone in his shop a hundred years ago.

He says, "Socialism has no more to do with Christianity than the whistling wind has to do with the price of coal". Well, I haven't heard
his case proved, but I have heard the whistling wind howling.

He says it is an inevitable phase of civilization. It is true Socialists say that, and it is absolutely without foundation in right or reason. And he says he knows all I am going to say. He maintains he has covered it all. Socialism is not a theory? Well, what has he been talking about? Anything else but theory? He says, "Mr. Goldstein will say Socialism is a philosophy". Yes, Mr. Goldstein will say Socialism is a philosophy, and Mr. Goldstein will not only say it, he will prove it to the satisfaction of every intelligent man and woman within the hearing of his voice.

A conference was held of the Socialists of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in this very city last summer, and they adopted a constitution. These men were clamoring in the press for an opportunity to use a constitution. Why didn’t they use it? Here it is! It is a preamble: The purpose of this Organization: To establish and propagate the philosophy of Socialism.

What does philosophy deal with? It deals with the general causes of things. It deals with the ultimate end of things. Socialism is a philosophy, and any man who has ever read Socialistic litera-
ture knows it is a philosophy, as Christianity is a philosophy. Is there any man who would dare to say, who would back it up with proof, that a man can believe in the philosophy of Socialism and in the philosophy of Christianity? Why, they are as far apart as heaven is from hell [applause]. Socialism, my dear sir, says a world authority—and, by the way, kindly bear in mind that I am not to talk about the "fifty-seven varieties" nor am I here to speak about the variety that sits at the other table. Not at all! I will deal with but one variety, the only variety that has an historic right to call itself Socialism. What is that variety? That is the variety that is represented by the Socialist political parties and in the international Socialistic movement. In your platform you declare for international Socialism.

What is international Socialism? It is expounded in the teachings of Marx and Engels and Bebel and Bax and Blatchford and Ferri and Allmann and Untermann and the rest of the Socialistic doctrinaires of the world recognized as authorities by your own political party. I never fought Socialism in all the days of my life except by quoting what those who speak say with authority back of them. And what do they say
about modern Socialism? They say it differs from the Utopias of the past and they say it is a science. Who says so, to begin with? In their own Socialist classics it says that Socialism becomes a science on account of the discovery of the materialistic conception of history and the law of surplus value; and materialistic conception of history deals with the philosophy of the movement, and it is that philosophy which underlies the Socialist movement that is taught by Socialist authorities throughout the world; that is founded upon pure Atheistic principles and is diametrically opposed to the belief in the living God and a future inheritance. I am going to quote authorities, because, my dear sir, I do not want you to take my word. I am not here trying to get a temporary victory. I am not a candidate for office. Not at all! I want you to get at the truth.

Here is a book, "Socialism, Positive and Negative", written by Robert Reeves Lamont, and he says on page 116: "The whole theory of modern Socialism"—it is not a theory he (Mr. Spiess) says—"the whole theory of modern Socialism rests upon the foundation of historical materialism; materialistic conception of history".

Here is another book, "Vital Problems in Social
Evolution", by Arthur Morrow Lewis of Chicago, a book circulated by the Socialist Party, and on page 6 I read, "They lit a great flaming torch, and in spite of all that could be done to hinder, they threw it far out and it fell in the very center of this area consecrated to the ruling class; there it started an island of fire which refused to be extinguished, but grew and spread in all directions until to-day it illuminates every path and by way of human activity, and constitutes the foundation and superstructure, both, of a true society. That torch is known as 'the materialistic conception of history', and the two men were Karl Marx and Frederick Engels".

Those men, by the way, are the founders of the movement this man speaks of and pretends to repudiate in his opening remarks.

Here is a Socialist paper, The New Times, of Minneapolis, Minnesota, Nov. 20, 1913, which tells of a debate on Socialism and Religion, and the Socialist takes the position of which the editor of the paper says: "I back him up in his position—I maintain that the economic interpretation of history undermines respect for faith in religious belief by denying the divine origin of Jesus".

Again, Antonio Labriolla, in "Socialism and
Philosophy”, says: “If historical materialism, which is sometimes called materialistic conception of history, does not hold good, it means that the prospect for the coming of Socialism is doubtful and that our hope of future society is a Utopian dream”.

I hold that Socialism is opposed to Christianity because it is founded upon a fundamental Socialist principle known as materialistic conception of history. A man may say: “I believe the Government should own the street cars. I am a Socialist”. He may say it. And all he needs to do to join the party is to sign an application and say he will not vote for any but Socialist Party candidates. But that does not say he knows what Socialism is. Nine out of every ten men who join the Socialist Party, if they ever learn what Socialism is they learn after they get in there by taking a course of instruction in the Socialist literature, so called, which my opponent since repudiated. He left nothing but statistics, and some of them are vague. And he might pardon me if I tell him, if he is not aware of the fact, that Henry Lawrence Call, who is so beautifully dramatic in his statistics, is a member of your own party, my dear sir.

The materialistic conception of history says
there is no God. Socialists believe, and they express it through their books, that so long as a man believes in the authority of God just so long will that man stand for capital, law and order, and you cannot make a rebel out of him. Then, Mr. Slater says, in your own official report of your convention of 1908, that ‘‘religion is a means of keeping people in ignorance; it stifles revolt. A man ceases to be a rebel and becomes like a young robin, willing to accept anything the old robin brings whether it be worms or shingle nails’’.

‘‘Socialism’’, says my opponent, ‘‘is nothing but an economic question’’. Well, I deny it. Socialism is something more than an economic question. It is a philosophical system. It seeks revolution not alone in industry but every department of human activity. Why, Mr. Ernest Belford Bax has repudiated that long ago, and he repeated his repudiation only two years ago. I will quote him from my book. ‘‘It is undeniable’’, says Mr. Bax, ‘‘that there are certain well-meaning but somewhat fanatic persons who are ever going about with book and pen trying to intimidate the weak-minded’’. The way they do this is sometimes specious. For instance, they first proceed to draw a regular fence around economics
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and insist that Socialism is economic and has nothing to do with any other phase of civilization.

Of course having drawn their own fence around the economic theory of Socialism it naturally follows that he can exclude everything else. Socialism is a revolutionary theory of society, my friends.

I have a quotation from another book which his party, my opponent's party, circulates, called "Revolution, Social and Organic", and it fits a certain class of Socialists very nicely. This is a lecture by Arthur Morrow Lewis, and in the introduction of his book he has in mind some of these gentlemen who are dramatic at times, who say they believe in the materialistic conception of history, but who state but their own idea. He says there is a type of brain, the specimens of which seem to be quite numerous, which possesses the faculty of keeping different kinds of knowledge and contradictory ideas in separate watertight compartments. In one watertight compartment they have Socialism. In the other watertight compartment they have Religion; and of course there is never any confusion or collision except the water-main bursts. The most conspicuous example of this, says Mr. Lewis, is the
man who accepts and openly maintains the truth of the materialistic conception of history, that theory which explains the origin and foundation and changes of religion. Yet this very man, using one lobe of his brain, will, while using the other, and with still greater frequency, maintain that the Socialist philosophy has nothing to do with religion at all. It is an economic question only. The left lobe knows not what the right lobe is doing. These men are model men. I wonder who he had in mind. I want to say, What better evidence can I give to an audience who are looking, not for my personal word, but for some substantial data to prove the contention that Socialism is opposed to Christianity? What better evidence can I give than the literature of the highest standing in the Socialist movement? But we are told they are personal opinions. "I", "I", "I", says my opponent, "repudiate them". Well, I am not discussing that brand of Socialism; I am discussing that brand of Socialism you are supposed to represent here to-night.

The Socialists of Springfield, and 399 other local organizations, Socialist, have conducted lecture courses throughout the country. Every one of these lectures cost the 400 Socialist organiza-
tions $300 apiece, $120,000. Each one of the three or four hundred local organizations received for their $300 the services of five lecturers and they also received 300 of these folders. These folders were sold for a dollar apiece by the Springfield local of the Socialist Party and 399 other locals throughout the country at one dollar apiece, and every one of you who happened to buy one of these in this city, or any other city throughout the country, you know that folder was sold for one dollar and admitted you to five lectures and gave you a dollar’s worth of books and papers. So they sold by selling these $120,000 worth of these folders, $120,000 worth of books, and the names of the books are printed on the folders. Now, I have the names of about twenty-five books on this folder alone. There is not one edited by a man named George Spiess, Jr. These books are personal opinions. I grant you that. But they are something more than personal opinions. They are the opinions of the Socialist Party, for the Socialist Party officially circulated them when they sold $120,000 worth of them. Let me read to you the names of some of them. “The Positive Outcome of Philosophy”, by Dietzgen. “Landmarks of Scientific Socialism”, by Engels. “So-

These books, some of them, have a world-wide circulation. These books are opposed to Christianity. These books are opposed to the belief in the Eternal God. These books are opposed to the Christian family. These books advocate free love. These books are personal opinions. Yes! These books are Socialistic Party opinions. Emphatically yes! Consume a portion of the half-minute of the thirty minutes you got with how a man can consistently call himself a Christian and line up with an organization that sells $120,000 worth of books and papers twenty-five of which advocate Atheism and free love [wild applause]. Here
The Buffalo Socialist gets out a supplement to its paper giving a list of books that Grossman prepares, and Atheistic and Socialistic books are on the list. Remember, my matter is open for your inspection here to-night. You may use any book or paper I have on this table. "What Is Socialism?" by Charles H. Kerr. I have marked the books. Read them to the audience, the names of them, and tell us whether they are founded upon Atheistic philosophy and whether they are not opposed to Christianity. I have marked them for your pleasure; about twenty-five of them.

Here is a catalogue from the international headquarters of the Socialist Party containing a list of cloth-bound books, that also contains the names of those twenty-five Atheistic free-love books.

Here is a publication, "Pleasure for Women and Teachers", in several volumes, and everything else concerning women and on the back of the book articles for the benefit of the female sex.

Here is a special book I want to call to your attention — personal opinion — "God and My Neighbor", by Robert Blatchford of England, published in Chicago. There is nothing about economic conditions in this book. It is from cover to cover an ably-written book; as able as
any Atheist could write. Ably written. And although I have read this to you before I am going to read it to you again. "I have been asked why I am opposed to Christianity. I have several reasons that shall appear in due course. At present I offer one: I oppose Christianity because it is not true". Page 49, speaking of God: "We cannot accept as a God of creation the savage idol of an obscure tribe and we have renounced him and are ashamed of him, not because of any well-defined revolution but because mankind have become too enlightened, too human and too honorable to tolerate Jehovah".

Well, I say to you, my dear sir, to your party through you, that you may not tolerate Jehovah but Jehovah is tolerating those members of the Socialist Party who circulate this book.

Here is another thing regarding Christianity, and your inevitable doctrine fits well in with it: "A religion built upon the doctrine of free will and human responsibility to God is built upon a misconception and must fail".

Well, Christianity, my dear sir, is built upon the doctrine of free will and human responsibility to Almighty God. It has not yet failed, and I am absolutely certain that your red rag will be for-
gotten in the sewer while the cross of Christ will be in the heavens. That book alone, circulated by the Socialist Party officially—and here is a little more evidence of it. Here is an ancient document, old as the hills. It was published Dec. 7, 1913—The New York Call. I always go to your master for it. Listen to what they say about this book, three weeks ago. "You will probably give away some books this year as Christmas presents. Why not give Socialist books? There are a lot of them particularly appropriate and they help the cause. In this connection it might be mentioned that one of the best books Robert Blatchford ever wrote is 'God and My Neighbor'. Admirers of Blatchford insist this is his best. It can be had for $1 and it is particularly appropriate as a Christmas present". Socialists in the audience say this, but your representative dare not touch it.

Socialism is opposed to Christianity first of all, my dear sir, because it has its foundation upon the materialistic conception of history. That principle which underlies the Socialist movement which is its foundation, is expressed in its literature. And you say those are personal opinions. I grant you that. But I will go a step further, and am willing to stake my whole position upon
this statement: That when the Socialist Party through its organs, its lecture bureaus, sells those books as the teachings of the Socialist movement, then the Socialist Party is held responsible for its teachings and it is logically and reasonably held responsible for the doctrines they contain, which prove, to anybody who has eyes to see and ears to hear, that Socialism is dyed-in-the-wool Atheism and is opposed to the advancement of Christian civilization.

---

MR. SPIESS.

Well, I expected it [laughter]. I knew it! I knew it! It is the old, old story! Mr. Goldstein has again set up the old proverbial “straw man”, labeled him “Socialism” and then proceeded to demolish him. And still the course of industrial evolution rolls on; and still the concentration of wealth is driving society headlong into Socialism even against its own will. Mr. Goldstein has not refuted my position.

I proved to you that you cannot dissolve the trusts. Then I proved to you that you cannot regulate them, and, therefore, I have proved that Socialism is the inevitable product of industrial
Having proved to you that you cannot smash the trusts, and cannot regulate them, you must accept Socialism as the only solution and therefore Socialism is still a phase of industrial evolution. Ex-Congressman Berger, who is a well-known Socialist in this country, makes this statement before the University of New York. He says: "Socialism is not a theory; it is not the invention of a professor. It is a phase of civilization." Then he goes on to prove it. All the books I have here to-night will prove this to you. I can quote to you from Karl Marx proving my position is correct, but I have not the time.

Mr. Goldstein says Socialism is a philosophy. Webster's dictionary defines philosophy as knowledge of phenomena as explained by and resolved into causes and reasons, powers and laws. Therefore, a philosophy is an explanation of facts. But whether a philosophy which attempts to explain certain phenomena be true or false does not make a bit of difference. The facts remain.

Take the human mind. A dozen different philosophies have been written throughout the ages attempting to explain the nature of the human mind. These philosophies are contradictory. They cannot all be true. Yet the mind remains a fact
in nature. The evolution of industry which is carrying society on into Socialism is a fact in industrial development, and Mr. Goldstein has not refuted my argument by which I proved it.

Mr. Goldstein has quoted certain Socialists, saying that these men maintain that Socialism stands for free love and Atheism. I still insist, whatever views some Socialists may hold, in spite of what Mr. Goldstein has said, that their theories are only so much personal opinion of individual men. Now, Mr. Goldstein says: "Yes, but the Socialist Party officially circulates these books, therefore it officially endorses all that those books contain".

Now it is a fact that the Socialist Party officially circulates those books, but it is not a fact that the Socialist Party officially endorses all that those books contain. The Catholic Church, friends, circulates the Bible officially. You cannot refute that statement. In the Bible, in the Old Testament, are shown instances that God, Jehovah, can be pleased with the killing, the burning of goats and sheep and even of human beings, as in the case of Jeptha's daughter in the book of Judges. The Catholic Church does not endorse that. Furthermore, the Catholic Church is opposed to divorce. Moses allowed it. The
Old Testament contains passages that are so immoral, that are so vile, that if I picked those passages out of the Bible, out of the books of Genesis and Kings, for instance, changed the Biblical names, and circulated those passages through the mail, and the Government got hold of them, I would be sent to the penitentiary for sending obscene literature through the mails. But the Catholic Church circulates the Bible.

In the New Testament we read that in the primitive Christian Church all the Christians owned in common all the wealth. If any man had a house and land, he sold them, brought the price to the Apostles, and they owned all things in common. They believed in public ownership, the same principle that the Socialists are standing for to-day. Mind you! I am not attacking the Church. I am merely pointing to a fact. Not only do you read that in the Bible which is officially circulated by the Church, but you read it in the works of the great fathers of the Church, St. Jerome, St. Basil, St. Gregory and a number of other leaders of the early Church who stood for public ownership of all property. They said that private property is robbery. Yet the Catholic Church circulates those books and teaches those
books in seminaries. Now, friends, I am not criticising the Church; I am merely pointing out the fact that there are things in the Bible which the Catholic Church does not endorse though she does officially circulate the Bible. Then how can Mr. Goldstein contend that because the Socialist Party officially circulates these books that he mentioned, that therefore the Socialist Party officially endorses everything contained in them?

I will tell you why we officially circulate those books, and if you are fair you will acknowledge that this is true. We officially circulate those books because we believe that mankind can never know the truth, and the whole truth, unless we have unrestricted freedom of speech, freedom of assemblage, freedom of the press; in one word, freedom of doctrine. We say that any book on any subject, whether we agree with it or not, should be circulated if it claims scientific value. The men who wrote those books that Mr. Goldstein named are men of international fame for scholarship. Yes, we will circulate those books! Not only, friends, do we officially circulate the books that Mr. Goldstein names, but we officially circulate also Christian books; books such as Professor Rausenbusch has written, a professor of
church history in a university in Rochester, as, "Christianity and the Social Crisis", and "Christianizing the Social Order". In these books this Protestant clergyman condemns some of the arguments of Marx and others, and yet we circulate them. We Socialists believe in freedom of doctrine. We say that in any community where freedom of doctrine is restricted or denied men are nothing more than a gang of slaves. And so sincere are we Socialists in our desire to guarantee freedom of doctrine to all the people that when in 1872 Bismark, the Iron Chancellor of Germany, caused a law to be passed which expelled the Jesuits, a Catholic religious organization, from Germany, which denied the Jesuits the freedom of doctrine in the Fatherland, our party stood by the Jesuits. The men who fought for the Catholic Church and stood by her were the Socialists. And when only a year ago a member of the Catholic party, known as "the Centrum" in Germany, made a motion in the Reichstag to censure the Government for a too strict interpretation of Bismark's law, the only men who stood shoulder-to-shoulder with the Catholic Party in Germany were the Socialists of the Fatherland. And, friends, among the Socialist deputies in the
Reichstag who voted against Bismark's bill in 1872 was the great August Bebel, who this man here to-night will yet defame. I know how Mr. Goldstein will answer this. He will say that was done by the Socialists for political effect. No, my friends, it was not. It was done because we believe in freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assemblage. We believe in those principles. Freedom to all. Liberty to all people, to the Catholics as well as to the Protestants, to A. P. A.'s, anarchists, and all others. We must guarantee true liberty to all the people. But Mr. Goldstein goes around the country condemning these books; says they are immoral, destructive of religion and the family; that no man of decency should read them. Yet Mr. Goldstein has read those books. I assume he has read them. If he has not it would be the height of impertinence for him to stand here and tell you about them. Therefore he denies to you the right which he has usurped himself. He says they should be circulated for him to read but not for you. He says that he can read them; that he has intelligence enough to read them without injuring his spiritual welfare but you have not brains enough to
read them without injuring your spiritual welfare. Now I am going to take up those theories which Mr. Goldstein condemns. I wish I had all night. I would certainly give you some light on Socialism.

What is the materialistic conception of history? It is not a materialistic conception of theology. It does not deny the existence of a God. It is a materialistic conception of history of human events. It is simply this: All human progress depends upon and is determined by material conditions. Now, I do not think the materialistic conception of history is true to all its details. There are things in history I cannot account for by the materialistic conception. But whether it be true in all its details or in a measure false, the fact remains that there is considerable truth in it, and that is what I want to prove to you now, friends. I am going to prove to you that thousands of working-people in this country to-day can’t, mind you, get the words, can’t live up to Christian principles as the Catholic Church interprets them because material conditions forbid. This will convince you that there is much truth in the materialistic conception theory.

The average wage, according to the census of
1910, in 268,000 industrial establishments in this country was a little less than $10 a week.

Now, here is a working-man who is a good Catholic, is a married man, and has an income of about $12 a week; and the Catholic Church, friends, takes the position that the practice of race suicide, of preventing children coming into this world, is a crime against nature and against God.

Now, here is a Catholic Christian having an income of $12 a week, who does not practice race suicide. Therefore in the course of a few years he has four or five or six children in the family. Now, with his $12 a week he cannot support his family in decency. Then he goes to his wife and says: "Molly, you know when I married you I loved you, and I love you still, and I cannot ask you to go into the mill or the store or the factory to work for three, four or five dollars a week. What am I going to do, Molly? I cannot pay the meat bill. I cannot pay the grocery bill. I cannot pay the coal bill. Little Johnny wants new shoes, and Mary wants a new dress. What am I to do?" And he feels like committing suicide. And his wife goes to the mill and works for four or five dollars a week and nine or ten hours a day.
The man is a good Catholic and does not practice race suicide, and more and more children come into the family.

I am speaking to you not of a theoretical man. I am speaking to you of my own father's family. There were twelve children in my father's house; because they were good Christians they did not practice race suicide. My brother is in this audience and he is one of the family who went to work in the factory at the age of fourteen years, and my sister at the age of twelve worked in a sweat-shop so that I and the other little children could be reared. Yes! I was reared on child-labor.

Well, to proceed. The working-man says to his wife: "Well, Mollie, I don't know what to do. I must send my little Johnny, twelve or fourteen years old, I must send him into the mill to take your place". And little Annie, ten or twelve, goes into the mill with him. There, friends, is the cause of child-labor. According to the Congressional Record, Volume 41, Part 2, not less than one million little children, five, six, seven and eight years old, up to sixteen years of age, are working in factories, in the mines, in the sweatshops of this country. I am excluding the children working on the farms. One million children
besides those working on the farms are being murdered in the factories, mines, mills and sweatshops so that the children of the rich may roll in their wealth. Yes, so that the daughters of the rich can go across the seas and marry counts and no-accounts, dukes and pukes. I want to ask Mr. Goldstein a question. I want him to answer it tonight: How is that Catholic working-man going to refrain from committing race suicide, which is a crime according to the Church, or else rearing a houseful of half-starved, half-naked, diseased, uneducated offsprings and degrading them by sending them into the factory and the mills? I say he cannot live a Christian life. If I am wrong I want Mr. Goldstein to show me where I am wrong.

I know what Mr. Goldstein will say. He will say we must organize the working-people into labor unions and force wages up. Let me show you what a farce that remedy is, friends.

According to the latest report of the United States Bureau of Labor the wages of the working-class throughout the country went up twenty-two per cent in the last fourteen years owing to labor unions. But the cost of living went up sixty-six per cent. In other words, wages really went
down about forty per cent. That is Mr. Goldstein's remedy—labor unions. Do not misunderstand me. I believe in labor unionism. I say the workers must be organized on the industrial field in order to resist the capitalist-class. But I say that is not enough! It is necessary that the working-people should also organize on the political field and capture the powers of Government as a class. Why, wherever the working-class are forced to go on strike as in Lawrence and Calumet and other places, you find that all the forces of Government are on the side of the capitalist-class and the police and militia are called out; and the police smash the heads of the strikers, and club their women, as they did in the City of Lawrence. Yes! They even forbade the little children to leave their native state in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Working-people, you workers here, let me appeal to you! You must, no matter whether you are Catholic or Protestant, or A. P. A., you must forget your religious differences and, as working-people, you must unite at the ballot box, capture the powers of government not only in the city but in the state and in the nation and throughout the whole world. You must capture the power of govern-
ment, and then you will have justice, and not till then.

Now, friends, I have remaining only two minutes, and I want to refute that “free-love” argument for you. What Socialists do say in their books is this. Here is their argument summed up: Under Socialism woman will be economically free. If she wants to work, society will guarantee her a living, a job, so that she need never find it necessary to sell her body and her soul for bread. She will then be independent. She will not be the slave of any man. She will then marry only for love. Love and not money or any other material consideration will be the basis of marriage. Then we will have true monogamy, true marriage.

Many people to-day marry not for love. Thousands marry for money, or a home. Thousands of girls go into matrimony and marry men they do not love to escape the hell-holes of capitalism, the factories.

Under Socialism, we say, a woman will not marry merely for a home. When she is economically free she will marry no man she does not love. Women will marry only for love. And the Socialists say that that alone is true marriage.
Is that free love, friends? Now, when once women are economically free, guaranteed a livelihood, a decent livelihood, no woman will degrade herself to lead a life of prostitution, and no woman will marry a man she does not love. No woman is bad naturally. Woman is naturally good. Woman is noble. Woman is beautiful. Woman is the master-piece of nature's art.

MR. GOLDSTEIN.

Well, I thought, when I was seated at my desk, that I was in a theatre, and I certainly must say that my opponent shows very plainly that he has been a trainer, and has had a training, at least in elocution, for he can use his voice much better than I have been ever able to use mine. He has had a college training. I have only had the training of a cigarmaker in a cigar factory, so to speak, for, my dear sirs, I do not need to point to authors. I have worked in a cigar factory for my living from the time I was eleven years of age until two years ago and I know something of the struggles of the poor. I know what poverty is myself from experience in my own family, but I know one thing: that while my mother has had
occasion to take her wedding ring and pawn it
Friday night that we might eat till Saturday
night the curse of prostitution never entered that
home. Race suicide and prostitution! Let me
present to your notice a supreme example: The
people of Ireland lived in mud huts, so to speak,
on the very soil with hardly enough to support
them under the persecution and the authority of
the English Government for nearly seven centu-
ries, the worst kind of poverty, and there prosti-
tution and race suicide was hardly known. Why?
Because they believed in those Catholic teachings
which my opponent says “I do not attack”, but
which is being attacked. They not only believed
in Catholic principles, but they lived the life of
Catholics in their sex associations. But to come
here in the name of the poor and to give us a
pathetic story in his dramatic, acrobatic way is
very attractive. It is very touching to the igno-
rant man. But let me say, instead of doing that
according to your parent organization, take the
leading Socialist daily paper of this country, that
you Socialists here to-night applauded, The Call!
That is your leading paper. This is the issue of
the 7th. You can take last week’s issue, or the
week before, and here you find articles on the
women's page, "The Limitation of Offspring; or, the Small Family Idea", where Dr. Robinson, a Socialist, backed up by the woman who edits the women's page, is crying to have that law abolished in this country that says that any man who dares to circulate in the mails information teaching people how to prevent conception shall be fined $5,000 and shall receive five years' imprisonment. And they are trying to have that law abolished so as to limit the working-class family.

You say the Socialists circulate Christian books. I challenge you, in your last ten minutes to mention the names of any Christian books that the Socialist party circulates that takes the position on Christianity as the Catholic Church understands Christianity. You present the name of Professor Rausenbusch's book. I read that book, and it is an attack upon Christianity, especially the Catholic Church. It is an attack. Page after page attacks the Catholic Church. It is an attack upon Protestantism as understood by Methodists and Episcopalians. It is an attack upon the belief in individual responsibility to Almighty God. He claims that the only responsibility is the Socialist proposition: If a man gets drunk he is not to blame for his drinking; society makes him in-
temperate. If a woman is a prostitute she is not to blame; society is responsible for it. Christianity teaches you, and each and every one of you, your individual responsibility to Almighty God for your thoughts, your words and your deeds, and the harder the struggle is, the greater is the crown of glory that God Almighty will give you [applause]. Of that one so-called Christian book—put this down, Mr. Speaker, and look it up—Mr. John Spargo, reviewing that book for the International Socialist Review, in the issue of February, 1908, on page 502, says of that book, "Christianity and the Social Crisis", it is only Christian in name. In that work the author says: "One gathers from personal responsibility a concept of Christianity which would justify most men who kill themselves, Atheists and Agnostics being included in the category of Christians. Theoretical Christianity is dead". That is the statement of one of the leaders of your own party, a man who stands in the forefront as a leader and writer of many of your books. You say you circulate these books because you believe in free speech, free press. But I believe in free speech and a free press but not in free love. You never heard me say that any man should read those books. I
say that no man who has any intelligence and moral stamina, who will read those books, will ever join the Socialist Party. He says—my opponent says—"they officially circulate them". I thank you for the concession. And "they circulate them because they are written by men of scientific knowledge". What scientific knowledge has Mr. Blatchford shown in "God and My Neighbor"? Is it science to attack the very source of Christianity? Christianity is founded upon real, true science and it will stand the test. "We circulate them". You do circulate them but you do not circulate Christian books. No, sir! Not Christian books. Not at all!

You say that you are going to make women economically free; you are going to make them better off. We will not talk of the future.

Another Socialist theory, a cock-and-bull story, that the history of the human race proves that greater harmony exists where the people owned property in common than under conditions of private ownership, and if you want to prove it, read the history of the colonies that have been established throughout the world. And he says the Apostles owned all things in common; they believed in public ownership. Well, Mr. Chair-
man, let me say this to you: If you understood the Bible as the Catholic Church understands the Bible [wild applause]—Do not laugh, my dear sir. The Catholic Church made the Bible [great applause]. If my opponent, and I give him credit for integrity; I can see by his statement about the Apostles he does not know what the teachings of the Apostles were. If he did he would still be a Catholic.

"The early Christians, many of them, sold their property". Read the story of Ananias and Sapphira. They sold their property? They sold their property? They were condemned by God for lying, if they sold their property. And could you believe in holding everything in common if they sold it and gave the money for carrying on the work? The Apostles did hold things in common; and even our Lord, when He was asked what we should do to be perfect, said: "Sell all you have and give it to the poor, and take up my cross and follow me". "Sell what you have". If you are going to sell anything there must be ownership before you can sell it.

He says there is no such thing in the Church to-day as common property; that they abolished that early-Christianity idea. Why, you don’t
know what you are talking about. Look at those men who join the Franciscan Order. Look at those men who join the Jesuits. Look at those men who have joined the one hundred and one orders. Look at the women who go into those different religious orders. Do they not own the property in common? At least no one can say in those orders, "This part of the property is mine", because they pledge themselves to poverty as well as chastity and obedience, and if you want to join these orders you will have to give up your property. But none of those orders stand against the private ownership of property. Not at all! The private ownership of property is maintained. If you will read the 19th chapter of St. Luke, the parable of the pounds, you will find that the Lord gave his servants ten pounds apiece and went away from home. On His return He called His servants before Him that He might know how much every man had gained by trading. Then came the first man and said, "Lord, thy pound hath gained me ten pounds". And the Lord said, "Thou hast been faithful in a very little; have thou authority over ten cities". And another man said, "I have used your pound and made five pounds". And to him his Lord said,
"You shall have authority over five cities". To the next He said, "What did you do with the pound? Did you do with it as I told you?" "No, I saved it in a napkin". "Why didn't you put it in a bank, that it might draw interest?" And he was condemned. In that parable you see the right to trade to obtain money is in the Bible. The Bible has in it many seemingly most damaging things and if you were to take them out of their context they would seem very bad matter. But, my dear sir, let me take a supreme example that you all know of. Don't you know the story of David? Don't you recall that David took another man's wife to him? Don't you recall that he caused the death of the wife's husband? That most shocking story is told in the Bible. But if you will read further on you will find about a year afterwards he began to repent, and he repented so sincerely after God had punished him—and God punished him for it—that he became God's beloved. That picture is put in the Bible not alone to give you the history of David but to show you no matter how high the sin a man may commit, whether it be prostitution or murder, or anything else, once he really repents God Almighty forgives him and loves him and elevates
him to eternal happiness. Is there any such thing in these Socialist books? I would like my opponent to read that, and not read those things out of their context. It would improve him.

Here is a book that has a little to say about the family relation, and which is officially circulated by the Socialists. "We must say, to begin with, that, concerning marriage and the family there will be a great change but there will be no binding contract, necessarily, between the parties as regards livelihood. While property and children will cease to exist, and every infant shall come into full citizenship" (be twenty-one years of age when it is born).

That is, a new basis of family would take place on the basis of a common, mutual inclination and affection and association, terminable at the will of either party; that such associated men and women may leave one another without the intervention of any other party. "In this coming-of-age condition let every woman whose heart bleeds for the suffering of her sex"—(I wish I had my opponent's dramatic ability to read it to you)—"hasten to declare and constitute herself as far as she possibly can a free woman. Let her accept the term with all the odium that belongs to it.
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Let her insist on the right to speak and dress and think and act and, above all, use her sex as she deems best. Let her face scorn and ridicule. Let her lose her love if she pleases, and should. Only when woman is ‘free’ will the prostitute cease to exist”. In this book, “Woman and Socialism”, in the joys of love she is free and unhampered by man. She woos and is wooed and enters into a union without any consideration, prompted by no other consideration than her sex feeling. This union is a private agreement without the interference of any conventionality. No man has a right to interfere. What I eat and drink, and when I sleep, is my private affair, and so is my intercourse with the opposite sex. In this book we have stated that as soon as sex passion ceases separation is a blessing for both parties and for society. But they will not have divorce courts. The duration of the time of sex-love is individual, and separation is a blessing for both parties when it ceases. But womanhood will be freer.

“Looking Forward” advocates doing away with the divorce courts altogether and allowing free love, the same as in their other books. Here is a book not for the future but for the present,
and looks at it from a new standpoint, and, speaking for to-day, men may justly reject and condemn sexual morality, he may condemn the morganatic marriage system which obtains to-day, he may claim the right to free union between man and woman. A man may claim the right to unite either temporarily or permanently, or go through some form of marriage, but it has no binding effect upon them. Now, I want to ask this question: If people can say they believe what is in those books, if they believe that their union is not binding between them and they have a right to do so according to their own inclinations, do you think it will better the family condition of the people?

I challenge the representative of the Socialist Party to point to one book, just one, only one, that has a world-wide circulation as have some of these books I have referred to to-night, just one that takes the Christian position regarding the relation of the sexes. One! That is all I want. He cannot mention one.

They circulate them. Yes! They circulate only that literature, and I have an official list, one of which I delivered over to him. I would like to have him point to a book that has a world-wide
standing in the Socialistic movement, that speaks upon the sex question, that takes any different position than those I have mentioned here tonight.

You do not attack the Catholic Church? Allowing you do not before an audience made up partially of Catholics; but your party attacks the Catholic Church. And when you say your party does not attack Christianity, well, you are the man putting up an animal stuffed with straw and calling it Socialism.

These books all advocate Atheism. I have another challenge for you. I would like you to present it to the Socialist party of this city. You have a national organization. You may vote to do certain things by referendum. I challenge you, my dear sir, to go into the Socialist Party local of this city or your own City of Hartford and offer for a referendum vote of the national organization a proposal calling upon them, your officials, to cease circulating these books that advocate Atheism and free love. I will make it better still. I will take just two of them, the two leading ones: This free-love book, “The Origin of the Family”, and this free-love book, this attack upon Christianity, this attack upon women,
this attack upon everything that Christians hold dear, ask your organization by a referendum vote to vote to cease circulating them. I am authorized to-night to say to you, to your party through you, that the Boston School of Political Economy will present your local a donation of $100 if you succeed in getting your national organization to adopt a referendum vote repudiating these two free-love books. Failing to do that, we shall hold you responsible for their teachings. Your Mr. Morris Hillquit, one of your leading men, in a discussion now going on in one of our popular magazines says very clearly that—and I can back up by authority everything I say—Mr. Hillquit in the October number of Everybody's says: "The utterances and actions of such writers and representatives if not formally repudiated by their party must be considered as the legitimate expressions and manifestations of the Socialist movement". That applies to the official utterances of the Socialist Party. That says very plainly that unless you repudiate those books you shall be responsible for the teachings of those books. And those books advocate free love; and, I will stake my life on it, no man can be a Christian and believe in their teachings on the family
as there set forth. And let me say to you Socialists who are here who are not living a free-love life you are living according to Christian standards, for I make bold to say to you, right square in the face, that if the men who belong to the Socialist Party that circulates these books live according to the teachings of those books free-love will be common among you.

I think I have pretty well covered the ground. My opponent used nine-tenths of his time talking about trusts. My friend, I have intelligence enough to know that when you are speaking on the subject Religion—that Socialism is not opposed to Christianity—the trusts have nothing to do with it. The question is the relationship and importance of character, and in our relationship of man to man there is no vital portion of human life of greater import to Christians than Christianity in the family life. Christianity teaches, when actually applied, that that which God has joined together no man has a legitimate right to put asunder, and the Socialists teach that mere sex passion shall be the standard, and when sex passion ceases you should separate. What is the effect?

I have a pamphlet here, "Socialism and the
Church’—the Catholic Church—written by Mr. Bohn, in which he says that when they join the Socialist Party they cease to be Catholics. And why? Do they attack Protestants? Oh, no! They either become nothing or they become rank Atheists. The materialistic conception of history underlies Socialism. It is a philosophy.

MR. SPIESS.

Friends, throughout this debate Mr. Goldstein has practically done nothing else than appeal to religious prejudice. He says that Professor Rausenbusch’s books are not Christian from the Catholic standpoint. He sets Catholic Christianity against Protestant Christianity.

To set Catholic Christianity against Protestant Christianity is not Christianity at all. If Christianity is anything it is love.

Now, friends, to summarize and substantiate all I have said, and to forever close the mouth of Mr. Goldstein I am going to quote an authority who is known throughout this whole country; a man who certainly does know what Socialism is, whose words have great weight with all of you. I am
going to quote this man's own words to prove all that I have said.

In September, 1902, there was held a convention of the Socialist Party of the State of Massachusetts. At that convention some one introduced a resolution to amend the constitution of the Socialist Party of the state, demanding that all Socialist speakers should refrain from speaking Atheism and free love. Now, as we Socialists do not talk such things—I never did, and never heard a Socialist speaker do it—it was voted down overwhelmingly, because to have done otherwise would have been equivalent to saying that Socialist speakers do such things. The next day a clergyman introduced the following resolution:

"Resolved, that the Socialist Party disclaims any attempt to regulate the religious or other private opinions of its members on the ground that the Socialist movement is a political movement, whose aim is to usher in by peaceful and constitutional methods an equitable economic system based upon the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution".

Now, then, the authority whose words I am
going to give you, whose whole speech I am going
to quote word for word, spoke as follows:

"I well know that the newspapers reporting
conventions, especially Socialist conventions, al-
ways try to find some sensational point in order
that they might create what they call news and
at the same time hit a blow to such progressive
movements as we represent. I know that Social-
ism stands for a political, for an economic, for an
industrial environment, as high as any civic,
political or industrial environment that ever has
been advocated by man.

"The Socialist movement to-day stands higher
than it ever did in all its history, and I believe in
time to come it will stand still higher than it does
to-day.

"I agree with the resolution presented this
morning. We have no connection with any reli-
gious views that certain members may hold. We
differ as much in our religious opinions as the
members of the Democratic or the members of
the Republican Party do. I am not united with
you for religious purposes directly. I am united
with you because I believe in establishing a con-
dition of affairs where the industries will belong
to the people, where every man will have free and
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equal opportunities to earn his bread and butter, and where relationship between man and man, between master and servant in the economic world will be abolished and a condition of affairs will be established where industrial democracy and equal relationship of man and man will obtain.

"I say, Mr. Chairman, that the press always picks up the sensational side of everything that is presented in a Socialist convention. I presented that proposition referred to in the papers. That was not the constitution. That was only a clause in the constitution, and the body saw fit not to adopt it, but by not adopting it they did not say that they sanctioned free love, that they believed in violence; but they did not say by rejecting that they believed in attacking the Church. No; all the body said by rejecting that was that they think it is inadvisable to place such a thing in their constitution.

"Still there are members here—possibly the majority of them—yes, two-thirds of the members here, if not all the members, if you went to them personally and said: 'Do you believe in free love? Do you believe in violence, in attacking the Church?'—I believe every one of them, if not,
almost every one of them, would declare against such doctrines”.

There was applause immediately after. And then the noted authority I am quoting said: “I am pleased to have the opportunity to stand upon this floor and second the proposition presented by McCartney” (the clergyman). This wipes away and forever settles all dispute about free love and Atheism. That authority is no other than Mr. Goldstein himself. I know how Mr. Goldstein will answer this. He will say: “I am sure now that I was wrong then”. But he was sure then that he was right, and if he was sure that he was right then why may he not be wrong now?

-Friends, Mr. Goldstein quoted from Bebel’s books, “Woman”, trying to show that Bebel believed in free love. Bebel says: “The moment the field of the known is abandoned and one launches out into pictures of future forms, a wide field is opened for speculation. Differences of opinion start over that which is probable or not probable. That which in that direction is set forth in this book can, accordingly, be taken only as the personal opinion of the author himself; possible attacks must be directed against him only; only he is responsible”.
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Why does not Mr. Goldstein read that passage? That would throw a little light on what follows. But it does not serve his purpose.

I am about to finish. In justice, friends, according to the rules of debate, I have the right to be the last speaker, but I have willingly yielded to Mr. Goldstein, allowing him to change the rules of debate and permitting him to be the last speaker because I was after that man. He escaped me once, but I got him here to-night, and in order to give him no chance to get out of my grip I consented to give him all advantages.

He has appealed to religious prejudices throughout. He told you what the Catholic Church stands for. Always to prejudice you. Now he is going to wind up his speech with a great big peroration, and throughout that he will again appeal to religious prejudice. He will tell you that the Socialists in the French Revolution murdered nuns and even dug up the bones of the priests out of their graves, when there wasn't a single Socialist in existence at the time. Karl Marx was born eighteen years after the French Revolution. The French Revolution was a struggle between the nobility and clergy on one side and the capitalists on the other. The Catholic Church
stands to-day by the capitalists against the working-class. I hope you will not feel offended by this remark. What I am to establish is truth, and I believe before my God that it is the truth.

I hope that throughout this discussion I have not said anything that may give offence. In a debate like this, one may, when heated, say things that give offence, but I tell you that in my heart there was no desire to offend. I now surrender the floor to Mr. Goldstein, and I want you to remember that in that speech he is going to appeal to your religious prejudices.

MR. GOLDSKIN

Josh Billings once said that it was not our ignorance of things that made us ridiculous but the assumption of knowing a lot of things that are not so.

To begin at the beginning. He says we imagine there were Socialists before Karl Marx's time. Well, there were Socialist papers, that held Socialistic views, held the same views that Socialists hold, many of them, that existed thousands of years ago. One man whose teachings were So-
cialist views, lived in those remote days. He was known as Rousseau.

Take up another point. Bebel does say that as it is speculation regarding the future some things must be accepted as personal opinion. For instance, Mr. Bebel says in this book that in the future society there will be comparative teaching. He says that women will nurse their own children. But he says in the first part of that paragraph that you only read part of: "All Socialists will probably agree with the fundamental principles here expressed". And one of those fundamental principles is the relation of the sexes. Could Mr. Bebel come forward and say: "This is my personal opinion; that I am the only one"? You ought to condemn it if you disagree with it, unless Mr. Bebel was the first one who expressed that opinion. Mr. Bebel refers to things that he brings out originally in this book when he speaks of that passage, but Mr. Bebel cannot speak of a thing as his personal opinion of things that other Socialists of greater position than he had said before him. Mr. Bebel says, "My opinion of the relation of the sexes is my personal opinion". What about this book, "The Origin of the Family"? What about "Love Coming of Age"?
"Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome"? What about "Looking Forward"? Those writers do not say, "It is my personal opinion". Not a word about it. And even if they are personal opinions become the opinions of the party when they are circulated in more than one of its books.

I resigned from the Socialist Party May 23, 1903. On September 8, 1902, I was one of a group of men who went into the convention of the Socialist Party of Massachusetts in Paine Hall, Boston, and presented a constitutional clause which said that advocates of religious views, free love or violence should be barred from the Socialist platform. I was defeated. The press the next day reported what I said. What did the press say in Boston? The Boston Journal, September 8th, headed its report of the convention, of my speech, "'Free Love' Talked. Socialists in Convention Refused to Adopt Goldstein's Constitution, Denouncing the Doctrine." And the Boston Journal on the same day said: "Some one moved that the Goldstein constitution be submitted to the members of the clubs for a referendum vote. Mr. Goldstein, speaking at length on this matter, pleaded that 'religion is the vital environment that sustains the human structure and, therefore,
sustains civilization. I hold sacred my religious convictions and do not want to force them upon the Socialist Party.'” What I did want was an end should be put to speakers using the Socialist platform as a means to tear down the church laws and up-build the state.

The Leader, a Socialist paper, spoke of Martha Moore Avery delivering a long defense of the Goldstein resolution, and she charged that certain Socialist books advocated free love and said that the Socialist movement will never make headway until the anti-religious support is moved out of it, and the movement must be cleaned of the literature which poisons the minds of the men and women who enter it. Those quotations can be seen in the daily papers which are on file in the Public Library and the newspaper offices in the City of Boston. The next day there is not a word delivered by your humble servant as quoted by my opponent. Where did it come from? It is supposed to be a stenographic report. It is not a stenographic report. It is a quotation taken, made up and circulated for the first time in the City of Belleville, Illinois, seven years and nine months after I left the Socialist Party; and the editor of that paper had and state officials made
the comment that it was produced to circulate through the mails—one of its editions—seven years and nine months after I left the Socialist Party, and by whom? By a renegade Catholic, James F. Carey, whom I hoped to have upon this platform to-night. That man performed the Socialist trick by trying to prove that Leo XIII in his encyclical on the working-man strikes the working-man. To the line of argument heard here you can prove anything; you can prove the Lord defends suicide. If you turn to the 29th chapter and the 5th verse of St. Matthew you may see and read from that that Judas went out and hanged himself with a halter. Then if you turn to St. Luke, 10th chapter and the 37th verse, you may read there, "Go thou and do in like manner".
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