



GERMAN LUTHERAN CHURCH,
CORNER TWENTY-FIRST AND BENTON STREETS, ST. LOUIS, MO. DEDICATED LAST SUNDAY.
This Building Costs \$100,000. An Expensive "House of God!" But Where Are the Houses of God's Children?



ALBERT MILLER ARCHITECT.

And while this "House of God" was being dedicated with parades, sweet music and solemn prayers, with all the splendor and show the human mind can think of, there were many thousands of "God's children" in St. Louis who did not know where to find a place for one night's sleep. Great, Almighty God, what are you going to do with all these magnificent temples? For one God to have so many houses to live in?!! Possibly "Almighty God" himself would object to this Christian civilization if he could, for it is not the fault of God, but of man. Capitalist-Christian civilization is a farce and a lie. Civilization will only be possible under Socialism.

NEW YEAR.

The American Federation of Labor and Sam Gompers' Presidency.

Peace on Earth and Good Will to Man
a Farce Under the Capitalist System of Society.

Again many millions of mouths have uttered "Peace on Earth and Good Will to Men." I think it is well if we take this out in thinking. In an age of greatest progress and wealth, when costliest edifices are considered the seats of purest Godliness, besides being erected on the side of the city on which most houses are large and comfortably furnished, intended for one family each, surrounded by a nice lawn, with ample room for flowers and trees, there is peace and good will to these men who occupy them. Nay, more, the men who occupy the other side of the city, which also progresses, and has a modern appearance by the name slum, these men too send their good will over to the other side. But among themselves, for themselves, they have hatred, curses and clinched fists: Being tortured, they torture those they should love; love those who torture them.

Thus we enter upon a new year. Formerly New Year meant the day for new hopes, for correcting things, for rejoicing, for wishing the same to the fellow-man. Then if a man owned an ax, a hammer, a saw, a plane he knew he could use them to make a living whenever he desired to work. To-day things are different. Now everything has become modern. Improved tools mean that man must loaf when he needs work most. The factory, the mine, the land, are places where men, women and children must beg for employment, improved tools make their labor to a great extent useless, and at certain times even the useful hands are laid off. Woe unto them, the laying-off generally takes place in the season of "Peace and good will to all men," when winter is grim and pitiless.

So what does New Year mean to us; what can we hope for? Surely we workmen cannot expect to see a change in Nature; she works out her mission by the improvements made. If these improvements are made for the benefit of the "few fittest," she is not to blame. Nature is not at fault if most men socialize their labor to give the substance of it to the individual; who can browbeat them? Nature is indeed the God who loves all—she even punishes at times to do good—but what does man, the only animal endowed with reason and aim? Does he study her language; does he interpret her lecture; does he enrich the race by opposing the doors of her stores? Certainly

he does, only the human race has dwindled down to a "few fittest." Is Nature at fault?

Let us look at those who in their high intelligence endeavor to reverse nature. When Gompers was again made organized labor's Messiah, he spurned and spat at Socialism. The capitalistic press spread it through the country, every anti-politics labor leader drew breath easier, the old parties had a new lease on him. But how is it that in the face of the convention of the A. F. of L., in which all this "Peace and Good Will to Capitalism" was declared, how is it that the organized clothing workers have been locked out? The labor unions are in session just about a few blocks away from where these organized work people are sweated and now thrown out in the cold, contract broken, nor shall they be re-employed unless they break from their union. What, then, is the meaning of war to the knife against Socialism? Gompers claims that labor is capital's brother, as capital wears Sunday clothes every day and labor wears every day clothes on Sunday labor must be looked upon as the weaker brother and is rightly treated as a step-brother.

A vain man like Gompers, who prides himself with being a member of the Society for Ethical Culture, cannot understand that labor is the very opposite to capital if the former is employed by the latter. Poor Sammy: to be a member of a society that cultivates moral philosophy, you have remained far behind the times. Think of it; philo means love, sophia means study, or to explain. Gompers, therefore, proves that he does not love to study nor explain morality. But he has his hands full, the Presidency of A. F. of L. nowadays depends on as many wires and colored acts as that of the Presidency of the United States. With the election, wire-pulling for re-election begins.

Therefore, comrades, let us hope that labor's brother, capital, will succeed in the current year to open a great many pairs of eyes, that they may seek our literature, learn and help to teach, so that the throne of "The Evil One" may be removed forever. S. ROSEN.

Hartford, Conn.

This country will land in absolute Socialism as surely as it landed in universal suffrage.—New York Press.

IN SHORT, whenever service is rendered from one human being to another on a footing of one-sided and not mutual obligation—where the relation between the servants and the served is not one of affection and reciprocal good offices, but authority, social ascendancy and power over subsistence on the one hand, and the necessity, servility and degradation on the other, there, in my view, is slavery.—Horace Greeley.

INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM.

The Sound Arguments of the Socialists.

Mrs. Martha Moore Avery's Lecture Delivered at Weaver's Hall, Lawrence, Mass.

The Socialist Labor Party of Lawrence held a rally in Weaver's Hall Thursday. Owing to short notice the meeting was not a large one, but those who were present listened to an interesting exposition of Socialistic doctrine by Mrs. Martha Moore Avery, a well-known labor orator. Charles A. Waite was Chairman of the meeting and introduced Mrs. Avery, who spoke for nearly an hour on certain phases of the industrial problem.

It is generally understood, said Mrs. Avery, that men vote for the prosperity of their country. Every man knows that his own vote has more or less to do with the bread and butter question. Socialists look upon man as a unit, not only a political, but also a social unit. Socialism is highly humanitarian and regards the interests of the individual and those of society as the same.

A common complaint among the business men is that the country is going to commercial perdition. Ask them why and they will say, "Because we have no market." As a Socialist I wish to examine this market problem from our own point of view. To begin with we want a market. Of course we are not now in the same throes of industrial agony as in 1893, but if we had a proper, sufficient market the outlook would be much brighter. What then is the reason that we have no market? For an answer look at the shoemaking trade. Improved appliances have made it possible to supply millions of people by working eight hours per day. But instead of working eight hours per day shoemakers are only working six, because the market for shoes is overstocked and hence destroyed. In Zurich 100 men and 100 machines can, in a given time, produce \$300 worth of material; under similar conditions in London \$800 worth can be produced and in Lynn \$1,400 worth. Thus are we coming into competition with very cheap labor. Machines are devised which, with the aid of one employe, do the work of 150, thus throwing the remainder out of work.

The wage earners themselves are, to a great extent, the market. When they are out of employment the market decreases and vice versa. The rich may purchase much, but it is the wage workers who make the great market. Under the present unequalizing capitalistic system there can be no deviation from such conditions. Under-consumption and not over-production is the

law. If all persons were permitted to use products there would be scarcely any over-production, as now understood, but it is the privileged classes who consume products and when this class have all they want and buy no more, then comes the cry of over-production. I shall never be satisfied until every man, woman and child has the best of everything. There are no such things as luxuries. The best is none too good for all of us. In the great onward movement which is bound to result from this state of affairs, the working women are sure to take an important part. I have no soft words for men who have voted working women into the position they now occupy.

How are we to get a market? As long as others own the tools of the workingman the latter is at the beck and call of the former, or the capitalist. The employer practically owns his employes. His own profits being so much greater than those of his laborers his tastes correspondingly grow more luxurious. There is no person in this room who could not find a legitimate use for \$100 where he now has fifty cents. Wants increase in the same ratio as means. There are advantages in being poor, for then one learns the noble lesson of self-sacrifice, but it is impossible for the rich man to elevate himself in this respect.

A co-operative commonwealth is the means by which Socialists hope to remedy this inequality; and this means that the people themselves shall own the tools with which they work and own all social services. At present we are working for the profit of others. Capital is not a philanthropist and gives labor no more than it is absolutely obliged to. Your employer gets just as much out of you for just as little return as he can. If laborers would organize and stand as one man there would not be such a contrast between the dwelling houses of the rich and poor.

Mrs. Avery then spoke of the great advantages that would accrue to the laboring classes if they owned mills and all large plants. Greater economy and fairer exchange could be brought about in this way, but under present industrial conditions the workingman is little better than a wage slave. This remarkable class inequality, so clearly shown in this country, is the highest example of capitalism. We are not looking for all the wealth, but merely the social ownership of industries and all public services. This Government is founded on Socialistic principles and asserts the rights of the people as a whole over those of individuals. Socialists feel that they have no occasion to apologize for their existence and think that the chance should be given the workingman as to the now privileged classes. They say there is "plenty of room at the top." Yes, room at the top is growing larger every year as wealth is more and more centralized, while the number of impoverished is increasing in exact proportion. At the conclusion of the lecture Mrs. Avery answered several questions asked by persons in her audience. One of them was regarding her attitude on woman suffrage. Mrs. Avery replied that she would never ask man for the right to vote, as that right existed without her asking. The only favor that man can bestow is to remove the obstacles to this right.

USHER VS. REV HERR.

Socialism Opposed to the Equal Division of Property.

Rev. Herr's Gross Misrepresentation.

The Worcester Telegram publishes the following:

The Rev. Dr. Elijah Herr of the Piedmont Church is reported in yesterday morning's issue to have said, among other things: "What are some of the demands of the Socialist? An equal distribution of property; that the Government should be paternal; that the unit should be the nation and not the man."

Mr. Editor, I am of the opinion that every intelligent citizen in Worcester and vicinity knows that this statement is a gross misrepresentation of the Socialist, not only of this city, but of the State, the nation and the world.

Dr. Herr is one of the foremost preachers in this city, and there is no doubt but what he desires to preach the doctrine of love, truth and justice; neither is there the least suspicion that he would take advantage of his exalted position to misrepresent the humblest of persons; nor, what we think, is the greatest and grandest reform movement ever inaugurated, would he intend to belittle.

But the reverend gentleman tells us that the Socialist demands "an equal distribution of property." He says in the earlier part of his lecture: "Were there an equal distribution of property in our country tomorrow, within six months there would be almost as great a disparity as now." Then he means, doesn't he, the land, buildings and all other accumulated wealth shall be divided equally among the people of this nation?

Who are the Socialists? It can be said without fear of contradiction that the only body of people in the world who are recognized as Socialists the world over is the Socialist Labor Party, more generally known in other countries as the Social Democrats Party. All who are in this party are known as scientific Socialists; all out of it may or may not be scientific Socialists, and for utterance of such we are not responsible. Edward Bellamy, author of "Looking Backward," is not recognized as a Socialist, but as a Nationalist, by all students of sociology and economy. There being no other name mentioned, I myself do not know to whom he has reference when he mentioned labor agitators.

Mr. Bellamy not being a Socialist, and

these agitators not knowing whether they are Socialists or not, I must respectfully request Rev. Mr. Herr to make mention of one person, book, pamphlet or any other literature issued by the party, that has for one of its demands "an equal distribution of property." If he fails to find any, I request him to mention any current literature that publishes this as a Socialist demand. I am confident that no reliable magazine or periodical would publish such a statement, for they know it is not true. I am also confident that all advanced economists would not make such a statement, for they know better; no intelligent citizen would either, for he has the free library to visit, and it can be positively said that neither the State nor National platform has any such a demand, and never had, to my knowledge; it is too foolish to conceive of, too foolish to reply to.

I am sorry to have to ask you to give space to a reply to such a foolish statement, oftentimes made through ignorance, oftentimes through malice; but this comes from a person who should know better, and one who belongs to a class that poses as a leader in social reforms, and should be seeking after truth and have the courage to expound it.

Furthermore, this is not the only misrepresentation in this sermon, and as a lover of truth and justice, I want to see these exposed, and as a Socialist I intend to expose them. L. D. USHER.

We are pleased to state that the Rev. Mr. Herr has been supplied with a copy of Merrie England, and hope he will be better informed when next he speaks on Socialism.

The ministers of the Christian churches have sympathy for the workingman, and some of them profess to be workmen themselves. Well, Rockefeller was once a workingman, and Jay Gould claimed he was a workingman, but they must remember that Judas was once an apostle and the devil was once in heaven. It is not good for a workingman to have to bite like a dog or kick like a mule, and woe to those who make the workingmen bite like dogs or kick like mules. They may talk all they like about harmonious relations existing between the under dog and the upper dog, but there can be nothing but inharmonious relations until both dogs stood on an equal footing. HERBERT N. CASSON.

Our industrial systems are mere haphazard customs that we have tumbled into rather than adopted because no scientific efforts have ever been made to keep up socially with our material progress. The necessity of doing this is beginning to dawn upon all thinking people. The new system must be built upon the truth that "labor creates all wealth," and that to the creators belong the products. Then there will be no such paradoxical, cruel conditions as now.—Lizzie M. Holmes.

