



The Iowa Socialist.

Published Every Saturday by The Iowa Socialist Publishing Co. E. HOLTZ and A. A. TAYLOR, Editors and Managers. Office: Cor. Sixth and Iowa Sts. Dubuque, Iowa.

Vol. 1 No. 16 Entered October 1, 1902, at Dubuque, Iowa, as second-class matter, under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Dubuque, Iowa, Saturday, Jan. 17, 1903 No subscription taken for less than six months. All subscriptions payable in advance. 50 Cents a Year

"Therefore, when the pope and his representatives tell you that the doctrines of social democracy are anti-religious, you know that you are right in rejecting those doctrines without further controversy." These were the unequivocal words in which Bishop Quigley gave the workingmen of Buffalo his opinion of the Socialist agitation. What is there, one is tempted to ask, in the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution which can be considered finally and hopelessly anti-religious? Why is one system of industrial organization any more anti-religious than any other system? In fact, is not Socialism much more closely allied to the Catholic idea than individualism ever can be? Does not Socialism emphasize that same idea of the subordination of the individual to corporate authority which Catholicism emphasizes? Ought not the Catholic hierarchy, out of consideration for its own philosophical system, to be inclined to believe that the ideal organization of society would be that in which the individual was subordinated in matters of religion and morals to the church and in matters of politics and economics to the state?

That these last three questions are sometimes answered in the affirmative can be seen in the fact that the younger members of the Catholic party in the Church of England are much under the influence of Socialist thought. One does not have to go far, however, in order to find that the Catholic church as a whole has good reason for its anti-Socialist policy. What is that reason? Not Socialism so much as the Socialists. Not the economic theory of collective ownership so much as the persons by whom that idea has been supported. Continuously and consistently Socialists take up a position of hostility to the church. Some Socialists, of course, call themselves Christian Socialists. Such Socialists, however, are not the body of the party. They are the fringe of the mantle. Socialist speeches are full of gibes and diatribes against the church. Socialist papers publish cartoons against the church. What is the result? The Catholic church turns against its maligners and with millions of workingmen at its back gives Socialism its anathema. It does not stop to distinguish between Socialists and the Socialist idea. Its centuries of experience have taught it too much for that. Socialism is in the hands of anti-religious men and Socialism may therefore expect to find religion ranked among its enemies.

That Socialism has for the present made up its mind to accept this situation appears clearly from the current incidents of Socialist activity. Take a few of the smaller straws in the stream. Those Chicago Socialist Sunday schools which came into temporary prominence a few weeks ago are not necessarily anti-religious—people may meet on Sunday afternoon and discuss anything they please—but in point of fact their tone is undeniably one of disregard or even aversion for the Catholic faith. Last Sunday, too, the Socialist city convention was held at the hour of high mass. Things like these are not overlooked by the church. How could they be overlooked? They stand out aggressively on the face of the Socialist movement. The Catholic church consults only its own safety and the safety of the souls committed to its charge when it denounces Socialism as a spiritual danger. Now the Catholic church is a church of working people, and it is from working people that Socialism expects to recruit its ranks. Are the Socialists good politicians?—Chicago Tribune.

No! They are not politicians at all. The democratic and republican parties may cajole and beg—yes, crawl on their bellies in the dust of humiliation in a manner that would bring the blush of shame even to the brazen cheek of a harlot, in order to get the Catholic vote, or the Protestant vote, prohibition vote or labor vote, only to give them all the cold shoulder after election, but the Socialists, never. They will swerve neither to the right or the left for all the votes in the world. However, it is not true that the Socialists "continuously and consistently take up a position of hostility to the church." It would be true if put the other way: "Continuously and consistently the church takes up a position of hostility to Socialism." That the Socialists should defend themselves against these attacks is natural, and if the church meets in Socialism a Roland for its Oliver it has no one to blame but itself. There is not a word in the Socialist platform as to church or religion. Socialism has no more to do with a man's religion than with his digestion. In "Socialism and Labor, and Other Arguments," Bishop Spalding, of Peoria, lends the authority of his position as a church dignitary to the statement that Socialism and religion have nothing in common. He says: "A Socialist may be a theist or an atheist, a spiritualist or

a materialist, a Christian or an agnostic.

A large number of Socialists, it is true, are atheists and materialists, but the earnest desire to discover some means whereby they may be relieved from their poverty and misery, and the resulting vice and crime, is in intimate harmony with the gentle and loving spirit of Him who passed no sorrow by."

Chicago ministers are discussing the coal strike and this from the sermon by the Rev. R. A. White at Stewart Avenue Universalist church is a sample of several radical utterances:

"Certainly if ever the absolute folly of permitting a comparatively few individuals to own and control one of the prime elements of industrial success and of life itself was made glaringly apparent it is just now. Whatever the immediate reason for extortionate prices for coal the final difficulty rests in the fact of the private ownership of a public necessity. If the present inconvenience, sickness, suffering, and directly and indirectly death hastens the time when the people shall control their own it will not all have been in vain."

The coal strike proves the inexpediency of private ownership of the coal mines no more than strikes generally prove that private ownership generally is a false system and that public ownership should be substituted. According to the logic of this clergyman, the A. R. U. strike proved the inexpediency of private ownership of the railways and a strike in the steel industry, resulting in higher prices for steel and a general suspension of business operations, would constitute an argument in favor of placing the government in charge of the steel industry.

Government ownership would transfer industry from a competitive to a political basis. The coal famine has resulted from no failure of the competitive system but from the failure of the government to protect the citizen in the exercise of his right to enter or accept the service of another. The government's failure to discharge one obligation is no reason why it should be charged with new responsibilities.—Dubuque Times.

Every strike proves the inexpediency of private ownership, and is a nail in the coffin of capitalism. When the history of the future co-operative commonwealth is written, strikes, and especially the great coal strike of 1902, and its resulting misery, will be found to have played a prominent part in hastening the overthrow of the tottering ruins of the competitive system.

Comrades Frederick Strickland and Oliver Jones will be in Dubuque from February 8 to 12 inclusive. Temple Hall, Ninth and Locust, has been secured by Dubuque Local, and lectures will be given every evening on the dates named. These comrades have a standing challenge to meet anyone in debate. Comrade Strickland challenged Tom. L. Johnson, of Ohio, during the campaign last fall and the latter accepted. It is to be hoped the fact that Mr. Johnson came off second best will not bar ambitious Dubuquers with a penchant for defending the competitive system from meeting Comrade Strickland on the rostrum.

One-third of the members of the French senate were elected on January 4. Of the 98 senators elected the Socialists secured 34. The radical party, which votes with the Socialists on many questions elected 18. This is an unprecedented gain and shows an increase in Socialist sentiment, which if continued will give the Socialists and radicals the majority when the terms of the present hold-overs expire and new elections are held.

One of the independent coal barons goes Vanderbilt one better when he says: "Let the public go to hell." With the characteristic short-sightedness of the average capitalist, this "independent" coal baron overlooks the fact that if his advice were followed there would be no market for his coal.

The Standard Oil Company proposes to pension its old employees. This will undoubtedly raise a question in the mind of Prof. Bascom as to whether they can conscientiously accept Rockefeller's money in pensions.

The Iowa Socialist and Wilshire's Magazine one year for 75c. For a limited time only.

Congress has removed the tariff on coal. Now, watch the price of coal tumble. Nit.

The following communication on "Socialism from a Woman's Point of View" by Caroline F. Corbin appeared in the Chicago Record-Herald of last Sunday:

To the editor:—In the lively discussion which is going on concerning the Socialist propaganda it would appear that women have as deep an interest as men, since they are equal sharers in social conditions. Possibly also their peculiar functions which lie at the foundation of all society give them a fully equal right to an expression of opinion or sentiment on the subject.

By all means the most important product of human society is the human infant. Not wheat nor corn, houses nor merchandise, stocks nor bonds, compare with it for a moment in importance or value. It is in fact for this one product that all others exist. If the human infant should cease to be produced every other social product would at once lose its value. But in this incomparably valuable entity the mother is by far the most important factor. So absorbing is her agency, so exhausting the draft upon her every power, physical and mental, that the common experience of the race has demonstrated that for her own good, for the good of society and the welfare of the child she ought to be exempted during the period of her maternity from the labor necessary to her support. Her maternal condition of physical incapacity becomes, therefore, a permanent and inalienable tax upon property.

In the present social order the father of her child is held responsible for her support, and his capital or labor—the labor which is his capital—is pledged for this purpose. But let us once suppose that all property is held collectively, then the provision for the support of the mother and infant must be transferred to the collective owner, namely, the state. This is a well understood and openly advocated tenet of Socialism. That it involves the utter destruction of marriage, the home and all private interest in children on the part of the parents is conceded by such Socialist leaders as Rousseau, Marx, Hasenclever, Hyndman, Bebel and many others.

Collective ownership, therefore, which is the kernel of Socialism, can never be fully discussed without taking into account this its ultimate result. It stands in fundamental and uncompromising opposition to the present social order and to the teachings of Christianity, and whoever accepts it must be prepared to go its full length and arrive at its avowed and advocated result.

It is utterly fallacious, therefore, to say that Socialism is simply an economic system. In its far reaching but inevitable results it threatens the whole basis of religion and morals, as embodied in Christian civilization. It proposes an entire revolution in the construction of society, and it is for this reason that it so justly takes the title of revolutionary Socialism.

The subject, therefore, becomes of serious importance to women, and two questions naturally arise in the consideration of it. The first is economic: Are women prepared to relinquish their present legally established rights and privileges in the home for a lien upon the state? The second is personal: Are they willing to give up these rights and privileges together with the care and protection of the father of their children and the love and companionship of the children themselves, in exchange for the right (and obligation) to earn their own living and to vote, with such humanitarian interest as the state may manifest in their welfare thrown in?

Such is the "justice" which Socialism proposes to mete out to the mother of the race. There may be a few men who are willing to escape the responsibilities of family life on such terms, but it is scarcely to be wondered at that women are not coming forward in great numbers to accept a proposition which they feel instinctively is fraught with ruin not only to the dearest interests, ideals and traditions of their sex, but to the best interests of mankind as well.

Society now undertakes the education of children in public schools. In some states and countries education is compulsory. But this has not resulted in the "utter destruction of marriage, the home and all private interest in children on the part of the parents." If the facts were not present to disprove it, there would be as much sense in claiming that public education would cause these dire calamities—evidently conjured up in a fit of dyspepsia or by a reading of Rousseau's pre-Revolutionary communism—as that they would result from Socialism.

"In the present social order the father of her child is held responsible for her support, and his capital or labor—the labor which is his capital—is pledged for that purpose." How many husbands are there today whose only capital is their labor power? And this is valuable only if they are able to sell it to others. How fares the mother and child when the husband is unable to sell? How

about the families of the average workingman of the United States? With an average annual wage of \$487 and an average of five in the family, the mother's "own good, the good of society and the welfare of the child" appears to be held very cheaply. Why, there is many a litter of prize pups rated much higher than that by the kennel clubs.

It is true that Socialism stands "in fundamental and uncompromising opposition to the present social order," but whether it is in opposition to the teachings of Christianity depends on whether you get those teachings from your Bible or your bank-book.

"Are women prepared to relinquish their present legally established rights and privileges?" Why, bless your soul, who ever heard of a slave having any rights or privileges. Woman today, as ever, is the slave of a slave. Not, perhaps, Mrs. Brownstone-Front, but the wife of the average workingman under the present system is nothing more than a slave.

"Are women willing to give up the love and companionship of their children?" In Massachusetts 9,000 children work in factories; in New York 10,000; Illinois 20,000 (twice as many as in 1897); Pennsylvania 35,000, not including the breaker boys of the mines. A few are also employed in the cotton mills of the South. Were the mothers of these children "willing" to part with their companionship or were they compelled to through economic necessity?

Under Socialism women will have the same right of suffrage as men. They constitute fifty per cent. of the voting population. The "state" will be the people. Can women not be depended upon under Socialism to so vote as will conserve "not only the dearest interests, ideals and traditions of their sex, but the best interests of mankind as well."

A correspondent of the Boston Herald says the purchasing power of a good, honest day's labor in the New England mills, as measured by the necessities of life, is less than during the hard times and there is social discontent in the home of honest labor. The prosperity that has come through gold inflation to the farmer, the merchant, the speculator and the trusts has not come to the wage-earner. "Hogs is high, and hogs is rising," and the western farmer is enabled to pay off the mortgage on his farm because 100 lbs. of live hog will pay twice as many dollars of the mortgage as it would half a dozen years ago, but the dollar that comes to the hand of the toiler will not buy half as much hog as it would six years ago. The Herald's correspondent suggests the remedy lies in a rise in wages to meet the new conditions. A good suggestion, but its just possible that a rise in wages will be followed by another rise in hog. Another rise in wages would be necessary every time there was a rise in hog. This might be kept up until the toiler drew \$100 per day in wages, but what benefit would he derive from this endless chain if the proportion between his wages and the price of hog remained the same? In other words, so long as the means upon which the toiler depends for a living remain in other hands, those others will fix his wages and the price of his living. And thus it will remain until the toiler demands an equal share in the ownership of the means of production and distribution, which is his by every law of justice, and under which he would receive not a mere wage, but all the product of his toil.

A correspondent of the Railroad Telegrapher, who is a railroad president, says all a laboring man needs and should have is enough to live on properly, and that he considers \$45 or \$50 per month an abundant sufficiency for that purpose. A living is all any beast of burden gets.

All signs point to the extinction of the democratic party, as that party has no longer a definite class interest to conserve.—John C. Chase.

This is a season of great prosperity, we are told. Yet the suffering this winter is as great as it was in the panic winter of 1894.

Wilshire's Magazine and The Iowa Socialist one year for 75 cents. It's a bargain. Grab it!

Subscribe for The Iowa Socialist.

Dubuque laundry workers have organized a union. See that your linen bears the stamp.

Wilshire's Magazine and the Iowa Socialist one year for 75 cents. It's a bargain. Grab it!

The large increase in the Socialist vote of last year is the most significant political event of the past forty years.

Read our great offer on page three of this issue. The International Socialist Review, regular price \$1.00, a standard cloth bound book worth 50 cents, and The Iowa Socialist, one year, all for \$1.00.

Since the Krupp incident and Kaiser Wilhelm's wild harangue denouncing its connection with the affair, the "Vorwaerts," of Berlin, has secured an increase in its subscription list of 5,000. Hit 'em again yet, Bill!

The ice teamsters engaged in harvesting ice for a certain firm of Dubuque ice men struck last week for an advance of five cents an hour in wages. This was refused by the firm on the ground that it was competing with concerns which were having ice put up at six cents per ton. "In the good old summer time" the festive consumer pays forty cents per hundred or \$8.00 per ton for ice. "How would you like to be the ice man?"

Pana, Ill., Jan. 13.—The coal mines in this locality are employing 900 men who are idle half of the time because of lack of cars. The miners blame the mine operators and the operators blame the railroads. A walkout is possible in one of the old shafts employing 350 men.

Meanwhile people are freezing to death. But what's the odds? Is not the charm of individuality thus preserved? And is not the future progress of the race thus assured?

The labor problem is impossible of solution, says Carroll D. Wright, U. S. Commissioner of Labor. As long as the wage system lasts there will be a labor problem impossible of solution under that system. Abolish the wage system and the labor problem will be solved. When Alexander was unable to untie the Gordian knot he took his sword and cut it, saying to cut is the same as to untie. The existing relation of labor and capital—the dependence of the former upon the latter—must be cut.

I believe that in less than ten years we will see great rents occur in the social fabric, almost simultaneously on all points. I believe that in less than twenty years, although it were idle to expect the realization of all we want in that time, profound political economical and purely social modifications will have bettered the world considerably, brought a greater total sum of happiness, made the good things of life more evenly, therefore more equitably, divided.

I also believe that we will soon abolish the abnormal privilege of inheriting wealth: it will be abolished on the same principle that made us republicans already deny the inheritance of the sceptre. The two things are one.

In fact, it is much more absurd that a young Vanderbilt or Castelliane, with a possible commercial value of \$25 a week, should inherit millions, than it would be to permit the sons of McKinley and Loubet to rule on because their fathers did.

To say that even today—Socialism—the wonderful doctrine of salvation—scientifically and practically irrefutable though it is, compelled to gain converts slowly—one by one, condemned without hearing by most people, its advocates driven from every point of vantage—the church, pulpit, the university hall, the editorial chair! Why! to make Socialism go down your progressive American throats Edward Bellamy (he said so himself) was compelled to sugar-coat it with fiction "Looking Backward!" These are facts which must bravely be uncovered to the public gaze. But after after all, I am not a pessimist. Deploring the present, I look forward into this pregnant new century with joyful confidence.—Emile Zola.

The Iowa Socialist in bundles at fifty cents per hundred. Express prepaid.

