

Getton's Weekly

50c A YEAR IN CANADA—TWO FOR \$1.00

Devoted to the Propagation of the Principles of
International Socialism

\$1.10 PER YEAR IN UNITED STATES

COWANSVILLE, P. Q., THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1909

LET US CLEAR THE WAY FOR THE SOCIALIST STATE

VOL. XXXVIII No. 30

SOCIALISM AND SOCIABILITY

We recently published a complaint signed by Socius against the Socialists because they were not sociable. While preaching the brotherhood of man, while preaching a doctrine of uplift for the poor, while claiming to have the good of humanity at heart, the socialists, according to this critic, are narrow bigoted and unsociable. The socialists will not fraternize with others who are trying to uplift humanity according to other theories. This is the complaint of Socius.

Socialism is a science and, being based on scientific principles, can have little to do with mawkish sentiment. According to socialist theories, man, so far as this physical world is concerned, is a natural animal and will react to the physical agencies of his environment. The rich will be refined and non-moral; the poor will be degraded and non-moral; the middle class will be respectable and moral according to the notions of morality now prevalent. This being the case, man's natural development will depend upon his station in life and his theories of God and the universe in relation to man will be influenced by his economic station. Change the present system and bring a state in which all men will be free and in which the physical wants of all men will be satisfied, and the race will take a great leap forward.

Holding the theories they do, the socialists must follow them and must work their hardest to bring their theories into actual governmental practice. The socialists have no time to be sociable. The socialists have no time to fraternize with those individuals who are trying to save humanity atom by atom. The Christians are doing fairly good work in spots. The Christians, inculcating principles of morality in the hearts of individual human atoms, are doing the best they know according to their lights to make the world better. Let them keep up their work if they desire, but the socialists must work according to their own theories. The philanthropic, socialist-opposing Christian is a narrow bigot. His beliefs perforce make him such. The socialist who opposes the influence of the non-economic, moralizing Christian is also a narrow bigot from the Christian's point of view. His beliefs and theories perforce make him such. Both Christian and socialist who hold strong beliefs that are antagonistic must, perforce, from their very sincerity, and from their strong opinions, oppose the influence of each other, and be mutually considerer narrow bigots. Let Socius remember that socialism has nothing to do with sociability.

CHARITY

Charity once meant love. Love for your fellow-men is a good thing, but charity in its present connotation is bad. We hear many things about charity balls, charity sales, charity organizations. Ladies and gentlemen will gather themselves together and have a good time and possibly do a little work and, while so doing, will contribute a few dollars towards some charitable object, and consider they have done well.

The very thought of charity is degrading. One set of people give to another set of people a few dollars. Even those who give realize the futility and the evil of their gifts. How often does the expression "pauperizing the poor" fall from the lips of the charity givers? They feel that the money they give will but make the poor dependent and servile.

The average person's moral outlook is determined by the manner in which he earns his bread and butter. If a person finds that he can get money by nodding and bowing and whining and pretending to be good, he is apt to do all these things in order to get a good living. The respectable charity givers are shocked at what they consider such depravity in human nature. Yet this fact but goes to prove the materialistic conception of life.

Mutual helpfulness is good, but assistance from the rich to the indigent poor, when accepted by the latter, works harm. The charity recipient becomes professionalized and hopeless.

In the recent processions of the hung-

er marchers in London banners were carried bearing the motto "Shall we work, beg or steal?" The word beg was significantly crossed out.

Charity may assist slightly and act as a palliative in individual cases. Charity as a remedy is hopeless.

THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

GERALD DESMOND

Think of the men and women who in all ages have lived and fought and laid down their lives for freedom. Every time and generation has had its tyrants and oppressors, its rebels, its heroes, its martyrs for the great cause. And just now it seems that we are at the critical point. It seems as if all the sacrifices, the heroisms, the struggles, lead up to the present. Upon the socialists fall the heat and burden of today's battle.

We are the heirs of all rebel humanity. Verily, "the times call for giants." We need those who will take up and carry to its consummation the work of Lincoln the Emancipator. We need the burning appeals of Payne re-written and brought into line with present conditions. We need such splendid defiance of wage slavery as Garrison at the heads of the exponents of chattel slavery. We need our writers, our orators, our poets, and they will come. Great men and women are the products of great epochs in history. This last struggle for freedom will fill the pages of history with great names and great deeds.

THE INDIVIDUALISTIC OUT-LOOK

Many people cannot understand why the socialists are not philanthropic. The answer is easy. The ordinary man regards humanity from the individualistic view point, while the socialist regards humanity from the gregarious point of view. The ordinary man takes every other man as an individual problem whose needs and wants and longings must be solved separately. The socialist regards the individual man as an atom of the whole whose needs and wants can only be solved through the general betterment and through the general alleviation of the human race. The non-socialist, who wants to do good, wants to get wealthy in order that through his generosity the sufferings of certain other individuals may be relieved. Hence he strives hard to build up his own personal fortune and by so doing he thrusts his competitors into want. Or perhaps the individual who wants to help his fellow-men realizes the futility of big fortunes and of personal wealth and goes about the problem in another way. He strives to teach the individual to be moral, not to smoke, nor chew, nor drink; but to be frugal and thrifty and good and by so doing to become strong and able through his own individual power to win himself a fair place in the economic war of competition.

The socialist, on the other hand, teaches that poverty and misery cannot be done away with by individual effort in a world of competition. A few select souls may succeed and be good and prosperous in the economic warfare, but the vast mass of men will be thrust into degradation while a few will rise to overblown affluence.

When an individual, therefore, comes to a socialist for personal assistance, the socialist may help purely out of a feeling of human sympathy. The socialist, however, will feel in his heart that such charity is simply a waste of good money. There are very few individuals who will give up their individualism for the good of humanity. It is only by hard knocks that the individual gets it ground into his brain that the present system is tyrannical and should be changed. The socialist can do nothing for the man who still hopes to rise high and become personally aggrandized out of the present system of industrial anarchy. There must take place in the individual a conversion to socialism just as in primitive days a conversion to Christianity. Individual assistance, therefore, will make the recipient less eager to kick against present conditions, and will make him either a pauperized soul, or a successful competitive brute if the assistance be sufficient and the conditions be right. In either case the recipient remains individualistic in outlook and therefore useless for the revolution that must take place before society can become regenerated.

THE WORK OF CHRIST

Very few people realize the work of Christ from the historical point of view. He is regarded as the Saviour of the world and the average Christian considers this a sufficient thing for himself. Historically, Christ can be considered to be the first great successful labor leader.

The pagan world looked down upon labor. All work was performed by slaves. The slave had no soul. It was only the patrician at Rome who had the right of burial. The slaves were cremated and their souls were considered to perish with their bodies.

There was a gulf impassable between the slave and the patrician. The patrician did no work. Work was the sign of a low and outcast condition. The slave was but a dog. He had no rights, no social positions, no soul. The slave did the work and died like a beast of burden. In ancient Greece slaves, men and women, toiled naked together under the slave driver's whip in the silver mines of Laurium. Sometimes some rich contractor would let out a thousand slaves to some sub-contractor at nineteen cents a day apiece. In the pagan world of Greece and Rome the slave occupied the same social position, the same stand in society, as does the quadruped horse today in Canada, and in many of the states, such as Sparta there existed no society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Slaves.

Palestine was held militarily by pagan Rome and Roman ideals were enforced. The Jews were struggling to free themselves, but the Jewish leaders were bound down by narrow bigoted views almost as much in conflict with Christ's teachings as with the Roman views.

Into this condition of society was born Christ. He was tainted with the taint of labor. He had the whole of the civilized world to contend with. He thought deeply and then went forth to preach his doctrine of the equality of all men under the fatherhood of one God.

Had Christ been born in Rome and had he begun to teach his doctrines openly, he would have been flung to the wild beasts in a hurry. Born as he was in an obscure corner of an outland province of the Empire, his pestilential doctrines grew unnoticed. For three years he taught and then his life was snuffed out. Roman leader and Jewish priest combined to get rid of him.

St. Paul, the aristocrat, was born a Jew and therefore was not so much tainted with Roman disdain of the slave. On the road to Damascus St. Paul saw a great light. For three days he lay in soul anguish while he was endeavoring to orientate his whole being to the new philosophy that had overwhelmed him. Then he went forth to preach his doctrine that every man had a soul, that the old Jewish differences between Jew and Gentile and the Roman differences between bond and free had become obliterated, and that all humanity were one in God through Christ.

The battles the modern socialists have to fight were as nothing compared to the battles the early Christians had to win. The work they did for the workers of the world is inestimable.

The workers should be the last to sneer at Christ, and in their hearts they all realize this. They have a perfect right to sneer at those so-called Christian women who kiss their poodle dogs on Saturday and pray to God on Sunday. They have a perfect right to sneer at the rich who pray unctuously on the Sabbath and beat down their worker's pay on Monday. The capitalists have hugged Christ to themselves too long. It is time that the workers should wrest Christ away from the overfed capitalists class and take him as their hero.

An English clergyman has been inspecting the slums of Toronto, and finds that they are worse and more degrading than the slums of Manchester. He declares that Toronto landlords are more grasping and heartless than the English variety. Happily for Toronto there are a lot of Socialists up there who will get on the city council some day and do things not to the liking of the capitalist landowners.

HARD ON THE CAPITALISTS

The worker who is down in the workshops and factories, wearing his life away in the daily grind, knowing that he will grow old and slow before his time, and will be thrust on the human junk heap, displaced by a younger man, will naturally be embittered against those who are enjoying the surplus value of his labor. Yet the present system is hard on the capitalists. In the first place, this present system outrages the human sympathy that is in the breast of nearly every man. It is not a pleasant thing for a rich man to go through the streets of Montreal or of Toronto or even through the streets of the small country places and see the evidences of poverty and misery on every hand. The haggard faces, the tattered garments, the hopeless air of misery, strikes the heart of the sympathetic man, and the average man is truly sympathetic. It is no wonder that the large capitalists rush to endow

hospitals where suffering may be relieved, to endow universities where knowledge may be increased, to endow churches and philanthropic institutions of all kinds under whose guidance pain and mental anguish may be relieved and the way to a better, happier life may be taught. There are certain capitalists and rich men who are callous of heart and who seek only their own pleasure, regardless of the misery they cause to others. These are, however, reversionary types of beings, atavistic brutes. Specimens of this type of being can also be found among the criminal poor.

In the second place the capitalist has a hard fight on his hands. If the average capitalist is a parasite upon labor, he himself is preyed upon by many parasites. Marc Klaw, one of the heads of the theatrical syndicate, declares that the theatre manager gets little. Much money goes through his fingers, but little of it remains. After he has paid advance agents and advertisements and troupe members and ushers and other persons, there is little left. What is true of theatres is true of other businesses. The capitalist, when he has paid his workers, his office staff, his advertisements, his bribes to legislators, his graft to municipal councillors, his fees to high priced, unscrupulous attorneys, his donations to charitable and philanthropic institutions, which he must do in order to cover his rascality with an air of respectability, has little left. The capitalist digs his own grave.

Then again the capitalist holds an insecure position. At any time some new invention may be discovered, by which the whole plait of the capitalist will have to be thrown on the scrap heap. The little capitalists are being crushed out and even the giant trusts are fighting for their lives against the rising tide of public indignation and the oncoming tidal wave of socialism.

The capitalist can be sure of nothing. If he leaves his wealth to his sons it may be dissipated or wrecked from them in some stock juggling operations. Harriman to-day stands like a giant colossus against the sky line of American finance. He has risen in a day and his fall may be more sudden than his rise.

The capitalist is an individual who wants to live on other men's labor, who wants to use his brains and energy for his own aggrandizement and not for the welfare of the human race. As such he is pitting his little brains and his little energies against the vast forces of humanity and the vast resistless half unconscious gregarious instinct of the human race. He may succeed for a little, he may hurt humanity in the process, but he is bound to fail in the end. By the course he pursues he is outraging his own human instincts, he is piling up for himself deep worry and the hostility of his own fellow men. His lot is one to be pitied, not one to be envied.

WHAT OF THE CAPITALISTS

The question often arises in people's minds as to what will be done with the capitalists under a socialist regime. The answer is easy. They will be made to do a little useful work or starve.

Very often during these hard times some poor beggar who has lost his

job and is starving comes around to the back door of a prosperous looking house and wants a handout. The workers do not like to do this and yet they have to beg or starve. The mistress of the house or the housemaid looks with scorn on the beggar and tells him he should work. He is treated very scurvily and maybe the very mistress who is flinging her Christian scorn at him is living off the pay of the worker which has been robbed from him by her husband.

Under socialism the worker will get his pay. The boss will get his pay too but no pay will go to the man who does nothing to get it. The present chaps who do nothing but live on other people's work will find it hard sledding. They will have to learn to do something really useful. The tables will be turned and the capitalists will be crawling around to the back doors of the pleasant homes of the workers asking that in God's name they be given a bite to eat.

Is it any wonder that the Catholic clergy who live in fine houses and swat the poor devils who join their church out of one-thirteenth of all they earn do not like socialism? Is it any wonder that millionaires who make their forty and fifty percent out of child labor do not like socialism? Is it any wonder that the capitalists get renegade churches to preach to the workers that they should be content to live in the sere in which God has placed them? Is it any wonder that the idle parasites who live on the sweat of the workers snarl at the socialists who preach to the workers that the drones should work or starve?

The capitalist class hate the socialists because the socialists teach that if a man does not labor neither shall he eat.

KIDNAPPING AND PUNISHMENT

Recently a boy was kidnapped from a rich American home and was held for ten thousand dollars ransom. The public was aghast. The idea that anybody would dare steal a child from a home and hold it for ransom shocked the public. There is a great outcry that the penalty for kidnapping should be increased. The only remedy that can be found by a capitalistic press and by a capitalistic public is more punishment for the offence.

There is another solution which would be far more effective. Let there be no poor to be tempted to do wrong and let there be no rich who can by their wealth be an object of temptation for other persons to commit crimes for the sake of money. Society is unjust when it heaps great wealth upon the few and great poverty upon the many.

There is another side to this question. If kidnapping is bad let it be punished, but let be punished alike for all. Children like the sunlight and the fresh air. The youth of children should be given them. Childhood should be a time of development of happy laughter and of wholesome nourishing food. It is not the criminal alone who is guilty of kidnapping. Some of our most respectable citizens, some of our most church-going, psalm-singing Christians are guilty of this offence. Children are worked long hours in cotton mills and other industrial enterprises. Children are crowded together in dark tenements because some prominent citizen wants to maintain a large house for the entertainment of his friends.

If kidnapping is to be punished let it be punished and let the punishment fall on all those guilty of this crime. Let the landlord be punished, who through his rent forces a child into a factory where it is kidnapped by a throbbing machine. Let the manufacturer be punished, who sacks a man and kidnaps a child to do the work.

If kidnapping was punished with such punishment as some of the big daily papers are howling for, some of their best advertising customers would be looking through penitentiary bars.

The Laurier-Foster debate sounds just like a chapter from that childish classic, "Alice in Wonderland." There is a tang about the debate that is reminiscent of the discourses between the March Hare and the Mad Hatter.

POVERTY AND POLICE

"They make a desert and call it peace," thus wrote Tacitus with regard to the victories of the Roman generals over the barbarian nations. In modern days under the capitalistic system it can be truthfully said that the masters produce oppression and call it prosperity.

Riches consist in the amount of income an individual receives. The greater the income the richer he is, and it seems evident that the various cities seem to vie with each other in the number of millionaires they can produce.

The greater riches the few can pile up, the greater will be the poverty of the many. The more ostentation and flunkeyism one quarter of the city will exhibit the greater the poverty and misery that can be seen in another quarter. New York, Berlin, Paris, London, there where riches are the greatest, there humanity becomes most degraded and oppressed.

Where men are free the police are not needed to keep order. Where men and women are forced to live in shacks and to pay high rent for doing so, where the millionaires pile up large incomes out of the sweat and toil of the poverty stricken, there is great danger of rebellion. Men and women will feel the exactions of the rich to be unjust. Consequently, the police are necessary to keep the toilers in their inferior positions. The police are therefore installed, courts of justice are inaugurated and gloomy penitentiaries built, all to overhaul the workers and to let the idle rich ride rough shod over them.

In Canada there has been a great outcry for more police protection. Thugs are operating on the streets and burglars in the homes and stores. The authorities of the Province of Quebec are seriously considering the necessity of establishing rural guards to protect the country districts. This simply means that our wealth is becoming concentrated and the strong men of the lower classes cannot find a legitimate and remunerative avenue for their energies. Poverty is increasing, police are being installed and oppression is coming into vogue under the dignified title of peaceful order.

LABOR VS SOCIALIST PAPERS

The master class do not mind labor papers, but they are down on the socialist sheets. The labor papers are written and printed from the labor and workingman's standpoint as such. The average labor paper recognizes that the worker is nothing but a worker and should have a boss over him. The laborer is the inferior and the boss is the superior. Even the trade union papers take this standpoint.

The capitalists and those with millions back of them do not object very strenuously to such papers, because the papers concede as a matter of course nearly all the bosses want. But with the socialist press everything is different and the bosses don't like it. The socialist press consider that the capitalists are nothing but parasites maintaining themselves in their idle luxurious positions by force, fraud or craftiness. The socialist press recognize that the whole host of capitalistic flunkeyism, advocates, real estate agents, stockbrokers, valets, coachmen, paid preachers of a reactionary religion, are nothing but minor parasites that are supported by the bigger parasites out of what they rob from the workers. The labor press simply want to improve the worker's condition while the worker still remains in wage slavery. The socialist press on the other hand want to give the workers all they earn and to make the capitalists come into the ranks of honest workers or get off the earth.

The capitalists as a class do not like the socialist papers one little bit. The laborers who have got their eyes open are becoming socialists. The merely labor papers are losing caste while the socialist press is being hailed as the only hope of awakening the workers to their own interests.

One thing can be said about the Roman Catholic clergy which cannot be said about the Protestant clergy. The Catholic church leaders understand economics, history and humanity.