EDITORIAL

EASY LESSONS [1].

By DANIEL DE LEON

Our Sunday Visitor, a Huntington, Ind., “National Catholic Weekly” of the 16th of this month, has an article by the Rev. F.X. Van Nistelroy, in which the reverend Father lavishly bestows himself upon humanity in order to save it from the calamity of Socialism.

So generous are the Rev. Van Nistelroy’s good intentions that they are “catchy”: they have “caught” us: and generously do we wish to return the generous gift, by bountifully imparting to the Father some information free, gratis and for nothing. We propose to do so in a series of “Easy Lessons.” Here goes—

No. I.

The Rev. F.X. Van Nistelroy objects to Socialists on the general ground that “they propose to right existing wrongs by working the poor man’s envy of the rich.”

Dear Father:

Let us make you acquainted with a certain book. It is a significant book; so significant that its name, Bible, means “Book.”

Next, let us make you acquainted with the Central Figure in that book. He is variously called “Jesus,” “the Nazarene,” and “Christ.”

There is a third general matter that we wish to acquaint you with, before entering upon specifics. That is, that the biography, or biographic sketches, of the central figure above mentioned is handed down by certain authors, collectively named “the apostles,” of whom one, is named Matthew; another, is named; Mark; and a third, is named Luke; are among the first.

Now, dear Father, let us make you specifically acquainted with some of the things that these biographers of the Central Figure report him as having said of the
rich: He said “a rich man shall hardly enter the kingdom of heaven.”

He explained why, to wit, that “the deceitfulness of riches choke the word.”

He summed up the ease of the rich man with the telling allegory that “it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God.”

And he had nothing but lamentation, if not contempt, for the rich, as indicated by the exclamation, which was a review of their condition,—“Woe unto you that are rich!”

Finally, dear Father, let us inform you that he of whom his biographers report such expressions is known as “the Prince of Peace.” From which the conclusion is legitimate that to denounce the rich is no act of wickedness; may even be the result of profound social penetration; and that the policy of assailing the Socialists, on the ground of their exposing the plutocracy, is a dangerous, a boomerang sort of policy. Avoid it, Father dear.

Chew upon all this, dear Father F.X. Van Nistelroy. Next week we shall give you another easy lesson on facts and reasoning.