

SCOTT COUNTY KICKER.

VOL. 7

BENTON, MO., FEBRUARY, 15 1908.

NO. 15

Observations by the Kicker.

The War Against the Saloon.—How Socialism Would Solve the Problem.—Kicker Discusses the Matter With a Member of the Local W. C. T. U.

Just now there is a "moral wave" sweeping over the country that threatens to demolish the liquor traffic. I have given it little or no attention for the very good reason that it is only another "craze," such as was the tariff, free silver, etc., where it is sought to correct one evil while losing sight of the remaining 9,999.

You cannot stay the fall of a tottering building by patching the roof. You must begin at the foundation. You cannot stop drunkenness by law; you must remove the causes that produce drunkenness. It is true that prohibition or local option may "help some," but why continue this patch-work when it is so much easier and better to remove the causes—poverty, unrest and worry.

Travel the country over and see if you will find a liquor dealer, high or low, who favors Socialism? I have never heard of one. In fact, the booze traffic is one of the main props of Capitalism. Under Socialism the saloon would pass out without making any noise—just as would the houses of prostitution, assignation houses and like Capitalist "industries." Oscar Badermaker, in the Chicago Socialist, writes:

The prohibition movement is unscientific, and therefore ineffective. It proposes to abolish intemperance by simply putting it under a ban. It entirely ignores the real causes of the evil, and consequently its remedies are to a large extent superficial and useless. The prohibition movement holds that liquor traffic is due simply to the laxity of our laws, and believes that by a careful amending and subsequent enforcement of them, alcoholic intoxication and all the misery arising from it, will disappear from the earth. It even declares that a great deal of poverty is due to drink, and that when drink is abolished, poverty will also be abolished. It affirms, moreover, that immorality is caused from drink, and that with prohibition this vice would disappear likewise. In other words, the temperance movement declares that drink is a creation of the law and that law can prohibit it. On top of all this it declares prohibition to be the natural way of procedure.

What can be more untrue? The principles on which prohibition is founded are entirely false. Intemperance, like all other vices, is due to economic conditions. If economic conditions are poor, morals are poor. If economic conditions change, morals change. The ethics, morals, religious views, education, and even the laws themselves, of the feudal era are different from our own. Each economic system of society has its own codes and its own standards of life. For instance, a workingman who drudges all day at his toil is not poor because he drinks, but drinks because he is poor. A man who has most of his life ground out of him at his work and comes to his hotel in the evening all tired out will, nine times out of ten, take to drink.

The gin shop is a much more congenial abode to him than the squalid place he lives in. There he comes in contact with his friends, and it is there, while under the influence of stimulants, that he forgets his hardships and is rejuvenated. Drink is not the cause of poverty, but it is in the main poverty that is the cause of drink. There is no more temperate people on earth than the Hindoos, and there is no poorer people on earth than the Hindoos.

The prohibitionists claim that drunkenness is the cause of immorality. In this claim they err again. Immorality is due to only two things, ignorance and poverty; and these two things are likewise attributed to economic conditions. All statistics bearing on this subject, that have come to my notice, show that at least 85 per cent. of all registered prostitutes come from the families of the working class. The working class is ignorant and poor because present economic conditions make it so.

Then, the prohibitionists maintain that the liquor traffic could be stopped by simple enactment of certain laws. They ignore the fact that laws conform to material interests, and that the nature of the predominant material interests depend upon the state of a society. Elevate the economic state of a society and you elevate the nature of its material interests; elevate the nature of its material interests and you rear a better people; and a better people means better morals, and consequently better laws. The prohibitionists, however, want to put the cart before the horse, and make better people, better morals, and better economic conditions by making better laws. Such a pro-

cedure is absurd. The principal trait of our industrial world today is production for profit. All commercial and productive enterprises have for their main spring the desire of pecuniary gain and for their collateral spring production for use. If this main spring be removed, therefore, and in its stead placed that of production for use alone, you take away the great prop of the saloon evil. The saloon is run and made attractive because there is a profit in doing so. With the removal of this prop it will cease to exist just as a plant ceases when deprived of its nourishment.

But when production in a commonwealth is carried on for use alone, that commonwealth is socialist; and a socialistic commonwealth means few hours and full reward to labor. In it a workingman would enjoy his work and have an attractive and comfortable home where he could meet his friends and acquaintances, where he would crave to stay. In it there would be no ignorance, no poverty, and vice consequently would be reduced to a minimum. Thus the liquor problem would be solved in a natural and scientific way.

We now have prohibition in several states of the union. Our neighbor, Kansas, has it. Have they any better government there than here? Are not the work people just as poor and dependent? What further evidence is necessary of the futility of trying to improve conditions by tacking a shingle on the roof and leaving the remainder of the rotten structure stand? Take the PROFIT out of the liquor traffic and it will disappear of itself. And Socialism stands for the abolishment of the entire profit system.

I want to relate a little incident and trust that the ladies of the W. C. T. U. will take no offense—for none is intended. Last week they closed a contest here. So that the reader may understand, the ladies separated themselves into two bodies—or "sides"—and the work before them was to get recruits for the W. C. T. U. The side that brought in the fewest members was to entertain at dinner the side that brought in the greater number. The contest grew very warm, about 100 new members were secured—and, incidentally, about \$75.

A good "sister" approached the Kicker and insisted that he join. The Kicker is always naughty and bluntly replied that he had quit helping the liquor interests. The good sister appeared puzzled and just in time to prevent her saying "you mean thing." I went on: "If the whiskey trust was financing the W. C. T. U. and directing its action, the W. C. T. U. could be of no greater service to the trust than it is."

Horrors! Maybe I wasn't into it. But after she recovered I was asked to explain. "That you are sincere in your work I admit," the Kicker went on, "but you are on a false trail. Ever since I can remember I have heard of the W. C. T. U., and it has grown in about the same proportion as the liquor traffic has grown."

To this the good sister would not agree and pointed to the present successful agitation against saloons. "This 'spell,'" the Kicker went on, "is due to an uprising of the people because they have been shown that the saloon is a chief factor in corrupting politics. The Socialists have the only natural and, therefore, effective remedy for the liquor evil."

There was a brief hush and the editor proceeded: "Do you believe the big breweries and distilleries would be in operation if there was no profit in making the stuff?" "No."

"Do you believe there would be any saloons if there was no profit in selling booze?"

"No."

"Then why don't you advocate Socialism, which stands fundamentally for the elimination of profits?" "Oh, I don't believe in that."

"Neither does the whiskey trust. Now, can you explain why you and the whiskey trust are together?" She could not—and I got off without paying a membership fee. I hope the ladies will not regard the foregoing as an effort to belittle their work. I only want to show them that the only effective way to put down the liquor traffic is by and through the Socialist party. And more: The Socialist party stands for woman's suffrage. Unlike the Capitalist parties, they believe the influence of women in



—Cartoon by Courtesy of the Chicago Daily Socialist.
After Defeating Capitalism in Court, Labor Steps From the Gallows in Idaho into the Political Arena to Battle for Freedom.

politics will prove beneficial. Why should not every woman become a Socialist? It is the only party that stands for their emancipation.

LEFT OUT IN THE COLD.

It is to laugh. President Roosevelt swiped the last bit of the "time honored principles of the Democratic party," rolled them up into a message and handed them over to congress in a special message last week. The message appeared in last week's Kicker—third page.

All along Frank McGuire, of the Jackson Cash-Book, has denied that there was really no difference between the Republican and Democratic parties, and that Bryan endorsed the Republicans of "going Democratic." Now listen to McGuire on the president's special message:

"To one familiar with the position taken by the Democrats in their three last national platforms on the subjects discussed by the president in his special message it will be seen that all he has to say is right in line with the Democratic party's policy and teaching, and altogether out of harmony with his own party."

When I quoted from Bryan's New Jersey speech, in which he said, "If I cannot take back what I have said about the Republicans I do not feel like saying it again," McGuire said Bryan was only joking, and that my sense of humor was very dull. Now comes McGuire and says of Roosevelt's message: "All he has to say is right in line with the Democratic party's policy and teaching."

Oh, say, Bro. McGuire, does the Democratic party stand for the national banking system? In a speech here during the last campaign Congressman Russell said he was opposed to the national bank, Bryan's hobby now is to strengthen the national banking system by having the government guarantee deposits. You are so insistent that Socialists should be very specific on all questions. Will you kindly inform a benighted editor as to what the Democratic party proposes on just ONE question?

The Democrats are real mad about it because the Republicans have stolen all the "principles" they swiped from the Populists in 1896. Being completely bankrupt, the Democrats will now have to proceed to appropriate to themselves large slices of the Socialist platform. But there's one slice of the Socialist platform they will never steal—that the worker is entitled to the full product of his labor without having to "divide up" with the idle class.

What do you think of that "recent flurry"? What do you think of the newspapers that so systematically lied to you? These same papers will want you to believe them during the campaign just opening. Will you do it?

WHAT WILL THE ISSUE BE?

From the Chicago Daily Socialist.

One of the few amusing features of the present situation is offered by the frantic efforts of the Democratic and Republican politicians to find an "issue" on which they can disagree. Roosevelt's speech-rolling at the capitalists seemed to be pretty good stuff with which to enthrone the little capitalists, and the unthinking workmen, and both parties promptly tried to steal its thunder. It is safe to say that if the headlines had been misphrased it would have been impossible to tell which sentiments were uttered by Hughes, or Roosevelt, or Bryan, or Tatt.

All agree that something ought to be done to the bad capitalists to prevent them from spoiling the whole game. All agree that capitalism itself is good, but that some capitalists are bad.

ALL ARE AGREED THAT SOMETHING MUST BE DONE, AND DONE QUICKLY, TO STOP THE GROWTH OF SOCIALISM.

In the last analysis this will be the real issue in the next campaign. No matter how it may be concealed, no matter what platforms and leaflets and spell-binders may say, the only real issue in every civilized country today, so far as all parties but one are concerned, is "What shall we do to stave off Socialism?" The Republican and the Democratic parties will stand upon the same platform. It will be but a few years until the same identity of interest that has driven them to a common platform will compel a consolidation of organizations and the issue will stand out full and clear—SOCIALISM vs. CAPITALISM.

Is there any doubt of what the result of that battle will be?

The president's special message was a campaign speech around which will be formed the "paramount issues of the day." However, it was very radical and revolutionary and if a Socialist had used the same language in some of our larger cities he would have been arrested and thrown into prison. His utterances will be used by the spell-binders this fall as evidence that the party is against "bad trusts." His urging labor legislation sounds very fishy when it is considered that his federal courts have, within the past three weeks, declared labor organizations as illegal conspiracies—to say nothing of several other jolts the courts have giving labor organizations. According to the courts it is legal for employers to blacklist the workmen, but illegal for the workmen to blacklist the hostile employers.

Bryan's income is now said to be \$75,000 per year. No wonder he wants his bank deposits guaranteed by the government.

FARMERS' MEETING.

Representatives of the various farmers' union locals adjacent to Benton met here Saturday to provide ways and means to build a warehouse at the station. Collector Christian was chosen chairman and George Vinyard secretary.

It was decided to locate the warehouse near the station if ground could be obtained, or to buy the Lambert warehouse if satisfactory arrangements could be made. J. E. Morrow, C. P. Underwood and G. A. Vinyard were appointed a committee to investigate and report at the next meeting.

The stock company plan was adopted—the stock to sell at \$10 per share and to be sold only to union members. Stock to the amount of \$750 was subscribed and each local is to report the amount of stock that will be taken by its members at the next meeting.

The warehouse is to be rat-proof and as large as the means will allow. The meeting adjourned to Saturday, March 7, at 1 o'clock p. m. when it is expected that all interested parties will be present and the subscribed stock taken up.

Talk about gall! The Stone County ring has it. In Stone County the ring is labelled Republican. They do business just like some rings labelled Democratic. Some years ago the Stone County Oracle turned against the ring and began to expose its workings. The result was that a new county court and prosecuting attorney was elected and several county officials are now under indictment. Several thousand dollars have also been returned to the county treasury by bondsmen. Last week the old machine rallied its forces and, in mass convention assembled, "wholly divested, expunged, removed and obliterated" the Oracle, the county court and prosecuting attorney "from all prestige or affiliation to or with the said Republican party." That is pretty nearly as bad as they treated me in Scott county some twelve years ago when the ring had its grand jury to endorse the rottenness of county affairs and officials that I had exposed.

The Vanderbills have bought for their daughter, Gladys, a Hungarian nobleman (?) and the price was the income on \$15,000,000. You work-mules will produce that income. Anna Gould has just got rid of her French no-count, after agreeing to support him for life. You'll have to foot that bill, too. And the sweet-scented Alice Thaw dumped her Yarmouth duke at a cost to you of \$40,000 a year. Not only do the workers of this country have to support in luxury the idle drones of this nation, but much of the rotten nobility of Europe. How do you like your job?

Organize, workers, organize!

SOCIALISM AND THE BIBLE.

(By Rev. S. R. Bowman, of the Gran Baptist Church.)

THE RULE OF THE PATRIARCHS.

Mohammed, of the tribe of Korah, was out of a stock of freebooters, pirates which acquired importance by rapine and plunder. He was born in the year A. D. 571. Not of humble parentage, as some assert, but of one of the most influential families of the Korahites which had won its large revenues by intercepting and plundering the merchantmen whose routes lay through their unhappy land, Arabia. We do not wish to write a story of the Prophet's life but intend only to notice those circumstances and events which go to mould the constitution of the Moslem Empire.

Should the story be written by his friends or by his enemies, the delineation of his character would be so shocking that any country might well blush with shame to have produced such a monster. At the age of two years his father died and the great wealth of the family fell into the hands of Mohammed's uncles. He and his mother, Abenna, were left destitute. Four years later Abenna died and the boy began a life of wandering from place to place among relations.

The natural instincts of thief and hunter were everywhere apparent in the youth. At the age of twenty-eight he married Khadijah, a widow in the fortieth year of her age, but without possessed of great wealth. This gave wings to Mohammed's ambitions. He became a merchant, not a camel driver, transporting valuable merchandise by camel from all points to Arabia.

Here he became puffed up with the art and ways of violence and rapine. At the age of thirty-seven his meditations began and at forty he was the Apostle and Prophet of God. He needed converts; his affluent circumstances permitted him to hold the needy.

Brothers was the "mad stiff" upon which he based the great faith, of which he was apostle. Too weak as yet to compel the impulsive tribes which gathered at Mecca, he paid out of his abundant treasury the price of man's allegiance. His religion of one deity did not appeal to the sturdy Arabs. "There is no God but Allah and Mohammed is his Prophet."

So he grounded a Paradise of free love and free land. The black abolitionists of cursed civilization promised to the wild tribes, "one thousand to look to his standard. Men are easily persuaded to believe what they wish to be true, even though it be contrary to all reason."

Not only did his heaven persuade men to follow his fortunes, but his hell which he invented caused the fearful to join his ranks. Being compelled to flee from Mecca he came to Medina and in order to rear for his own comfort a substantial home he deprived some poor orphans of a plot of ground and thereby cast upon the mercies of the world. This shameful deed which excites our pity was accomplished by the self-styled "Prophet of God" without fear or compunction. Yet this monster not only established the foundation of an Empire but gave to the world a religion.

His converts were given swords and from Medina he led them to adjacent towns and pillaged and burned them dividing the spoil with his soldiers and distributed the vanquished among his soldiers as slaves. These slaves could only buy back their freedom by accepting the religion of Mohammed.

Thus many became Mohammedans for booty and others accepted it for freedom. The whole life of Mohammed from this time is one continued scene of butchery, rapine, violence and crime. His converts were freebooters and thieves. He plundered every caravan of its valuable merchandise and made distribution according to the eighth chapter of his Koran.

Defeated at Ohud he brought forth a new doctrine, that, "those who fell fighting for Mohammed should be rewarded with a seat of honor in Paradise." This caused men to fight with desperate fury and offset all retreats.

His religion, now accepted by the fierce tribes of Arabia and the Koran fully accepted as a divine message, his followers set out upon the war of conquest. The Turks were conquered. The Ottoman empire, backed by the faithful in hard fought battles, established the religion and the Book of Mohammed as the supreme law of the land. "Those books that agree with the Koran are useless, those that disagree are dangerous, burn them all," they said and thus the light of

the old world's literature was put out almost completely.

The history of the Mohammedan world today, as we look backward, tells us only that the spirit of the ancient Koran still survives.

They have been faithful to the book, to its teachings and laws.

The Caliphate of Bagdad has been bathed in blood. The Caliphate of Cordova was a place of slaughter. The long chain of crimes imputed to the Turk tells us nothing so plainly than that the Turk has been true to his religion.

What more can you expect from Turkey?

But we are not in Turkey. We boast of living in a land of Bibles, of churches, under the blaze of Christian civilization. Today we hear the cry of millions in Bible lands, and for what do they ask? Do they ask us for charity? Do they beg us for bread? Does the father of young American manhood look his child in the eye and say, "I am begging for you?" No! He simply asks to be permitted to invest his time and energies in profitable employment that he might enjoy the fruit of his investment.

He is simply claiming his inalienable right, striving to break the fetters bound in an evil hour.

The cry of suffering humanity today in Bible lands is answered as it was answered six thousand years ago when the first red-handed murderer looked God in the eye and asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" —Gen. 4:9.

Cain is considered an civilized land, as a reproach; his name is associated with the flag and our throat and yet perhaps the spirit of Cain which made him the first murderer was as evil as the act, "might makes right." Yet today, in a land of open Bibles—in a Christian land, professed Christians are preaching the doctrine of Cain, "might makes right."

The Bible condemns the spirit of Cain, condemns the man—yes, condemns the church member who denies his right to help his fellowman, believing that "might makes right." Worse than Cain is that man today who would oppress his brother because it is in his power to do so, to be able to do greater things with his resources than his neighbor.

The patriarchy developed a sort of government that seems to have been almost ideal when kept within the divinely appointed limits.

It was a sort of democracy in its administration. The father with his sons and their children formed a commonwealth in miniature. Their administration of justice was in accordance with the fixed law of God. The guilty man must suffer regardless of rank or position.

The father ruled; he was the judge of his own children yet it was the voice of his children many times that brought forth his decisions.

The social side of the patriarchy was communistic. Nominally the father held the right to all property but he was only the legal representative of his people. He was the visible head of a petty confederacy and in him centered their well being and about him clustered their individual rights.

Many times, we read in the Scriptures how these little confederacies were wrecked and ruined but always because the great principle of communistic democracy had been violated.

We do not advocate the institution of the patriarchy as a national government. It was never intended as such. The divine hand which created it afterwards set it aside as an institution for national government but the great underlying principles were never revoked and SHALL NEVER BE FOR

"Right is right since God is God. And right the day must win. To doubt would be distinctly. To falter would be sin."

The rule of the patriarchs, then, endorsed by God and contained great truths that were capable of carrying over into the national governments, viz "Communistic Democracy." (Continued Next Week.)

Robberies are so common now that our "prosperity" has come to a head that they cease to be news. Two weeks ago the safe of B. F. Earles, at Morley, was blown open and \$25 secured. The Morley post-office was also robbed of a small amount. Last week burglars attempted to blow the safe of the postoffice at Chaffee but were frightened away by a boy at whom they shot.

St. Francois county will vote on local option March 7.