

Socialism Unmasked

"It is rather surprising that the Protestant churchmen of this country have been so slow to see that Socialism is the enemy of Christianity—so slow in defense of their faith."—Inter-Ocean (Chicago) August 12, 1912.

Pro Deo et Patria

PRESENTED BY

Fort Wayne Assembly
FOURTH DEGREE
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

1912:
Catholic Publishing Company
Huntington, Indiana

Nihil Obstat

RT. REV. MON. J. H. OECHTERING, V. G.

Censor.

Table of Contents.

	Page
False Principles of Economic Socialism Shown.....	5
Why He Left the Ranks of the Socialist Party.....	16
The Philosophy of Socialism Is Un- Christian.....	20
No Christian Could Subscribe to the Creed of Real Socialists.....	22
Sample of Socialist Blasphemy.....	30
Bishop von Ketteler Opposed Child- Labor Before Marx.....	31

INTRODUCTION.

So much has been written and said on Socialism in late years that our little brochure would hardly seem to fill a want. Yet, my dear reader, nothing seems to be so little understood, even by Socialists themselves, as true Socialism. When Socialists ask for a hearing they present only what is known as "Economic Socialism," viz. their proposed solution of "the bread and butter problem," and their plan for the more even distribution of the world's goods. But they base even this part of their program on wrong principles, on false philosophy.

We are not offering in these pages a long, drawn-out dissertation on the subject, but we

1. Examine the props on which Economic Socialism rests;

2. Refer the reader to one who was for years an ardent apostle in Socialism's behalf, but who openly repudiated it after its *false* philosophy became apparent to him;

3. Allow a learned Secular Journalist to deal with its *un-Christian* philosophy;

4. Show from the foremost Socialist Leaders and Editors that Socialism is not wholly Economic, but proposes a most immoral creed, which no Christian could subscribe to.

—THE COMPILER.

I.

False Principles of Economic Socialism Shown.

(By the Rev. M. Phelan, S. J.)

"I shall confine myself to the three main pillars on which Socialism rests. When the props are shattered, time is wasted on details."

THE FIRST PILLAR.

The main article of Karl Marx's creed, viz., "All wealth comes from labor"—that is, unskilled labor—is the bedrock of the various systems. It has been styled "the right arm of Socialism." Let us address ourselves to the theory. The absurdity of a theory that passes for an axiom will appear clearer from illustration than from dry scholastic arguments. Arkwright, a barber of moderate income, invented the spinning jenny, which was destined to revolutionize the weaving industry. The result of his inventive genius is, after much brainwork, a concrete fact. The framework of his thought has solidified it into bolts and mortices. The child of his brain lies at his feet, yet it is powerless to produce a penny till another power steps in. Two gentlemen of foresight and moral courage are found to venture their money and float the scheme of Arkwright, and make it a palpitating force in the industrial world. A third element is now required, the muscle-labor of, say, ten men. Now the machine begins to throb and become a wealth-producer. You have three independent forces combining in that production:

1. The inventive genius of Arkwright—an intellectual force.

2. The courageous enterprise of the capitalists who floated it—a moral force.

3. The muscle exertion of ten laborers—a physical force.

It works with marvelous results. By its aid these ten men produce as much as a hundred working with their hands only. These men previously produced ten pounds weekly, now they produce a hundred. To whom does the surplus ninety pounds belong? The Socialist answers, since "all wealth comes from labor," it belongs to the ten men working the machine. If Arkwright, the inventor, or his friends who brought foresight, courage and capital to the venture, claim a penny, it is called robbery. This simple illustration, better than the most subtle arguments, will help you to realize the absurdity of a system that rests on such a foundation.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE.

Let us take another example. A building contractor, a man quick to discover the drift of his times and take advantage of it, calculates that the city will extend in a certain direction. He sees this before his neighbor. Now he calls in another gift—moral courage. On the strength of his calculation he invests money and buys land in that locality. He casts around, and by the aid of a third gift he discovers where materials can be produced cheaply close at hand. A fourth force he now brings into play—the genius of combination. He organizes his band of workers. He discovers not only quarries, but more hidden treasures—the varied capabilities of his workmen. He reads their characters, and places each at the precise post for which his individual strength or temperament fits him. You in-

spect the works. Some men are dressing stones, some polishing marble, and some laying bricks—all engaged in separate employments. Yet the man with his hands in his pockets is the frame that holds together, combines and harmonizes these various labors, pointing all individual efforts to one definite end. His brains are to their toil what the cement is to the house; it combines and holds together the varied elements into one structure. He touches neither trowel nor plane, yet see what he contributes to the building. His foresight enabled him to lay his finger on the pulse of the times and read its current. His courage then backed his judgment. Finally, he discovered the abilities of the men, assorted and marshalled them. Dead capital lay at the bank; it is incapable of making a blade of grass grow till he comes and touches it with the genius of enterprise, and lo! it is vitalized and becomes the source of wealth to scores. See what an array of forces this man contributes to the building. It is finished. Time has justified his judgment. Prices in that quarter of the city rush up. He sells the houses and makes a thousand pounds. Every penny of it, the Socialist says, should be divided among the workmen, for their creed is "All wealth comes from labor"—muscle-labor, of course. The varied forces he threw into the task are ignored.

ACTIONS VERSUS THEORIES.

Let us pursue this reasoning one step further. Let us suppose that all his workmen are Socialists. They hold an indignation meeting. The speakers enlarge on the employer's villa and parlor comforts, on the rugs and phaeton of his wife, and assure their hearers

that all these are purchased by the sweat of their labor. We have seen that there were other and higher elements also contributing towards the production of wealth.

Now, let us see how do the actions of these workers square with their own theories. Ask the carver and bricklayer why do they claim higher wages than the hod-carrier. If all wealth comes from labor, his hours are longer and his work more laborious than theirs. They quickly answer that, besides muscle-strength, they bring minds and skilled judgment to their task. True, but that answer cuts the ground from under their feet as Socialists. The moment they admit that there is any source of wealth other than labor the whole case for Socialism topples. There is no argument for the claim of skilled labor to surplus wage above unskilled that does not equally hold for the surplus profits of the employer. So much for the "right arm" of Socialism.

THE SECOND PILLAR.

The second pillar of the Socialist system is—the rate of wage. It is called the left arm of Socialism. They assume that all wealth comes from labor. They are confronted with a serious difficulty. In the republic they would establish, they can not do without people who work, not with their hands, but their heads mainly. How, then, will they reward the surgeon, the general, and discoverers of new machines? Their answer is, since all wealth comes from labor, a labor-day wage is the unit of measurement. If, let us say, five shillings a day is the fair wage settled on, then the author, general, and doctor will be paid five shillings for every day they work. Now I think, if

they were strictly logical, they would pay them nothing, for by doing so they acknowledge there is another source of wealth that is not manual, and therefore the whole Socialistic scheme tumbles like a house of cards.

Let us pass, and see how the wage law would work out in practice. Some of the greatest events in the world's history were accomplished in comparatively short periods of time. It is said Napoleon planned the battle, converged his forces, and won the victory of Austerlitz in a fortnight. While musing on the swaying sanctuary lamp in the Cathedral of Pisa, during the brief time of Benediction, Galileo discovered the laws of the pendulum. Probably in half that time Newton, observing the fall of an apple, discovered the law of gravitation. While watching the steam lifting the lid of the boiling kettle, the idea of the engine grew on the mind of Watt. His invention has revolutionized the world. Let us suppose these men looking for their rewards from a Socialistic State. Napoleon goes to Paris. He says: "I have laid two Empires at your feet. I have covered your army with deathless glory. I have given a name that will thrill the blood of unborn millions. Austerlitz will be a magic sound of Frenchmen for all time. What is my reward?"

He is asked: "How long did it all take you?" "A fortnight," he replies. "Then you are entitled to fourteen five schilling pieces, for, according to our law, the makers of empires and makers of wheelbarrows stand on the same level—'One man is as good as another.' 'All men are equal.'" By the same wage-rate Galileo would be rewarded with sixpence, and a three penny-bit is all that would come to Newton, while poor Watt would scarcely get

sufficient to buy water to fill his own kettle. The system that would pay a surgeon, who extracts a tumor and saves a life, a couple of pence, that would rate the labors of a field-marshal and a hod-carrier of equal importance, that would measure the work of Shakespeare and the work of a scavenger by the same standard, is too absurd to be argued with. So much for the left arm of Socialism.

THE THIRD PILLAR.

We now come to the last pillar that supports Socialism. "All misery," they cry, "comes from the possession of private property." All private possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or municipal bodies." Before addressing myself to this contention, a word of explanation. A Catholic is as free as any one to advocate co-operation of industries, also to insist on the State assuming control over this or that department, if the public good demands it. Men say, since the State controls the police, the postal department, etc., why not control the railways, too? There is no moral reason why it should not. It may take up this and that and the other department. It is impossible to draw an abstract line to limit it. But that there is a line across which no State must pass is beyond all question. The State must never thrust its hand into your pocket and claim the purse you have filled from the sweat of your brow. Secondly, the State must never invade the sanctuary of your home, to wrench from you the authority with which God and Nature invested you over your child and house. These are the two tyrant powers Socialism would arm its republic with. They cry:

(1) Private possession is public robbery. (2) The State, and not the father, rules the home. Let us address ourselves to these two.

1. "Every man has by nature the right to possess private property as his own," says the Pope, "and man is older than the State, and he holds the right of providing for the life of his body prior to the formation of the State. * * * God has granted the earth to mankind in general, not in the sense that all, without distinction, can do with it as they please, but rather that no part of it has been assigned to anyone in particular, and that the limits of private possession have been left to be fixed by man's own industry and the laws of individual peoples."

CLEAR STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE.

Here is the clear statement of principle bearing not only the stamp of the Church's teaching, but the approval of common sense. If the possession of private property is a natural law, you might as well legislate against the laws of maternity, or the circulation of the blood, as to uproot by a civil enactment what is based on the laws of nature. That private possession is so founded becomes very clear when we go back to the infancy of the human family. The home existed before the State. It had its laws and rights before States were heard of. The first pair founded a perfect commonwealth. Nature commanded the head of the home—the father—to provide for its members. Did he allow his children to starve till a State sprang into existence to feed them? No; by his labor as a huntsman and a tiller of the land he supported them. He gave them clothing, built their homes, and made provision for the future. When he placed meat and

clothes before his child, to whom did they belong? Was his private property his own or the State's? Not the State's, for no State was in existence. Therefore by natural right it belongs to himself. Is he robbing a Republic that does not exist when he appropriates and assumes absolute control over animals he has killed, or the fruit he sowed and reaped?

These are questions Socialists are called on to answer when they say private property is robbery. Men multiply, civil communities, cities and States are formed. They make laws. What are the nature and extent of these laws? Do these laws extinguish the natural rights man previously had? If so, when and how?

IS THE HOME ABSORBED BY THE STATE.

Certainly not. The civil laws control one only in those things where the good of the community is concerned. There they begin and end, and the natural rights and duties of the individual remain as strong, and the home as absolute and as sacred a commonwealth, as when Jacob sat under his own fig-tree, and Lot and Abraham parcelled out the plains by the Jordan. There is no condition of greater self-effacement than in the life of a soldier, yet even stern military law halts at the sacred boundary marked out by Nature's hand. It respects the private right of the soldier to his purse and the control of his home. What madness on the part of anyone to impose on private civilians a strain that even military discipline will not bear? If private property is robbery, it was so when God gave the Ten Commandments on Sinai. Yet He says: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife; nor his house, nor his field, * * * nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his" (Duet. v. 21). Here the Divine

law not only recognizes the rights of private ownership, but hedges it around as a sacred thing. When Christ came, wherever His eyes turned they rested on private property—the treasured home, the walled garden, etc. Does He denounce them as robbery? He tells the young man to sell his possessions. How could he sell them except he, and not the State, owned them? The first step towards abolishing private ownership should be the striking of the Seventh Commandment from the Decalogue—"Thou shalt not steal."

INEVITABLE RESULT.

If such teaching were carried into private practice, see the consequences to follow. If you search down amongst the fibres of the human heart you will find the mainspring of most of our actions is labelled "self." A man toils for fame. Whose fame? His own. A man wears out his life in building a home and fortune for a wife and child. Why? Because they are his bone and blood, and bear his name—his other self.

Now, before making the first step into the Socialistic-Republic, you are called on to place the forceps deep into the inmost chamber of the heart, and tear out its strongest fibre—self. Here you destroy the most powerful force that ever nerved men to deeds of daring.

Will the author slave in a garret under the midnight lamp, if he is assured, when his work comes out, it is not his own, but the "result of his social environments"—the products of the State? Will the patriot tramp through winter snows, and bear the rough privations of war, for a State that watches his heroic achievements not with a pencil of light to inscribe his name on a Scroll of Fame, but with a sponge

to blot out, and tell him he is but a cog in the wheels of the great machine, the State, and mere cogs must be content in their legitimate obscurity? Will the business man toil and rack his brains if you destroy the hope of the suburban villa where the autumn of life may pass in ease and comfort, with a family established in affluence? Will the farmer face the darkness and sleet of the winter's morning, or toil in all weathers, if he may not claim the yield of autumn? Will he sow if he knows another will reap? Will men of exceptional ability make great exertions except tempted by exceptional reward? *

But this in a Social State would be treason, for the Chief Justice and the street-sweep are to stand on a common level. Destroy private possessions, and you paralyze exertion. All will struggle in the race when the prize is a substantial plum cake, but take away the cake and substitute a sunflower, and few will sweat for the prize.

2. Space does not permit more than a word on the proposed absolutism of the State. The sovereignty of the father must be upheld in the home if life is to be worth living. The State and its functionaries must remain outside. The State exists for the man, and not the man for the State. The servant must not become the master. "The idea," says the Pope, "that the Civil Government should, at its own discretion, penetrate and pervade the family

(*Note—The author, of course, will admit that there are exceptions to this rule of selfishness, but when not inspired by the religious, supernatural motive, they are so rare that the Socialists' hope is laughable. And under socialism God, eternity and supernatural will yield to self, the present life and the natural.)

and the household is a great and pernicious mistake." If the State were dragged into the home to meddle, pry and dictate in the most sacred and private details, life would be intolerable. We all admire the policeman. He is a picturesque object on the street, but none of us wish to be put to bed by a policeman, and our food prescribed by a policeman. These are the three main pillars on which Socialism rests. To all I have said, I know there is an answer:

1. I will be told, in the new Republic man will be a changed being. His Heart will be filled with brotherly love. The author, general surgeon, all will be so enamored of the State that they will toil for the State, and rejoice to share brotherhood and common equality with the scavenger. Here the inherent defect of the whole system crops to the surface—the people of the Republic with man as he is constructed in dreams, instead of poor old selfish humanity as we know it. What is to purge man of corruption and transform him into an angel? Religion, that could muzzle his lowest passions and purify his highest aspirations, is thrust out of the scheme. The poet of Socialism tells us, "Heaven is to be left to the angels and the sparrows."

2. Again, I will be told machinery will be so perfect that men will need only work two hours a day and five days a month.

3. That the world of chemistry is practically unexplored; that it may yet be possible to extract bread out of sunshine. You see, it is very convenient to have the bank of futurity to draw checks on. The answer to all this is evident.

II.

Why He Left the Ranks of the
Socialist Party.

(We present herewith the letter which David Goldstein wrote to the Massachusetts State Socialist Committee, in which he states his reasons for repudiating what he long stood and fought for.)

"Boston, May 23, 1903.

"To the Massachusetts State Committee, Socialist Party, Hon. James F. Carey, Chairman; Mr. Squire E. Putney, Secretary:

"Gentlemen:—After a lapse of eight years of active work upon the soapbox, on the lecture platform, in debate and in the press, in behalf of what I had understood to be the principles of Socialism; after eight years of work as organizer, executive officer and candidate of Socialist parties; after eight years of study of the alleged scientific basis of Socialism, namely Karl Marx' 'Capital,' now when I feel competent to expound its doctrinal points, I have come to the point where I desire to terminate my connection with the Socialist movement. I am convinced that it is not a bona fide political effort, that it would gain political power to the end of dissolving the social, religious, civic, economic and family relationship which now exists—which have cost man countless ages in upbuilding. Careful study of the underlying causes of discord and disruption which are of constant recurrence, not only within the Socialist parties of the United States, but also in every country in which Socialism has taken up its propaganda, leads me to the conviction that the attitude of negation to all that is fundamental in human affairs—

the denial of God—the opposition to the State—the disruption of monogamic marriage—does not, nor can it ever lead to a coherent political party with a constructive program.

“The basic reason for the long sustained and persistent attempt to stifle the voice and pen of Martha Moore Avery is that she may not throw the lime light upon the low-browed philosophies cherished as Socialist sentiment. Even though Mrs. Avery devotes her knowledge and her critical ability, not to speak of her life, to the upbuilding of a State wherein workmen may come into a position of industrial equity, the fact is that she is philosophically opposed to those Socialists who control the press and commanding official positions, prompting dishonest methods to be employed in their effort to suppress open discussion. How weak must Socialists feel when free speech is denied its membership!

“I had long hoped and often expressed the sentiment that the irrational literature and the economic absurdities spread broadcast amongst the people of our country would change in character with the growing power of the organization. But after close application to the doctrinaires, their philosophy and their so-called science, I must conclude that the Socialism I was preaching had no basis, in fact—it was not the kind which the political Socialist movement stands for. It is my conviction that were the philosophical doctrines applied to a given country, or to the civilized world in general, as promulgated by the founders of ‘Modern Scientific Revolutionary International Socialism,’ namely by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, by Kautsky and Bebel of Germany; Guedse and De Ville of France; Hyndman and Bax of England; Vandervelde of Belgium;

Ferri of Italy, and many others upon the continent of Europe; by Simons, Herron, Lee, Unterman and others in the United States, that economic justice, even in the degree which exists today, would be unknown. That is to say, I am convinced that Socialism as organized internationally stands for the entire breaking down of the individual standards of Moral responsibility; that the Socialist philosophy of 'Economic Determinism' stands for the substitution of religious principles by social standards of ethics set up on the basis of mere physical satisfactions.

"The State,—no; did I say the State?

"Socialism, according to the authorities which I have cited, stands for the dissolution of political action—in short, for the abolition of the State. These Socialist authorities declare they 'have no respect for the present marriage system,' they stand for the abolition of marriage. The children? Yes, there will be children under Socialism—but they will not belong to the mothers. The community will be the father and the mother of them all—the guardians of all children, 'legitimate and illegitimate.'

"Are these doctrines new in the Socialist field? No! You know full well my opposition to them is not new—I would recall the resolution which I presented to the last convention which declares that speakers who attack the theological doctrines or dogmas, who advocate violence, 'free love,' or other doctrines of Socialism shall be by the Executive Committee deemed disqualified for the Socialist platform. Your hostility to my attitude towards these questions caused you to make strenuous efforts to block my progress on the Socialist platform and in the press. I do not forget the deceitful challenge from the floor at the last state con-

vention to produce evidence of my assertions. Many were prejudiced by your clamor into thinking it did not exist.

"I may tell you that I have taken up your gage of battle. I will bring forward my proofs—overwhelming you shall find them. I have for months been engaged in collecting the material for a book; which, with the help of Almighty God, I will in the near future give to the public, which will prove to the candid mind (if facts count for anything) that a vote cast for Socialism is a vote cast for the destruction of those institutions which promote and sustain civilization, namely, the Church, the State and the Monogamic family.

"Citizens will ponder this question; can society be saved from the present economic injustice, which is a stench in a true man's nostrils, by the general destruction courted by the Socialist philosophy in control of the political power? For myself, I answer emphatically NO.

"Therefore, I take leave of Socialist organizations. I have this day tendered my resignation as member of the Highland District Socialist Party, and of the Boston Socialist Party Ward and City Committee. I have, too, tendered my resignation as representative of the General Committee of Massachusetts Socialist Clubs. I beg leave herewith to resign my membership in the State Committee of the Socialist Party of Massachusetts.

"Respectfully,

"DAVID GOLDSTEIN."

III.

The Philosophy of Socialism
Is Un-Christian.

(Chicago "Inter-Ocean," Editorial, Aug. 12, 1912.)

"It is rather surprising that the Protestant churchmen of this country have been so slow to see that socialism is the enemy of Christianity—so slow in defense of their faith.

"The hostility of Socialism to Christianity is inevitable because of the fact that socialism is not merely a political method, but also a philosophy of life whose assumptions and aims are purely materialistic—are directed solely to the attainment of ideals of 'comfort' as life's greatest good.

"Marxian Socialism, the only kind that is militant and seeks political revolutions and so counts in effect, refuses to concern itself with anything beyond the present life and this world. It has no answer—it even denies the need of any answer—to the perpetual question of the soul: 'If a man die, shall he live again?'

"Socialism professes to leave every man free to think as he pleases on that subject. In reality it discourages thought on it as unimportant. Most of the foremost exponents of socialism have been and are avowed atheists, denying both the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. At best the attitude of socialism toward religion is agnostic. It says to the eternal question: 'We don't know; we can't find out; it isn't worth while to try.'

"Denying the need of any religious sanction for morals, socialism degrades those human relations which Christianity, because of their fundamental character in distinguishing men

from brutes, has clothed with an especial sacredness.

"Marriage, for example, is regarded by Socialism as purely a civil contract and as less binding upon the parties than a contract for the purchase and sale of commodities. If a farmer has agreed to sell so many bushels of potatoes in the ground at the market price, and then should refuse to deliver them when dug because the price had meanwhile risen, socialists would call that farmer 'dishonest.'

"But if a man and a woman had sworn to live together until death should part them, and then should change their minds about it, because the man had found some other woman he liked better, or the woman some other man she liked better, socialism would denounce as oppressive any exertion of the power of the state which prevented either or both of them from following their personal desires.

"To say this is not to say that all Socialists are unfaithful to their marriage vows. Many of them are just as strict in personal practices as the most devout Christians. But it is merely a personal practice.

"Wherever Socialism has obtained power in government, as in France today, that power is exerted to eliminate the Christian religion as an influence and factor in the conduct of human life. The public schools of France, under Socialistic control, teach 'morality' indeed, but it is a morality without God and repudiating the need of any sort of sanction for its teachings beyond the finite reason and will.

"No real Christian can be a Socialist—if he understands socialism. The two systems are wholly antagonistic and mutually destructive. Socialism recognizes no higher power in the universe than man himself.

IV.

No Christian Could Subscribe to
the Creed of Real Socialists.

Now let us see what is the attitude of Socialist Leaders and Editors toward religion and morality, Socialism as they would have it:

1. Proposes to reject God and religion.
2. Proposes to abolish monogamic marriage.

I.

Leaders in Socialism everywhere,—in Germany, France, Spain, England and the United States, say that under Socialism God and Christianity must be repudiated:

MARX.

(In his "Secret Society in Switzerland.")

"We shall do well if we stir hatred and contempt against all existing institutions; we make war against all prevailing ideas of religion, of the state, of country and of patriotism. The idea of God is the keystone of perverted civilization. The true root of civilization, the true root of liberty, of equality and of culture, is ATHEISM."

BEBEL.

(In an essay, republished in the Vorwaerts in 1901.)

"Christianity is the enemy of liberty and of civilization. It has kept mankind in slavery and oppression. The Church and the State have always fraternally united to exploit the people. Christianity and Socialism are like fire and water."

LIEBKNECHT.

(In his "Materialist Basis of History.")

"I am an Atheist, I do not believe in God. It is our duty as socialists to root out the faith in God with all our might, nor is any one worthy the name, who does not consecrate himself to the spread of Atheism."

LAFARGUE.

(A noted French Socialist and son-in-law of Marx.)

"The victory of the proletariat will deliver humanity from the nightmare of religion."

HERVE.

(Another noted French Socialist leader, quoted by Harold Begbie— Interview Nov. 10, 1906.)

"It is absolutely necessary to destroy all vestige of religious idea, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, in order to carry out the entire program of advanced Socialism, which depends upon the disappearance of every form of theological influence."

SPANISH SOCIALISTS.

At a convention of Spanish Socialists held at Madrid, Sept. 21, 1899, it was resolved to expel any comrade who supported positive religion.

VORWAERTS.

(Leading Socialist paper in Germany.)

"We know that Christianity has not brought redemption. We believe in no Redeemer. No man, no God in human form, no Savior can redeem humanity. Only humanity itself, only laboring humanity, can save humanity."

ROBERT BLATCHFORD.

("Leading Socialist of England, in "The Clarion.")

"I do not believe that Christianity or Buddhism or Judaism or Mohammedanism is true. I do not believe that any one of these religions is necessary. I do not believe that any one of them affords a perfect rule of life.

"I deny the existence of a Heavenly Father. I deny the efficacy of prayer. I deny the providence of God. I deny the truth of the Old Testament and the New Testament. I deny the truth of the Gospels. I do not believe any miracle ever was performed. I do not believe that Christ was divine. I do not believe that Christ died for man. I do not believe that he ever rose from the dead. I am strongly inclined to believe that he never existed at all.

"I deny that Christ in any way or in any sense ever interceded for man or saved man or reconciled God to man or man to God. I deny that the love or

the help or the intercession of Christ or Buddha, or Mohammed, or the Virgin Mary is of any use to any man.

"I do not believe there is any heaven, and I scorn the idea of hell."

JOSEPH LEATHAM.

(In "Socialism and Character.")

"At the present moment I cannot remember a single instance of a person who is at one and the same time a really earnest and intelligent Socialist and an orthodox Christian. Those who do not openly attack the Church and the fabric of Christianity show but scant respect to either the one or the other in private. * * * While all of us are indifferent to the Church, many of us are frankly hostile to her."

JOHN SPARGO.

(In The Comrade, May, 1903.)

"How often do we see quoted in our own press, from the Encyclopedia Britannica, that familiar fallacy that 'the ethics of Christianity and Socialism are identical.' It is not true; we do not ourselves, in most cases, believe it. We repeat it because it appeals to the slave-mind of the world. It is easier so to act, than to affirm, what in our very souls we feel to be true, that Socialism, as an ethical interpretation of life, is far removed from Christianity and of infinitely greater beauty and worth. * * * Socialism Christianized would be Socialism emasculated and destroyed."

GEORGE D. HERRON.

"Christianity stands for what is lowest and basest in life. The Church is the most degrading of all our Institutions, and the most brutalizing in its effects on the common life. For Socialism to make terms with the Church is to take Judas to its bosom."

THE NEW YORKER VOLKSZEITUNG.

(The principal organ of Socialism in America.)

"Socialism and belief in God, as is taught by Christianity and its adherents; are incompatible. Socialism has no meaning unless it is atheistic."

THE NEW YORK CALL.

(March 2, 1912.)

"There is nothing to be gained by holding out any false hopes that a study of Socialism does not tend to undermine religious beliefs. The theory of economic determinism alone, if thoroughly grasped, leaves no room for a belief in the supernatural."

THE WORKER.

(November 10, 1901.)

"Christianity is a huge and ghastly parasite, consuming billions of treasure out of the labor and patience of the people, and is supremely interested in keeping the people in economic and spiritual subjection to capitalism. The spiritual deliverance of the race depend on its escape from this parasite. The world must be saved from its salvations."

THE REVOLT.

(May 6, 1911.)

"Socialism and ethics are two separate things. This fact must be kept in mind."

II.

Socialist leaders explicitly declare that, under Socialism, marriage will terminate at the will of either party; therefore, at the end of a month, or a week, or earlier:

FREDERICK ENGELS.

("The Origin of the Family," p. 99.)

"If marriage founded on love alone is moral, then it follows that 'marriage is moral only as long as love lasts.' The duration of an attack of individual sex love varies considerable according to individual disposition, especially in men. A positive cessation of fondness or its replacement by a new passionate love makes a separation a blessing for both parties and for society. But humanity will be spared the useless wading through the mire of a divorce case."

MARX AND ENGELS.

(In the Communist Manifesto.)

"It is self-evident that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the

abolition of the community of women—present marriage—springing from that system of prostitution, both public and private.”

BEBEL.

.Woman, pp. 334, 335.)

“In the choice of love, she is, like man, free and unhampered. She woos and is wooed, and closes the bond from no considerations other than her own inclinations. This bond is a private contract, celebrated without the intervention of any functionary. If incompatibility, disenchantment or repulsion set in between the two persons that have come together, morality commands that the unnatural and, therefore, immoral, bond be dissolved.”

LIEBKNECHT.

“Socialism will destroy prostitution, whether it walk ashamed under the mantle of marriage for wealth or convenience, or whether it run shameless, painted and naked upon the streets.”

EDWARD CARPENTER.

(Praised by such leading Socialists as Leonard D. Abbott and Marlon C. Wentworth.)

“Let women insist on the right to speak, dress think, act, and, above all, to **USE HER SEX AS SHE DEEMS BEST**; let her face the scorn and the ridicule; let her lose her own life if she likes.”

BAX.

(In “Outlook from the New Standpoint,—p. 160.)

“Meanwhile we ought to combat by every means within our power the metaphysical dogma of the inherent sanctity of the monogamic principle.”

SHAW.

(“Quintessence of Ibsenism.”)

“Unless woman repudiates her womanliness, her duty to her husband, to her children, to society, to the law, and to everyone but self, she cannot amancipate herself.”

THE UNINITIATED DO NOT BELIEVE THESE THINGS.

But, lest Christians might not give Socialism a hearing, *its moral program is purposely covered up* by its apostles.

At the National Socialist Convention held in Chicago, May 1908, the subject of "Religion under Socialism" came up, and many delegates expressed their regret, inasmuch as their cause would be hurt by it. We quote herein a few of the displeased ones:

MR. LEWIS.

"I am among those who sincerely hoped the question of religion would not be raised at this convention. I am willing to concede that we should let sleeping dogs lie. I know that the Socialist position in philosophy on the question of religion does not make a good campaign subject. It is not useful propaganda in a political campaign. I DO NOT PROPOSE TO STATE IN THIS PLATFORM THE TRUTH ABOUT RELIGION FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE SOCIALIST PHILOSOPHY."—Chicago Daily Socialist, May 16, 1908.

A little farther on in his impassioned address, the same speaker added these significant words:

"Kautsky says: So long as Christianity ruled the minds of men, the idea of revolution was rejected as a sinful revolt against divinely constituted authority. "But we," continued the speaker, "must not go before the people of this country telling them that so long as Christianity rules their minds, they will reject the idea of the Socialist revolution."

MR. HILQUIT.

(Another Delegate.)

"We should not go out in our propaganda among the people who are still groping in obscurity (religion) and tell them that they must first become materialists before they can become members of the Socialist party. After we have disposed of the things

which touch their material welfare it will be time to approach them with the full consequences of the socialist philosophy."

MR. DEVINE.

(Delegate.)

"I find myself in a different position from the other speakers. I am of the few here, who are actively engaged in the factories. I want to say here, that we must be careful on this question. I stand here as one actively engaged in the factory, trying to bring the workers into the socialist movement. I find they are men of all religions. I am accused by a certain class of people in the factory. I am asked how can I be a Catholic and a socialist? What I am doesn't matter. They don't know and you don't know, and it is nothing to either of us."

It is true that the Socialist platform says "Religion is a private matter," but this only means that a person may believe as he pleases in his own home.

* * *

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH MUST REPUDIATE IT.
SOCIALISM THE SAME EVERYWHERE.

1. The Communist Manifesto, on which Socialism rests, was written by Carl Marx and Frederick Engels, both of whom are AVOWED ATHEISTS.

* * *

2. The philosophy of Socialism is based on the materialistic conception of history, which the Christian cannot at all subscribe to.

* * *

3. A Christian must believe in God, creation, revelation, eternity, the spirituality, and immortality of the soul. The REAL Socialist denies all these things.

* * *

4. A Christian must believe in the sanctity and divine institution of marriage. Under

Socialism there would be no lasting marriage, but one "terminable at the will of either party."

* * *

5. A Christian must admit the right of private property, otherwise there would be no meaning to the commandments "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods, nor his wife, nor anything that is his."

* * *

You might be told that Socialism in America is not the same as in Europe, but,

"Socialism means the same in every land."
—(Appeal to Reason, May 16, 1903.)

A. M. SIMONS.

"It is with the work of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels that modern Socialism began to definitely take on the forms by which it is known today."

HILLQUIT.

"The International Socialist movement with its thirty million adherents, at a conservative estimate, and its organized parties in twenty-five civilized countries in both hemispheres, is all based on the same Marxian program, and follows substantially the same methods of propaganda and action. The 'diverse Socialism' outside the organized movement are represented by small groups of social and political dilettantes toying with problems of the universe and exercising no influence whatsoever on the course of the International Socialist movement."

Socialism Is Often Blasphemous.

(On the editorial page of *The New York Call*, March 28, 1911, under the caption "An Ancient Charity Case," appeared the following).

"What would have happened if 1,900 years ago organized charity of the modern type had flourished in Palestine and a certain young carpenter from Nazareth had applied for relief?

"His case would have been duly referred to a trained investigator. And the answer to the schedule of inquiries would have been something like the following:

"Name: Jesus, son of Joseph, the master carpenter.

"Born: At Nazareth, Judea.

"Age: Thirty-three years.

"Health: Good. Capable of hard work.

"Applicant has not worked at his trade for the last three years. Has no tools. Either sold or pawned them, probably. Has no home. Associates with low characters of both sexes, also shiftless and roving. Indulges frequently in disreputable and seditious talk about the constituted authorities. Is strongly suspected of anarchistic tendencies. Manifestly has been living on handouts, or worse. It is on record that he and his gang plucked ears of corn in the fields without permission. Also that he instructed some of his gang to steal a jackass and bring it to him for his use. Which they did.

"He should be taken into court as a vagrant and committed to the farm colony for tramps."

Comment is unnecessary, save to reiterate Socialism's anti-Christian character.

Bishop von Ketteler Opposed Child-Labor Before Marx.

In 1869 Bishop von Ketteler delivered a sermon before 10,000 workingmen, elaborating a platform of social reform. He denounced the cruelty of child-labor in unequivocal terms. The following was his platform:

1. Increase of wages corresponding to the true value of labor.
2. Shorter hours of labor.
3. Days of rest.
4. Prohibition of child labor in factories.
5. Prohibition of work of women and especially of mothers in factories.
6. Future prohibition of the work of young girls in factories.

The following is his arraignment of child labor: "I regard child-labor in factories as a monstrous cruelty of our time, a cruelty committed against the child by the spirit of the age and the selfishness of parents. I look on it as a slow poisoning of the body and the soul of the child. With the sacrifice of the joys of childhood, with the sacrifice of health, with the sacrifice of innocence the child is condemned to increase the profits of the *entrepreneur* and oftentimes to earn bread for parents whose dissolute life has made them incapable of doing so themselves.

"Hence I rejoice at every word spoken in favor of the workingman's child. Religion in its great love for children cannot but support the demand for the prohibition of child-labor in factories. You, my dear workmen, can second this demand most efficaciously by never permitting your own children under fourteen years of age to work in a factory."—*The Live Issue*, September, 1912.

