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CHAPTER I
Spirit and Purpose of Socialism

In the Christmas (1911) edition of the Tidings, the official organ of the Catholic diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles, appeared an article by Francis S. Montgomery, Ph. D., entitled "Can a Catholic Be a Socialist?" The writer is very plainly in the negative of the question, and by a series of quotations from foreign writers on Socialism attempts to prove his position.

By no process of juggling of quotations, or misconstruction of its principles, can Socialism be placed in the attitude of antagonism to the Catholic Church, or religion in any form.

The platform of the Socialist party declares explicitly that: "The Socialist party is primarily an economic and political organization. It is not concerned with matters of religious belief."

The spirit and purpose of Socialism are just as explicitly stated to be: "That all those things upon which the people in common depend shall by the people in common be owned and administered; that the tools of employment shall belong to their creators and users; that all production shall be for the direct use of the producer; that the making of goods for profit shall come to an end; that we shall all be workers together, and that all opportunities shall be open and equal to all men."
What is the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church towards Socialism? This question was answered recently at Syracuse, N. Y., by Bishop Ludden, the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese, when he was invited to take part in a discussion on "Socialism Not Opposed to Religion." He said: "Officially the Catholic Church has taken no stand for or against Socialism, nor will it."

When a Catholic writer or teacher takes a stand against Socialism, he does so as an individual, and his views are only his views, and subject to the approval or disapproval of all other Catholics.

On May 25, 1891, Pope Leo XIII declared: "But all agree, and there can be no question whatever that some remedy must be found, and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the poor. * * * By degrees it has come to pass that workingmen have been given over, isolated and defenseless, to the carelessness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. * * * And to this must be added the custom of working by contract and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself."

That is just the condition Socialism is facing—to which it has applied itself.

There are men, and leaders, too, in the ranks of Socialism, who are opposed to the Catholic Church and unbelievers in religion in any form. They are pure materialists and can see nothing but materialism.

These men are of a scientific quality of intellect, and have done invaluable service to Socialism and to humanity.

Indeed, upon their teachings is founded the basis of scientific Socialism.

But they are not infallible. Their views are not all above criticism. Their conclusions are not all absolute.
The men who framed and signed the Declaration of Independence were not infallible. As Americans we have accepted their documents as the basis of our national life. But we do not endorse their every view or adhere to their every conclusion.

The men to whom Dr. Montgomery objects and whose writings he refers to as proving that a good Catholic cannot be a Socialist, gave to humanity a Declaration of Independence economically sound and one that will stand as long as human industry is a factor in the world.

They have furnished the very thing sought for by men of the most deeply religious spirit—a remedy for the evils of capitalism.

Shall we throw out the telephone, the phonograph, the electric light and the host of inventions initiated or perfected by Thomas Edison, because that wizard of science has denied the immortality of souls and many things of religious belief?

The science of economics belongs to the realm of science, the same as the science of politics or the science of electricity.

Because we utilize the inventions of Thomas Edison does not imply that we endorse his religious, or any other, views.

If the contention of the learned writer were true, that a Catholic cannot be a Socialist, will he answer these questions: "Can a Catholic be a Republican?" "Can a Catholic be a Democrat?"

Were the men who founded these parties of the soundest and most orthodox religious belief?

Are the platforms of these parties written by men theologically true?

Robert G. Ingersoll was a power in the Republican party. Yet with the same tongue with which he embellished the most brilliant utterances that ever echoed in a Republican convention hall, he ridiculed the Bible, the church and orthodox religion generally. Can a Catholic be a Republican?

Ambassador White wrote "Conflict of Science and Religion." Can a Catholic be a Republican?
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Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic party, was an infidel and emphatically denied the claims of the Catholic Church and of every religious denomination. Can a Catholic be a Democrat?

Socialism aims at a practical result. It aims to democratize industry, to establish popular self-government in the industrial as in the political world, to democratize the means of production and distribution upon which the people in common depend.

There is nothing in this program to interfere with religious views of any kind.

The Socialist sees in the private ownership of the means of production and distribution the source of an unending list of social evils.

This condition and its consequent evils are in all parts of our Republic and of the world. They are to be found in Mormon Utah, orthodox New England, barbarous Turkey, and in the strongholds of all religious faiths.

Socialism does not aim to regulate these faiths, but the conditions by which the worker is made a slave and suppressed in his struggle toward liberty.

Catholics are no more exempt from the ravages of these evils than are members of other denominations.

Of the three million child-slaves, the seven million women workers, the twelve million paupers, the seven hundred and twenty thousand prostitutes and all the other classes of unfortunates produced by the prevailing inhuman and unchristian system of society in this country, large proportions are from Catholic homes.

The Socialist party is the only party; yes, the only agency, that furnishes a program for the destruction of this system and the establishment of a system truly and entirely democratic—a system that will give to the worker the full product of his toil, and thus wipe poverty and its attendant evils of crime and vice and divorce and hopelessness, and the rest, out of existence.
PASSING along the street the other day the writer saw, in front of a Catholic church, a blind man holding a tin cup in his hand. A beggar—an unfortunate unit of society reduced to the necessity of appealing to the charity of passersby in order to sustain life. Looking upon that poor brother man, by no fault of his own rendered helpless, and watching the people emerging from the sanctuary of the Catholic faith, meeting at the very threshold of their place of worship the sad spectacle of a Christian social system, the wonder came, "How can these Catholics help being Socialists."

Socialism does not interfere with religious beliefs. It stops at the door of the church and deals with the blind beggar—with the economic affairs of all the needy children of earth.

The blind beggar makes no distinction in the religious beliefs of those who drop their mites into his cup. Jew or Gentile, Chink or Jap, Catholic or Protestant, believer or unbeliever—all look alike to him. He listens to the jingle in the cup—the music sweeter to him than the sacred songs swelling in the sanctuary.

Socialism, and Socialism alone, knows the diagnosis and remedy in such a case. It has made a scientific study of society and possesses the only adequate pathology of economics.
Neither the Catholic Church, nor any other agency in the
world, religious, social or political, can ever treat the blind
beggar and the elements in society which he typifies, except
by the very processes prescribed in this pathology.

The Socialist looks upon that blind beggar not as a men-
dicant, not as a pawn of chance, not as a stimulus to what we
have sacrilegiously called "charity." But as a social being
—an heir to the social wealth of the world laid up for
society by the industry of mankind of all generations.

Edward Bellamy beautifully brings out this idea when
he makes one of the characters in "Looking Backward" say
that those able to work are able to produce more than so
many savages because of the knowledge, machinery and
strivings of the race for thousands of years. Each genera-
tion can add only a small part to the general knowledge
and experience of all, which alone makes possible the great
amount and variety of production today.

And as all this has come down to the race as a whole,
so all the race, and not merely the stronger part of it, has
an equal claim upon the value of the products thus made
possible.

What, he asks, did you do with the share of these unfor-
tunate and crippled brothers? "Did you not rob them
when you put them off with crusts, who were entitled to sit
with the heirs, and did you not add insult to robbery when
you called the crusts charity?"

That’s the estimate Socialism places upon the blind beg-
gar at the door of the Catholic Church.

"A Socialist society," says Morris Hillquit, "is one based
on the system of public or collective ownership of the ma-
terial instruments of production, democratic administration
of the industries, and co-operative labor; and the guiding
principle of such society must be the recognition of the right
of·existence and enjoyment inherent in every human being."

Why does the blind man beg for a living? Why? Be-
cause he has been robbed of his social heritage, through a
system of exploitation known as private ownership by the most cruel monster the world has known—capitalism.

In 1865, Abraham Lincoln made this startling prediction: “I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me, and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people, until all the wealth is aggregated in a few hands, and the republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of our country than ever before, even in the midst of war. God grant that my forebodings may be groundless. Monarchy itself is sometimes hinted at as a refuge from the power of the people. In my present position I could scarcely be justified were I to omit to raise a warning voice against the approach of a returning despotism. * * * It is assumed that labor is available only in connection with capital; that nobody labors unless somebody else, owning capital, somehow, by the use of it, induces him to labor. Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could not have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. I bid the laboring people beware of surrendering the power which they possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to shut the door of advancement for such as they, and fix new disabilities and burdens upon them until all of liberty shall be lost.

“In the early days of our race the Almighty said to the first of mankind, ‘In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread,’ and since then, if we except the light and air of heaven, no good thing has been or can be enjoyed by us without first having cost labor. And inasmuch as most good things have been produced by labor, it follows that all such things belong of right to those whose labor has produced
them. But it has so happened in all ages of the world that some have labored and others have, without labor, enjoyed a large portion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any government.

"It seems strange that any man should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing bread from the sweat of other men's faces.

"This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it."

How true has proven the prediction of Lincoln! Now let us see how this system of exploitation operates against society.

N. A. Richardson has put it very clearly: "In our capitalist system of industry the means of production—the natural source of raw material, the earth, and the artificial appliances for putting this raw material into useful things, machinery—these absolute requirements to our national existence and our individual lives, are private property.

"Now, as this private possession is absolute, is held more sacred than life itself, is backed by every organized force of government, it follows that the right of access to these things and consequently the right of the laborer to life itself, is entirely at the disposal of the private owner.

"He can admit the laborer to this life-source or exclude him from it, to suffer and even die of want; and there is nothing in capitalism that dares to question the righteousness of this authority."

As a result of this absolute authority over all the industrial interests of society, the conditions of the members of society are subject to the dictates of capitalism.

The blind man stands in front of the church and begs because capitalism has placed him there.

It won't do to excuse his presence there by quoting the words of the Savior of Men: "The poor ye have with ye
always,” and assuming that He meant that mankind must for all time endure such spectacles of human necessity.

Capitalism is the promoter of pauperism.

The God who made this world made an ample one. He stored it with plenty for all. And he intended that all shall enjoy the fruits thereof.

He intended that men shall be brothers, with brother instincts and brother interests, not with those of robbers, or despots, or wild beasts.

Capitalism has seized, with the brutality of these lawless, selfish creatures, the heritage of the industrious and the needy, contrary to the laws of God and of humanity.

Socialism, recognizing the awfulness of human conditions, to which the church is giving so little heed, has come to the assistance of the blind man with the only weapon that can avail to restore him to his rights—the ballot, projected at the destruction of the system of private ownership of social assets and the utter annihilation of the monster, capitalism.

Leaving the services of the sanctuary to those who are devoted thereto, it seeks to take the blind man off the street and place him in a home of his own, provided with all the necessities of human existence in the twentieth century.

It would oust from their places of privilege the luxurious idle and supplant them with the unfortunate needy.

It would lift Lazarus out of the crumbs to a seat at the great banquet table of labor’s bountiful products.

It would invest society with the spirit of humanity instead of the instincts of jungle beasts.

How can a Catholic help being a Socialist?
HERE is not a single suggestion in the program of the Socialist party that can be construed as interfering with the religion of any denomination. There is much in it conducive to making religion more acceptable and practical. The failure of the church to meet the “something needed” and to deal with the blind beggar at the door of the sanctuary is a fact, and one that cannot be set aside or evaded as long as churches and society exist.

“Enslave the liberty of but one human being,” said Garrison, “and the liberties of the world are put in peril.”

Neglect but one needy child of God—one humble and obscure inhabitant of His universe—and “humanity with all its fears and all its hopes of future years” suffers, and there is joy prevented “in the presence of the angels of God,” though the “ninety-and-nine” are in comfort.

Something must be done—something that is not possible to be done except by means of the program Socialism prescribes.

The Catholic Church is doing much practical work for the alleviation of human suffering. Its schools, hospitals, asylums, etc., are among the grandest philanthropic monuments of modern civilization. But what is it doing to prevent the conditions that render these institutions necessary?

“An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.” In dealing with this paramount problem of society the preponderance in favor of prevention is incalculable.
Socialism has but one object of assault. It is capitalism.

John Spargo describes Prometheus, who for ridiculing the gods, was bound to a rock upon Mount Caucasus, by order of Jupiter, where daily for thirty years a vulture came and tore at his liver, feeding upon it.

Then there came to his aid Hercules, who unbound the tortured victim and set him free.

"Like another Prometheus," says Spargo, "the soul of man today is bound to a rock—the rock of capitalism. The vulture of Greed tears the victim, remorselessly and unceasingly. And now, to break the chains, to set the soul of man free, Hercules comes in the form of the Socialist movement."

Should the Priest come and minister to the spiritual needs of the bound one, or the good Sister bring food and drink and medicines for his immediate hunger and suffering, Socialism would not attempt to prevent their ministrations. But it does say: "Why not break the bonds, remove the implements of torture and slay the monster whose depredations fill the pages of human history with the blackest stories of shame and brutality?"

Would man not be a more devout worshiper at a shrine thus dedicated to human salvation?

If a Catholic can be charitable cannot he also be a Socialist?

Isn't Socialism infinitely better than charity? Indeed, is not Socialism the perfection of charity?

Says Prof. John Commons: "Involuntary idleness and irregular employment are the antichrists of today that drive men and women into crime, intemperance and shame."

These are the result of capitalism, which owning the land and machinery, the means of life, becomes the owner of man as well.

The man who won't work should not be permitted to eat. But the fact is that it's only the man who will work who can't eat.
Only the other day Lloyd George, England’s Chancellor of Exchequer, said:

“What does poverty mean? It means that men haven’t enough to purchase the barest necessaries of life for themselves and children.

“One-fourth of the population of this country, even in times of prosperity, are living under conditions of poverty thus defined.

“The national income is one billion pounds. That is the revealed income. That means 200 pounds a year for every family. Yet one-third of that income is received and spent by 250,000 people, one two-hundredth part of the population, or, in families, one-fortieth of the population is receiving and spending one-third of the income of this country.”

While this chapter is being written, its pencil strokes are accompanied by the pangs of poverty of about twelve millions, in the United States—people in a state of chronic poverty.

That is, they are without sufficient food and clothing and shelter to keep them in such a condition of comfort we would wish for animals—to keep them in a state of efficiency to compete in the struggle for work and to maintain a full standard of efficiency while at work.

“And the sad part of it is,” it has been pointed out, “that large additional numbers—numbers most appalling for a country such as this—are each year, and through no fault of their own, dropping into this same condition.”

No man, Catholic or Protestant, believer or unbeliever, will for a moment deny that these conditions exist, that they are unnecessary in a land of plenty, that the cause of them is one opposed to the ideals of religion and humanity, and that something must be done to remove the cause and conditions.

He must admit that the Republican and Democratic parties are powerless to effect the necessary result.
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He must admit that the Socialist party is the only agency that even offers anything like an adequate remedy.

As long as these economic antichrists continue to mock society, and the church to ignore them, the blind beggar will continue to stand at the door of the church and listen for the jingle of the pennies rather than the paens of praise.
ONE OF the most-used weapons of argument against Socialism is that “it would destroy the home.” As the question of “free love” will be taken up in succeeding chapters, this chapter will be confined to the home without reference to the marriage relation.

It is assumed by most opponents of Socialism that it aims at absolute public ownership of property, including the home.

Socialism aims at no such thing. It demands that “all those things upon which the people in common depend shall by the people in common be owned and administered.”

Socialism is not against the private ownership of the home, but against the private ownership of the home for purposes of exploitation.

It aims to do away with that private property which is obtained through the toil of others. Thus a man could build a house on his own land for his own use; but not to let to another for the purpose of deriving a profit.

It would establish home-owners, instead of landlords.

Then every man’s house would indeed be his castle, absolutely immune from the assaults of the bandits of business and dollars, sacred to him and his as long as used as a home.
Those who have to do with the building investment companies know the cruel evils permitted to be practiced by such concerns.

Under Socialism these bandit concerns would not be permitted to exist. The people co-operatively would own the land and materials, and would encourage and assist the individual in the building of a home, and protect him in maintaining and embellishing it.

Such a condition is utterly impossible under capitalism. Socialism is the only agency adequate to destroy capitalism.

Capitalism has completely destroyed the home. Can a Catholic be a capitalist? Can a Catholic lend his support to capitalism?

The other day the New York Sun published the following on "Pauperism in London:"

"The city of London closed the year 1911 with a total of 134,218 persons classed as paupers. Of these 77,853 were in the workhouses and 32,018 on the outdoor relief lists; the aggregate of 109,871 being lower by 14,012 than in December, 1910. It gives a rate of 24.3 paupers to the thousand of population. The grand total is attained by adding 958 casual paupers, 4240 cases of medical relief and 19,149 pauper lunatics.

"In January, 1911, it appears 11,491 aged persons took advantage of the law to transfer themselves from the pauper class to that of old-age pensioners; but a very large number of these after a very short trial returned to the workhouses. After the comparative comfort, the cleanliness and the order of these establishments they could not stand the misery of their old surroundings. Some had not the providence to make ends meet on the pension pittance and some found that friends and relatives had lost interest in them and they were no longer welcome in their old sphere of life."

Pauperism is the direct product of capitalism.
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Not only does capitalism destroy the possibility of home-owning—it also destroys the very instincts that endear home to the human heart.

Some years ago Frederic Harrison, the conservative English publicist, gave a graphic description of the lot of the working class of England, a description which applies to the working class of America with equal force:

"Ninety per cent of the actual producers of wealth have no home that they can call their own beyond the end of the week, have no bit of soil, or so much as a room that belongs to them; have the precarious chance of weekly wages which barely suffice to keep them in health; are housed for the most part in places that no man thinks fit for a horse; are separated by so narrow a margin from destitution that a month of bad trade, sickness or unexpected loss brings them face to face with hunger and pauperism."

There is no use trying to charge these conditions to intemperance and improvidence.

These evils exist, but they do not explain the homelessness and poverty of the workers.

Poverty does not always accompany these evils.

Many are both intemperate and improvident and at the same time wealthy.

"In spite of the greatest extravagance and laziness," it has been pointed out, "there are millionaires who cannot get poor; and in spite of the greatest industry and thrift, there are workingmen who cannot get out of debt."

Socialism would restore the natural order, by making plenty the reward of energy and thrift.

Capitalism drives the boy and girl away from home to look for work.

It separates the husband from his wife and home to seek a job.

It makes the cost of a home so high that the worker is compelled to make the tenement his habitation.
It renders the habitation of the worker so cheerless, so wretched, that the solace of drink is sought.

Thus the conclusion of Prof. Commons is arrived at: “A new race of men is being created with inherited traits of physical and moral degeneracy, suited to the new environment of the tenement house, the saloon, and the jail.”

Socialism believes in the home. It regards the home as the basis and bulwark of society. It contends that “a noble nation of ignoble households is impossible.”

Dare any man, Catholic or Protestant, stand for the thing called home in society today?

Look at it, as painted by Prof. Commons, and not too colored, by any means:

“Today, among the poorest classes, home is a travesty. The mother must work to compensate the father’s enforced idleness and low pay, and her children come into the world with feeble bodies, broken nerves and moral impotence.

“It has been said that to educate a child you must begin with his great-grandfather. More to the point is it that if you would have a people intelligent, moral, and Christian, you must relieve their mothers and grandmothers from excessive toil.

“The home is the place where, most of all, environment tells. Overwork for women and children is the physical basis for crime, intemperance and vice.

“The youth, the man, or the woman who has grown up in a home—or the mockery of a home—such as this, can never escape from the prison of his own faltering body.”

Socialism would give each family a home, free from debt, idleness, low pay; overwork of father, mother, brother or sister—free from everything that imperils and enchains.
CHAPTER V
Would Make Motherhood a Blessing

HEN a little newsie was asked: "What is home?" pointing to his mother, scantily clad and standing in the doorway of a cheap shack, he proudly said, "It's where she is."

Home is the center of civilization. It is the workshop of the world, where all the great things of life are fashioned, and the master mechanic is mother.

Whatever debases motherhood is a direct menace to mankind. Whatever uplifts motherhood is a direct blessing to mankind.

The existing social system in nothing shows its utter inefficiency, inhumanity and irreligion so much as in its treatment of motherhood. And let it still be remembered that the mission of Socialism is to destroy this system and supplant it with one that offers to motherhood the utmost security and sacredness.

Capitalism is rendering the very possibility of motherhood more and more difficult.

The girl child of the working class furnishes the saddest tragedies of all history.

As far back as 1795, Dr. Aikin, writing of industrial affairs in England, declared that the term "factory girl" was an insulting epithet, and the young woman who bore it could not hope for other better employment, nor yet for marriage with any but the very lowest and despised of men.
John Spargo in his "Bitter Cry of the Children" tells of an experience at a large flax mill in Paterson, N. J., a few years ago. He says:

"At six o'clock the whistles shrieked, and the streets were suddenly filled with people, many of them children. Of all the crowd of tired, pallid, and languid-looking children I could only get speech with one, a little girl who claimed thirteen years, though she was smaller than many a child of ten.

"Indeed, as I think of her now, I doubt whether she would have come up to the standard of normal physical development either in weight or stature for a child of ten. One learns, however, not to judge the ages of working children by their physical appearance, for they are usually behind other children in height, weight and girth of chest—often as much as two or three years.

"If my little Paterson friend was thirteen, perhaps the nature of her employment will explain her puny, stunted body. She works in the 'steaming room' of the flax mill. All day long, in a room filled with clouds of steam, she has to stand barefooted in pools of water twisting coils of wet hemp.

"When I saw her she was dripping wet, though she said she had worn a rubber apron all day. In the coldest evenings of winter little Marie, and hundreds of other little girls, must go out from the super-heated steaming rooms into the bitter cold in just that condition."

What kind of mothers would little Marie and the hundreds of other little girls of the flax mill make?

There are tens of thousands of little Maries in the ranks of labor in the United States at this very moment.

To those capable of motherhood, capitalism has made the very idea a horror.

Spargo tells of a woman working in a textile factory for more than thirty years. He says:

"She began to work as a child before she was ten years old, and is now past forty. She has never married, though
many men have sought her in marriage. To her more intimate friends she confesses that she chose to remain lonely and unwed, chose to stifle her longings for affection, rather than to marry and bring children into the world and live to see them enter the mills for employment before they became men and women."

In the tenderest moments of motherhood the female worker is compelled by the presence of poverty to toil for an existence. The most sacred function of womanhood mocked by the gaunt brood of capitalism, the wolves of hunger and want!

Even the savages had a universal custom to exempt their women from toil during stated periods prior to and following childbirth.

In civilized America women frequently endure the agony of childbirth in the very midst of the roar and whirl of machinery.

Then the awful mockery to the mother who has endured the pain and anxiety of travail, even to the brink of death, to find only a lifeless thing—no warmth of childhood’s life to compensate the chill of the dark valley!

More than 60 per cent of these mockeries is due to the influences of poverty.

In this country more than seven million women leave the sanctuary of home daily to fight the hard battle for bread, among them more than a million mothers.

If one is really eager to save humanity, isn’t there a sufficient menace in the crimes of capitalism against motherhood to furnish an incentive to an immediate and absorbing opposition?

Socialism would remove this menace by absolutely removing the pressure of economic necessity.

Socialism would make the development of girlhood and her preparation for motherhood immeasurably more important than the development of private bank accounts
and the preparation of dog worshippers and aristocracy apes.

Socialism would entirely relieve the hours of childbirth of all the influences of poverty.

Socialism would keep woman in the home and restore the mother to the position of master architect of humanity's greatest workshop.

Socialism would break every debasing bond of capitalism, and set the mother free to the cultivation of efficiency, the advancement of humanity, and the enjoyment and practice of religion.
A N ARTICLE in the Tidings is headed "Labor Unions and Socialism." Its principal expressions are as follows:

"To all deeply interested in the cause of workingmen, there is reason to be encouraged at the strong indications of positive determination on the part of many of the prominent Labor Unions to make clear that there is in their organizations no principle of affiliation with elements that tend to anarchy and crime. Those who are close to the true spirit of the labor movement can never be led to believe that violence is a part of the program in favor of the reform which is seriously needed to right the wrongs under which the working people have struggled for a fair wage and an honest consideration of their rights.

"Socialism has taken advantage of the labor movement, and has succeeded in many sections in deceiving the workingman into the belief that the socialistic movement is a purely political one, and that by it alone can labor hope to obtain redress for its grievances and a permanent acknowledgement of its rights. Labor organizations are beginning to see that this really means the absorption of the labor movement by Socialism, and the committing of the labor organizations to socialistic principles, the most important of which are antagonistic to the welfare of the laboring men.

"After the terrible ordeal through which we have passed in the recent dynamite trials, it is time for all classes to study
seriously the whole industrial situation, and strive to determine the right and wrong of the principles which actuate all parties to the issue. One of the strongest elements in insuring confidence will be the absolute breaking away of all labor parties from affiliation with any party which advocates violence and contempt for law. The labor movement means too much to the welfare of the country to have it associated with men whose utterances are at absolute variance with obedience to God and justice to men."

The writer of the foregoing is wasting a lot of applause. The "strong indications" that cause the aforesaid encouragement have as yet failed to become apparent to those intimately related with the labor movement, either in the Labor Unions or the Socialist Party.

In Los Angeles, California, the United States, and all over the world there are "strong indications" to those closest "to the true spirit of the labor movement" that the solidarity of labor—the relation of purpose and program between Unionism and Socialism—was never so pronounced and secure as at the present moment.

And more than this, the very fact that the Tidings is spending so much space on the question of Socialism shows that Socialism never had a hold on the minds and sympathies of Catholics as now and that the hold is becoming more and more secure.

It is difficult to treat moderately with the statements of a writer who insists on allying Socialism with "elements that tend to anarchy and crime."

There is nothing more widely separated in both principles and practices than Socialism and anarchy.

As for crime, Socialism would make it so rare as to become an object of curiosity.

Crime is the fester caused by the presence of the profit splinter in the social body.

The employer wants profits and forces wages down to the lowest level, and the employe is unable to live by his
labor, no matter how industrious he may be. He loses faith in his job and is forced to steal or drink—falls into crime of some kind.

The trust wants profits and closes up mills, or mines, or factories, and "Satan finds mischief for idle hands to do."

The manufacturer wants profits and demands children to work for him. The child, robbed of recreation and education, grows into the kind of an adult of which criminals are made.

The merchant wants profits and requires girls for his establishment. Vice commissions everywhere have shown the intimacy between the underpaid girl and a life of prostitution.

The husband is unable to earn sufficient money to support his home, and is forced into the divorce court or a jail cell for domestic delinquency.

These are facts that furnish the most terrible tragedies of the world today.

Remove the splinter of profit and you remove the fester of crime.

Socialism is the only social surgeon that offers a successful method for the performance of this operation.

The Tidings should be somewhat considerate in its references to the "terrible ordeal through which we have passed in the recent dynamite trials."

The McNamaras had the same hatred for Socialism that actuated the writer of the Tidings’ editorial. They were members of the Catholic Church, and no one has been unfair enough to charge Catholicism with any responsibility for their crimes.

They are but examples of the cruel conditions which are forcing thousands of people—of all religious faiths—into crime. They are but examples of the very thing already shown in this article—that crime is the woeful wound of capitalism.

Had they been imbued with the ideals of Socialism they would have realized that there is no virtue in violence and
that the only remedy for the ravages of capital lies in the peaceful revolution of the social system.

Had they been as devoted to Socialism as they were to Catholicism they would have realized what the writer quoted expressed without realizing its meaning: "One of the strongest elements in insuring confidence will be the absolute breaking away of all labor parties from affiliation with any party which advocates violence and contempt for law."

It was not a Socialist party that endorsed the shooting down of workers at Homestead, the bull-penning and slaughter of miners at Cripple Creek, the exploding of bombs in Idaho, the incarceration of law-abiding citizens without any idea of legal prosecution in Los Angeles, and the recent bayoneting of men, women and children at Lawrence, Mass.

Back of every one of these manifestations of violence and crime operated the machinations of either one of the two great political parties of capital, the Republican and Democratic.

Contempt for law! Why even the halls of Congress and the Cabinet room of the White House have become but the committee rooms of the interests in which to devise and execute means by which to evade or prostitute the laws!

In nearly every state in the Union scandals of the most treasonable type against the law have been exposed, from the lowest to the highest official positions. And in not a single instance has the Socialist party, or any individual Socialist, been involved.

Yes, truly, "Political, as well as industrial success must have its foundation in principles of right which religion sanctions." That's just what the Tidings is overlooking, in its real significance.

The Republican and Democratic parties have their foundations in principles whose fruitage is utterly poisonous to everything that makes for right and justice.
In principles which say that a man has a right to do as he pleases—the source and substance of all anarchy.

In principles which say that might makes right—the incentive and impulse of all violence.

In principles which say that property is the first concern of society—the inspiration of all crime and contempt for law.

SOCIALISM HAS “ITS FOUNDATIONS IN PRINCIPLES OF RIGHT WHICH RELIGION SANCTIONS.”

In principles of brotherhood.
In principles of social justice.
In principles of human betterment.
In principles which say that all men are brothers.
In principles which say that the injury of one is the concern of all.

In principles which say that all things that are exist as the common heritage of humanity and that each human being in the world is entitled to the utmost of industrial endeavor and of collective encouragement.
LARGE-SIZED deluge of opposition is being hurled against Socialism just now by Catholic teachers and the Catholic press, and the essence of it is the charge of materialism.

James Russell Lowell once gave a bit of advice on the preservation of health that may be applied to many other concerns of life. He said, "There is no good in arguing with the inevitable; the only argument with an east wind is to put on your overcoat."

The wind blows. It makes the body cold. The body shivers. Increased clothing will protect the body. It will stop the shivering. Put on your overcoat.

This applies to both Catholics and non-Catholics, to every human being.

It may be very materialistic, but it is also very important.

Even Catholic colleges have their scientific and materialistic departments.

They teach astronomy, geology, botany, chemistry, anatomy, political economy, etc., etc.—all very scientific and very materialistic.

All these subjects are taught in material buildings and the professors and students are to a large degree materialistic creatures.

In fact this is a very materialistic universe. And no amount of argument can make it otherwise.
The writer has just been interrupted by a visit from a fellow worker, who came in to ask assistance in securing a job. He is a very materialistic being, with an equally materialistic family. He has been many months out of work, though he has sought diligently for a job.

He said that his wife is taking in washing to make it possible for them to keep the wolf from their door.

He believes in religion. So does his wife, and his children share in their religious belief. But they are woefully worried and beaten by materialistic conditions.

What that man needs, the Catholic Church is not very actively concerned with.

He needs a job. He needs the money a job will bring. He needs the food and other necessities of life the money will buy.

He needs the results of the intelligent and practical application of a materialistic conception of conditions by human society.

The fact of materialism will always be present in this world as long as it possesses its physical qualities. But Socialism will some day remove the terrible pressure of materialism from the lives of mankind.

God made this material world big enough for all material beings. He equipped it with the means of providing plenty, so that none need feel the pressure of material conditions.

Yet so severe is the pressure that only a select few are not everlastingly suffering from it.

In the great cities of the East thousands have died already this winter from the cold. In the very vicinity of great cathedrals men, women and children are at this moment dying of cold. What is the Catholic Church doing to furnish even ordinary clothing for scant protection against the cold? An overcoat is as impossible to them as a corner lot on Mars.

In the same vicinity men, women and children are dying of hunger. Nearby are the mansions of the rich. All around
are banks—storehouses of the wealth produced by the hands of the people who are suffering—plenty to supply all their needs.

The men who own the wealth are in no danger of hunger. They do not need the surplus wealth.

What is the Catholic Church doing to place the world’s wealth where it will sustain the world’s people? What is it doing to stop the gnawings of hunger that are doing more to stifle the religious idea of mankind than all the anti-religious teachers of the ages?

Does the Catholic Church demand that no Catholic shall be a doctor because the doctor uses material remedies?

Does the Catholic Church demand that no Catholic shall be a fireman because he believes in engines, hook-and-ladder trucks, and the other material accessories of a modern fire department?

If the Catholic Church has some spiritual formula by which the materialistic pressure of economic conditions may be removed, it will confer a great favor on the Socialists and an inestimable blessing on mankind by at once applying it.

But something is needed. Something must be provided to accomplish this result. And that something must be identical in its economic and political propaganda and program with Socialism.

Nothing can be done to remove this pressure as long as the present privileged system of society exists—that is, nothing worth while.

This system is what the Catholic Church must attack if it would overthrow the materialism that is threatening the souls of men and the foundations of society.

The men who own the resources upon which the people depend for life and prosperity are not going to give up their monopoly voluntarily. The heart devoted to Mammon knows no impulse but that of greed.
Socialism is the only agency that assails the damnable materialism of private ownership—of the exploitation of the producing people.

Unless a Catholic wishes to close his mind and antagonize his best feelings to the dominant demands of citizenship and Christianity he must devote himself to the task Socialism has undertaken by means of the same processes the Socialist employs.
CHAPTER VIII
Would Destroy Acute Individualism

If this world is a bloody arena in which the masses are to be tortured for the amusement of the "masters, lords and rulers," then Socialism has no right of existence and the duty of every intelligent individual, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, is to shun as a menace to the great world-purpose the Socialist party.

But Socialists are of the belief that this world is "a field in which to grow men and women," and cultivate them to their highest possibilities, securing to each the largest possible degree of "life, liberty and happiness."

Socialism divides society up into two classes. It makes a rational division—a division whose line of separation is drawn legibly by the hand of human experience and easily discernable to the eyes of all imbued with progressive ideals.

Abraham Lincoln saw it plainly. He said:

"It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time; and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, 'You work and toil and earn bread, and I'll eat it.' No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the
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fruit of their labor, or from one class of men as an apology for enslaving another class, it is the same tyrannical principle.”

The Tidings, which is desperately endeavoring to show Catholics that their duty is to shun Socialism, published extracts from an address delivered by Rev. Terence J. Shealy, S. J., at the Catholic Club in New York.

Father Shealy undertook to show the “dangerous attitude of Socialism toward American institutions.” But in a portion of his address, he unconsciously traced this very line of division in the clearest terms. He said:

“A review of the past few years presents a striking social phenomenon, which, while it offers so far no serious ground for alarm, is by no means of indifferent import. We are face to face with a new situation unlike anything in our history, a situation arising out of an acute sense of contradiction between economic development and civil liberty and equality, and expressing itself in doctrines and schemes both reconstructive and revolutionary. The cause of this change is not far to seek.

“Many of the conditions which prevail in Europe are being fast transferred to our own land. The pauperization of labor is in evidence. Wealth has become vastly more concentrated and more selfish. There is a cut-throat economy of supply and demand, of unregulated competition, which is throttling human life. There is an oligarchy of capital behind the wheels of industry and almost beyond the power of law which would bargain with labor as a commodity and treat as chattel American free-born men. There is a muckraking which maddens the nostrils of honest citizenship, and there is a flaunted luxury which rankles in the breast of the struggling masses. In fine, there is a deep impassioned spirit of unrest abroad, for the worker is beginning to realize that even liberty and equality can lead to the anarchy of individualism, and when applied to industry can produce an appalling servitude.
"This in turn has created a class consciousness in labor, which rises above racial diversity and prejudice, so that, however ineffective the efforts to socialize production and distribution have been, there is a growing socialization of thought and feeling. In a word, we have today a Socialism that is truly racy of the soil, with brain and sinew, with heart and spirit that is American. A Socialism that has definiteness in its aim, system in its methods, zeal in its propaganda and which has, moreover, not only the arm of disaffected labor in its battle line, but the indefatigable energy of the trained mind and the strategic insight of experienced leadership.

"Many are its distinct and vehement utterances on the platform and in the press, on the curbstone and in the halls of legislation. It has invaded the office and the workshop, and has already divided the school and the college. There is no place beyond its reach, no task beyond its striving, for its sacrifice is commensurate with its ambition."

Socialists should thank Father Shealy for this concise and accurate statement of social conditions and the splendid tribute to Socialism.

Yet, while his critical mind showed him clearly these conditions, his prejudiced feelings against Socialism, expressed concretely in a political party, led him to the conclusion that "Socialism threatens our national existence our homes and our altars."

How, in the name of common intelligence, can the "anarchy of individualism" and "appalling servitude" in industry be removed from society except by the "socialization of thought and feeling" applied to the socialization of production and distribution?

Father Shealy has shown clearly the very thing Abraham Lincoln stated and which Socialism states and consistently contends, that "Socialism and individualism are the two contending principles underlying all modern social theories and movements."
And Father Shealy is either consciously or unconsciously lending himself to the "anarchy of individualism."

Capitalism is acute individualism.

It is this that "threatens our national existence, our homes and our altars."

Is it necessary to present any argument to prove that capitalism threatens our national existence?

Says Senator La Follette: "The question before the American people is not a party question. It is a question whether you will have a government for and by the people or whether you will have government of the people by the special service corporations."

Both ex-President Roosevelt and President Taft have pointed out the necessity to the preservation of our national existence of curbing the power of the "anarchy of individualism" expressed in capitalism.

Even the good Father Shealy himself, in another portion of the address quoted from, says:

"We must, indeed, find a way to adjust the forces of capital and labor, and make every man able to live in this great land of God's bounty, to the full stature of decent and worthy citizenship—by a wage that is truly living, unto the fullness of strong and happy manhood."

Now, how are we going to find this way unless we get down to fundamentals—unless we establish a democracy of industry commensurate with the fundamental principles of American democracy?

How are we going to arrive at the overthrow of capitalism except by the establishment of Socialism, "that has definiteness in its aim, system in its methods, zeal in its propaganda, and which has, moreover, not only the arm of disaffected labor in its battle line, but the indefatigable energy of the trained mind and the strategic insight of experienced leadership," directed at the socialization of production and distribution, as it is idealized in the socialization of thought and feeling?
How is a Catholic going to do his part in preserving our national existence unless he becomes a Socialist or applies himself to the measures proposed by Socialism?

Capitalism—"the anarchy of individualism"—is the most dangerous menace to the home.

Indeed, it makes the home an impossibility.

Nowhere is its destructiveness more apparent than in the home.

It sits like a heartless Nero in the midst of society.

It blasts the infant—to death or to physical, mental or moral disability—as its whim directs.

It seizes the daughters of the poor and despoils them of the charms of girlhood or the priceless treasure of virtue, as lust impels it.

It claims the wives of the workers to satisfy its wicked desires.

It invades the sacred precincts of the home and by the pressure of poverty parts husband and wife.

It is the chief supporter of that most damnable of destructive devices in modern society against the home, the divorce.

It leers at love and makes the marriage altar a bargain counter of gain or lust.

It converts the home into a machine of misery to swell its profits.

It prevents the acquisition of that only sacred private property, the house and lot of the worker.

There never was a viler libel than that which charges Socialism with designs upon the home.

What is the main incentive that causes the workingman to seek Socialism? Is it not his hope that it will enable him to have a home and maintain it as a sacred and inviolable institution?

Socialism is the only power that directly applies itself to the overthrow and annihilation of this modern Nero.
Can a Catholic stand with the Nero of Capitalism against Socialism?

Socialism does not tamper with the altars of religion. Capitalism does.

It keeps the child away from the influences of religion.
It maintains the "crowded couch of incest in the warrens of the poor."

It scorns the sacraments of baptism and marriage.
It wraps the family in rags that prevent its members attending the services of the church.

It dissipates by its flippant displays and cruel oppressions faith in everything beyond the sensual.

And, alas, it even enlists by subsidy or subtlety the priests of the sacred altar to help perpetuate and potentize its power.

Socialism, on the other hand, while withholding interference with the sacred altar, assails sacrilegious capitalism and by removing it from society would remove its blights and bars from the experience of humanity, religiously, as well as economically.

Socialism would make the way to the altar free to the Catholic.
HE fundamental mistake made by critics of Socialism is that they do not understand the object of their criticism. They set up in their minds an "ism" and proceed to tear it to pieces.

Socialism is not an end. It is a means. It is not a state to be attained by some instantaneous process. It is the process by which humanity is to be enthroned and rule supreme.

What are you going to do with this or that when you reach your heaven-on-earth state? Socialism is going to remove the this or that and keep it out of the way.

Socialism isn't going to take away a man's property. It's going to provide the means by which every man can have necessary property.

Socialism isn't going to divide up the possessions of the people. There can't be any dividing up. Socialism is the means of keeping a man from being compelled to divide up what he earns with those who do not earn.

Socialism isn't going to take from the owners and give to the employes. It's the process by which men get that which they earn by the sweat of their brow—by which the earner becomes the exclusive owner.

Socialism isn't a communist paradise where none shall suffer nor sweat. It is that condition of social relationship
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wherein each shall feel the sufferings of all and all shall sweat that none who are willing to sweat shall starve.

Socialism isn’t a realm of materialism wherein none shall enter who have faith in spiritual things. It is that disposition which permits the individual absolute liberty of conscience so far as it concerns his own individuality.

Socialism isn’t a free-lover’s harem or a communistic brothel, wherein marriage is denied and lust is given unlimited license. It is a system of social relationship which renders obsolete and impossible the immoral and inhuman mockeries that make wedlock a tragedy, a slavery by which to lock needy or deluded womanhood to ignorant or designing manhood.

Socialism isn’t a rendezvous of anarchy, from which law and government are excluded. It is a means of making law the rule of justice and government the control of, for and by the people.

Socialism isn’t a hobo heaven, where the indolent and unaspiring may enjoy sweet rest and plenty. It’s a scheme of industry which insures to all who are industrious and aspiring “a man’s share of what is going on in life, not a pig’s share or a dog’s share.”

Socialism isn’t a scientific structure erected by men who no longer live to know the growing and changing needs of humanity and society. It is a system of democracy subject to the revision and expansion of all who are devoted to the culture of humanity and society.

Socialism means the socialization of thought and feeling applied to the socialization of production and distribution—the socialization of everything of social utility.

Socialism is the science and practice of socialization.

Socialism means the practice of brotherhood and the application of democracy to all the practical affairs of human life.
Socialism is the logical process of culture of the social spirit and of establishing democracy in the industrial as in the political world.

Socialism is the essence of everything progressive in public life today.

Socialism marks every movement in the way of popular reform.

Socialism is the means by which alone man, the social being, can grow and develop into the dominant world-creature designed by the God of all churches.
N page 132 of the March (1912) number of "The Messenger of the Sacred Heart," edited by the Jesuit Fathers, in New York, occurs the following: "Unlimited competition has forced producers to make their expenses as low as possible and to give the lowest wages to the working-men. If these refused to work, they were replaced by others who were poorer. Besides reducing the wages of the workers, the employer has sought to increase the hours of production. The age of the machine brought with it uninterrupted hours of labor, by day and by night. The Sunday rest and the hours for recreation were ignored. What has been the result? Money has had full dominion over the most precious possessions of the nations, over the health and the strength and all the intellectual and moral forces of the people. Among the oppressed the germs of revolt, of nihilism and of anarchy have sprung up.

"The degradation of the workingman has brought with it the ruin of family life. Living from hand to mouth, without any security should injury or ill-health befall him and with a wage that is barely able to keep off starvation, the workingman has been forced to send out his wife and his children to labor in the mills and the factories. There can be no real home where the spouse and the mother is absent. Is it any wonder that family ties are relaxed and too often
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broken when infamous laws of divorce permit an easy dissolution?"

Sounds more like a passage from a red-hot Socialist publica-
tion than a conservative church paper to which the word Socialism stands for everything insulting to the church and injurious to society, doesn’t it?

It states clearly and strongly the conditions that Social-
ism is endeavoring to awaken the people to and for which it offers the only efficient remedy.

The competitive system of industry is the thing responsi-
ble for the awful conditions in which “the degradation of the workingman has brought with it the ruin of family life.”

Facts are stubborn things, and often seemingly irreverent.

Socialism deals in facts—the hardest facts of human ex-
perience, such facts as are stated in the above quotation.

It states the fact that there is a competitive system; that the competitive system is demoralizing both the employer and the employed; that the demoralization of these brings with it the demoralization of family life and of all society.

It does not stop here, however, but states the facts that society must recognize and apply before there can be the necessary social salvation.

It declares that this competitive system must be over-
thrown and replaced by a socialistic system; that the relation-
ship of employer and employe must be supplanted by co-operation under which the making of goods for profit shall come to an end, production shall be for the direct use of the producer, all shall be laborers together, and every opportunity shall be open and equal to all.

The proposition is a plain one: The competitive system is responsible for the conditions that are demoralizing so-
ciety. Socialism offers the only rational means of destroy-
ing the competitive system and establishing a system under which the demoralizing conditions are impossible.
Socialism does not deny that if the love of God possessed the hearts of the people, these conditions could not exist. But the fact is that the love of God has no such possession.

The Catholic Church and other churches have been preaching the love of God for centuries. But while the churches have been growing in numbers and wealth and social influence, competition, with its awful evils, has been growing more rapidly.

What new method does the Catholic Church, or any church, offer to destroy this growth and eradicate these evils?

From past experience it is amply demonstrated that the competitive system is capable of existing even in the presence of the most flourishing churches, and that its power of expansion and evil prevails even in the most religious communities.

The fact is the church has not attempted to apply itself by the necessary methods to the overthrow of the competitive system.

If a church wishes to erect a building for a sanctuary it must apply the laws of mechanics.

If a church wishes to purchase a piece of property it must apply the laws of business as they exist.

If a Catholic has a piece of steel in his eye, he must apply the laws of surgery to remove it.

If a Catholic would travel to Europe, he must apply the laws of navigation.

If a Catholic or the Catholic Church wants to remove the competitive system and bring about a sane and safe state of society, it can only be done by a practical application of certain social laws.

Socialism doesn't ask the Catholic Church to cease its preaching. But it does ask that this great institution begin a practical process of putting society in a position where the worker, the home and society will be safe.
In spite of the Catholic Church, Catholic workers are becoming poorer and poorer.

In spite of the Catholic Church, Catholic homes are being brought to ruin.

Why? Because the Catholic Church cannot help create employment for the worker and comfort for the home without Socialism any more than it can erect a church building without the necessary material, or pay off a debt without money or its equivalent in credit.
CHAPTER XI
Poverty Prevents and Destroys Marriage

The most spiritually-minded individual is not the one who ignores the practical side of every question. It is he who is able to grasp the spiritual significance of everything, for there is nothing in all the world that can be divorced from the human soul—the spiritual interests of mankind.

If the contention were true that Socialism is acute materialism—which it is not—the church is at least too inclined to overlook the material side of things.

A religious precept, however sound and good, cannot supply material nourishment to a famishing body. It is not denying a man's spiritual nature or interests to demand for him bread to feed his hungry body.

Vice has its material as well as its spiritual side.

Poverty is one of the most industrious and effective agents of vice.

The true teacher of religion will study vital statistics as well as vital theology, for how can he apply his theology to the uplift of the human soul unless he is familiar with the environments and exigencies of the human soul?

Marriage is a sacred thing. Poverty prevents it and destroys it. Here is the material fact. How is the priest or preacher or teacher going to apply the spiritual teachings of religion to marriage unless he recognizes and studies the various features of this material fact?
Three thousand eight hundred and eighty-three persons were arraigned in the Domestic Relations Court in New York City alone during the year 1911.

In commenting on these cases of domestic infelicity Miss Rose McQuade, the probation officer of the Domestic Relations Court, says:

"The chief source of discord between married people that sends them to our court is the mother-in-law.

"The second source of trouble is drinking on the part of the husband and slovenliness on the part of the wife.

"But underneath it all is the vital fact that the average weekly wage of the men arraigned here is between ten and twelve dollars."

It is not sufficient to say that if men and women were true to their marriage vows by virtue of their spirituality they would not be arraigned in the Domestic Relations Court, nor would they resort to the divorce court.

The fact remains that poverty—a low standard of economic conditions—keeps them from marrying and when they do marry disturbs the marriage relation.

Here is one of those irreverent conditions that must be met by material means.

True, rich people are subject to marital discords. But the rich are as much victims of economic conditions as the poor. Riches breeds selfishness, extravagance, infidelity and the kind, just as poverty breeds discontent, discord, desperation and the kind.

Both are the product of vicious economic conditions.

That vice is an organized institution in our social economy is one of the most appalling facts the religious teacher should face.

In the March (1912) issue of Current Literature there is an astounding article entitled, "Organized Vice As a Vested Interest."

The opening paragraph of this article reads:
The problem of prostitution is as old as civilization. No country in the world has been able to root out this evil. In the United States even its regulation in large cities meets with a resistance inexplicable to the uninitiate. We may be able to grapple with the gravest of social questions more effectively if we realize that, in attacking prostitution, we are attacking a vested interest. The report of the Vice Commission of Chicago, a body appointed by the Mayor and the City Council, throws a glaring light on the financial aspect of prostitution. Conditions in Chicago, we gather from the report, are typical of the state of affairs in every important city. We are considerably startled to learn that the annual profits from prostitution (according to conservative estimates) in the city of Chicago alone amount to sixteen million dollars. Rentals of property and profits of keepers and inmates make up more than one-half of this total. The sale of liquor in disorderly saloons yields over four million dollars, while the sale of liquor in houses, flats, etc., and the commissions of inmates reach the imposing figure of nearly three million dollars. The men who attack the social evil must be prepared to fight a highly profitable business.

Then follows an array of facts and figures of startling proportions to show the extent of the property interests involved in this awful organization of vice.

It quotes from the report of the Vice Commission to show the buttress of that treacherous thing we call "respectability" behind which these interests are intrenched:

"While these properties are increasing in value, without a cent of expense on the part of the owner in improvements, the property in the neighborhood is decreasing, or at a standstill.

"The Commission has secured a large list of owners of houses where prostitution is openly practiced. In some instances these owners are vile and abandoned men who make a business of exploiting these unfortunate women. And
side by side with these men, ignorant and vile, stand so-called respectable citizens who are also sharing in the increased values from property used to extend the business of prostitution. Indeed evidence has been produced tending to show that a highly honored and respectable company, in whose hands respectable citizens entrust their money, has apparently assumed the trusteeship of four of the vilest houses of ill-fame in the Twenty-second street restricted district.

"Another disgraceful fact is that some ostensibly respectable women are owners or have control of property where prostitution is practiced."

Of twenty-two real estate owners or agents visited in one district, fifteen were willing to let flats and houses for immoral purposes at extortionate rentals. The profits of the owners of brothels are sufficiently large to permit such expenses. A keeper of a house of ill-fame admitted that he paid $8,000 a year on a ten-year lease for his house.

One madame testified before the Commission that in a cheap house on the West Side she with one girl took in $175 to $200 a week. She also testified that she had entertained sixty men in one night. This prosperous woman is supporting members of her family and has $7,000 in the bank. Other testimony shows that the girls are not encouraged to stay in these cheap houses unless they turn in at least $25 a week.

Testimony from a keeper and inmates shows that her girls each earn from $100 to $400 per week, and in one or two cases where the girl is especially attractive even $500 a week.

Summing up these with other similar facts, Current Literature says:

"Omitting the factor of rental of property and the keeper's share, the per capita earning capacity of the average prostitute appears to be $1,300 per annum. This, as the Commission points out, is five per cent on $26,000. The
average wage paid in a department store is $6.00 per week or $300 per year. This is five per cent on $6,000. In other words, a girl represents as a professional prostitute a capitalized value four times greater than she would represent as a hard working industrial worker. These facts are so monstrous as to render comment superfluous. The keeper's share amounts to millions of dollars. 'Why, then,' the Committee asks, 'wonder at the commercialization of prostitution or its permanence?''

The article again quotes from the Vice Commission's report:

"A madame with ten girls in a house has a sure revenue of $250 per week, or $13,000 per year. After paying her exorbitant rent of $2,400 per annum, is there not enough left for 'protection' and graft of every conceivable description? The reasons for the statements of a keeper that she pays $8,000 per year rent for a house that would ordinarily rent for less than $2,500, and that her daily expense for twenty-four servants, breakage of furniture, glassware, etc., etc., is $225, are easily accounted for, when compared with the accompanying statement that 'I have accommodations for twenty-four young ladies,' and the further statement both from her and the inmates that the 'earnings' are from $100 to $500 per week per inmate, and remembering that the 'madame gets half.'

"Assuming the lowest figure with twenty-four girls earning $50 per week, the madame's share is $62,400. "If, however, the statement of daily expense amounts to $225 is correct, this must be too low, as there would be a deficit. "On the basis of $100 per week for each inmate as the madame's share, there would be a profit of $42,675 per year. "These figures speak for themselves, and show in a startling manner why vice exists in Chicago, why it is allowed to exist, and why politics and graft are inseparable from it under existing conditions.
The rich hoard thus offered explains the reason for the army of cadets and thieves, exploiters and scoundrels who live on the earnings of the bodies of the unfortunate women, who are led to believe the life is 'easy.' It also accounts for the commercial interests that support, bolster, and live upon it, the real estate owners, and agents, the liquor interests, costumers, furriers, jewelers, druggists, doctors and many others who live on or share in the earnings of the prostitute.

'The girl is peculiarly susceptible to all forms of graft, and is persistently grafted upon by all. Nobody respects, admires or loves her; no one wants her but for one purpose.

'Confined as in a prison, her only resource is in 'blowing in her easy money' for what she can get to make the hours fly, and she is an easy victim to each and every grafter who gets the chance to prey upon her. It is the case of her exploitation that largely accounts for the so-called commercialization of prostitution and its perpetuation.'

Thus the contention of Socialism is again vindicated—that vice has its source in the economic system designated by it as capitalism, and that neither the church nor social or political reformers can eliminate vice as long as private property and profits are fostered by that system.
REPEATEDLY has it been stated in these pages that Socialism is no more responsible for the marital opinions of certain Socialist writers than is Republicanism for the infidelity of Robert G. Ingersoll or science for the views of Thomas Edison on the immortality of the soul.

True, Socialism does deal with marriage and love. But only in their economic aspects.

Socialism is not concerned with the forms of marriage, but with the facts—the economic facts.

One of these facts is that the existing economic system is rendering both men and women incapable of properly entering the sacred relationship of marriage. Because of the blight of poverty before birth in the weakening of fatherhood and motherhood; the injury to them, physically, mentally and morally, due to overwork and improper nutrition; the inadequacy of wages and the high cost of living, marriage in its noble and sacred significance is forever denied them.

Another of these facts is that a shockingly large proportion of the girlhood of this nation and of the world is forced by circumstances—economic circumstances—into lives of prostitution. In this country alone there are 720,000 prostitutes—all the product of an unhealthy social state—to whom love is the vilest of shame and marriage impossible.
In the preceding chapter it has been shown by facts and figures furnished by the Chicago Vice Commission the premium put upon prostitution by society. The same commission says: "One of the chief reasons why girls enter the life of prostitution is evidently the economic one. They cannot live on the wages paid them."

"The whole tendency of modern industrialism is to place too heavy a strain on the nervous system of all classes, men and women alike. How much more serious is this, when the strain is placed on the growing girl at the period of adolescence when the child has to assume the burden of self-support and self-direction, and often aid in the support of her family."

The Republican party offers no adequate remedy for this condition, neither does the Democratic party. Socialism alone does.

Socialism says that every man's child is the ward of all men—of society. It does not take away from the parent the responsibility for or the control of the child. But it shares these with him.

Socialism says that it is each man's duty to conserve every man's child, by every possible means of conservation.

Socialism shows the processes by which girls are made prostitutes and furnishes the means for the destruction of these processes.

Socialism does not interfere with the moral or religious instruction of the child, but with the physical, mental and moral destruction of the child by processes propagated by economic influences.

Socialism proposes to take away the incentive of profit which causes employers to underpay their employes, the pressure of necessity which compels girls to work when work is an injury to them, and to assure to all who are deserving by virtue of industry or ambition the means with which to sustain life.
Another of these facts is that marriage is in many cases a matter of convenience and even of compulsion on the part of woman. She wants a home—a home of her own. She tires of the drudgery of the shop, store or kitchen. The man she loves is unable to support her or unwilling to assume the responsibilities of married life. She meets a man she does not love. But she knows he can support her comfortably. She gives him her hand, but not her heart.

She enters the lowest form of slavery known to history. She becomes a legalized prostitute.

No marriage ceremony can render sacred such a wedding. By providing employment and the full product of such employment to all who seek employment by making all the means of employment open and equal to all men, Socialism would make the girl free to marry the man of her love, and invest her marriage with sacredness and not with shame.

Another of these facts is that marriage is frequently a business transaction on the part of the contracting parties. The infernal incentive that is lauded by false teachers as the mark of superior intelligence and industry is the motive: Love is a joke. The sacrament of marriage becomes the basest of commercialized prostitution.

Socialism, by abolishing the private ownership of the things upon which the people in common depend, would abolish this infernal incentive.

It would prevent the mingling in the sacred field of matrimony of the wild oats of Dollardom with the blighted buckwheat of Snobville.

It would keep the degenerate sons of degenerate dukes on the other side of the Atlantic and the hard-earned dollars of American workers—now used as gilded baits of marital debauchery—on this side, and stop one of the most putrescent parodies on Christian civilization.

In a previous chapter was shown the awful fact of divorce caused by economic influences.
There are many more facts of the same nature that might be stated and discussed. But these will suffice to show the utter fallacy of the contention that Socialism aims at the debasement of marriage and the destruction of the home—that it seeks to make of society a free-lover’s harem or commu-
nistic brothel, in which marriage is denied and lust given un-
limited license.

Some day the leaders of the Catholic Church and of other churches, will awaken to the fact that Socialism offers the only means by which love, marriage, religion and all the things sacred to humanity, can be redeemed from the hand of capitalism and cleansed from the taint of commercialism.

Socialism does not seek to take the place of religion, but to place mankind in such a state of freedom from economic influences that it may be amenable to all ennobling influences.
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