

Abilene Christian University

## Digital Commons @ ACU

---

Stone-Campbell Books

Stone-Campbell Resources

---

1912

### The Evils of Socialism

W.F. Lemmons

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs\\_books](https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books)



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), [Comparative Methodologies and Theories Commons](#), [Comparative Politics Commons](#), [Economic Theory Commons](#), [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#), [Ethics in Religion Commons](#), [History of Christianity Commons](#), [Labor Economics Commons](#), [Political Economy Commons](#), [Political Theory Commons](#), [Practical Theology Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Lemmons, W.F., "The Evils of Socialism" (1912). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 187.  
[https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs\\_books/187](https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/187)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

# **The Evils of Socialism**

BY W. F. LEMMONS, EDITOR AND AUTHOR

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS  
PER COPY

PUBLISHED BY THE  
FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE  
AUSTIN, TEXAS

VF Lemmons, W.F.

Private Library

of

CENTER FOR RESTORATION STUDIES  
ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

Reuel Lemmons



# THE EVILS OF SOCIALISM



THE EVILS OF  
SOCIALISM

Copyright, 1912.

## INTRODUCTION.

---

I have no apology to offer for bringing out this book. The signs of the times, and the approaching crisis seem to demand just such a work. Socialism has grown and its infidelity is having its influence on society generally. I may be censured for not quoting the various definitions to the word "Socialist," but who can better define Socialism than its own writers, whose testimony appear in this book. I have gone to the founders and writers for evidence with which to refute the doctrine of this eighteenth century twaddle. A clear definition is not to be found. The Great German writer, Emile De Leveleye, says:

"I have never met with a clear definition or even a precise description of the word. Every one is a Socialist in somebody's eyes."—Socialism of Today, p. 14.

If we want to learn what Methodism is, we go to the propaganda of the Methodists. If we want to learn what Mormonism is, we go to their writers. If we want to know what any people teach, we go to the propaganda literature put out by the leaders of the theory. We have followed this line in defining Socialism in this book. This is right. Therefore, the authority we have quoted is as good as can be had. It is orthodox.

In conclusion, my aim is right, and none of the quotations are garbled. They give the full meaning. I hope that good may come from this effort, through the suppression of evil.

W. F. LEMMONS.

Tyler, Texas, Jan. 12, 1912.

## THE EVILS OF SOCIALISM.

---

Since my discussion with Clark, I have received a number of letters from brethren who were Socialists, condemning me for what they consider "dabbling in politics." On the other hand, I have received a number of letters from brethren asking me for my arguments. I cannot answer all these letters, and for this reason, and others, I have decided to write a book on this question for the benefit of all concerned. I deny the charge of "dabbling in politics," only in so far as the truth demands of every loyal Christian. Some want to know why I do not condemn the Republican and Democratic party. I am not condemning parties, but theories. The God of heaven has put the parties that are ruling over us in power, and through them he has given us liberty to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and they promise us this liberty so long as they are under the constitution of the United States. And inasmuch as they are in power, I am commanded to pray for them as rulers, and am forbidden to condemn them.

It is true that no government has ever existed, and none will ever exist, that has no evil men in it. In fact, God has ordained that the world shall rule in civil governments, and that Christians shall be subject to the powers that be. I am not commanded to be subject to the Socialist party, for they are not in power. If they ever come into power, then, and not until then, am I commanded to be subject to them and to pray for them. In this I am going to give my reasons for objecting to such a system of economics as is offered by the Socialist party. There are many good brethren in the party who are giving more time, attention and money to the party than they are to the cause of Christ. This is a fatal mistake. Those brethren do not understand Socialism. They commenced in

the middle. What is in the foundation is wholly Greek to them. I think I know Socialism from its foundation up, and the authority I shall give in this book will come from their best propaganda literature, furnished by Chas. H. Kerr & Co. of Chicago. I have in my library more than a hundred of these books and pamphlets, which were recommended to me by said company as books to study on Socialism. Hence, if these men have advocated their own doctrine I know what it is—what Socialism means. I call on every honest thinking man to watch the arguments which shall follow.

### **I. It Is a System of Infidelity and Darwinism.**

I want the reader to note that the very foundation of Socialism is infidelity and Darwinism. We quote:

“But while Spencer’s Study of Sociology is the most signal and brilliant refutation of the *Great Man* theory, no one man really killed that theory. The general spread and acceptance of Darwinism has produced an intellectual atmosphere in which such a theory can no more live than a fish can live out of water.

“By Darwinism we mean, as you know, the transmutation of species by variation and natural selection—selection accomplished mainly, if not solely, by the struggle for existence. Now this doctrine of organic development and change or metamorphic evolution, which was, with its originators, Wallace and Darwin, a purely biological doctrine, was transferred to the field of sociology by Spencer and applied with great power to all human institutions, legal, moral, economic, religious,” etc.—Socialism Positive and Negative, pp. 18, 19.

Our readers must see from the above that Darwinism is applied to every department of economics, including religion, by the leaders of Socialism. But J. H. Moore, another recognized leader, says:



"But Darwin has lived. Beings have come into the world, we now know, through the operation of natural law. Man is not different from the rest. The story of Eden is a fabrication, bequeathed to us by our well-meaning, but dimly-lighted ancestors. There has been no more miracle in the origin of human species than the origin of any other species. And there is no more miracle in the origin of the species than there is in the birth of a molecule or breaking of a tired wave on the beach. Man was not made in the image of a hypothetical Creator of heaven and earth, but in the image of the ape. Man is not a fallen god, but a promoted reptile."—*Universal Kinship*, p. 107.

When I say that this is the doctrine of all the main leaders of the Socialist party from Karl Marx on down the line through Chas. H. Kerr, Wayland, Col. Dick Maple of the Rip-Saw, Clark and others, I speak the truth.

"Which is worse, to be a demagogue or an infidel? I am both. For while many confessed Christians contrive to serve both God and mammon, the depravity of my nature seems to forbid my serving either."—*God and My Neighbor*, by Robt. Blatchford, p. 25; *Value, Price and Profit*, p. 5.

Next we quote from the pen of Ernest Untermann, another recognized leader of the party:

"Haraklitos \* \* \* claimed that a continuous process of development pervaded the universe; that all forms were in constant flow, and that, 'struggling is the father of all things,' thus expressing the idea of Darwin in regard to struggling for existence."—*Science and Revolution*, pp. 21, 22.

Next we quote from Fredrick Engels; who stands next to Karl Marx as authority on Socialism. His works also abound in manifestations of infidelity:

"Private ownership of flocks must have had an early beginning. It is difficult to say whether to the author of the so-called First Book of Moses, Father Abraham appeared as



the owner of the flocks by virtue of his privilege as head of a communistic family or of his capacity as general chief by actual descent."—*The Origin of the Family*, p. 66.

Wm. M. Bolsche, in *Evolution of Man*, p. 11, in speaking of man's evolution from vegetation, says: "We all have grown up, we all have developed from such a small baby, such a bud of humanity."

Karl Kautsky, another recognized leader, says: "Thus for instance the development of the human ape from a tree-fruit eater to a devourer of animals and plants, which are to be found on the ground, was bound to be connected with a transformation of the hind pair of hands and feet. \* \* \*"

"If man begins his rise over the animal with the discovery of the tool, he has no need to create a social compact, as was believed in the eighteenth century and as many theoretical jurists still believe in the twentieth century. He enters on his human development as a social animal with strong impulses."—*Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History*, pp. 135, 136.

Karl Marx accepted Darwinism, and applied it to every department of social economics. We quote the following from the pen of Arthur M. Lewis:

"Karl Marx accepted evolution with all its consequences and implications, and applied it without any reservations to those questions which engaged his attention. It is because he did this successfully that he is justly regarded as the real creator of sociology and the founder of that historical philosophy which has its root in evolutionary materialism."—*Vital Problems in Social Evolution*, p. 22.

This shows who is the real founder of Socialism, and proves beyond quibble that it is founded on Darwin's evolutionary materialism.

Again, our author says of Marx: "He believed in Socialism not because it should be, but because it will be; not be-

cause it is in harmony with any ethical ideas, but because, with its present composition and tendencies, capital has no other possible outcome," p. 35. See pp. 119, 123-125.

I challenge you to find a recognized leader in the Socialist party who does not believe and advocate the doctrine in the above extracts. In these theories Socialism must stand or fall. Are you willing to be led by such infidels? Am I not justified in entering my protest before it is too late against such leadership?

I hope that our readers, both in the Socialist party and out of it, will be conservative enough to give our evidence a careful reading. Our next witness is Friedrich Nietzsche, another recognized leader, who says:

"When on a Sunday morning we hear the old bell ringing, we ask ourselves: Is it possible? All this for a Jew crucified two thousand years ago who said he was God's Son. The proof of such an assertion is lacking. \* \* \* A god who begets children by a mortal woman; a sage who demands that no more work be done, that no more justice be administered, but that the signs of the approaching end of the world be heeded; a system of justice that accepts an innocent as a vicarious sacrifice instead of the guilty; a person who bids his disciples to drink his blood; prayers for miracles; sins against a god expiated upon a god. \* \* \* Is one to believe that such a thing can be believed?"—Human, All Too Human, pp. 149, 150.

Ranker infidelity was never advocated by leading infidels in any age of the world. W. T. Brown is our next witness:

"It does not follow that because a man can trace his lineage back to the monkey, that he is justified now in living a merely monkey life. The fact that the human ancestry descended through wolves and reptiles does not justify any human being in living a wolfish or snakish life."—Socialism and Primitive Christianity, p. 6.

Next we call Ernest Untermann and others on the stand, to prove that religion is a menace to Socialism, and to establish our next point, viz.:

## II. Socialists' Attitude Toward Religion.

"The chief sinner against this canon of dialectical thinking is our old friend theologian. When the evolutionary naturalist demonstrated the hopeless untruth of his 'revealed' legends about the origin of man and things, he sought refuge in the ingenious theory of these fables which, while scientifically indefensible, were, notwithstanding, spiritually true. In short, scientific truth and spiritual truth were so distinct as to have no vital relations. \* \* \*

"Socialists have always been among the first to enjoy these entertaining performances, and it seems like divine retribution when these same theological and 'reverend' persons tumble over into the Socialist camp and bring their obsolete methods of thinking with them.

"They dub themselves 'Christian' Socialists and proceed to show that Socialism is a philosophy concerning the social and economic life of men, *and not the religion at all*. When Marx declared that political and legal and other socialist institutions and ideas were the result of economical conditions and class interests, religious institutions were, of course, exempt.

"After a mental contortion like that, what is to prevent a reconciliation between the seventeenth century twaddle of the Methodist pulpit and the materialistic conception of history." —*Evolution Social and Organic*, pp. 133, 134, 135.

That Socialism is the only religion, according to the leaders of the party, is unquestionably true from the following from Untermann:

"According to materialist monism, the only 'true religion'



is the 'religion' of Natural Truth. And this truth is not to be sought in the unknowable and impossible nothing called the supernatural. It is contained in the physical and chemical elements in us and around us. And it can be found with the natural means which every human has received by nature, and the five senses, and the brain, which is the origin of the sixth sense of mankind. \* \* \*

"But this 'true religion' of Natural Truth never came to conscious life until it found its monistic expression in the minds of thinkers of proletarian socialism. \* \* \* To the extent that science compels nature to yield one of its mysteries after another, the basis of mystical religion and authoritative revelation disintegrates, and the science of life comes into its own," etc.

"As for the revealed word, to whom was it revealed? To Moses, the prophets, the editors of the Christian gospels who wrote from two to three hundred years after the death of the first Christian revolutionaries some contradictory records which they claimed were the revealed words of Christ and his disciples, were human beings like the rest of us, but with less positive knowledge of themselves and the world. \* \* \* A proletarian who today believes their assertions, or those of their unthinking followers, all of whom were either members of the ruling class or merely controlled by them, surrenders his intellectual or 'spiritual' life into the hands of his enemies."—Science and Revolution, pp. 164, 165, 166.

Who is it among the leaders of the Socialist party that does not believe that Socialism is all the religion that the world needs? Can you show a single one who is not first, last and all the time, against the preachers of the land? Do they not fight Christianity from start to finish? Why? Because they know that the preachers will not stand for their infidelity, so long as they remain outside of the Socialist camp. They all believe that the Bible is a fabrication, written by a half civil-

ized class of people. I am talking about their leaders. They seek to undermine Christianity, and this will have been accomplished when they get into power. We here introduce more testimony:

“There is much to show that greed of private property was the old serpent which brought about the fall of our first parents.”

“With these earlier worshipers, too, the later religions have mingled with inextricable but not meaningless entanglements. The Passover, the greatest feast of the Jews, borrowed from the Egyptians, handed down to become the supreme festival of Christianity, and finally blending in north of Europe with the worship of the Norse goddess Estre, is, as is well known, closely connected with the celebration of the spring equinox and of the passover of the sun from the south to the north.

\* \* \* The sun at the moment of passing the equinoctial point, stood 3,000 years ago in the Zodiacal constellation of the Ram or he-lamb. The Lamb, therefore, became the symbol of the young triumphant god.”—Love’s Coming of Age, p. 130.

“Certainly it is curious that in later Egyptian times the bull-headed god was adopted in favor of the ram-headed god Ammon; and that Christianity adopted the lamb as the symbol of its Savior.”—Ibid.

“Jesus himself—so entangled is the worship of this greatest man with the earlier cults—is purported to have been born like other sun-gods, Bacchus, Apollo, Osiris, on the 25th of December.”—Ibid, p. 132.

In the extracts we have learned that Socialism, as a system, denies the first statement in the Bible, that, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,” and that the statement of Genesis, 1:27, which says that “God created man in his own image;” that instead of God’s making man and giving him dominion over the “fishes of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over

every creeping thing of the earth," as in the 26th verse, that man, according to Socialism, sprang from this lower creation. In the *Evolution of Man*, by W. M. Bolsche, can be found the pictures of the fishes, animals, and reptiles through whom we have evolved.

Why is it that socialism takes evolution as a basis for its so-called system of social economics? The answer is easy. It supposes that religion and our present system of civil governments are only the outgrowths of heathenism, and that we have reached a point in evolutionary developments when all our present systems of religion, governments, marriage relations, educational institutions, and society generally, must give way to Socialism, which proposes to correct all the present evils of society, and that, too, without offering us one statutory law, through which we are to reach this end: Socialism is to become the religion—the politics—the everything, with many promises, but with no remedy through which they can be carried out.

Nietzsche, in speaking of a certain religious work, says that had the author lived in our day he would have said:

"Never has a religion, directly or indirectly, either as dogma or as allegory, contained a truth. For all religion grew out of dread of necessity, and came into existence through an error of the reason."—*Human, All Too Human*, p. 140.

"In reality, there exists between religion and true science neither relationship nor friendship, not even enmity; they dwell in different spheres. Every philosophy that lets the religious comet gleam through the darkness of its last outposts renders everything within it that purports to be science suspicious. \* \* \* Moreover, though all the people agree concerning certain religious things, for example, the existence of a god (which, by the way, as regards this point, is not the case) that fact would constitute an argument against the thing



agreed upon, for example, the very existence of a god."—*Ibid*, pp. 141, 142.

"Let us transport ourselves back to the time in which religious life flourished most vigorously and we will find a fundamental conviction prevalent which we no longer share and which has resulted in the closing of the door to religious life once for all so far as we are concerned; this conviction has to do with nature and intercourse with her. In those times nothing is known of nature's laws. Neither for earth nor for heaven is there a must."—*Ibid*, pp. 142, 143.

Chas. H. Kerr & Co., as well as all leading Socialists, will tell you this is good Socialist doctrine. What right have I to deny it? Who has a better right to know Socialism than the makers and promoters of the party, who furnish the literature through which people are converted to the doctrine? But read carefully the following from W. T. Brown:

### III. It Claims to Be Primitive Christianity.

"But comparably the most important fact to be noted in connection with modern Socialism is that it is—not may be—a religion. Indeed, I claim and shall proceed to show that it is the logical and historical successor to primitive Christianity as a world religion—that is the only thing in the world today that bears any moral or spiritual resemblance to the religion of Jesus. And I undertake this task purely because I am convinced that until Socialism becomes for you and for me our religion—that by which and in which we live—we know neither Socialism nor religion. \* \* \* Nothing could induce me to become a party to the work of getting men and women \* \* \* to join any church you can name \* \* \* under the impression that in doing so they were performing a religious act. It means nothing of the kind—never did mean anything of the kind. The whole process means one thing and only one: the manufacture of hypocrites; and for

the best of reasons, namely, because men can not be religious in a church or through a church. The thing is simply impossible. They can in that way merely 'act a part'—the exact definition of hypocrites."—Socialism and Primitive Christianity, pp. 4, 5.

"If a man loves father or mother or wife or children or land more than this cause, he can not become a part of this movement. \* \* \* I cannot too earnestly say to you that we men and women, or any others, are not religious, cannot know the meaning and uplift or power of religion, unless we are today consciously giving our lives to and in and for a movement of world-inclusive beneficence. What movement is there which answers to the description outside of the world-wide struggle for Socialism?"—Socialism and Primitive Christianity, Pamphlet, pp. 14, 15.

Speaking of religion, which Mr. Roosevelt says will be destroyed by Socialism, our author says:

"I do not forget that Socialism has often rejected the whole philosophy of religion on which the church rests, and even professed atheism. I am not the least disturbed at that. No more name—I care not what it be—has any sacredness. No repetition of the word 'God' ever made or ever can make any man religious. No profession of any faith, however ancient or popular, makes a man religious."—Ibid, p. 19.

Hear the testimony of Chas. H. Kerr, who owns the publishing house of the Socialist party, and who furnishes practically all the literature in the way of books, and who publishes a daily Socialist paper, and owns other publications. He certainly voices the sentiment of the party.

"The national religion, like that of our viking ancestors who worshiped Odin and Thor, is the religion of equals, of freedom and free women. They teach that happiness is good, that the body is good, that the way to serve the gods is to help your neighbor. That is the way the people naturally

think and feel when there is no master and no slaves among them. These religions took shape in the various independent tribes of many different races all over the world, including the ancestors of the Jews who wrote the Bible.”—*Folly of Being Good*, Pamphlet, p. 9.

“The church teaches that God made some people rich and others poor, that to covet the property of another is a sin, and that to please God and receive a reward in heaven when we die, we must deny ourselves and be content without earthly pleasures.”—*Ibid*, p. 10.

Real and practical Socialism knows no God that is above man. It is really, when boiled down to its quintessence, a system of man-worship. A. M. Lewis says that “It is no longer God and man, nor even man and God, but man only.”—*Evol. Soc. and Org.* Paul says of such: “Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise they became fools.”—Rom. 1:21, 22. Again he says in the following verses that God gave them up to vile affection because they changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator. But hear our author once more:

“And thus, as a result of scientific research into the origin of dualism and the nature of dreams, as Professor Clifford says: ‘The dim and shadowy outline of superhuman deity fades slowly from before us; and as the mists of his presence float aside, we perceive with greater and greater clearness the shape of a grander and nobler figure—the figure of him who made all gods and shall unmake them. From the dim dawn of history, and from the inmost depths of every soul, the face of our father man looks out upon us, with the fire of eternal youth in his eyes,’ and says: ‘Before Jehovah was, I am.’”—*Evol. Soc. and Org.*



Even the casual reading of these extracts will convince the most skeptical, if honest, that Socialism is the only religion that the world needs, if we are to rely on the propaganda literature put out by the party. Furthermore, we are forced to the conclusion that in order to be a first-class Socialist, we must forsake everything that is dear to the truly Christian. Not only this, but we must forsake home and home relationships, and give ourselves wholly into the hands of this new god, and worship and serve it, and it alone, or we are neither Socialists nor Christians. In fact, we are only animal, we are not human until we reach this evolutionary system called Socialism, as we shall see as we proceed with our investigation. "Socialism has often rejected the whole philosophy of religion," and that is what it will always do. The would-be "Christian Socialists"—their leaders—all reject the Bible. Even the editor of the "Christian Socialist" is a materialist of the first water. His writers are not different from the rest—the main party—the International party—all alike are infidels, and his branch of the party is under the guise of "Christian Socialists" as a blind to catch a few suckers out of the religious field. They "compass sea and land to make one proselyte," and when he is made, "they make him twofold more the child of hell" than themselves. Why? Because he must deny the religion of Jesus Christ, become an infidel or materialist—swallow Darwinism—in order to be a genuine Socialist. Look at the many who have gone into Socialism from the various denominations. Are they not, nine out of ten, infidels, or semi-infidels? I could cite you to preachers, as well as "Lay members," who have lost all interest in Christianity, and are giving their life's work to propagate this daughter of Rome, which is seeking for an amalgamation of church and state.

#### IV. A System of Free Love.

Socialism, as defined and advocated by its leaders, is a system of reconstruction. That is, it proposes to tear down all the present forms of governments, religion, and the home, and build upon the ruins thereof, a system that will give freedom in all departments of society. It proposes to do away with the marriage tie by doing away with every law, both human and divine, that binds man and wife as one. This you will see from the following from the pen of Edward Carpenter:

“There is no solution which will not include the redemption of the terms ‘free women’ and ‘free-love’ to their true and rightful signification. Let every woman whose heart bleeds for the suffering of her sex, hasten to declare herself, as far as she possibly can, a free woman. Let her accept the term with all the odium that belongs to it; let her insist on her rights to speak, dress, think, act, and above all, to use her sex, as she deems best; let her face the scorn and ridicule; let her ‘lose her own life’ if she likes; assured that only so can come deliverance, and that only when the free woman is honored will the prostitute cease to exist.”—*Love’s Coming of Age*.

What does this mean? It simply means that Socialism proposes to make private prostitutes of its subjects in order to stop public prostitution. I presume that will stop it.

“Even more than men should woman be ‘free’ to work out the problem of her sex-relations as may commend itself best to her—hampered as little as possible by legal, conventional, or economic considerations, and relying chiefly on her own native sense and taste in the matter. Once thus free—free from mere cash-nexus to a husband, from the money-slavery of the streets, from the nameless terrors of social opinion, and from the threats of perpetual virginity or perpetual bondage—would she not indeed choose her career (whether that of

wife or mother, or that of free companion, or one of single blessedness) far better for herself than it is chosen for her today—regarding reality in some degree the needs of society, and the welfare of children, and the sincerity and durability of her relations to her lover, and less the petty motives of profit and fear.”—Love’s Coming of Age, p. 63.

“With the return of women to freedom the ideal of the female may again resume its sway. It is possible indeed that the more dignified and serious attitude of women toward the sex may give to sexual selection when exercised by them a nobler influence than when exercised by the males. Anyhow, it is not difficult to see that women really free would never countenance for the mates the many mean and unclean types of men who today seem to have things all their way, nor consent to have children by such men, nor is it difficult to imagine that the feminine influence might thus sway to the evolution of a more manly and dignified race than has been disclosed in the last days of commercial civilization.” \* \* \*

“What exactly evolution may be preparing for us, we do not know, but apparently some lively sparring matches between the sex.”—Love’s Coming of Age, pp. 66, 67.

Doubtless when we reach this wonderful cog in this evolutionary machine, and we drop over into this mill of “freedom and free-women,” and are thereby ground into one solid mass of free-love-powder, there will really be some “sparring matches between the sex.” There is really likely to be some head-skinning take place here and there. But of course Socialism proposes to bring about such a wonderful love feast—such a millenium in the world—that there will be neither cause for marriage nor giving in marriage—but we will be as the angels in heaven. We hardly expect to live to see this millenium. But let us have some more of this hash:

“It will follow in fact that these different forms and functions of the love-sentiment, and while really believing that a



life-long comradeship (possibly with little of the sexual in it) is the most satisfying forms, will see that a cast-iron marriage custom which, as today, expects two people either to live entirely in the same house and sit on opposite sides of the same table, or else be strangers to each other—and which recognized only two sorts of intimacy, orthodox and criminal, wedded and adulterous—is itself the source of perpetual confusion and misapprehension.”—Love’s Coming of Age, p. 118.

### **The Above Points Vindicated by Recent Publications.**

Under this head we wish to prove by the Industrial Democrat, the Socialist organ published at Oklahoma City, that the Socialist attitude toward religion, the home, etc., as represented in the foregoing extracts are not misrepresented. We clip from the issue of September 24, 1910:

“Nor must the matter of religion be overlooked. The early advent of the co-operative commonwealth is generally conceded now, even by those who most fiercely oppose it. It is an accomplished fact of the near future, so we have ample space to devote to the details of the new civilization. Personally the writer would not prize anything that economic freedom can give unless it also is to give freedom from the pernicious notion of religion and morality instilled by capitalism. The unspeakable terror under which he lived in childhood, due to lying religious teachings, was such that he would not be willing to endure it again even to buy an eternity of bliss. Almost all the children of the past have suffered similarly, excepting, perhaps, in the families of the wealthy, where it is probably understood that hell and torture are only intended for the serving class. At least there is no record of the ruling class having attempted to keep the ten commandments.

“Do not be so tender with the moral and religious sensibilities of the enemy—they have never hesitated to condemn

your children, at birth, to hard labor for life, nor to condemn you to eternal torture for venturing to doubt their cowardly religious teachings. All the hells ever pictured have never been so horrible as the mind of a vindictive Christian worshipping a vindictive and revengeful God."—Industrial Democrat, Sept. 24, 1910.

Read the following in answer to a preacher's inquiry in regard to the Socialist's position on religion:

"Rev. Robt. A. Baird, of Purcell, is anxious to know the Socialist view concerning the various institutions brought into being by capitalism. For his enlightenment we will simply say if Socialism does not eventually do away with the home, the family, the marriage relation and the Christian religion as we now have them, as well as private ownership of property, then we hope the people will side-track Socialism and send it direct to hell without change of cars.

"Only think of it! The honor and happiness of a woman depends upon whether or not some scoundrel had or had not been ordained as a minister of the gospel. Could anything be more absurd or more offensive to a thoughtful person? And the question naturally arises: Is morality really moral, or is it a flagrant humbug?

"It is really unnecessary for Socialists to make war upon this proposition, because well informed persons understand that both marriages and religion are economic developments, marriage being a direct result of private ownership of property.

"With the disappearance of private ownership this 'made-to-order' marriage will naturally cease. Not that mutual love and sexual loyalty will cease—for under changed conditions real and ideal marriage will be possible for the first time in the history of the race, and that without the authorization of any civil or ecclesiastical lunkhead. Under Socialism a couple will live together because they want to and not because they

have to, there being no reason for a couple living together longer than mutually agreeable to both." Ibid.

Being criticised by some of his subscribers, and asked to apologize for the above, the editor apologized in the following words:

"We are in receipt of a communication from a western county, signed by four valued comrades who demand that we apologize for our remarks concerning the church, or take their names from our subscription list. The names were promptly removed. We have another letter containing three new subs, saying that the issue of September 24 was a 'hum-dinger.' Still another comrade sends seven new subs and urges us to 'let 'em have both barrels next time.'

"Now, we wish to state once for all, that it is the intention of the publishers of the Industrial Democrat to furnish a better and stronger advocate of Socialism in its purity than can be found among American publications. Capitalism will be stormed to its very foundation and nothing that is middle class will escape being shelled. Every time the enemy howls we shall give them more of the same and in the same place.

"We trust that all comrades who desire the success of an absolutely fearless and uncompromising advocate of Socialism, snappy and aggressive, will use their utmost efforts to extend the circulation of the Industrial Democrat. Give us the subscribers—we'll do the rest."

Who is it so blind that he can not see the very purpose and intent of Socialism? The editor of this paper tells you that well informed people know that the home, the family, the marriage relationship, the Christian religion are to be uprooted by Socialism. Hear a dispatch in the Daily Socialist of January 20th in regard to David Goldstein, a Catholic, who was the first candidate of the Socialist party for mayor of Boston, which says:

"He (David Goldstein) seceded from the party when it re-



fused to embody in its constitution a provision repudiating speakers who attacked religion and practiced free love."

Why did they refuse to incorporate this provision in the constitution of the party, as such oppose the common attacks on religion? If the party is opposed to free love, and the advocacy of such by their speakers, why should they refuse to incorporate a clause in their constitution prohibiting them from advocating the doctrine of free love? There is but one solution to the problem, and that is that it belongs to, and is a component part of Socialism. Their propaganda is full of the doctrine of free love. If Socialism as a science does not stand for free love there is no such thing as modern Socialism. If it is not a part and parcel of their system of evolutionary economics, they have no system of any size or sort. If the marriage tie is to be dissolved and destroyed, as Socialism claims; and the women freed to do as they please, and if a couple does not have to live together longer than mutually agreeable to both under Socialism, free love is the inevitable result. If marriage is the direct result of the private ownership of property, as all leading authorities on Socialism proclaim, then when you destroy the private ownership of property, you destroy the origin of marriage; or, in other words, if you destroy private ownership of property you destroy the marriage tie. Indeed, this is Socialist logic in a nut-shell. It can tie up with this system if you choose, but decent people are going to steer clear of its contaminating influence. It is too rotten even for a Catholic like Goldstein to tie to, and he is now making speeches denouncing it because it proposes to destroy the home and religion.

#### **As Shown by "Woman Under Socialism."**

"Woman Under Socialism" is Herr Bebel's book, which has run through twenty-three German editions. I will quote

from the English translation, by Daniel De Leon, and published by the New York Labor News Company. We will give a brief outline of this book:

1. The "mother-right" was universally acknowledged in the primitive age when there was no such thing as marriage, and when the intercourse between the sexes was so promiscuous that no one knew nor cared to know who was the father of the child. It was self-evident who the mother was, and hence the "mother-right."

2. To establish "capitalism" the selfish owner of property established marriage, in order that he might beget an heir to inherit his wealth. In this way and for this very purpose the "father-right" superseded the "mother-right."

3. The bulwark of "capitalism" for this reason is the marriage relation with its "father-right," and therefore society must abolish the "father-right" and return to the "mother-right," or we perish. Under this system it makes no difference who the father of the child is.

4. The lustful appetite being a natural one, it must be satisfied just as we would satisfy hunger or thirst. To refuse to satisfy it is harmful and produces harm to mind and health.

5. Private property being abolished, the state vanishes away—crime is no longer committed and religion vanishes away.

Herr Bebel draws a correct picture of Socialism, and this brief outline will furnish the reader with the gist of his book. Is there any better authority amongst Socialists? This book has been recommended to me by Socialists, such as Chas. H. Kerr, as one that sets forth the Socialist idea of the woman question. Can you find such propaganda coming from Democrat or Republican leaders? This book is the very language of the devil.

He arrives at Morgan's conclusion, that, "at the lower stage of slavery there was sexual intercourse between the several

grades or generations, *every woman belonging to every man, and every man to every woman.*" Then he says:

"The theory that \* \* \* sexual intercourse was indiscriminate as further supported by the Hindoo myth, according to which Brahma married his own daughter."

"The same myth turns up again among the Egyptians and northern Edda. The Egyptian god Ammon was the spouse of his own mother, and boasted of it. Odin, according to Edda, was the mate of his own daughter."

Great heavens! Shall we return to Socialism? Why is all this essential to an argument in favor of Socialism? It is the doctrine.

Referring to these primitive ages when the father of the child could not be known, Herr Bebel says:

"The reign of the mother-right implied communism, equality of all, the rise of the father-right implies the reign of private property, and with the oppression and enslavement of women."

On the same page of this book, Herr Bebel says, that the reason the husband does not want the wife to have children by another man is "that the offspring of some one else would thereby get his property." Hence, if the husband objects to the wife's intimacy with another man, it is due to "capitalism." Everything is laid at the door of "capitalism" with Socialists. This is one of their main arguments, in proof of which I quote:

"Wholly otherwise stood matters for men. Although with the eye to the begetting of legitimate heirs for his property, he imposed upon woman strict abstinence from other men, he was, nevertheless, not inclined to lay a corresponding abstinence upon himself." Page 34.

Socialists argue that under "capitalism" women are the private property of the man, and that they propose to abolish private property. This will bring us to the "mother-right."



You can see that. Suppose it is true that she is the private property of one man, is that not much better than to be the public property of all the men, and thus become nothing more than a slut? God gave to man the woman in the beginning, and she, therefore, became his private property. For this reason he can treat her right; otherwise he would feel toward her entirely differently. Sarah belonged to Abraham. Hence, Socialism is contrary to the teachings of the Bible on this point. This author further makes the argument that the church, the state, and monogamous marriage, like private ownership of property, are obstacles in the way of Socialism. This is why he is fighting the three in this book. He goes so far as to make the following statement:

"According to Christianity, woman is the unclean being; the seducer who introduced sin into the world and ruined man." Page 60.

But hear him again:

"The ruling class, finding itself threatened in its existence, clings to religion as a prop to all authority, just as every ruling class has done before."

Hear Herr Bebel babble again:

"Religion is the transcendent reflection of the social condition of given epochs. In the measure that developments advance and society is transformed, religion is transformed along with it." Page 320.

A greater error was never put in cold type. Socialist writers lose sight of the faithful of God in the past ages; they go blind to the enlightened people of God, and work out all their problems from the myths of heathenism. Religion did not come into being as a result of private ownership of property. Religion is as old as man. He says again:

"The organization of the state changes only when the interests of property so demand. The state is, accordingly, an *inevitably necessary* organization of a social order that rests

upon a class rule. The moment class antagonisms fall through the abolition of private property, the state loses both the *necessity* and the *possibility* for its existence. With the removal of the conditions of rulership, the state gradually ceases to be, the same as creeds wane when belief ceases in supernatural beings, or in transcendental powers gifted with reason." Page 272.

The state does a great many things besides protect property. It must keep the peace between man and man; to protect life, and punish the criminal, and promote good morals and a hundred other good things. We can see plainly from the quotations given from Herr Bebel's "Woman Under Socialism," that it is a system of "free love" and destruction to the state and a reconstruction of society on the ruins thereof.

I can not close this part without giving one more quotation from this gospel of Socialism:

*"The satisfaction of the sexual instinct is as much a private concern as the satisfaction of any other instinct. No one is therefore accountable to others, and no unsolicited judge may interfere. How I shall eat, how I shall drink, how I shall sleep, how I shall clothe myself, is my private affair—exactly so my intercourse with a person of the opposite sex."*

Now, there it is in plain English, and I put it in italics because the author put it that way to emphasize the doctrine. This is enough to make angels weep. Return to such a system? God save us! Man with as much right toward the opposite sex, and with no less restraint than he has toward the water brook that runs through his neighbor's field, with the same right and privilege that he has to his own table—all this right toward all the opposite sex is Socialism in full blast. Let us pray!

#### As Shown by a "Socialist Wedding."

"A Socialist Wedding" is a published account, in pamphlet form, of a wedding which took place as a demonstration of how

marriage would be performed under Socialism. Geo. D. Herron was a married man when he met Carrie Rand. His wife divorced him in 1901. In May of the same year the marriage affair given in "A Socialist Wedding" took place, and he and his wife are now living in Italy. After this wedding took place the Socialists went to the Knickerbocker Press and paid the cost of printing this little book to describe the Socialist "wedding."

Mark you, Geo. D. Herron is a high-up Socialist, and is often quoted by Socialists. He is quoted in the "Socialist International Review," in September, 1909. He is a "comrade" in good standing, and a man of authority on that ism. For your benefit I will quote some of the proceedings in this "wedding" as it appears in the pamphlet:

"We were gathered together, *we of the inner circle of comradeship*, on the last Saturday evening in May. Outside our door the rain beat down, but within the mellow light fell on a room decked with the skill of the craftsman and aglow with the art of the painter. The fragrance of the blossom of spring flowers seemed to transform our room into a fairy garden; and the strains of a primitive love melody, as they drifted to us, were full of mystery and beauty.

"Our comrade, George D. Herron, arose, careworn and sorrowful as one who has passed through the valley of the shadow of death, yet strong-hearted and gladsome withal; and beside him stood Carrie Rand, clad in pure vestal white and bearing lilies-of-the-valley in her hand. 'We believe, friends, in fellowship,' he said, 'and because we believe that fellowship is the life we have asked a few of you to let us share your fellowship and sacrament of unity of life which we wish to *now announce to you. For many years this unity of life has made us one in fact*, but now we wish this unity to become *manifest unto the world*; and it is to *announce to you this marriage of our souls*, which is to us a reality before the foundation of the world, and which we can conceive of as having no ending, that we have asked you



to kindly come together tonight.' Miss Rand responded: 'This is the day and hour which we have chosen *to announce to you* and to the world our spiritual union, *which is a fact in the heart of God.*'"—L. D. A.

This took place the last Saturday in May, 1901. Following the above declarations, speeches were made by prominent Socialists. F. H. Wentworth said:

"There seems in the gathering of such a company *a hint of the dawning of the day when the spirit of freedom shall rule the world—freedom of the body and freedom of the soul.*"

Mr. Chas. Brodie Patterson said in part:

"God only joins those who love one another. If the love exists in the hearts of the two persons for one another, *then*, whom God hath joined together, no man can put asunder."

In the address of Richard LeGallienne is this declaration:

"All the friends of Mr. and Mrs. Herron love and will love them forever, and love them all the better because they have had the courage to stand up and say that they love each other, and *that love is all the marriage they need.*"

In Leonard Abbott's address he hopes that the Herron affair may:

"Make an ever greater devotion and completer consecration to the Socialist movement and the Socialist ideal."

Bolton Hall said in part:

"While we lead an advance in the world, we must put up with the snarling and the biting of the dogs."

In the concluding paragraph of "A Socialist Wedding" we read:

"The gathering broke up, and finally, as a sweet benediction, the bride herself took her seat at the piano and played to us for a while, pouring out her soul in the interpretation of one of Beethoven's greatest sonatas. And as she played *the memory of a ghoulish press of human vultures, of slave marriage, of cruel capitalism, was blotted out.* We saw only the vision of

*the new life of Socialism, when the love that made this union holy shall be the only basis of marriage, and when this love, stretching out, shall embrace the common life of the world."*

There, now, we have the idea of marriage under Socialism demonstrated. Could love be more free than that? Notwithstanding all this evidence Socialist speakers will deny that Socialism is a system of free love. Where will be the sanctity of the home under this system? We are to lose sight of monogamous marriage, and jealousy will cease to be. Is that man? It is even contrary to the very nature of intellectual manhood and womanhood, and yet, good brethren—ignorant, of course, of Socialism—will stand up and fight for this system. Even preachers will do so.

But, "*We of the inner circle of comradeship*" are going to do what? Give to the world an example of marriage under Socialism. There is no license issued by law. There is no ceremony. There is nothing legal in the whole procedure. It defies the law, and stings the very heart of society. There is nothing like it in all the annals of history.

Geo. D. Herron and Carrie Rand take up with each just as quails would mate out in the spring, except that the purpose and intent is to invade the home of other quails with no expectation of a scrap between either the hens or the roosters. Great God, maybe our state is too slack; maybe it is too free—when it permits such doctrine to be advocated and such books to be sent through the mail, and such people to run at large—a set of men and women who are poisoning the minds of the rising generation—who would even be odious under the nostrils of a follower of Brigham Young. Not only is this so with the whites, but it gives negro and white social equality, and Mr. Negro will have the same right with the whites, as you will see in the closing chapters.

## V. Socialism Borders on Anarchy.

That Socialism borders on anarchy no one can successfully deny. The only difference between Marx, the founder of Socialism, and Proudhon, the founder of anarchy, is really as to the source from whence their ideas came, and the value of production and its distribution. This can be seen from the following extracts:

“The fundamental difference between Marx and Proudhon, however, is as to the source of ideas, the question as to where we must look for an explanation of progress and for indications of the course of future developments.”

“Proudhon proposed to ‘constitute’ value of production. Socialism put all commodity of production at actual cost of production at the time it was produced.”—Vital Problems in Social Evolution, pp. 190, 191.

As I see it, the anarchy system is the more sensible way of carrying on commerce. Everything has always had and will always have a commercial value, based on supply and demand, and even though we have government ownership of all commodity of commerce and government distribution of the same, it would necessarily follow that the government would have to place a market value on the commodity at the time it is placed on the market—governed of course by supply and demand. This could not be under Socialism, for the reason that there is no profit and loss upon which to base a commercial valuation of production. That means that under Socialism there can be no profit in labor, neither is there any loss, for if one makes no man breaks. This is contrary to the Bible. Solomon says that “in all labor there is profit.”

## VI. It Proposes to Come Into Power by Force of Arms.

The fact that Socialism proposes to come into power by force of arms is another manifestation that it is a system of anarchy. Those who are accustomed to listening to their speakers (and



occasionally their papers come out on this point), naturally get the idea that they are for peace and opposed to war. But with the well informed on this line it is very evident that this is only a cry for "peace, peace, when there is no peace." They cry out against war when the United States is involved in war, while they themselves expect to come into power by force of arms, as is evident from the following:

"The Socialist philosophy has recognized long ago that this problem will never be solved by any application of the golden rule, but only by a class war."—Vital Problems in Social Evolution, p. 182.

"Now, my good friends, we Socialists simply claim that capital should be taken by the people from the capitalists and should be owned and used by the government in the interests of all the people."—God's Children, p. 70.

"The nationalization of land and capital, and the government employment of all labor, said government to regulate, control and superintend labor and manipulate the use of capital and decide the distribution of all wealth."—God's Children, p. 82.

"Go to them with words of peace, persuasion and reasoning, but if these methods be of no avail forget not that sacred spirit of revolt which has so often in the past crushed despotism and dethroned opposition."—Ibid, p. 85.

Could language be plainer? They do not expect to solve the problem of social economics by any application of the golden rule, and yet they claim Socialism as the world religion, and the only religion necessary. This gang of semi-anarchists, or wholly anarchists, as the case may be, propose to take the wealth from capitalists and use it as a common fund for free distribution amongst the masses—unless this wealth be turned over to them for the asking—which, of course, they know will not be done. This is worse than highway robbery—it is wholesale robbery. Indeed, it involves the whole nation in theft. No

man or nation can take that which does not belong to them and appropriate it—manipulate it to themselves—without violating God's law. But what do Socialists care for violating the law of God, when it is a system of infidelity?

### VII. It Is Opposed to Our Flag.

There is nothing more evident than that Socialism is opposed to the constitution of the United States—opposed to the flag—and therefore opposed to a republican form of government. It even calls the constitution a "Musty document written a long time ago."—*Vital Problems in Social Evolution*, p. 24.

"Capitalism is better served by a republican form of government than any other, and when any feudal nation adopts this mode of production, one of the first changes in the political superstructure which is seen to arise from that change in the economic base, is a change, or a series of changes, leading from absolute monarchy in the direction of republicanism."—*Vital Problems in Social Evolution*, p. 104.

Not one word of the above, under this head, will any leader of the Socialist party deny. They make no other claim than that they are opposed to our government from its very constitution up. If our government has produced wealth and capitalists, it is evidence of a good form of government. Any system of government that would keep all its subjects poor is as poor as its subjects. A nation cannot rise above the system of government under which its subjects live. The fact that the United States is the greatest nation in the world is evidence that we have the best system of government in the world. To apply the Socialist idea of free and equal distribution of wealth amongst the subjects of this government would involve our nation in poverty and place it at once in the power of other nations, and thus make our subjugation absolutely certain.

Under Socialism the Flag of Liberty—the Stars and Stripes—under which we have breathed the freedom of conscience, the

flag that today floats over the heads of millions of freeborn citizens, must be torn down and the red flag—the bloody flag—of Socialism take its place. Socialists are treasonists to this commonwealth, and but for the freedom of this government, promised in the constitution, they would be dealt with as such. All over the country they march through the streets of the towns and cities carrying their flag, apparently, if not boldly, daring and challenging this government. At my discussion with Stanley J. Clark, they raised their flag the first night and shouted and clapped their hands worse than a gang of Indians at a war dance. Who is behind this move that opposes our government? Is it our American born citizens? Not one of the leaders and promoters of this move is truly American. All of them are foreigners and Catholics—men who have always been against this government. Many of them are people who have been adopted as citizens—men who have sworn allegiance and loyalty to this government, the constitution and the flag. Benedict Arnold was never more a traitor to this government than the leaders of Socialism, and if they were dealt with by Uncle Sam, according to their conduct, he would give them a kick and send them back to the place of their nativity. The negro is much more loyal to this government than they. Our government is good enough. All we need is reform where reform is needed—loyalty to the flag and to the law is all the reform we need from a national standpoint. Hear the testimony of the so-called “Christian Socialist.”

“It proposes the utter destruction of the kingdoms of this world and the establishment of the Kingdom of God on the ruins thereof. (See Daniel, the Gospel and Revelation.) And it is through Socialism that these Bible prophecies are to be fulfilled.” C. S., December 1, 1910, p. 1.

Jack London, one of their best authorities, said in the Socialist Review, August, 1909:

“In the United States there are four hundred thousand men



who begin their letters 'Dear Comrade' and end them 'Yours for the revolution.' "

He says that in Germany there are 3,000,000; in France, 1,000,000; in Austria, 800,000; in Belgium, 300,000; in Italy, 250,000; in England, 100,000; in Switzerland, 100,000; in Denmark, 55,000; in Sweden, 50,000; in Holland, 40,000; in Spain, 30,000; all comrades who end their letters, "Yours for the revolution." Is this to be taken as meaningless? Does it mean that this vast army of "revolutionists" stands for peace—that they are advocates of "peace on earth and good will toward men?" But this quotation further states:

"These are numbers which dwarf the grand armies of Napoleon and Xerxes, but they are numbers not of maintenance of the established order, but of conquest and revolution. They compose, when the roll is called, seven million men who, in accordance with the condition of today, are fighting with all their might for the conquest of the wealth of the world and for the complete overthrow of existing society.

"Such an army of revolution, seven million strong, is a thing to make rulers and ruling class pause and consider. The cry of this army is 'No quarter! We want all that you possess! We will be content with nothing less than all that you possess! We want in our hands the reins of power and the destiny of mankind! We are going to take your governments, your palaces and everything away from you. Here are our hands! They are strong hands!' "—See his book.

Gabriel Deville, another Socialist in high standing, as authority, says:

"Before classes came into being there was no state; when classes shall cease to exist, there will be no state. This, then, is our object, the overthrow of the state."

Belfox Bax, another big gun, says:

"Socialism is essentially revolutionary, politically and eco-

nomically, as it aims at the complete overthrow of existing economical conditions."

H. N. Hinman declares:

"We do not claim to be men of peace; we are ready to resort to force if it will bring us to a better period more rapidly."

Victor Berger said in a speech at the national convention, 1908:

"I have heard it pledged many a time right in our own meetings by speakers in attendance that the only salvation for the proletariat of America is direct action, that the ballot box is simply a humbug. Now I don't know how this question is going to be solved. I have no doubt that in the last analysis we must shoot, and when it comes to shooting, Wisconsin will be there. We always make good."

Eugene V. Debs, the standing candidate for the presidency, said in a speech in St. Louis, August, 1907:

"The time will come to incite the populace. In the very near future there will be an uprising of the people. Congress will be dispersed and the Supreme Court abolished. When that time comes you can count upon me. I will be ready to shed the last drop of my blood."

In his "Life Writings and Speeches" we read:

"When the revolution comes we will be prepared to take possession and assume control."—Page 443.

In a speech seconding the nomination of Debs for the presidency on the Socialist ticket, John Spargo acclaimed him in 1908: "The personification of the revolt of the working class in this country."

These quotations are from the Christian Socialist, December 1, 1910. They are too plain to need any comment. That the Socialist party are deeply tinctured with anarchy; that they are opposed to the flag; that they are a set or party of revolutionists; that they are treasonists to this commonwealth, there is not the least shadow of doubt with those who can

understand plain language. Are we going to continue in silence, and never raise our voices against such capital evil? Talk about the "fool people;" we are fools, and blind, and deaf, if we can not see that Socialism proposes to tear down the home, the government, and the religion of Jesus Christ.

### VIII. It Is Wrong in the Very Nature of Things.

Karl Marx, in a note, p. 205, of his book, translated by E. Untermann, has the following to say on the origin of capital:

"In the first stone which he (the savage) flings at the wild animal he pursues, is the stick which he seized to strike down the fruit which hangs above his reach, we see the appropriation of one article for the purpose of aiding in the acquisition of another, and thus discover the original of capital."

This is from an Essay on the Production of Wealth, by R. Torrens. If this stick, with which the savage knocks down the fruit to satisfy his hunger is his "capital," as Marx and Torrens claim, and if "capitalism" is wrong within itself; then these savages did wrong in using these sticks to knock down the fruit. Who believes such a position is true? This argument of Marx demonstrates the fact that "capitalism" is not within itself wrong, but that the wrong comes from the bad use of capital. If the savage should use his stick—capital—to knock down his neighbor, in so doing he invests his capital wrong, and therefore it becomes a sin to him.

Later on the savage invents the crude instruments with which to slay the wild beast for food. Was that injurious to society, so long as he used them for that purpose? No, but when he began to use them as war implements, with which he slew his neighbor, his "capital" became an injury to society. When the ax was invented to chop wood, with which to make a fire, it was no injury to society so long as it was used for that purpose. But when it was used to slay the



neighbor, such use became injurious to society. Just so with all inventions, which Marx calls "capital."

The invention of the cotton factory, and all other modern inventions for the purpose of manufacturing different articles for the convenience and betterment of humanity is "capital," and is all right if used for that purpose. But when they are used to plunder society, that is the bad use of "capital," and it becomes a sin. The same is true of money and everything. Therefore, according to Marx's stick argument, capitalism within itself is not a sin, but the sin is in the bad use of capital.

Socialists have a great deal to say about "surplus value." Marx is champion of this doctrine. Is there such a thing as "surplus value?" Only in the brain of Socialists. You had just as well talk about surplus water in the Molten Sea, when it is full, or the surplus value in an exact bushel of corn. The value of an article is like an endless chain, or an exact circle, that is complete within itself. Value may be large or small, just as a circle may be large or small.

Karl Marx took for his main argument the production of a cotton mill. I will use an every-day illustration that everybody can comprehend: I know two men who were raised orphans. At the age of 21 years they began to work for themselves. They purchased a farm from their former guardian and began to work for him at 25 cents per day and their board, and worked until each of them paid for his farm. Both of them are now living and own a number of good farms and are quite wealthy. All this was made on the farm, and they have a number of renters. What is all this wealth? Is it not their congealed labor—their capital?

Now, suppose, a negro comes to one of them and wants to rent a farm, is it right to charge him rent? If yes, what is this rent? Is it not interest-profit—on the "capital"—the congealed labor of the landlord? If yes, then, is it not "sur-

plus value?" But this landlord wants this same negro to work a day for him. Would it not be as reasonable to ask the negro to work for him—use his labor—which is his capital—without a reasonable compensation, as it would be to ask the landlord to rent him his farm, which is congealed labor—his capital—without a reasonable compensation? You know it is right. Therefore, Socialism is wrong in the very nature of things.

Next comes the engineer. Success in every department of life depends largely on the boss. Socialism says we must be free. We need no boss. Remove the head of the faculty and what becomes of the school? Remove the officials of the railways and there will be a wreck between every station. Remove the manager of the factory and the whole thing is thrown out of commission. Just a change in managers sometimes results in bankruptcy. The big store sells out, and the management changes and bankruptcy often follows. Again, a business may be failing, and a change in management brings success. The farm must have its manager. The church must have its managers. God selected Moses as leader of the children of Israel. He selected Joshua as his successor, and then the judges, and then the king; and yet, Socialism will tell us that we need no manager—boss—we must be absolutely free, that each individual may work out his or her own problems—hampered by no bossism. Will we have no bosses under Socialism? If yes, what becomes of your doctrine? If no, is it not contrary to the very nature of things?

But the factory or the mine is owned by individuals. There is a lot of money invested, besides the promoters—engineers. Shall they not be compensated for this investment, and the skill of management? The difference between the value of the manufactured article and its commercial value is, what? Socialism says that it is "surplus value." Not so. It is interest on the investment and compensation for management.

This money invested in the concern and the skill of management is their capital. It is their congealed labor used in conjunction with their personal labor and ingenuity. Shall they not be compensated for this? Is it any more a sin than for the hired laborer to demand a reasonable wage for his "capital"—his labor? Suppose the laborer is paid two dollars per day for his labor, but he can support his family, paying rent, grocery bills, house rent, and other incidental expenses for one dollar per day. What is this other dollar? Is it "surplus value?" You know it is not. It is interest on his capital—his labor. If he uses this extra dollar right, does it injure society? No. But suppose he uses it to get drunk on or to hire lewd women. In this event his "capital" becomes an injury to society, and therefore becomes a sin. Therefore, we establish the fact that the only sin of "capitalism" is in the bad use of capital, and Socialism is wrong in the very nature of things.

Now note the following points which fairly represent Socialism:

1. It proposes to unite both church and state, for the reason that it teaches that Socialism is the only religion and the only politics that we need—that it is the religion of Jesus Christ in effect. The kingdoms of this world and the kingdom of Jesus Christ are two distinct institutions, and therefore Socialism is wrong in the very nature of things. This doctrine is Romanism and is a backward step to the Dark Ages.

2. It proposes to correct all the evils of society, but offers no remedy—not one statutory law. It would be foolishness for the physician to diagnose the patient's case and tell him how near death's door he is and refuse to give a remedy for his disease. Regeneration of the life of men is the only thing that will correct the evils of society. That we state the facts, I will quote the proposition affirmed by Stanley J. Slark, state speaker for the Socialists of Oklahoma, and W. S. Noble, state



organizer and speaker of Texas, and J. W. Thompson, whom, I understand, is state organizer of Arkansas. Here it is:

Resolved, That Socialism is right, and is therefore the remedy for all evils of society.

I debated this proposition with all these men. They are the representatives of Socialism in the three states in which they live and in which these discussions were held. Do they know their doctrine? Does this not prove that Socialism is wrong in the very nature of things?

3. It blindly supposes that every law is in favor of the rich and opposed to the poor, which is absolutely wrong and superstitious. The laws are made for the protection of the righteous and the punishment of the evil-doers (Rom. 13). Hence, wrong in the very nature of things.

4. It makes men and women absolutely equal, while the Bible says that the woman should be treated as the weaker vessel, which means that she should be dealt with more tenderly and with greater care than man. Hence, it is wrong on this point, as on others.

5. Socialism can dictate just how many children each family must have and these children are the property of the government.

"Let us frankly say that economic equality must inevitably work great changes in our form of marriage—that it will automatically abolish religious superstition—and that children will no longer be left to the care of incompetent parents, but will be recognized as belonging to the state. This for the children's good and for the public good."—Industrial Democrat, Sept. 24, 1910, the organ of the Socialists of Oklahoma.

Could language be plainer? Is this not wrong in the very nature of things?

6. It robs the nation of its wealth, which is the natural result of hundreds of years hard labor and study. Why? Because Socialism is a destructive and reconstructive system—a

reverting back to the ancient system of Tribal Commune, and hence the wealth will be wasted in the idle masses, and our great institutions will be wasted away. Hence it is contrary to natural progress, and is therefore wrong in the very nature of things.

7. That God never suggested such a system of economics is evident from Bible history, and for this reason it is wrong in the very nature of things. It is out of harmony with God's dealings with the people under the judges, and under the kings, and it is therefore wrong.

God has always had laws to restrain evil. He never once supposed that all men would do right, and would therefore need no laws for the protection of the righteous and punishment for the unrighteous, as Socialism blindly supposes he will do under their system. The very presence of God did not restrain the Jews from sin in the wilderness. The Socialist Millenium will never come as long as man is human.

### **IX. God Intended That His People Should Be Capitalists.**

If God intended that man should use his tools, and if the stick which the savage uses, according to Karl Marx, is his capital, then God intended that his people should all be capitalists. That this is true is further proven from the following facts:

1. Adam and Eve were capitalists. God placed them in Eden and gave them free access to everything except the tree of knowledge of good and evil, which belonged to the Devil. But the Devil was a Socialist and he insisted on Adam and Eve dividing the inheritance—having all things common—they at once joined his party, and wrought havoc in all the nation. God forbids us taking that which belongs to others and appropriating it to ourselves, and when we do our eyes will be opened to our own nakedness and shame.

2. Job was a capitalist—the richest man of the East—Job,

1, and this same Socialist Devil took his property by force and divided it out among the people, and then cursed Job with carbuncles from one end to the other. Socialists would do the same thing for the rich today if they had the power in their hands. But God gave Job double the property that he had before because of his faithfulness. If it is a sin to be rich, why did God give to Job this great wealth? He was the Rockefeller of his age.

3. Abraham was rich, and God endorsed it. God gave him this great wealth. If it is a sin to be rich, why did the Lord do that?

4. Solomon was the richest man that had ever lived, or that should ever live after him, in fulfillment of God's promise to him. 1 Kings, 3:13. Did the Lord do the wrong thing? God made him the capitalist of his age, and Socialism says that it is a sin, to be a capitalist, and that the power that makes capitalism possible is a sinful power. Therefore, we are forced to the conclusion, if Socialism be true, that God is a sinner. The wrong is not in being rich, but the sin consists in the bad use of riches. Solomon's annual income from one source was \$3,996,000, and more than that from other sources. He had 1,400 chariots and 40,000 horsemen. He had 300 pounds of gold in his houses of Lebannon. He was thirteen years in building his own houses. The temple alone was worth more than one billion dollars. He made silver in Jerusalem as plentiful as the stones. Truly, he was exceedingly rich, and God was the direct cause of it. God wants his people to have wealth and has demonstrated the fact in every

#### **X. Communion of Nations Is Condemned of the Lord.**

1. At the tower of Babel the people were of one language and co-operated together, and God confounded their language and scattered them into all parts of the earth. Gen. 11:1-10.

2. When the Jews entered the promised land God gave to



each tribe a certain territory, and each individual family the right to own and control his own property. Joshua and Judges.

3. Abraham and Lot had tried the commune system before, and it had proven a failure and they separated, each owning his own land and personal property. Hence the Jews had learned from their forefathers that this system was a failure, and refused to try it in the land of Canaan.

### **XI. Socialists Are a Set of Calamity Howlers and Complainers.**

The calamity howl is raised and kept up by the leaders of Socialism, and as a result the people are in a state of discontentment, and all the poverty and misery that is brought on is laid directly to the government. They imagine that we are going to be starved to death; that we will be sold as servants to the rich, unless the reins of government are soon placed in the hands of the Socialists. John the Baptist commanded the soldiers to "be content with their wages." Luke 3:1. Paul said, "I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content." Phil. 4:11. Again, "Godliness with contentment is great gain. \* \* \* Having food and raiment, let us be therewith content." 1 Tim. 6:6-8. Again, "Let your conversation be without covetousness, and be content with such things as ye have, for he hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." Heb. 13:5. Again, "Do all things without murmuring." Phil. 2:14. Once more, "Neither murmur as some of them also murmured and were destroyed of the destroyer." 1 Cor. 10:10.

You cannot find a single Socialist in all the land who does not violate every injunction in the above. It was on account of the fact that many of the Jews thought they were going to starve to death in the wilderness that caused them to raise the calamity howl against Moses and Aaron, and become discontented and to revolt against their leaders, and God de-

stroyed them. This, the apostle Paul tells us, was written for our examples. When a nation of people becomes dissatisfied there is going to come a change either for the better or for the worse, and as a rule it has been for the worse. Under the Judges God gave the Jews a good system of government, but they became dissatisfied and demanded a king, and God gave them a king in his anger and told them the result that would follow their foolish demands.

## **XII. They Curse Our Rulers in Open Violation of God's Law.**

It is a common thing to hear Socialists cursing the rulers of our land. This is wrong. God has always condemned it. The Lord said to the Jews: "Thou shalt not revile the gods nor curse the rulers of thy people." Ex. 22:28. Peter says of this class of people: "They are chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lusts of uncleanness, and despise governments," and then adds: "Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities." 2 Pet. 2:10; Jude 8. In verse 14 Peter says they are covetous, and then calls them "cursed children, who have forsaken the right way." When Paul spoke evil of the high priest he apologized and said that he did not know that he was the high priest, for it is written: "Thou shalt not speak evil of the rulers of thy people." Acts 23:5. Can we, as Christians, violate these plain commands of God and go uncondemned? If not, we cannot oppose our laws, our rulers, and our government, and join the Socialist party, which seeks to undermine the rulers and the government, and go stock free in the sight of heaven. We should not forget the lesson of Paul that "Godliness with contentment is great gain," and "Having food and raiment, let us be therewith content."

## **XIII. They Are Wrong in That They Curse the Rich.**

It seems that Socialists think that they are not serving their party to any advantage unless they curse such men as Rocke-

feller, Carnegie, Morgan and others. This is a sin in the sight of God. Christians can not afford to do that. But here I may also state that the Socialists are not the only folks who are guilty of such high-handed sins against the plain precepts of God, as cursing kings and those who have gained wealth in this world. It is just as wrong for Democrats or Republicans or Populists as it is for Socialists. A thing is not wrong simply because it is done by a Socialist, but it is wrong because it is a violation of the spirit of Christianity. But that it is wrong to curse the rich we only have to cite you to the following: "Curse not the king, no, not in thy thoughts; and curse not the rich in thy bedchamber." Ecc. 10:20. Rockefeller is the chief text of every Socialist speaker. They try to make it appear that he is robbing the poor. While it may be that he is not a Christian in the exclusive sense of that term, yet I feel that I am safe in saying that he is very far beyond the leaders of Socialism, whom we have shown are a set of infidels and materialists. Furthermore, he has done more in the development of this country than the whole Socialist gang from its foundation to the present time. Not only so, but I believe that I would be safe in saying that he has done more—contributed more—to the poor of this country than the whole Socialist party. Again, I believe that it is safe to say that he has given more to the suffering and starving in China than every Socialist put together in the United States. You may claim that he has stolen this from the public, and is therefore only paying a public debt. Not so, Rockefeller does not make as great a per cent on the dollar invested as Wayland does on the Appeal to Reason, as will be seen later on. The oil industry has developed great things on the earth and under the earth. The railway companies, the manufacturers, in every department, have been great public benefactors in the advancement of education, civilization, and



I would not be willing to go back and live in the age before such development. Would you?

#### **XIV. They Fight Against God in Resisting the Rulers.**

The prophet of God said that "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." God is going to direct civil governments and overrule everything to his glory. This right he has always reserved to himself, and we can no more change civil governments than we can change the seasons that come and go, unless it is in keeping with the purposes of God. When God gives us a good government and we oppose it, in doing so we fight against God. The Lord said:

"By me kings reign, and princes decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." Prov. 8:15, 16.

"And he changeth the times and the seasons: he removeth kings, and setteth up kings." Dan. 2:21.

"This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones: to the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdoms of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men." Dan. 4:17, 25, 32.

"The powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever resisteth, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." Rom. 13:1.

This language is too plain to need any comment. It is evident that God sets up kings and removes them; that the powers that be are ordained of God, and that in resisting the rulers we fight against God, and therefore bring to ourselves damnation.

#### **XV. Our Relation to Civil Government Is Subjective.**

God has so clearly revealed to us our relationship to civil governments that there can be no mistake in regard to this

question. God never intended for his children—Christians—to rule in the kingdoms of men. The kingdoms of this world and the kingdom of Christ are two distinct institutions. Christianity and politics will no more mix than oil and water will mix. I speak of the subjects of Christ's kingdom, and not the power that governs the subjects, for the same power rules both kingdoms. But the subjects of Christ's spiritual kingdom are subject to the governments—the powers that be. Christ's kingdom is composed of Christians, while human governments are composed of the world, and the relation of Christ's kingdom to human governments is wholly subjective, as will be seen from the following scriptures:

"The man that will not hearken unto the priests, or unto the judges shall die." Deut. 16:12.

"Whosoever will not hearken unto thy words shall be put to death." Josh. 1:18.

"Whosoever will not do the law of God and of the king, let judgment be executed speedily unto him, whether it be unto death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of goods, or to imprisonment." Ezra 7:26.

"Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work. To speak evil of no man." Tit. 3:1, 2.

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to kings, as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them who are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well." 1 Pet. 2:13, 14.

"For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou not then be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon

him that doeth evil, wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." Rom. 13:3-7.

The proof on this point is overwhelming. God has instructed us fully as to our relations to the powers that be. They are not a curse to Christianity. The law was not made to punish the truly Christian, but the lawless and disobedient; for the protection of the righteous, and we must submit to them; we must pay our tax, and in this way we support civil governments and they promise us protection in the worship of God.

### Syllogisms.

1. The powers that be are ordained of God. Rom. 13:1-8.
2. Socialists are against the powers that be.
3. Therefore Socialists are wrong.

- (a) Socialists are against the powers that be.
- (b) The powers that be are ordained of God.
- (c) Therefore Socialists are against an ordinance of God.

1. It is wrong to curse the rich. Ecc. 10:20.
2. Socialists do curse the rich.
3. Therefore Socialists are wrong.

### XVI. Private Ownership.

Socialism is wrong in its contention for public ownership of land, personal property, etc. God laid down the principle of private ownership in the Garden of Eden when he gave man the Garden as his home, and gave him full control over everything. Abraham owned both land and personal property, so did Lot. Job owned a very great husbandry—a great deal of land. David owned land. He bought the place on which the temple was built from Onen for a certain sum of money.



Solomon owned lands and vineyards. Jesus slapped the Socialist idea of dividing property square in the face in the following language:

"One of the company said unto him, Master, speak unto my brother that he divide the inheritance with me. And he said, Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" Luke 12:13-16.

Socialism assumes to be the true religion of Jesus Christ, and yet it assumes to do a thing Christ refused to do—divide the inheritance. In the same chapter private ownership is set forth in these words:

"The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully, and he thought within himself, what shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, this will I do; I will pull down my barns and will build greater; and there will I bestow my fruits and goods." Luke 12:16-19.

Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-10) owned their property, as well as many others of the disciples who sold their possessions and laid them at the apostle's feet. God did not condemn Ananias and his wife for owning the property, but for lying to God. This case teaches that the property belonged to them until they made up their minds to sell it and give it to the Lord. When they did this, and sold it for that purpose, it was no longer theirs, but it was the Lord's, and they appropriated a part of the Lord's money to their own use and benefit, and then lied about it, and for this God condemned them. God did not demand that they sell this property, but they purposed in their own hearts to sell it and give it to the Lord. They were Socialists and wanted to divide the money. Solomon says:

"A good man leaveth an inheritance to his children's children." Prov. 13:22.

"Wisdom is good with an inheritance, and by it there is

profit to them that see the sun. For wisdom is a defense, and money is a defense. Ecc. 7:11, 12.

How could one lay up an inheritance for his children's children under Socialism? Solomon says that a good man lays up wealth. Socialism says nothing but sinners lay up for their children's children. Therefore Socialism is wrong on this point.

Socialists try to dupe the farmer into believing that he can own his farm under Socialism, and many farmers have accepted the theory of this gang of destructives. They use the term "collective" ownership in order to cover up the truth, and catch a few suckers amongst the honest farmers, who have labored and saved up enough to own their farm. "Collectivism" is another term for government ownership. If land is "collectively" owned, it is not privately owned, and hence the farmer is just a government renter under Socialism. There is a large section of Eastern Oklahoma that is owned by the government—the segregated section—on which there are poor log shanties, which were built by the first settlers of the country, and the people are powerless to get the government to erect better houses. They rent the land from the government at so much per acre cash rent, and the cash must come, sink or swim, and they must be content with these log shanties, cold or hot. That is a sample of government ownership of land. If the whole people own the land in common it does not belong to anybody in particular, and what does the whole mass of people care for the kind of house you live in, if you are renting from all the people? "What is everybody's business is nobody's business," is true. Why should you think that renting from the government is any better than renting from private parties?

We have privileges under private ownership that we could not hope for under government ownership. The government runs the postoffice business, but you use a post stamp that has

been used, and see what becomes of you. We can go out on a railroad and pick up a hammer or a spike, or any other tool, and use it and return it to the section boss, and it is all right. But suppose the government owns the railroads, and you do a thing like that, what will become of you? Under the system, we would have to have a Federal court in every precinct in each county, and a standing army at every county seat, in order to keep the government's business straight. Socialists are kicking and cursing the Federal courts now, and what would they do under their system? You must assume, as Socialists do, that everybody will do right under Socialism. This is an assumption beyond reason and common sense.

"Collectiveism" is "communism." Who believes that a "commune" six miles square with collective ownership will live in peace? It is an old saying that "One house is too small for two families." That is true. Even the father's family and the son's family can not get along together under the same roof, even where everything is held in common. That is why the son when he marries must get out and scratch for himself on a different place, or in a different house. Even the best of neighbors will fall out over the ownership of a hen. I sat on a jury once in a case like that, where the law suit was over the ownership of a hen. That is the only case that I have ever sat in as jurymen in court. The decision was rendered right; and yet, we made an enemy out of the plaintiff. For the "commune" system to be anything like satisfactory we would have to have nothing but a wig-wam, and plenty of game and good hunting ground like the wild tribes of the Indians. Even then, one tribe—commune—would fall out with another, and had to settle it in wars with each other. But that is what Socialism proposes to return to—tribal communism.

**"Can't All Own a Home Under Capitalism."**

That is an assumption. The land is not monopolized and



can not be. In industrial Texas our cultivated area is 30,000,000 acres, while our uncultivated area is 137,865,000 acres, as shown by a pamphlet put out by the Commercial Club of Fort Worth. Then you tell me that "land is monopolized." This cultivated area produced \$561,339,000. The gross income of the state was \$1,302,505,000, divided as follows: Agriculture, \$561,339,000; manufacturing, \$124,600,000; mining, \$16,556,000; increase in property and property values, \$600,000,000. This is an increase in wealth of \$325 per capita per annum. Our increase per day is \$3,600,000, \$150,000 per hour, \$2,500 per minute, or \$41 per second. Out of the uncultivated area there is but 2,118,000 acres of water surface.

With these figures before us, what is to hinder every family owning a farm? Look at New Mexico and many other states with their millions of acres of land subject to homestead, where 160 acres of land can be had from the government for about \$14—the homestead fee. Then, why the poverty and want of the cities? The answer is that there is a lot of Socialist inclined people who prefer to remain in the city and hunt work. They could get out in the farm districts and work on the farm, or homestead a farm of their own and stop this cry of suffering. It is a well known fact that farm hands have been at a premium for several years. You can scarcely get a negro to work at any price. I have had trouble at the various parts of the state where I have lived in getting a negro to do a washing. This trouble exists in the home and on the farm right in Tyler, and Smith county, where the negro population is almost equal to that of the whites. If these poor people in New York and Chicago and other cities would get out into the country and dig, as God ordained, they would not suffer.

Who are the Socialists, and where do they stay? Are they the farmers of this country? Are they the men who till the soil and go through the hardships of life? No; they—three-

fourths of them—are confined to the cities and those of them who work are in the mines and manufacturing districts. If their wages do not suit them, why don't they get out and settle on a farm and raise their own hog and hominy and be independent? There are many Socialists in Pottawatomie county, Oklahoma, in and around the city of Shawnee. A brother, who lives in the city and who has made all his wealth farming, said to me in the presence of some Socialists, that he had made all his wealth on a farm and that he could buy every Socialist in the county. In fact, most of the Socialists are foreigners, who come to this country and begin to curse the government before they get the foreign twist out of their tongues. They are the people who carry the red flag, in open defiance to our laws. You see whom you are tied up with.

#### **XVII. They Are Wrong on the Labor Question.**

The "Communist Manifesto" is the creed of Socialism, which was published 1848 by Marx and Engels, who are the highest authorities on the labor question. The first article says:

"The exchange value of commodities depends upon the amount of socially necessary labor time required to produce them."

"If we will stop and make a few simple comparisons with every-day affairs it will prove the untruth of this labor article of Socialist faith. Let us see: Here are two ten-acre fields side by side, and one man puts his field in cotton and the other plants his in corn. The land is exactly the same, and they spend exactly the same amount of labor in making the crop. You want to buy both crops, would you give as much of the ten acres of corn as you would for the ten acres of cotton? Do they have the same value? No. Then the necessary labor-time does not govern the social value.

It is evident that there are thousands of acres of land in

Texas that will not produce on an average, thirty bushels of corn per acre, with a certain amount of labor, but the same land with the same amount of labor will produce a bale of cotton per acre, which if sold in the seed will bring sixty dollars, while the corn raised on the same acre at one dollar per bushel would only bring thirty dollars. So, what becomes of the Socialist's idea of labor?

Again: Here is a farm of one hundred acres in the river bottom, rich and fertile; joining it, on the hillside, is a farm belonging to his neighbor, of the same amount of land. They begin at the same time in the spring and plant the same amount of corn, cotton and other marketable cereals and spend the same amount of labor in making, gathering and marketing the crops. It turns out in the end that the man with the rich farm has made twice as much as the man with the poor farm. Hence the Marxine theory of value won't hold shucks.

In fact, the labor-time and cost of making a bale of cotton or a hundred bushels of corn varies from state to state and from section to section. The northern states will produce twice as much corn per acre with the same amount of labor and expense as the south, but does that change the social value of the corn? The same is true of wheat and other stuff. Not only so, but the crops will vary the same way in the same state and in the same county and in the same locality, and yet the social value of production remains the same.

Not only that, but the rainfall has much to do with the amount produced with the same labor-time. At times, even in the same county, the rainfall is local. Some sections get a good rain at the right time and produce a good crop, while their neighbor is burned out, and yet they all do about the same amount of labor in producing their crop, and those in the dry section do not produce half as much with the same labor of their neighbor. But does that change the social value



of their production? Will cotton be bulled up for the dry section man? No; he must be satisfied with the market price.

The same is true in manufacturing articles which have a social value. It requires as much labor-time to manufacture a silver watch as it does a gold watch, but do they have the same social value? One coal mine will produce twice as much as another with the same labor, but does that change the market value of coal?

On the pearl streams in Arkansas I have known pearl hunters to work for a year or more and not find more than enough pearls to pay their expenses, while their neighbor would find one in one hour that sold for as much as \$3,000, but did that change the social value of pearls? I worked a week and found nothing. A boy went down to the river and picked up a mussel and broke it open, and in it found a pearl that brought \$4,000. You may call this luck, but it is the production of labor.

It is an evident fact, returning to the cotton question, that a certain grade of cotton is quoted at the same price all over the country, with a total disregard for the amount of labor-time in producing it. Hence the Marxine theory of value is child's play.

### **The Bible on Labor Question.**

The Socialist idea of labor is that four to six hours per day is all that will be required to make a support under Socialism, and that the rest of the day can be spent in reading up on Socialism—informing yourself, of course, on Socialist economics, and I suppose, the possibility of evolving into human gods, for man is the only god of Socialism, as we have proven. This, also, contradicts the very purpose of God in the beginning. God divided the day from the night and gave us the day in which to labor. Hence he says:

“Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work.” Ex, 20:9. And again:

"In the morning sow thy seed and in the evening withhold not thy hand." Ecc. 9:6.

"Seest thou a man diligent in business, he shall stand before kings." Prov. 22:29.

"He that is slothful in his work is brother to him that is a great waster." Prov. 18:9. "An idle soul shall suffer hunger." Prov. 19:15.

"Go to the ant, thou sluggard, consider her ways and be wise; which having no guide, overseer, or ruler, provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest." Prov. 6:6-9.

We learn from these passages that God intended that we shall work six days, not six hours each day; that we are to work both morning and evening; that we are to be diligent in our business, and that we should profit by the ant, which works all day, and lays up its food preparatory to the time when it cannot work. Take the nation over, in all its agriculture, manufacturing and commercial enterprises and four to six hours per day will not make a support for the nation, even though the successful divide up with the unfortunate. Pestilence and calamities of various sorts will come under Socialism as well as under the present system, and these emergencies must be met, and that we may be able to do so, God has required us to labor six days in the week, and Socialism is again wrong from a Bible standpoint.

### XVIII. Profit in Labor.

Socialism claims that no one should make a profit on his labor; that he should have all he produces, but no profit in his production. In this I wish to enlarge on our fifth chapter. That the Bible recognized profit is unquestionably true. Socialists themselves being witnesses, no man can become wealthy without profit in his production. This being admitted, Abraham, David, Solomon, nor any one else could have

gotten rich except under a system with profit. God originated the systems under which these men and others of their day became rich, and therefore it is right; unless it can be proven that God did wrong. When Christ said that it was as difficult for a rich man to be saved as it was for a camel to go through the eye of a needle—needle's eye—he did not teach the impossibility of the rich being saved, but the difficulty of their being saved. He referred to a place in Palestine called Needle's Eye, through which it was difficult for a camel to pass, and not to our common needle, used in sewing. Luke uses the expression, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter the kingdom of heaven." We only have enough of Christ's language on record to get the lesson before us, and much that he said about those things are not on record. If the Socialist idea be correct, then Abraham, Job, David, Solomon and all the kings were lost. But Lydia, of Thyatira, was a seller of purple (Acts 16:14), and she was a worshiper of God. She could not have sold goods without profit. She was not condemned for her method of doing business. Solomon says:

"In all labor there is profit; but the talk of the lips tend to poverty." Prov. 14:23.

Again he says that "The hand of the diligent shall make rich." Prov. 10:4.

This proves God's endorsement of profit through labor, and that he has so fixed it in this life that those who are diligent in business will become rich. There has never been a sensible government under which some did not become rich and others poor. The Lord said:

"For the poor shall never cease out of the land: therefore I command you, saying, Thou shalt open thy hands wide unto thy brother, to thy poor and to thy needy." Deut. 15:11.

Socialists say that there will be no poor and rich under its system; that all will be alike, on an equality, in point of



wealth; but Jesus says: "The poor ye have always with you." Matt. 26:11. Either the Lord is wrong or else the Socialists are wrong. The main reason why there are so many poor people in the world is because they do not use their wealth—that which they produce—judiciously. When God cursed the ground for man's sake, he ordained that in the sweat of man's face he should eat bread all the days of his life—this, of course, being contingent on his judicious use of that which he produced.

To cut out the system of profit on production, it will be necessary for every man to handle his own production in a way that it cannot pass through the hands of another; for if it passes through the hands of another, it will be necessary for him to make a profit on it in order that he may have a profit on his production. Therefore, the full principles of Socialism put into practical use would stop railroads, steamboats, steamships and, in fact, it would lock every wheel in the commercial and industrial world. There could be no preachers, lawyers, doctors, dentists, etc., for the very reason that none of this class of humanity produce anything and, under Socialism, every man and woman must produce something, and since the preacher and the lawyer produce nothing but wind and fuss, that is all they can have, and that since the doctor produces nothing but pills or their equivalent, it follows that that is all he can have under Socialism, and since the engineer produces nothing but steam, that is all he can have under this wonderful system of economies.

### Syllogisms.

1. God says that in all labor there is profit. Prov. 14:23.
2. Socialism says there shall be no profit in labor.
3. Therefore Socialism is wrong.

**XIX. Socialists Are Idolaters.**

I mean by this term that Socialism is a system of idolatry. That it breaks the tenth command in the Decalogue, there is no question. They covet that which belongs to others and propose to take it by force, and Paul says that covetousness is idolatry. Col. 3:5. The tenth command says:

“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife, nor his man servants, nor his maid servants, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor’s.” Ex. 20:17.

This passage lays the ax at the very root of the Socialist tree, and lays it flat on the ground. It strikes at its very foundation and undermines one of its main foundation stones. If it does not covet the property of others it ceases to be Socialism. It is indeed, seeking the wealth of others, that it may appropriate it to itself. It seeks to take the fields and the general wealth of the rich from them, and God has pronounced a woe upon such covetousness. They even propose to take it by force in open violation of God’s law. Hear the prophet: “Woe unto them that covet fields and take them by violence.” Micah. 2:1, 2. It seems that God looked down through the ages and saw this sin of Socialism. Can a Christian afford to be mixed up with such a system? Can you afford to worship at the feet of this idol of modern times? This is a high-handed sin against light and knowledge, and you will not be excused at the judgment if you continue in this idolatrous practice. We can only glorify God through the church (Eph. 3:21), and for this reason we must come out from amongst such a set of idolatrous infidels and materialists.

**Syllogisms.**

1. It is a sin to covet that which belongs to others. Ex. 20:17.

2. Socialists covet the wealth of others.
3. Therefore Socialists are sinners.

1. Covetousness is idolatry. Col. 3:5.
2. Socialists are covetous.
3. Therefore Socialists are idolaters.

1. It is a sin to take the land of others by violence. Micah 2:1, 2.
2. Socialism proposes to take the land by violence.
3. Therefore Socialists are sinners.

1. Christians can only glorify God through the church. Eph. 3:21.
2. Socialism is not the church.
3. Therefore Christians can not glorify God through Socialism.

Brother, can you answer these arguments? If you can, you can do more than Stanley J. Clark could do, for he would not tamper with them. He spent his time dealing with other matter.

## XX. Master and Servant.

Socialists have a great deal to say about master and servant. That it is best to be free there is no question. But if we are servants of the capitalists, as Socialism claims, we, as Christians, cannot afford to be continuously complaining and speaking evil against our masters. Our relationship as master and servant is clearly marked out in the Bible. Furthermore, God has ordained that a certain class shall always be servants of other classes. Back of capitalism, is the decree of God, and therefore we are not servants as a direct result of capitalism. Capitalism may be a secondary cause, but directly sin is the cause of servitude. If another employs me to do work for him I become his servant. We get our wealth, or our mere



living, as the case might be, as a result of working for another. Therefore, the capitalists themselves are serving some one, otherwise they could not gain wealth. There can be no practical system of government in which there can be absolute equality, and at the same time allow each one to use his own brain as he sees best to use it (and this Socialism admits should be); for some men have more natural ability than others to make money and get along in the world. Some men have not sense enough—financial ability—to make a success in the world. That class sees best to spend their money in riotous living like the prodigal son, and it will be necessary, in order for that class to succeed, to have a guardian appointed to look after their financial affairs. This would make them servants, which is contrary to Socialism.

Then, there is another class of men in the world who will not succeed because they belong to the trifling, lazy, don't care class of men. For this class to be equal with the energetic go-ahead class, it will be necessary for them to have a master to push them out and compel them to work and strive for success equal with the energetic, and this would be master and slave again, which is contrary to Socialism. There could not be equality and freedom unless all were talented alike and all had the same energy to get up and go. Therefore it will be necessary for Socialism to change the nature, or natural proclivities of man in order for their system to succeed. This being beyond the power of man, it follows that there must always be master and servant.

It is neither wrong to have servants nor to serve. Abraham, the father of the faithful, had servants; Job, David, Solomon and hundreds of others had servants. There were servants in the days of the Savior and he did not condemn either master or servant. There were servants in the days of the apostles and they neither condemned the one nor the other. Let us hear the Bible:

"The king's favor is toward a wise servant." Prov. 14:35.  
"He that waiteth on his master shall be honored." Prov. 27:18.

"Art thou called being a servant, care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. He that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman." 1 Cor. 7:21, 22.

"Servants be obedient unto them that are your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will, doing service as unto the Lord, and not unto men." Eph. 6:5.

"Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their masters worthy of double honor; that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." Tit. 2:9, 10.

"Servants be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the forward." 1 Pet. 2:19.

The above scriptures are plain and convincing. We are not to care for it in case we become Christians while in servitude, but if we are granted our liberty it is better. We are to obey our masters, not only those who treat us right, but those who do not treat us right, and we should not complain, as will be seen from the following:

"Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God." Col. 3:22.

Can Christians, granting for argument's sake that they are servants, disobey all these plain injunctions, and please God? If so, there is none of God's commands that cannot be disobeyed for the same reason and the subject of his kingdom go stock free. Man can violate the commands against stealing, lying, defrauding, swearing, adultery, or anything else, for the same reason that he can violate these commands. If not, why not?

I am not arguing in favor of servitude. I believe in freedom—freedom of conscience—freedom of speech—freedom of everything in so far as man is capable of using freedom in a way that it will not militate against the life, liberty and the pursuits of happiness of himself and others. But some cannot use liberty in this way, or at least they have not done so. No system can give absolute freedom, and at the same time put a stop to crime. The Socialist doctrine, that it is impossible to live a Christian under a system of economics that will produce rich and poor—servant and slave—is a frank admission that neither Christ nor the apostles were saved; for the reason that it claims that under “certain environments”—environments that will admit of rich and poor, capitalist and poor—master and servant—“Christian character can no more grow than a rose bush on a sand heap.” *Christian Socialist*, Dec. 1, 1910. Since the days of Christ there has been no other system of government. It is common for Socialists to affirm this doctrine. If the early Christians did live the Christian life under a system that admitted of servant and slave—rich and poor—bond and free—then it is possible for us to live Christians under the present system of government, which they themselves admit is far superior to the governments under which the apostles and early Christians lived and died. This being true, it follows that Socialism is wrong on this point. The same issue of the *Christian Socialist* says:

“No one but an insane brute could ‘realize himself truly saved’ while he is forced to live in slavery on crusts of wealth in a dirty tenement in the midst of a social hell of vice, want and misery.” Page 5.

This is an admission that the Bible account of Lazarus, who ate the crumbs that fell from the rich man’s table, and was afflicted with sores, was no one else than “an insane brute.” Jesus Christ was so poor that he had not a place on which to lay his head, and he was “an insane brute” of Socialism.



All the apostles were poor and therefore servants of the capitalists, according to Socialists, and they were a set of "insane brutes," and again Socialism is convicted out of its own mouth.

Socialists who take the Bible (a book which they do not believe) to substantiate their theory, unjoint its teachings at every juncture, by trying to make it apply where it has no application. They claim that "Christianity and Socialism are ethically the same." *Christian Socialist*, Dec. 1, 1910. That means that they are morally and religiously the same, and therefore the Socialist movement was the movement—the institution inaugurated, and established by Jesus Christ for the salvation of the world. This is first-class Catholic doctrine. It is the kingdom of Christ in all its applications to the human soul being set up under a new name. It is indeed a religio-politicus institution fresh from Rome. But Socialism goes beyond Rome, in that it will sacrifice religion in favor of infidelity. Hear the editor of the *Christian Socialist* in the same issue:

"But let it be remembered by all religious bigots and hypocrites that the atheism of the Socialist movement is invariably strongest in those countries where the church has existed longest and strongest and most ruthlessly betrayed true Christianity by sacrificing the working people to capital thieves. Wherever Socialism must choose between the church and the outraged poor it chooses the poor."

This is a vindication of the infidelity of Socialism, and a defense of itself over the church of Jesus Christ. It is further proof of what has been proven in foregoing chapters and emphasizes the fact that the church is inferior to Socialism; that the church is only composed of "bigots and hypocrites." Whatever may be said of Christianity as a whole, of its failures in part, it can not be successfully denied that the world owes its civilization, both socially and politically, to its influ-

ence. While it may be that not more than one out of six of the world's population has accepted Christianity in its various forms and shades, yet the five-sixths have felt its influence, and have enjoyed its liberty of conscience, and to its influence we owe our present economic systems in every department of human life. We can therefore return to the old forms of the chattle slavery—true master and slave—as under Romanism—by uniting church and state under Socialism, and again give Rome the victory over us and our children. Are you ready for this?

### **XXI. Its Effect on the Church and the Home.**

In this chapter we are going to show that Socialism has a tendency to ship-wreck the church, by producing the testimony of those who are on the ground and know of the effect that it has had, or what has been effected.

I can produce the original letters from which I can show that others have been effected as G. W. Austin, whose letter follows:

“When we get Socialism, people who are now out of reach of the gospel will then be gospel subjects. This is one reason why I am lecturing on Socialism instead of preaching all the time.”—G. W. Austin.

I have many letters from elders of churches and from brethren who claim that the church has been torn asunder by Socialism. I can testify from personal knowledge that brethren who were once loyal gospel preachers have destroyed their influence and usefulness as preachers on account of Socialism. You would be surprised if I were to publish the names of preachers who claim that Socialism is the true religion of Jesus Christ. Brethren are calling just such preachers to hold their meetings instead of men who are loyal and who have the cause of Christ at heart. Such preachers are mak-

ing merchandise out of the church while they believe that Socialism is the true religion of Jesus Christ.

I would like to know how, under Socialism, we can reach those who are now out of reach of the gospel, since Socialism claims that it is not "concerned about religion." I am not in sympathy with any political move that is "not concerned about religion." I can only favor a government, or a political party that promises religious liberty, and until this plank is placed in the Socialist platform, I shall be against it as a political move. God protects religion through the political powers. Hence political parties should be concerned enough about religion to promise us religious liberty. It matters not if some of the writers of the constitution of the United States were infidels, they were concerned enough about religion to promise us religious liberty, and that is all we demand, if that promise is carried out. Without this constitutional plank religion will be destroyed, or at least its followers persecuted.

Here is what another brother says:

"We have had the Bible taught for the past 1900 years and the world is not any better, and never will be until you change the system and do away with money, which the good book says 'is the root to all evil.'"

That means that the Bible is a failure; that in order to correct the evils of society we must, through the ingenuity of man, invent a system of economics superior to the Bible.

Shall we destroy money because it is the "root of all evil?" Did Christ advocate the destruction of this "root of all evil?" He made no such attempt, but even sent Peter out on a fishing expedition that he might get enough of the "root of all evil" to pay his tax. Even if we were to destroy our kind of money something would have to be substituted for an exchange medium. Otherwise we would have to trade cotton for corn, and the production of the farm for the production



of the factory and the mine. In this event this exchange commodity would become "the root of all evil." It would be more evil than our present system, for who is more evil than the horse trader? In his case no money is necessarily exchanged, and yet one tries to swindle the other.

The Bible a failure! Do we not know that civilization has only gone where the Bible has gone, and stopped where it has stopped? And yet, this statement comes from an old brother, and you tell me that Socialism has a good effect on the church! It is destructive to the church and the home.

Another brother writes that he is a Class Conscious Socialist, and that he is afraid I have not studied Socialism much, and wants to know how many Socialist books and papers I have studied. I have more than one hundred books on Socialism in my library, covering every phase of Socialism, and I have studied Socialism from its foundation up, and the more I have learned, the further I have gotten from its foolish doctrine. It is more ungodly than Mormonism, and is as full of infidelity as Payne's Age of Reason.

J. W. Brice says:

"I am as familiar with Socialism as any one, as I have read a considerable amount of their literature, and am positively certain that it does not advocate infidelity."

J. W. Brice is one of our preachers, and yet, with all his information, he thinks that Socialism does not stand for infidelity. I only have to call your attention to the first chapters of their book to refute this statement. Has he read over all these books and statements and can not see that it is a system of infidelity and Darwinism?

Another brother says:

"It is strange that every man doesn't know that Socialism is a religious institution. Better read the National Rip-Saw, and post up."

That is your trouble. You have read the Rip-Saw until you think it is the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Another brother says that Socialism is the greatest curse of the age. Elders of the church sometimes talk Socialism in the congregation and thereby cause division. Is it injurious to the church? To ask the question is to answer it. The effect is clear.

Under the commune system no one owns a home. Hence the very incentive for home is destroyed by Socialism. This is contrary to nature. It is natural with everything in the animal kingdom, including man, to have a natural incentive for home. "Home, Sweet Home," has thrilled and filled the millions with joy and gladness. A place to stay—a permanent abiding place. The peckerwood that stores its food in the winter has its home there. The cow, the horse, the hog, the wild beast of the forest—all have a certain location—a home. We are renters under Socialism and have no permanent abiding place—no place that we can truly call a home. You say that is the trouble with the renter under "capitalism." Suppose it is, is it not better for two-thirds of the people to have homes than for the whole people to have no home—for all to be renters under Socialism?

Admitting, as we must, that there is much evil under the present system, is it necessary to destroy the Nation in order to correct the evils? That is like killing the patient to cure the disease. Shall we, because there is evil in the church, tear up the church and make an entire new church and destroy the Book that gave life to the church and denounce its author? That is exactly what Socialism says must be done to the state. Destroy the state, the constitution, the law, and the courts, and build an entire new concern on its ruins. "The state is responsible for the home, and its evils, society and its evils; destroy the state, and you destroy the home and society as it now exists, and the church as well, and build

Socialism on its ruins and you will correct all the evils of society." Still I am told that Socialism is not destructive to the home and the church. May God help you to learn Socialism!

Too many have read the Appeal to Reason—Treason—and Rip-Saw until they have gone crazy. These papers and the Socialist speakers have appealed to the stomach instead of the head, until the head is full of treason and sawdust. Look at the bright side—the good—we get from the government and you will be regenerated. Like the prodigal son, you will "come to yourself."

Look at the millions of dollars spent every year for liquors, amusements and other foolishness by the poor of this country, and can you wonder that we have poverty in the cities—poverty everywhere? Is there any wonder that the home is destroyed and character is sold for gain? Whose fault is it? Not the law, not the government, not our system, but the people who abuse their rights under the law and the system. Look at the enormous amount of liquor and its value. Here are some figures that are wonderful, which apply to the United States only:

Malt liquors consumed per year, gallons.....	1,491,191,325
At three dollars per gallon.....	\$4,372,573,975
Amount of wine consumed per year, gallons...	42,316,836
At three dollars per gallon.....	\$ 129,950,508
<hr/>	
Total consumed in cash for liquors.....	\$4,501,524,483

It is reasonable to suppose that the poor—the homeless class—spend at least one-fourth of this amount, which would be \$1,125,481,120. This amount alone would make a \$500 payment on a \$1,000 home for more than 2,225,096 of the homeless. In New York and tributaries alone in 1906 there were



\$11,620,744 spent for liquors. One-fourth of this amount would make a \$500 payment on a home for 5,890 of the homeless of that city. If it were put in food and clothing it would feed and clothe every helpless poor in the city. These figures are conservative. They are taken from the World's Almanac 1907. Then there is spent annually \$600,000,000 for tobacco, for amusements, \$400,000,000; for jewelry, \$300,000,000. None of these things are essential to life, and we might mention a hundred other things and sum up all the unnecessary expenditures of the poor, which, if saved for one year, would pay for a \$1,000 farm for every homeless family in the United States. There is no use for us to dodge the issue; we all know that the poor spent their proportionate amount of this vast sum. Every class of people spend more for the luxuries of life than they do for the necessities of life, which Socialists say are "food, clothing and shelter."

The man that hangs around the cities and towns and hunts an "easy snap"—an easy job—in the city, is liable to make a failure. Country people have a craze for the cities, and hundreds of thousands of them have gone to the cities and towns and have made a failure. The country promises success to every energetic family. If the tools he must work with is capital, even then he can rent his land, team and tools and succeed. Here is an example:

"J. C. Dorsett \* \* \* landed in Hunt County two years ago with the sum of \$1.75 in his pocket and no teams or tools to make a crop. This is his second year to farm here and he has on deposit from this year's crop \$1,500 and owes not a dollar. His crop this year consisted of 175 acres and he has gathered to date eighty-seven bales, and conservative cotton men state that he is sure to get thirty bales yet."—Dallas Farm News, November 7, 1911.

This shows what a man can do with brains and muscular power, with nothing but rented capital. The thirty unsold

bales no doubt brought \$1,000, and thus run the bank account of Mr. Dorsett up to more than \$2,000. The farm on which the crop was made is two miles west of Lone Oak and belongs to M. C. Fry. The crop was made with Mr. Dorsett's immediate family, consisting of three boys and two little girls. If the people will get out of the crowded cities and into the country and push, much of the poverty will vanish away.

## XXII. Socialism in the Schools.

Socialism was born in Germany, like Darwinism, and came out of the same school. It is therefore a foreign doctrine, and came from Catholic schools, and step by step it has inoculated its poisonous influence into the schools of this country. There are over 3,000,000 Socialists in Germany, and just a little more than 4,000,000 in the rest of the world, with possibly a little over 400,000 in the United States. Socialism belongs, essentially, to the school of higher criticism, which is another proof of its infidelity. I quote the following from the Louisville Courier-Journal:

"I, for a long time, have believed," said Mr. Coler, "that nothing but positive religious instruction can protect the country. The schools are being conducted on a basis fundamentally wrong, and they are responsible for the spread of Socialism.

"Seven out of every ten teachers in the New York City schools are Socialists, and they are teaching the children discontent. I am devoting my time to an attempt to correct the system, and I believe that the time must come when a parent can secure for his child supplementary religious instruction in the schools. Our children are being brought up as atheists under the Socialistic tendencies inculcated in them by Socialist teachers."

Mr. Coler said the school question in the United States had become troublesome. "The public schools," he declared, "are

fast becoming temples of a new religion. By some it is known as agnosticism; by some, atheism; by some, Socialism; and by others, ethical culture. It is affirmative, dogmatic and intolerant."

Mr. Coler has studied the question. Think of it, "seven out of every ten teachers in the New York City schools are Socialists," and they are teaching it in the schools. Is there any wonder at the growth of this infidelity? That means that just that number of teachers are teaching the doctrine of Darwin, either wholly, or in a mild form known as "higher criticism." There is no wonder that Jack London, who is recognized authority on Socialism, says:

"Evolution a mere tentative hypothesis. One by one, step by step, each division and subdivision of science has contributed its evidence, until the case is complete and the verdict rendered. While there is still discussion as to the method of evolution, none the less, as a process sufficient to explain all biological phenomena, all differentiations of life into widely diverse species, families and even kingdoms, evolution is flatly accepted."—*War of the Classes*, p. 217.

While this evil of Socialism is largely confined to the cities, like other capital evils, it is gradually punctuating with its poisonous fang the public schools of the country. Like Jack London says, "Evolution is flatly accepted" by the families and kingdoms. Where is the nation that has not felt the sting of its poisonous fang? We need reform—reform that will deliver us from this world-wide evil; but we can not hope to get it through the Socialist party, for evolution is a component part of the science of Socialism. The Chicago Inter-Ocean uttered the truth when it said that the 40,000 votes cast for Eugene V. Debs for president was the "worst advertising that Chicago could receive." The number of votes cast from any community for Socialism will determine the growth of infidelity in that community. It is a standard from which



we can measure the status and growth of infidelity in any community.

Watch the Socialists' fight against the preachers. Why this fight, if Socialism stands for Christianity and Christian education? They know that the preachers are poisonous to their infidelity. Can they hope to succeed so long as this fight is kept up? The great German writer and author, Emile De Leveleye, says in his book:

"Preachers have been at the bottom of every real reform. Socialism cannot hope to accomplish anything until it stands for the Christian religion."

The same author says that they are pessimistic, and then adds:

"He places in full relief the bad side of the social state. He points to the strong crushing the weak, and rich making gain out of the poor, inequality becoming harsher and more pronounced. He aspires to an idea where well-being will be allotted in proportion to desert and services rendered."—*Socialism of Today*, p. 15.

That sounds like Socialist speakers and writers in this country, as well as in Germany, in the days of Karl Marx and Engles. In this way discontentment is fused into the common people—the working class—and they accept Socialism with all its infidelity, in the schools, in the church, and in the state, and step by step they are poisoned with evolution, with its materialistic conceptions of history, and apply its theory of economics to every condition of life.

With these facts facing us, we are forced to the conclusion that Socialism is a universal evil, and should be fought as a poisonous dagger that threatens to stab the life out of our homes, our schools and our commonwealth.

### XXIII. Questions for Socialists.

1. Is Socialism a science or just a theory?

2. Can there be capital without capitalists?
3. Can a nation, as such, build up without capital?
4. If a nation can build up without capital, tell us how it can be done.
5. If a nation, as such, can not build up without capital, and if we can not have capital without capitalists, and you destroy both capital and capitalists, do you not destroy the life of the nation?
6. Since Solomon says that "A good man leaveth an inheritance for his children's children" (Prov. 13:23); and since a man can not lay up wealth under Socialism, will you tell us how he can obey this Scripture under your system?
7. Since the wealth of the sinner is laid up for the just (Prov. 13:22), is it not good for the just that we have wealth? If not, why not?
8. If, under Socialism, a man cannot become a capitalist—lay up for old age—may he not die a pauper, and his children be left paupers?
9. If, to become wealthy, is within itself a sin, why did God give to Job, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, Solomon and others wealth?
10. Since Job was the richest man of the East (Job 1), was he not the Rockefeller of his age?
11. Since Solomon was the richest man the world has ever seen or will ever see, was he not the capitalist of his age? and since God was the direct author of his riches, is it not a fact that the Lord sinned, according to Socialists?
12. Can a man do his whole duty without being a Socialist? If you answer "No," then, does it not follow that a man can not be a Christian without being a Socialist? If you answer "Yes," then, why should a man be a Socialist?
13. Can a man be a Christian and seek to overthrow that which is ordained of God? Rom. 13:1-10.
14. Since Socialism would make woman and man equal

economically and every other way, and since God commands that the man shall treat the woman as the weaker vessel, and that the woman shall be under subjection to the man as the church is to Christ, does not your system contradict the Bible, and how can it be true?

15. If the man is the head of the woman, as Christ is the head of the church, would she not have to cut off her head in order to be a first-class Socialist? If not, why not?

16. Is it not a fact that, under Socialism, a woman is not bound to one man (by any legal statute) more than to another? If you answer "Yes," then, where is your boasted "freedom of action?" If you answer "No," does it not contradict the Bible?

17. If Socialism cuts off the lawful—legal—marriage tie, does it not, in so doing, at least lay the foundation for free love?

18. Is it not a fact that if you take the wealth from the capitalists by force, that it is equal to highway robbery? If you pay for the capital of the capitalists, from whence will come the money? If it is paid by taxation, would not the interest alone drain the life out of the subjects of the government?

19. Can a man be a Christian and curse the rulers of the government in the face of the fact that the Bible teaches us to pray for them?

20. If, under Socialism, I wanted to start a propaganda paper in opposition to Socialism, would they furnish me a house (which they would have to do, for everything belongs to the government) and allow it to go through the mail as other papers favorable to Socialism?

21. If everything is to be owned by the government, timber, land, iron, etc.—who would build church houses?

22. Can there be freedom of religion under Socialism? If "Yes," will there not still exist the division, strife and hatred



of one sect against another? and if so, where is your supposed paradise on earth? If "No," then, will not Socialism be either "the religion," or else destructive to religion, as we now have it? and if there is any true religion now, destroy it?

23. If everything is to be settled by majority vote, may not certain denominations be voted out of existence?

24. Is it not a fact that no one can build a church house—the government owning everything—must therefore build all church houses under your system?

25. If, in the event our people want to build a church house in Tyler, and Tyler belongs to the government, and the majority vote against it, will not that suppress religion and religious freedom?

26. Is it not a fact that the majority are heathen and anti-Christian? If "Yes," since Socialism is a world religio-politique movement, would not the church be voted out of existence? If not, why not?

27. If the majority of the world are heathen and anti-Christian, does it not stand to reason that they would vote against religious sentiment?

28. Is it not likely that those in the supremacy would vote out of existence the minority churches?

29. Since the people of God have always been in the minority, is it not likely that they would be voted out of existence under Socialism?

30. Do you think that, under Socialism, Catholics would vote to build Protestant church houses?

31. What would Socialism do with Mormonism? since they believe in polygamy, would they be allowed to practice their belief? If not, where is your boasted freedom? If so, is not your system out of harmony with the Bible?

32. If you claim that there must be a limit to the building of churches and church houses, and that they will only be built where they are needed; then, who is to decide when and

where they are to be built? If you answer, "by a majority vote," then what would become of all the weak churches? If you answer, "by legislation," in that event may not the weak churches be voted out?

33. Under Socialism, would not the ministry have to cease giving all their time to preaching the gospel?

34. Will the government support the ministry? If "Yes," is it not a fact that everybody will be getting a "call to preach?" If "No," then, how will they be supported, seeing that they are neither producers of food, clothing nor shelter?

35. Since Socialism claims that modern Christians can not come anywhere near practicing the commands of the Bible (see *Christian Socialist*, Sept. 21, 1911, p. 3), does it not follow that there is not a Christian in the world today? And since Christ and the early Christians lived under what you call "capitalism," does it not follow that none of them were Christians?

36. Since your system teaches social equality of all your subjects, regardless of nationality or color, does it not follow that Socialism is a system of "nigger" equality?

#### XXIV. A System of Social Equality.

That Socialism is a system of social equality, cannot be denied successfully. Of course, I expect that Socialist spellbinders by the hundreds will go off half-cocked in their denial of the facts as I present them in this chapter. But the reader should remember that they are in the denying business. They even deny their own literature, and declare that each book just sets forth one man's opinion, and that every man has a right to his own opinion.

We know that Socialist doctrine, as set forth in their propaganda literature, does set forth social equality. It is, therefore, useless to quote from their books in proof of this point, for well informed people know this. We have an example of this theory at a "great coon dinner," which was pulled off

in New York City, and published by the daily press, and reproduced in the Harpoon in its June issue, 1908. At this dinner a gang of negroes and some alleged white men and women held a great meeting to declare for "social equality for whites and blacks." Mark you, that some of those who sat side by side and face to face with these negro men and women were "high up Socialists"—Socialist writers and speakers. We quote below from the Harpoon:

"New York, April 28.—Social equality and intermarriage between the races were advocated last night at a banquet of the Cosmopolitan Society of Greater New York, where twenty white girls and women dined side by side at tables with negro men and women."

Mark you, this was at Peck's Restaurant at 140 Fulton street. Some of the negroes were as black as coal.

### **"White Girls Among Negroes."**

"Miss Mary Ovington, a Brooklyn society girl, who has been prominent in settlement work, and whose father is proprietor of Hotel Saint George, was the only white woman who occupied a seat at the speaker's table. Negroes were clustered all about her. On her right hand sat William H. Ferris, colored graduate of Harvard, who told of his efforts to implant his 'Boston education in the South.' At this table also sat Hamilton Holt, introduced as 'editor-in-chief of the Independent,' and whose subsequent utterances on intermarriage stirred his audience to enthusiastic applause.

"At the left of Miss Ovington was seated Editor Villard of the New York Evening Post, and his plea for 'equality and abolition of caste spirit' a few minutes later drew forth another wild outburst.

"But the one table in particular which attracted attention was that at which half a dozen white women were seated, and



where the dashing young negro, Captain H. A. Thompson, sat between two prominent white girls from Greenpoint.

**"Miss Eaton and Miss Doolittle."**

"These young ladies were Miss Isabel Eaton and Miss Marion Doolittle. They laughed and chatted with their negro entertainer during the meal, while he retold his exploits at San Juan Hill. \* \* \*

"At this table also were seated Mrs. J. W. Gates and her 16-year-old daughter, Bessie. \* \* \* Directly across the table from the little debutante sat Edward C. Walker, president of the Sunrise Club.

**"Blackest Man in the Feast."**

"Mrs. A. Stirling, a white woman, occupied a seat at the same table at the left hand of Dr. John A. Morgan, a West Indian, who was the blackest man in the assemblage. Mrs. Morgan sat near Professor Walker and importuned him during the dinner.

"Mrs. Landis, said to be a prominent Brooklyn woman, sat at an opposite table at which were ten negro men and women. Her husband also occupied a seat at this table. Miss M. Lyons, one of the colored women speakers, sat directly opposite Mr. Landis. \* \* \*

**"Dominated by Military Man."**

"Miss Mary Perrin, who did not give her address, was a young white girl who sat at the side table which was dominated by the gallant negro army captain. She sat close to Miss Martha Thompson, a colored girl and a relative of the military negro.

"The 'social equality' of the affair acted like new wine upon the diners, two-thirds of whom were negroes. The free license of the speeches were received with loud outbursts. Cheers greeted the names of Roosevelt, Taft and Bryan, and wild ap-

plause followed every mention of Socialism. But the greatest demonstration was drawn out by direct or indirect allusion to intermarriage, whether through the gentle discussion of 'social equality,' as spoken by Miss Ovington, or the broad, bald advocacy of the direct intermarriage.

"Hamilton Holt, editor of the Independent, said: 'Inter-marriage, if continued long enough, would solve the race problem. \* \* \* When the colored people get educated the whites in the South will have to recognize them as their equals. What must the remedy be? To let things remain as they are is unsatisfactory, deportation is impossible, then it must be amalgamation and education.'

"Miss Ovington said: 'Move your chairs nearer together and get up closer. \* \* \* I am very glad I have been asked to welcome you in behalf of the Cosmopolitan Club. \* \* \* Caste spirit is not simply a race question. I am in the work because it is human.' \* \* \*

" 'I like to think that we are going to eat with and stand up for our colored brethren and sisters whenever and wherever we meet them or wherever we can. I believe that it would be a terrible state of affairs when the negro gives up any of his rights as a man.

" 'He should never be satisfied until his equality is recognized. The power of love overruns caste and brings people of all castes together.'

"Editor Villard said: 'This spirit of caste is the most dangerous spirit that can threaten any land, particularly a democratic form of government. We stand in this country for equality—equality of rights, liberty and to do as we see fit.'

"Dr. Ferris, colored, said: 'Is it too soon to admit the negro into the brotherhood of equality in the human family? This meeting means more to the negro of the Black Belt of the South than to the negro of the North. It marks an epoch for the down South negro. It is a question of recognizing

him as a man and as an equal. There is only one way—demand your equality.

“‘We have two leaders, Booker Washington, advocating peaceful resistance, and then there is Dubois, saying: ‘Exercise your rights.’ Now which shall it be?’

“‘Exercise our rights!’ shouted a voice, followed by great applause, which was joined in by whites and blacks alike.

“Rev. George Frazier Miller, a negro, declared that the great bug-bear to abolition of caste was the ‘social equality.’ He said the natural remedy was the ballot. He declared he could see no reason for giving the negro vote to Roosevelt, Taft or Bryan and he owed the Republican party nothing. Our rising sun is Socialism, which promises true equality without reference to race or society.

“Vice President Humphries said: ‘Race prejudice is not going to be settled with peaceful means. The man with the hoe should not hesitate to use it at both ends—to belabor with the handle. You must have equality.’

“John Spargo said: ‘You negroes must assert your powers—you, my friends, whose skins are tanned darker than mine. The equality of opportunity must be placed before every child born in this world.’

“Max Barber, a Chicago negro editor, spoke of Candidate Taft as ‘the heir to the throne,’ and declared that he would not give the negroes ‘untrammelled use of the ballot.’ He said that opportunity was at hand to wipe out caste by the use of the ballot box.”

In defense of this dinner, Dr. Owen M. Waller, secretary of the society, said: “Fully half of us are among white people. \* \* \* Monday night’s dinner was our first, but there will be others. The best of white people were there,” he said, “and the best of colored. There was Miss M. Lyons, vice principal of public school 83, and also these colored clergymen in New York: the Rev. Geo. F. Miller, H. C. Bishop, E. W. Daniel and



N. P. Boyd. We believe in intermarriage where such intermarriage is desired."

"Geo. Miller, a colored clergyman, of 121 North Oxford street, Brooklyn, said: 'If you want to marry a woman who looks like a piece of coal, and she is willing, whose business is it? It is a question of the individual. I am a Socialist because I find that the Socialists are more liberal in their regard for other people than others. I do not think that we have anything to hope for from the Republican or Democratic parties.'"

That is what I think, too, so far as negro equality is concerned. The speakers at this dinner seemed to be of one voice in their declarations for social equality. This affair is looked upon by the most prominent men in the United States as a disgrace to society. In a dispatch to the editor of the Post-Dispatch it was denounced by the following men: Albert S. Burleson, congressman from Texas; Jas. K. Vardaman, former governor of Mississippi; editor of the Picayune, New Orleans; E. M. Sinimins, senator from North Carolina; N. C. Blanchard, governor of Louisiana; N. C. Haskell, governor of Oklahoma; Rabbi Leon Harrison, of Temple Israel, St. Louis. These dispatches can be found in the Harpoon, June, 1908.

Our readers must note that this dinner was a Socialist dinner, participated in by some twenty whites and forty blacks. It was to demonstrate what Socialism will do when carried into effect. Under this system of government we will not only see buck negroes riding side by side in the same coach and street car, but we will see them sit side by side and dine at the same table and sleep in the same bed. Under that system when the white people of the Southland want to relegate the colored trash to a separate coach, the powers that be will rise up and say, "Not so, under the red flag is social equality, and our colored 'comrades' have as good right to sit by the whites as Mr. Anybody." They will tell us that "we are for the first

time in the history of the race come to our own. This coach is common stock, it belongs to all alike, regardless of race and color, and there can be no social discrimination." Your daughter can arm a colored gentleman(?) to church at high noon on Sunday, or on the dark of the moon at night, because we will be so perfect under Socialism, having for the first time "come to our own," that it will be no stigma on society.

I am glad that we have some decent negroes in this country who are first, last and all the time opposed to such "Socialism."

Socialist speakers and writers who will make a weak effort at answering these charges will tell you that the party is not to be charged with what a few up in New York did. But, you come back at them with the proposition that this is exactly what Socialism proposes to do—bring social equality—that one man has no more rights under Socialism than another, for the reason that everything belongs to everybody in general and nobody in particular. They will tell you that Roosevelt dined in the White House with a negro. This lie has been exploded time and again. He dined at the same table just as all presidents have done, but not at the same time.

### **Some of the Speakers at the Dinner.**

Who is John Spargo, and what is he? John Spargo is one of the highest up Socialists. He is one of their greatest writers and authors of the present age. He is author of "The Common Sense of Socialism," a book of 184 pages; "The Socialists, Who They Are and What They Stand For," 148 pages; "Capitalists and Labor," 127 pages; "The Marx He Knew," 86 pages; "Underfed School Children," pamphlet. These are the works I have in my library. He is doubtless author of many other books. Do you dare to tell me that Spargo would do a thing like that and make the declarations he made to demonstrate Socialism, when he knew it was not their doctrine?

Spargo made a speech seconding the nomination of Eugene V. Debs for the presidency in 1908. You note that this is the same year in which they had this glorious dinner, and the dinner party had performed before this speech of the nomination was made. If that dinner was not a demonstration of good Socialism, why did Debs allow such a man to make a speech at his nomination?

Honestly, this dinner affair is enough to make a decent man want to throw up his socks. Think of this wonderful worker(?) amongst the colored, Miss Mary White Ovington and other hightoned white ladies, in the midst of forty blacks, making a speech for "social equality" and intermarriage of the whites and blacks—and there is no use for you to turn up your nose nor to hold it while you gag—for the affair stinks to heaven. Miss Ovington; who is she? Is she not one of the ablest speakers in the Socialist party? Was it any other than she who offered \$100 to any one who would meet her in joint discussion? If she will put up the cash and act the lady I will promise to meet her and put her to the wall.

### Other Evidences.

If Socialism does not promise political and social equality, what does it promise? This means, that when it comes into effect that the nation or nations that accept its theory and practices its doctrines will crumble into heathenism; that as advancing nations they will retrograde.

What has caused the downfall of nations and peoples but the mixture—the mingling of the races? What caused the flood but the fact that "the sons of God married the daughters of men." Gen. 6:1-10. What caused the downfall of Solomon and the Jewish nation but the fact that "Solomon loved many strange wives?" What caused their corruption while in captivity in Babylon but the mixing of the Jews with the black, the brown—the people of different shades and color



and nationality? Again we may ask: What brought on the Dark Ages? Unquestionably the intermarriage of the nations, which resulted in the interweaving into the true worship, the worship of the heathens. Socialist writers are great historians, but they know how to wrench history out of its place and give to it a false interpretation.

The intermarriage of nations has never worked to the lifting of the lower, or heathen nations; but quite to the contrary—it has served to lower the standard of morals and religion and to weaken the race of enlightenment. You might cross the negro and the white a thousand times and you can make nothing but mules—mulattoes—of the cross. The pure blood—the white race—will be lost in the black and will give us the brown—with its thick skull and thick lips—just as planting the red corn in the same field with the white gives us the yellow, with possibly here and there a grain of streaked and striped. This is an inexorable law of God. The curse that God places on the sons of Ham was the black—the direct negative of the white—and the different shades; the intermediate shades and colors have come as a result of a mixture of the pure bloods with their negative—the African—of the dark continent.

The white races, such as Germans and others, if their blood has been kept pure, have come through the lineage of Japheth, the youngest son of Noah. The pure Jewish blood is from the lineage of Shem, the oldest son of Noah, while the negroes are the direct lineage of Ham. The great Nimrod was in this lineage. Gen. 10:1-32. From these three sons of Noah came the three distinct nationalities, viz.: The Jews (white), sons of Shem; the Egyptians, negroes, sons of Ham (black), and the Gentiles, Canaanites, sons of Japheth (white). The intermarriage with the Gentiles and the Jews with the Egyptians—negroes—gave us the intermediate colors, who took their names from the locality in which they lived, or some one of their ancestors, like the Girgasites, Hivites, Amorites, Philistians, etc.

Egypt was the land of Ham. (Ps. 78:51; 105:22; 106:22.) On account of a famine Abraham went down into Egypt (Gen. 13), and there he got his wife's servant—Hagar—the Egyptian, who, by mutual agreement between Abraham and his wife, became the second wife of Abraham, to whom were born Ishmael (Gen. 16:1-16). From this mixture came a great nation of people (Gen. 21:18). This is the first case of the Jews intermarrying with the Egyptians. Twelve princes came from Ishmael, and they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt (Gen. 25: 16-20).

The sons of Ham, originally, had for their country the land of Libya, which is called Africa, Cush and Ethiopia. Egypt joins Africa—Ethiopia—on the north, which was settled by the sons of Ham before Egypt ever existed in Bible history, and at this time, doubtless, was a part of Africa, which was afterwards formed and inhabited by the mixed breeds, to whom the children of Israel sold themselves as bondsmen for four hundred and thirty years. You should remember that from Noah to Moses and Joshua covered a period of about 1,000 years, or some fourteen generations; and that, during this period all the different nationalities and colors had been formed. The inhabitants of Africa had kept their blood pure and their skin black—except those who had scattered among the nations of Japheth and Shem. A few of the Jews, who dwelt in the hill country of Judea, kept their blood pure and their skin white. The sons of Japheth—the Canaanites—the bulk of whom dwelt in the land of Canaan and the Jordan valley, kept their blood pure and their skin white. But the straggling multitudes who were traveling and mixing and mingling with each other produced the different nations and intermediate colors. It has always been a violation of God's law to intermarry amongst the nations, the Socialists to the contrary, notwithstanding.

From these historical facts we reach the conclusion that Socialism threatens our civilization, for it offers to the negro ab-

solute equality with the whites. Hence, by the "brotherhood of man," Socialists simply mean putting the race on equality. What ails Portugal, Spain, South America and Cuba but the mongrel? In them there is almost no pure blood. Education and civilization will never make the negro a white man nor change his God-given intellect to that of the pure Anglo-Saxon. No intermarriage with the blacks can ever produce an Alexander the Great, a Cicero, a Carlyle, a Calhoun, a Washington, a Woorster, a Webster, a Lincoln, a Henry Clay, an Andrew Jackson, an Alexander Stephenson, a Roosevelt or a Bryan. It is not in him and can not be fused into him by any amount of cross breeding. Social equality follows where political equality leads. Hence, I do not even believe in political equality. The negro is not capable of self-government. If the American negroes were turned lose to themselves—to self-government—a few years would find him back in his primeval state—canibalism. God cursed the sons of Ham and condemned them to everlasting servitude, and it can not be changed.

#### **XXV. Socialists Are Modern Absaloms.**

Absalom was the son of David, king of Israel. Absalom, by his fair speech and promises, undertook to wrench the kingdom from David. He tried to show up the corruption and the injustice which his father David was doing toward his subjects. He would stand at the gate and make his fair promises. Here is his language:

"And Absalom said moreover, Oh, that I was made judge in the land, that every man which hath any suit or cause might come unto me and I would do him justice. And it was so, that when any man came nigh to him to do him obeisance, he put forth his hand, and took him, and kissed him." 2 Sam. 15:1-7.



"He kissed him" and possibly called him "comrade." In this way the account says that "Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel." This is exactly what Socialists are doing. By their fair speech and promises they are stealing the hearts of the people all over the country. They promise that if the reins of government were in their hands they would "do justice to all;" that when any suit comes up they would do the right thing. This was called "conspiracy" in the Bible. It is the same thing now. Socialists are conspiring against the government for the reins of power and promise liberty, while they, as Absalom, are the servants of corruption.

"The people increased continually with Absalom." The hearts of many people are turned toward Debs, who is the Absalom of Socialism. Mark you, those who were following Absalom were of the house of Saul, who was the enemy of David and his righteous rule, until the day of his self-murder. These conspirators with Absalom, their leader, with more than 20,000 men, made war against David, that Absalom might come into leadership by force of arms. Absalom followed the counsel of the wicked house of Saul (Karl Marx) and it became necessary that David should defend his kingdom against his own son. But he gave charge to Joab to deal gently with Absalom. The battle was pitched and Absalom lost 20,000 men. But Absalom was one of those long-haired Socialists, who was riding a mule, which in the fright of battle ran under an oak and his head was caught in the boughs, and the mule on which he rode went from under him and left him hanging by the head in the tree, and he was thrust through the heart with three darts, and the Socialist move came to naught.

That will be the fate of Socialism of this age. The hobby mule they are riding is going to go from under them when the real battle comes, and their own heads will be their down-

fall. Absalom knew David was a man of war, but he followed the advice of the fanatics and set himself against the whole kingdom and was defeated at his own game.

Let me sound a predictive warning now. This government is a man of war, which is feared by the nations of earth. What could a few revolutionists do in battle with her? When this time comes—if it ever does—my prediction is that Socialism will meet the fate of Absalom and his revolutionists, who committed high treason against their rulers and government. This is not a matter to be lightly considered. Absalom, like modern Socialists, measured everything by the bad and lost sight of the good, and for selfish ends, and crazed with the idea of supremacy, committed treason and was caught in the trap they set for others. History has been repeated time and again. Will you be led by this class? Loyalty is what we need.

### Concluding Remarks.

Let it be remembered—once for all—that the author of this book is a friend to the “working class;” that he was raised on a farm; that most of his people are farmers, and that there is not one sentence in this book against that class or any other good class of workers. I believe in “capitalism,” but not in the bad use of capital. I believe in bringing capital and labor more closely together, and that to the extent they co-operate, just to that extent will both classes be benefited. To keep up a constant “class war” will work to the downfall of both. The one can not succeed without the other. We can not live to ourselves. We must live for others. All classes of people are laboring people, unless it be the tramp, and with this exception, all are producers—all produce something—and their capital is whatever they use as a means of support, be that small or great—whether it be tools, according to Marx, money or other wealth. Capital is a failure without brains to direct

its successful operation. Labor is a failure without brains to direct its production to lessen labor.

While I am a friend to labor, I am also a friend to our government that makes it possible to succeed in life. You can't blame me for being a friend to our country or government and our people, when I tell you that I owe my life to the protection of the law; that time and again I would have been mobbed but for the protection of this commonwealth—like Paul, I would have been dragged from the pulpit and out of the city—had it not been for this freedom of speech and conscience. I never expect to utter a prayer to my Father in heaven without invoking his blessings on the rulers of our Nation.

Watch Socialist spellbinders while they make a weak effort to answer my arguments. They will deny their own propaganda and try to answer by sophistry, ridicule and evasion, and thus cover up the truth. They can not answer them fairly and squarely.

Let every citizen of this commonwealth stand by the Stars and Stripes—Old Glory—that floats over the heads of 90,000,000 people, a government which protects its subjects in every country and in every clime. We close with a prayer for the kings and rulers and those in authority over us, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.—Amen.

(Note.—Since completing this book the election in Germany has been held, and the Socialists gained twenty-eight seats in the reichstag (German parliament), and among the successful who returned to their seats were Herr Bebel. The dispatch by the Associated Press says: "Herr Bebel and most of the other Socialist leaders were easily re-elected." The reader should turn and read the chapter on Herr Bebel's nasty book



and then ask himself the question, "Does Herr Bebel know the Socialistic doctrine?" This shows his standing in the party.—Author.)

