

CLIP AND COMMENT

The Capitalist Newspapers Read Through Social-Democratic Spectacles

Military training transforms a man; it is the finest thing he could have."—Kingston (Jamaica) Gleaner.

Certainly, dear fellow member of this wonderful imperial nation, military training does transform a man. It makes of him no longer a man, but a thoroughly-drilled subservient, tractable machine—a highly valuable acquisition for our capitalist system. Highly valuable, because it is a machine which admits of complete exploitation with the minimum amount of kick—no allowance even being made for the depreciation of the machine.



"In the slumland of a great city there lived and worked an old woman. She was well over sixty years of age, and had known little beyond toil and sorrow all her many days."—"Canadian Defence."

It was interesting to turn from this paragraph headed "Life," and turn to the last two pages giving a list of members of the Canadian Defence League. Unusual interest centred in the vice-presidents' names, among which was noted that of Sir Henry Pelham. It is said that in the great castle owned by this financial king (who is reaping big harvests from firms engaged in the manufacture of munitions of war), even the horses and dogs are better housed and fed than a goodly number of his fellow-citizens of Toronto. Then they say "why Socialism?"



"Nothing but universal service, each man according to his ability and according to the country's need of it, can possibly be just to the men and women who are willing to suffer."—Chicago Tribune.

Your utterance, dear pride of capitalist contemporaries, rather begs the question. Universal service might win some consideration from the workers if those who really had the ability to

sacrifice something for the country's need—the men who have most at stake in the country and its material wealth—were numbered among the men and women willing to suffer. But frankly, are they?



"The part played by teachers in joining the army will automatically promote this ideal (patriotism), and their influence over the children when they return to civil life will be powerfully reinforced."—London (Eng.) Times.

It may be well for teachers to inspire the rising generation with hatred of certain countries, but when the Times—a typical Northcliffe sheet—says to propagate this ideal, it is really laughable. Had not the Times better set a good example to the children by first getting new owners for the many shares held by Germans in this publication? The I. L. P. in England long ago warned the Times about the contradictory character involved in the ownership of this notoriously capitalistic mouthpiece.



Where Was the Censor?

The Russian official communique in the British press (July 8), said:

"During an attack on the village of Vertniki Het Monasterjisk the Germans received our troops with jets of liquid fire. As a result of this conduct on the part of the Germans, all the German prisoners taken after the capture of the village were bayoneted by us. We took prisoners over 1,000 men."

The Times (July 21), from Mr. Stanley Washburn, special correspondent with the Russian forces:

"During the withdrawal from the Polosie region the enemy burned much timber to delay the pursuit. He is said to have done so by spraying liquid fire, which has not been used against our infantry, as has been reported."

THE DIVORCE OF PRINCIPLE AND PRACTICE

Maurice Spector

Inconsistency has often been declared to be the striking characteristic of modern capitalist industrial society. The vast gulf between its idealism and its reality, between its religious ethics and its actual social conduct has constantly been a subject of ridicule, scorn and protest to the social dissenter. Yet in spite of all the taunts of the Zolas and Tolstoys, the Ibsens and Shaws, for its hypocritical smugness, its callous indifference or deliberate blindness in relation to social matters, the bourgeoisie apparently go on their placid way with the same self-satisfied righteous feeling. They are as content as ever to endorse and applaud one set of morals on holy days, to practice a contrary set on week days and to defend both with equal zeal. This they consider to be normal behavior, and are ready to condemn anyone as an extremist and undesirable who, having a sense of humor or capacity for logic, will insist on regulating his conduct in accord with just one set of morals. It affects the bitterness of the radical's objections but slightly to know that this anomalous condition is the result of the wedding of inherited traditions and a church influence older than modern society, to economical circumstances stronger than the ethics of the church.

This peculiar psychology of the middle classes seems grounded in the fear that they would lose their power and comfort were they to act in spirit with their religious ethics or were they to resolve their actual economic life into a philosophy to replace those ethics. For in the latter case they would just

as certainly lose comfort and power as in the former, for the realities would become too evident to the proletariat, who would also follow in abandoning religion. Perhaps also, the bourgeois realize the need of some softening influence such as religion to take their minds off the merciless rigors of their economic system.

This accounts for the relative failure of both Tolstoy and Nietzsche's appeal. The former pleaded with the world to become Christian in deed as in creed, preached the Christian virtues of resignation and humility; the latter urged the necessity of making ethics agree with the facts of life, that is the abandonment of Christianity, and boldly proclaimed the expediency of the will to power, the recognition of the claim of the strong to dominate the weak. But Tolstoy's gospel was not in harmony with the facts of industrial life and the middle class regarded him as a visionary who would misplace Sunday ethics. And though in the business world there is no mercy for the weak, and the will of the strong is law, and there is no peace but war, yet the business men (a notable example is the millionaire, Rockefeller) are loyal supporters of the Church. They shudder at Nietzsche's brutality.

This worship of the principle divorced from practice is a disagreeable characteristic of bourgeois society. In the matter of war and capital punishment, in spite of the fact that the state takes the lives of thousands, yet the bourgeois would never think of abandoning the absolute "Thou shalt not kill" and "Love thy enemy." Their point of view is, I suppose, that if there is so much of crime, war, etc., when we have such beautiful moral principles to guide us, there would verily be chaos if we were to lose these formal principles altogether.

Bourgeois society regards the home as a sacred institution, the cornerstone of our social arrangements. No greater indictment can be hurled against any movement than that it is inimical to the home. But the present economic system, besides having turned the home into a very poor thing indeed, is gradually undermining its existence by compelling the wife and child, as well as the husband in the proletariat, to serve in the bleak factory. Very few and far between are the protests of the bourgeois against this attack on the institution "home." Millions of homes are destroyed when fathers and sons conscripted by the state are sent to destruction by the state in times of war. And war is an inevitable result of the capitalist industrial system. But the principle of the home must be upheld.

Another illuminating example of this attitude is the bourgeois relation to property, which is, if anything, more highly esteemed than human life, and is the prop of capitalist society. Socialism is vigorously denounced for its hostility to private property—for Socialists, they urge, would abolish it, confiscate it, destroy it. When that symptom of capitalism, international war looms up, private property is confiscated on the grounds of necessity, and millions of dollars worth of private property is destroyed. (Witness the German cruiser "Emden.") Nevertheless, "all's right with the world" as long as private property is maintained in principle.

A SLANDER.

Satan was Furious.

"I'm going to sue General Sherman for libel," he thundered. "Hell may be bad, but it isn't modern war, by any means."

Thus we see that there is a limit even to epigrams.—Philadelphia Ledger.

PLATFORM

Social-Democratic Party of Canada

We, the Social-Democratic Party of Canada in convention assembled, affirm our allegiance to and support of, the International Socialist Movement.

By virtue of the ownership of the means of production and distribution (natural resources, factories, mills, railroads, etc.) all wealth the workers produce, accrues into the hands of the capitalist class. This property the capitalist defends by means of the state (the army, the navy, the judiciary.)

The object of the Social-Democratic Party is to educate the workers of Canada to a consciousness of their class position in society, their economic servitude to the owners of capital, and to organize them into a political party to seize the reins of government and transform all capitalist property into the collective property of the working class. This social transformation means the liberation not only of the proletariat, but of the whole human race. Only the working class, however, can bring it about. All other classes maintain their existence by supporting the present social order.

The struggle of the working class against Capitalist exploitation produces a constant state of warfare between these two forces for the control of political and economic power.

As a means of preparing the minds of the working class for the inauguration of the Co-operative Commonwealth, the Social-Democratic Party of Canada will support any measure that will tend to better conditions under capitalism, such as:

- (1) Reduction of hours of labor.
- (2) The elimination of child labor.
- (3) Universal adult suffrage without distinction of sex or regard to property qualifications; and
- (4) The Initiative, Referendum, and right of Recall.

A NEW COMMANDMENT

"A deputation from the Clerical Patriotic Association addressed the Synod on the subject of recruiting. Major (Rev.) T. Crawford Brown, Capt. (Rev.) G. R. Patterson, Rev. M. C. MacLean, Capt. (Rev.) A. McLurg, composed the deputation. The delegates specially urged the necessity of urging the call of the King among the rural people of Ontario. The following resolution on the subject was adopted by the Synod:

"This Synod rejoices to see that the clergy of the Anglican Church are organizing to do all in their power to inspire the Church and the nation in truth and righteousness for the furtherance of the great struggle to which this nation and Empire are committed."—Toronto Star.

Rural churches and recruiting stations are close of kin since the churches first "rejoiced to see" the workers of the world desert the Christian principle of human brotherhood. Now that "love one another" is supplanted by "Thou shalt kill," perhaps the "authorities" of the churches will understand the reason why their "righteousness" wins so little favor.

A plea for the right to make, sell and use oleomargarine is the natural result of the high cost of living. It is remarkable the amount of sense developed by necessity after argument has signally failed.—Toronto Globe.

We shall never sheathe the sword till we have the right to make, sell and use, to say nothing of the right to eat, if we are able to buy, oleomargarine. It is a natural result. One class will make and sell, and another class—will use.

Portugal, writes La Justicia (Spain), has decided to re-establish the death penalty which was abolished at the installation of the Republic. Although this is but the logical effect of the war campaign into which Portugal has been drawn; we note with sorrow this retrogression of the Portuguese nation.