



SOCIALISM:

A REPLY

TO

The Common Assertion that the Socialist
Movement is Atheistic, Irreligious,
and a Menace to the Family.

BY

EARL C. DAVIS.

Published by Pittsfield Socialist Local.

OCTOBER, 1910.



SOCIALISM:

A REPLY

TO

The Common Assertion that the Socialist
Movement is Atheistic, Irreligious,
and a Menace to the Family.

BY

EARL C. DAVIS.

SOCIALISM: A REPLY.

Socialism is the product of three great revolutions. First, the revolution which ushered in the idea of democracy in the political world; second, the revolution in thought, ushered in by the teachings of modern science and especially the doctrine of evolution; and third, the revolution in industry in which invention and the application of steam and electricity to the production and distribution of the necessities of life, has created the present capitalistic society, with its two classes,—the ruling class and the working class. The socialist proposes to deal with the situation of capitalistic monopoly, with which we are confronted to-day, in precisely the same manner as the leaders of the movement against monarchy dealt with their situation. Political power had become concentrated in the hands of the monarch and the ruling class. Moreover, this social condition was strongly bulwarked by the religious superstition that the ruler derived his power from supernatural sources, and ruled by divine right. Democracy said that the sovereignty of government rests in the people. The monopolistic authority of government was transferred from the ruling class to the people. It was socialized. Again in the world of thought we have the same kind of a transformation. It was held that our source of truth was supernatural, that it came, not from the bottom up, but was handed down from above in a supernatural way, to be doled out to the people by a class set aside for that purpose. This class was, par excellence, the church. In other words there was a monopolistic control of truth by a privileged class. Science came upon the field and said, "That is not the way we get truth. Truth is not handed out. We get it by the slow process of experience and reason. The source of authority is not in a special class, but in mankind as a whole. Study the facts and conditions of life and human nature. There is truth." The monarch of authority was overthrown, and the principles of democracy applied to the moral and intellectual life. Now, the socialist, facing the fact of a ruling industrial class, makes precisely the same analysis, and proposes precisely the same remedy. The source of wealth is not the capitalist

class, which, by means not always open to investigation, has usurped the control of wealth, but the source of wealth is in labor. Then let those who produce the wealth own it and use it. Just as in political life we say that the right to govern rests in the consent of the governed, i. e., in the consent of the people, so in industrial life we say that the right to wealth rests in the consent of those who have produced it; that is, in the consent of the workers of the world. Therefore, take the control of wealth from the hands of the usurpers and place it in the hands of the producers. Apply the principles of democracy, socialize it. This is the spirit and intent of the socialist movement. For the purpose of attaining these ends it is organized politically. It is essentially an economic movement with an ethical background.

Now, in the address to which you listened here some time since on the subject of socialism, there were presented four criticisms against the movement. First, that it is based on a new philosophy; second, that the new philosophy, being materialism, rules God out of the world; third, that it teaches the doctrine of free love, and is, therefore, a menace to the family and the home; fourth, that it will confiscate private property which would be an injustice to people of wealth. These criticisms are based on quotations from well known writers and present the same kind of evidence and argument that was used to show that Jesus Christ was a glutton and a winebibber, and a blasphemer. Yet the founder of Christendom declared that by their fruits ye should know them, that judgment should be a righteous judgment. To those who are satisfied with that class of evidence, and that method of argument, the address is absolutely irrefutable. I do not attempt for one moment to say that those men have not held those views. But there are certain people who are inclined to judge a man and a movement, not by the accidents of form, not by the clothing, past or present, but by its spirit, its purpose, its integrity, its real nature. To such I am addressing this reply. After all the error of opinion among a few people here and there is not of such great importance, for the cumulative momentum of the socialist movement is already building the social order of to-morrow. You might as well try to stem the ebb and flow of the tides. The socialist movement as politically organized to-day may be destined to defeat, although the political temper of to-day points in the other direction. But the co-operative commonwealth is on the way.

The first conclusion was to the effect that socialism is based upon a new philosophy. I am sure that no one will

deny that assertion. The revolution in thought to which I referred is guarantee for its veracity. But this new philosophy is taking grip on the whole modern world. In a little more than fifty years the whole influential life of the modern world has been conquered by the essential principles and methods of evolution and modern science. The teaching in our universities, the preaching in most of the churches, the teaching in our public schools are all based on the essential principles of what we have come to call Modern Thought. Even in those institutions which still attempt to cling to some of the old language, old dogmas, and forms which belonged to the age before Darwin, a large share of their energy is expended in the vain attempt to put the new wine of evolutionary thought into the old bottles of a special creation philosophy. They realize that the essential principles of evolution are established, and the fate of their forms and dogmas depend upon their ability to make them square with the essential principles of modern thought. The socialist movement is based upon the fundamental principles of evolution, and the methods and teachings of modern science. As such it is not a fixed deposit of dogma, but a movement, facing the facts, and making use of the principles and forces of the life and the universe in which we live. ,

A second aspect of this point, which leads to the second conclusion of the paper is to the effect that the new philosophy, upon which socialism is based, is philosophical materialism. This, it is asserted, would rule God out of the world, and is irreligious, as if the existence of a God depended upon philosophy. I have more faith in God than that. The kind of language we use, and the names that we give our honest interpretations of life do not, in my opinion, change the nature and character of that which we call God.

Now philosophical materialism is a phase of thought that men have passed through and are passing through on the way from the philosophy of supernatural creation to the new philosophy of modern thought. For centuries the church had taught that religion was an affair entirely foreign to the natural life of man. Until some far-off God interfered and injected the anti-toxin of religion into human society man was a Godless and totally depraved creature, capable of no real good. All apparent goodness was but disguised evil. For the sake of redeeming man from this deplorable condition, in a purely arbitrary manner, religion was injected into the world. Its credentials were the supernatural events called miracles, and its wisdom was a supernatural book, given over to

the care of supernatural representatives of God. "If," said the Church, "you do not accept religion on this basis, and if your faith in God is not based upon these evidences, then there is absolutely no reason for belief in God or for a religion." No miracles, no religion; no supernaturalism, no God; that was the teaching.

Now, while the church was giving forth this ultimatum, the scientific spirit of the modern world was demonstrating to the satisfaction of the modern mind, that all these claims to the miraculous, to the special creation, to the supernatural revelation were without sufficient evidence to support them. They searched all the evidence from beginning to end, and, in view of all the facts and all the known principles of life, the man of the modern world said that, while it cannot be asserted that a miracle is impossible, or that a supernatural intervention by an external God has not taken place, still such an event is infinitely improbable. That it has taken place is not a question of blind faith, but of evidence. After searching the evidence we find that it does not support the claims of the churches.

In face of the dilemma thus placed before him by the church, when she said that man must believe in her God or none, and upon her evidence or none, the materialist said: "Very well, we will take you at your word. No God and no religion for us." It is a great tragedy that the institution which bears the name of Christ should have been, because of its lack of faith in the integrity of the universe, a factor in thus suppressing man's instinctive hunger for truth. Philosophic materialism may be likened to a great dismal forest that men passed through on their way from the barren and exhausted fields of supernaturalism to God's open country of freedom and democracy of truth. Many there are who are still in the forest, but the way is no longer difficult, for a pathway has been worn by the hundreds of thousands of hungry mortals who have passed through the wilderness on the way to the promised land.

Among those who went into the wilderness were the early socialists, and among those who are still in there are some of the living socialists. In that forest the socialist movement life, but to say that socialism is tethered in that forest is to say that the whole modern world is tethered there. It is to deny the principle of progress. The basis of modern thought is not materialism, but naturalism.

It was a daring thing for the modern man to investigate the claims of these gods, but it has proved worth while, for,

in so doing he has learned that in the history of religions there has been a clearcut evolution. The religious instinct of man is as natural as his social instinct; it is, in fact, a part of it. His social instinct leads him to reflect upon and discover through experience his relations with his fellow humans. Carrying that a step farther, he is lead to reflect upon his relation to, and dependence upon, the great universal life. In the light of his experience and his development he interprets these experiences. The relationship of the religious to the social aspects of life, and the real nature of each is suggested in that oft-repeated phrase, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and love thy neighbor as thyself."

We have seen by studying the history of religions, that men in all ages, in the face of this great mystery and power of life and the universe in which we live have tried to explain the nature of that power. They have done so in terms of their own experience, and civilization. There is a clearcut, distinct evolution of Gods among all people. Gods have been made in the image and likeness of the culture and wisdom of the people who made them. These Gods stand for the people as a symbol of their interpretation of the great ultimate mystery of the universal life. The evolution of that process is clearly illustrated in the Bible. The Jehovah of the age of Moses is not the same as the Jehovah of the Prophets, nor is either of them like the spirit father whom Jesus loved. The Jehovah as pictured in the song of Moses is a fierce, warlike creature; one who leads the children of Israel in its battles, destroys the Egyptians in the Red Sea, and consumes enemies with his wrath like stubble. He is not the one God, but one God among many; the God, not of all the tribes and people, but just the God of Israel, a great, monstrous warrior. At least that is what the Bible says about Him. The people of that time explained the mysterious powers of the universe in those terms. The God that is described in the song of Moses is not especially valuable as indicating the real nature of that great life spirit, but it does reveal the state of civilization of those who described him and worshipped him. The point which I wish to make is this, that men in all ages reflecting on the mystery of life, and the universe, have interpreted that life and its universal relations in terms of their own experience and wisdom. So we have a clear cut evolution of Gods, each one being made in the image of the makers, as their interpretation of the ultimate reality of the ultimate God spirit.

Now, in the face of this fact of historical knowledge, I want

to turn to that remark that socialism will rule God out of the world and is irreligious. When you ask me that question, I must ask, and I think that many socialists would ask the same,—Of what God are you speaking? Whose picture of God are you referring to? Are you referring to the God whom Moses called a great warrior, the destroyer of men, a barbarous monster? Then I have to say that with all my heart I do not believe in such a God, and I do not believe that there are many people who do believe in such a God unless it be those who make their money out of our monstrous navy. In my opinion the sooner such a God is ruled out of the world the better. If you are referring to the God of Medievalism the God of Feudalism, under whose alleged instructions mankind was held in slavery, in ignorance, the God of the Inquisition, then I make the same answer. I have no honor or respect for such a God. If you ask me if I believe in such a God as is worshipped in the churches of Russia to day, again the same answer. If you ask me if I believe in the God pictured by John Calvin and his kind,—the God of predestined damnation, I do not. If you ask me if I believe in a God who sits supinely contented in face of the poverty, ignorance, degradation and the unspeakable prostitution of modern society, I say again and again that I do not. If you compel me to choose between such Gods as I have mentioned, who have omnipotent power,—if you compel me to choose between such Gods and absolute soulless materialism I would choose with joy the latter alternative, for I have found in man a better nature than is pictured in those Gods.

But who is he that has the right and dares to shut me up to the choice? I do not believe that those pictures of God are any real adequate interpretation of the great mystery of life. We stand to-day in the face of the same great life mystery, the same unfathomed challenge of the real nature of the universe, as have the people of old. We are doing the same task that they have done, we are making our God in our own image, as a witness to our ultimate faith in the integrity of life and the universe. Let the Gods of a former age pass with the age that made them. Let us make and worship our own Gods.

So we come down to the ultimate question, Will socialism rule God out of the world? I do not believe that the socialist philosophy or any other philosophy has anything to do with it. All about us, in and through us, is the great life mystery. We are the products of its mysterious workings, the children of its wonderful ways. In us, in our hopes, in our dreams,

in our glimmering sense of justice, in our flickering flames of human love are the manifestation of this which passes understanding. Call it what you will, Life, Force, Matter, The Great First Cause, Law, Chance, Intelligence, or God, there it is and we are held in its tremendous grip. Our pictures of it are a revelation of our own inner souls, rather than an adequate description of its real nature and essence.

I believe in that great life spirit, in that living God which is quivering and pulsating in human life to-day. I believe in the substantial integrity of humanity and human life. I believe that these hopes of ours, these dreams of justice, this passion for truth, this love of human life, this hunger for a wholesome, whole-souled human fellowship is not a mockery and a delusion, but is as natural to our life as the flower on the rose bush, and the self same power that made the one has made the other. I believe that this great life spirit, which I, too, like to call God, has produced these very ideas and longings in us, and that the whole power of the universe is working towards their realization. I find among people who call themselves socialists a spirit akin to this. Their aim and purpose is to give their life to the attainment of the age long hungerings of a God-intoxicated humanity. I rest my case here but sometimes when I hear the talk about atheism and irreligion, I recall, that the founder of Christendom is said to have asserted that God is spirit, is life, and those who worship him must worship him in life, and without reservation. I cannot help feeling, somehow, that among those who are making sacrifices in behalf of the oppressed and outcasts of the world there is the essence of pure religion.

Now comes a consideration of the alleged menace to the family from the teachings of socialism. Socialism teaches free love and will destroy the family it is said. This is based upon quotations from certain socialist writers, and even the spirit of those quotations is dwarfed and perverted by the propoession that puts a sensual interpretation on every consideration of this kind. Now, I do not believe that whatever of family integrity we have to-day in our modern society rests upon such a shifting foundation as ecclesiastical dogma, or legal enactment. Thank God, most of the families that I know intimately, are quite oblivious to such artificial regulations. Their family integrity, their family purity rests, not upon the conventional demands of the semblance of integrity, but upon a real deep human love and companionship. They are as Paul used to say above the law, for in their love the law is fulfilled and more. Now, if you study the spirit of

most of those who have spoken of that which is called free love, you will find that their advocacy grows out of a faith that if men and women were free from the economic and commercial aspects of marriage then the marriage tie would become more sacred, and more pure, and that we should have, as a result, an infinitely better condition in society than we have to-day with our economic prostitution, with our commercial matrimonial alliances, and our double standards of morality. If you read such a book as August Bebel's "Woman Under Socialism," you may not agree with all it says, or with his conclusions, but you must admit that his idea of the true family is worlds ahead of the conventional marriage by contract. Many people think that when one speaks of freedom in marriage that he is advocating unrestrained animalism, of promiscuous sexual relations. You will find that what he really means is that the true union of man and wife in the family relation should be based solely on one consideration, that of pure love. To such a one considerations of social standing, wealth, and economic necessity degrade the ideal of the family life into mere legalized prostitution. Yet any one who dares to assert that the family should be based on love is regarded as a menace to society.

Any one who knows anything about the social conditions of our time knows that the integrity and the safety of the family as a fact in society is being menaced. The home is the direct object of a brutal assault that is being made to-day, not by the menace of socialism, but by the horrible brutality of our social order, based, as it is, upon the worship of mammon, and a cruel lust for wealth. If you are familiar with the statistics and other facts connected with marriage and divorce you are appalled by the extent to which they reveal the cold, inhuman fact that a large percentage of marriages sanctioned by the state and the church to-day are based, not upon love, but upon cold economic or social considerations. It cannot be said too often that the action of the state or the sanction of the church cannot make a holy wedlock out of a union which is little less than a barter in flesh. International marriages for the payment of debt, or for social standing, or domestic arrangements of the same type are examples of this legalized immorality. The same kind of barter goes on among the more humble folk, under the pressure of economic necessity. Now, I believe in the political, economic and social freedom of women. Then a woman, being free, is not compelled against her will to give herself to the

first man that comes, for the sake of a living and a place of shelter. It is not the lack of the power of love that is working havoc in the home to-day, it is the economic pressure, our inhuman greed for wealth, and our vulgar creed of measuring the worth of the marriage tie by the economic and social advantages involved. Even the divorce courts do not disclose one-half of the results of the brutal assault that is being made on the safety of the home and the family life by this horrible brutality of our times. The slums, the tenement house, the poverty, on the one side; the apartment house, idle children of wealth, and a perverted sensualism on the other side, are a black cloud hovering over us, and what element of danger there is in them, one hardly dares to think.

A second serious criticism which the conventional standards of society compel one to make, I want to bring to your attention. I want to drive it home with all the power that I am able — that is the double standard of morality — one standard for men and another for women. The immoralities of men are winked at in almost every grade of society. Mothers smile with approval and delight upon the marriage of their daughters to men who are not fit to touch the hem of a decent woman's garment, while the women, the victims of unrestrained passion, are cast into outer darkness, to die in shame, and want, and be buried in the potter's field. These men have lived promiscuously, many of them are foul with loathsome diseases, and yet they dare to ask a woman to marry them, dare to ask her to risk her life and health, dare to ask her to become the mother of children who may inherit the taint of a loathsome father. Do you know that the Massachusetts Commission on Sex Hygiene states in a pamphlet that seventy-five per cent. of young men of marriageable age have or have had a venereal disease? Do you know what this means not only to the women whom they marry, but the children born to them? This is part of the price that we are paying because we accept as a practical basis of sex ethics this vicious double standard of morality, and because we are so disgustingly prudish that we shrink from teaching the children that we bring into the world the elemental facts and safeguards of health and morality, and this, too, in a so-called Christian civilization. We think that when the young man has had his fling, and settles down to quiet life and asks for the hand of a pure girl in marriage, that all his past is wiped out. The Old Testament contains no truer sentence than this, that the iniquities of the

fathers are visited on their children even unto the third and fourth generation. By silently accepting this vicious double standard of morality, we are practically saying to the young men, "Go your own gait, and when you have finished your vile days with the women of the street, we will welcome you with open arms to our midst and to our daughters whom we will keep for you unspotted from the world."

These are hard facts, and they make us squirm, but there are more of them yet, and I relate them to show to you that the sanctity of the home is not in danger from the socialist movement, but from the very institutions that the socialist is trying to eliminate. The worst fruits of this immoral double standard are not seen in the homes and hospitals of conventional respectability, but in the women of the street and the brothel. Thousands upon thousands of young women each year pass along this hideous road from poverty to prostitution, and from prostitution to the pauper's grave. They are the unwilling sacrifices of economic necessity on the one hand, and the brutal sensualism of that double standard on the other. If there is ever a time when I doubt the essential integrity of human life, it is when I come face to face with this horrible fact of modern life. When I think of the innocent children born into the beauty of God's world and destined to end their life as the prostitute ends hers, I stand in speechless silence. Read Hawthorne's "Scarlet Letter," read "Tess of the D'Urbervilles," read Hugo's "Les Misérables," and understand something of the misery and degradation,—the horrible sordidness of it all. Expert statisticians tell us that there are not less than 250,000 professional prostitutes in this country to-day,—almost ten times as many as there are people in the city of Pittsfield,—a sacrifice to our greed and our brutality, and yet we dare to mention the name of Christ. What are the causes? Two principal causes so far as the girls are concerned, poverty and ignorance,—and ignorance itself is but an aspect of poverty. It is the pressure of poverty, the lack of a chance for an honest living, the pitiable wage, the long hours of toil, the prayer for daily bread, that is forcing these girls, whom the pious, speaking in abstract terms, call the children of God, along the highway of prostitution. This, coupled with the infamous treachery of men, who have the tacit sanction of society to satisfy their animal passion at a market price, make up the list. It is one of the fruits of our capitalist society, which declares by every law that it makes, and every movement that it sets on foot, that property, dividends, wealth, are more important than

human life. This prostitution is a part of the blood money that is exorted from the working class and the poor that we may have commercial prosperity, and pay dividends on invested capital for the support of a lot of idle parasites. By their fruits shall ye know them.

What are we doing to stem this evil, to provide for the sanctity of the home, to safeguard the young girls who are growing up in our midst? I tell you this, we are putting a greater pressure on them every day. The tremendous increase in the cost of living, the relative decrease in the rate of wages, the crushing pressure of the factory and the mill, are making prostitutes every day. Every time we take a bit of unearned money from the profits of labor, we are giving some girl a shove over the brink towards prostitution. But you say, "Are we not providing homes for fallen women, are we not sending missionaries into the city to lead them to the true way of life, to take them from their conditions?" Oh the pitiable helplessness of it! You believe we are God's children. He gives into our care a tender innocent child, as pure as the rose that blooms in June. In twenty years He comes for her, and we hand Him back a broken prostitute. As a propitiation to a just God for such treatment, out of the wealth that has ruined this child, we dare to say that we have given a few dollars to support a house for the care of fallen women.

Could we by any known means do more to disrupt the family than we are doing to-day? I tell you that it takes more than the marriage ceremony administered by the church to protect the integrity of the family. Yet you dare say that socialism will disrupt the family because some of its leafers using a language that you do not understand, have dared to say that the family tie should be based solely upon love, and have said that woman should not be compelled to give herself to a man for the sake of social position or for money. "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do."

Let me tell you what the socialist hopes to do for the family and the home. Give a woman economic freedom, so that she may be free from any kind of compulsory prostitution, so that the family relationship may be one of love, instead of commerce, and then trust to natural impulse of people for integrity and cleanliness. He hopes that by making woman economically free, she will enter into the duties and joys of life, enlightened, free from the ever-present dread of poverty, that she may bear her children without being hounded by the fear that the daughters may be forced into shame.

Now what has the socialist done wherever he has had such

limited power as is now conferred. Providing decent and simple cottage homes at cost rates, clearing up the cess pools of the large cities, scorning all political alliances with vice, closing dance halls and saloons that are allied with this vice, as in Milwaukee, providing decent and wholesome places of pleasure and social recreation. One particular place I wish to speak of as illustrating their attitude. When they came into power in one town in France, they found that large numbers of people in the city were living together in an illegal way on account of the fact that the marriage fee charged by the church was beyond their means. The socialists, who are destroying the family, arranged to have the city pay the church its miserable fee, and scores of people took advantage of this by becoming legally married. That illustrates the difference between the conventional standards of to-day and the standard of the ethics of socialism. One is commercial, the other is human; one is of mammon, the other is of God. Do you wonder that Thomas Kirkup, the man selected to write the article on socialism for the Encyclopedia Britannica, a man who was not a socialist, stated that the ethics of socialism were akin to if not identical with the ethics of Jesus?

I leave you to decide whether or not the integrity of the family is menaced by this movement, whose great purpose is to eliminate prostitution and place the family life on the foundation of pure affection instead of commercial barter.

That conclusion of the address about the confiscation of private property, does not interest me much. Andrew Carnegie once said, I believe, that wealth did not belong to the possessors, but was simply held in trust by them to be administered in the interests of society. I quite agree with him on that point, but I do not like the trustees. They have a lean and hungry look. In the appointment of these trustees, I should like to see the principle of democracy applied. I think that the results would be more satisfactory. In the address delivered here the assertion is made that the whole socialist philosophy in regard to property is based on the principle that private property is theft. I should say that private property is that property which men have earned a right to, by honest, clean hard work. Private property which has been accumulated by exploitation of poverty, vice, labor, by defrauding the government, by knavery and trickery, is not private property, but stolen property. This is not a statement of wild theory, but just a rehearsal of the cold facts made public by court investigations. Judge Lindsey's "Beast and

the Jungle," the Sugar Trust frauds, the Standard Oil, the Beef Trust, the investigations of the life insurance deals, the bribery investigations now proceeding in New York and Chicago, simply confirm the assertion that the great fortunes once looked upon as the pride of industrialism, are now the shame of the nation. All these facts go to show that a large part of the fortunes are plain stealings, and a strong suspicion remains that the rest of them are due to advantages, not of skill and efficiency, but advantages of duplicity and underhandedness. So extensive have been the ramifications of this sordid stealing that I have come to the point of assuming that all great fortunes are the fruits of dishonesty, and when I come in contact with a particular case, you must demonstrate to me that it is honest, or I assume that it has been amassed in the same manner as the rest.

Now all this evil has been done, but the concentration of wealth is doing more for the coming of socialism than all the agitation in the country. When the process is sufficiently matured, the same principle will be applied as was applied to the concentration of political power. It will be socialized. In the process, which will undoubtedly follow many methods, I am willing to trust that it will be more just and human than the process of accumulation has been. It will not demand the price of prostitution, or poverty, or degradation. It will not take the last crust of bread. All that it will say is this, "In the interests of human life, all the superfluous wealth, all that is not needed for the necessities of life, decency and comfort, must submit to the administration of trustees who are the servants and not the masters of society. ship with those who are dominated by this great humanitarian. The rights of human life must be master of the rights of property.

Years ago such criticisms as the above were very common against the socialist movement, but nowadays they occur only rarely because people have come to see that they have no real foundation, for many of the greatest thinkers of the country realize that in the socialist movement is the center of the moral and spiritual dynamic of our times. In the opening paragraph of the address in question, there is a passage, which, taken in connection with the closing remarks, is full of pathos, and discloses the real tragedy of modern life. Speaking in defense of the ministers, the speaker said: "If the people would heed their messages, many of the things which form the burden of complaint to-day would be removed." Then in the closing appeal reference is made

to the great task of working together with God to bring in the brotherhood of man through Jesus Christ. We unconsciously betray our weakness and reveal our hidden secrets. That passage, "If people would heed the messages of the ministers," unconsciously sounds the tragic note of the Christian churches to-day. People do not heed the messages of the ministers, even when they have one. Why? Because most of the people who have the time and leisure to listen are not interested in the vital message of our times or any times. They are diletantists in religion, in pleasure, and in life. They have lost their capacity for living, and are feeding on the husks in the swine trough. They have no great absorbing purpose in life. On the other hand, the people who have the passion for real life, who want a chance to live, who know what life means, are so burdened with the task of supplying their daily bread that they have little opportunity to listen to the message of the minister. Then, too, they somehow feel a sense of incongruity in the fact that those who are most active in the mad scramble for wealth are quite often very active in the churches. The very people who deprive them of their rightful wage and their chance to live, are the people who support the churches. There may not be any valid basis for this suspicion, but it is there. Many have come to believe that those who hear the message and heed not its meaning have driven the spirit that was in Christ out of the institution that bears His name. They see that there can never be peace, goodwill and brotherliness among men until this great struggle for the flesh pots of profit, until the war-fare for daily bread, until the class struggle has given away to co-operative living, and co-operative effort. Many people say that this idea of a co-operative common wealth is but a hopeless dream. Very well, but it is better to have dreamed a noble dream and worked for it, than to have lived an ignoble life. I do not claim to speak with authority upon the makeup of this glorious world in which we live, I do not claim to be judge between men, I do not claim to be able to say who is atheist and who is not, but I do believe that the spirit of the living God is in the movement for the freedom of humanity from the curse of wage slavery, in the movement that seeks to eliminate prostitution, in the movement which places the worth of men above the value of property, in the movement that dares to dream of a co-operative common wealth. At least it may be said that life is immeasurably more satisfactory when lived in fellow-passion.