

# THE RED WAR ON THE FAMILY

BY  
SAMUEL SALOMAN

Four years of enthroned socialism in Russia, then this confession:

"Poverty-stricken, ragged, starving, the labor republic celebrates the fourth anniversary of its birth.

"For four years it has been bleeding, covering the field of battle with the bones of its best men, giving away all it has for the achievement of victory.

"Millions of its children are in the bony clutches of famine. The stacks of hundreds of its factories stand smokeless. Their whistles are silent. Hundreds of steel horses are pining away on the iron rails."

(Everything lost to the socialist beast except his snarl.)

"But with a firm foot the red republic stands on the free soil, its own soil, after vanquishing untold enemies. . . .

"The iron apparatus of governmental power is still in the hands of the working people. Guns and cannon are still in the hands of the red army of workmen and peasants. The land and all the wealth of the country are under our control. And our will, our ability, our persistence in labor are still intact and strong. . . .

"Laugh, our enemies, laugh louder! On the day of the overthrow of the Babylonian kingdom of capital, on the first day of the world uprising against your rule, it will be we who will laugh at you in triumph!"

(Editorial in special edition of *Moscow Pravda*.)

COPYRIGHT, 1922,  
By SAMUEL SALOMAN,  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Press of  
J. J. Little & Ives Company  
New York, U. S. A.



To  
MY MOTHER

TO ALL GOOD WOMEN EVERYWHERE  
THIS BOOK RESPECTFULLY IS DEDICATED

## FOREWORD

It should not be necessary to apologize for yet another volume on socialism.

True, much has been written on both sides, and publication assuredly will continue until such time, if it ever comes, when socialism will be an assured fact or will be relegated to the limbo where peacefully rest for all time other theories of life that, too, had their outspoken defenders, other philosophies that in their day, like socialism to-day, made their appeals to the hearts and minds of men.

But even before the close of the greatest war in history a material change had taken place in the world's affairs, and necessarily in the socialist philosophy. Socialism in some measure is not as it was, and transmuted into practice it has undergone radical change. Because of such change the opposition is compelled to revise its methods and its arguments and to adopt an entirely different outlook on what before had been regarded by some fearful ones as a remote threat but which since has become an immediate menace to existing institutions.

A material change has taken place in some of the great countries of the world but lately participants in the Great War, and socialism, the great "doctrine of despair," as ever has thrived on the unrest resulting from defeat. In some of the countries, notably Russia and for a short time Hungary, socialism has had its innings, and was able

## VI

to show to an astounded world just what socialists purpose to do when all power is put into their hands.

It hardly is necessary to state to observant readers that in those countries where socialism dominated the state it has not made an impressive showing, even to those of the socialist faith, as is evidenced by the many apologies offered by the latter for the lack of success met with by socialist visionaries in such countries. But their experience has not been without value, and enables us more correctly to appraise socialism than ever before.

In this volume we have dealt with possibly the most important phase of socialism, that dealing with the moral issue. We not only have dealt with the very interesting though destructive theories of the recognized socialist fathers of other days, but have been enabled by reason of the turn of fate's wheel that brought socialists to the top in some countries to watch the working out of the socialist scheme not only in what sneeringly had been referred to by Karl Marx as "duodecimo editions of the new Jerusalem"—the pocket editions of socialism of Robert Owen and men like him of earlier days—but what possibly would have been more to Marx's liking, the communist states of Russia and Hungary, where the attempt seriously was made to hew closer to the line of socialism than before had been possible.

For the assistance involuntarily rendered by our inspired comrades of socialism in the makeup of this volume of facts I am more than grateful. My heartfelt thanks go out to these would-be saviors of society for the inestimable privilege afforded me of reverently inspecting their inspired articles and books and for being permitted here and there to cull therefrom some priceless thought.

But there is some little difficulty there. Generally when

## VII

an antisocialist endeavors to employ something of particular value from socialist sources he is met with the expression, "But that is a private opinion, for which socialism reasonably can not be held responsible."

This view, we are pleased to record, is not always shared by Morris Hillquit, recognized as one of the greatest of living socialist authorities, judged by his preliminary statement in his debate with Prof. John Augustine Ryan, in *Everybody's Magazine*, October, 1913, in which he admits that—

The utterances and acts of such writers and representatives, unless formally repudiated by their party, must be considered as legitimate expressions and manifestations of the socialist movement, and its defenders and opponents alike may properly refer to them in support of their contentions. The same rule applies to the editorial attitude of the official publications of the socialist party.

This will appear to the average individual, whether affected or unaffected by the socialist virus, as a fair and reasonable statement, and no amount of ingenious disavowal by Mr. Hillquit himself or of any other socialist seer must be permitted to blunt the edge of this clear-cut declaration. It is useless for Mr. Hillquit, before the ink was dry on the quoted statement, to affirm that what he said is held to apply only to certain parts of the socialist faith and reasonably must not be applied to such alleged extraneous issues as religion and morality. Even if such disavowal were made in good faith, Mr. Hillquit destroys the force of his own argument by debating that which he claimed was not a legitimate subject of discussion and then by his further admission that with the incoming of socialism all things materially will change, even marriage and morals. In this last he is in full

## VIII

accord with the generality of the socialist philosophers, especially those who pin their faith on the determinist philosophy of Marx and Engels.

In order to be still more secure in my position I sent some years ago a letter to the national secretary of the socialist party at Chicago, inquiring whether books published by the nationally and internationally prominent socialists reflect the socialist attitude on the very important questions of religion, morals, the family, etc., and asking where such books could be obtained, if they could not be purchased of the local bookseller. I received a reply on the official stationery of the national socialist organization, signed by the national secretary, in which I was informed in part:

I am here inclosing our catalogue, which, however, is not an official list, as there is no such list in our office, *but it contains all the works that are officially recognized.*

*Any of the books listed can be secured from this office. (Italics mine.)*

Here we have the official admission that while books contained in the *official catalogue* are not to be regarded as in any way official they are "*officially recognized*," also that such books can be secured from the national office of the socialist party.

Whether such books have an official status or merely are "officially recognized" is after all of but slight consequence. The difference between the two expressions is as the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. The fact that such books—Bebel's "Woman" and Engel's malodorous "Origin of the Family," for example—are "officially recognized" and officially sold by the socialist party is to the average mind, unclouded by socialist sophistry, the next thing to official acceptance of such

## IX

precious books, for it is inconceivable that an organization ever propagandizing, ever angling for public support, willingly would sell or give away that which distorts or misrepresents doctrines it would publish to the world.

From theory we have gone to practice. And here our socialist friends where they had the opportunity have done that which they ever threatened to do, and by so doing have made a sorry mess of things, as they were expected to do.

We hope the recital herein of both theory and practice will stimulate the growing number of the foes of socialism and the other allied subversive doctrines to renewed efforts in their war on that which are harmful as theories and destructive in practice.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| FOREWORD . . . . .   | i    |
| THE SOCIALIST INDICTMENT . . . . .                                   | 1    |
| THE SOCIALIST CURE—IN THEORY . . . . .                               | 12   |
| THE SOCIALIST CURE—IN PRACTICE . . . . .                             | 52   |
| MODERN SOCIALIST PARADISES . . . . .                                 | 67   |
| A VERITABLE "SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENTS" . . . . .                   | 93   |
| SOCIALIST SUCCESS MEANS THE DESTRUCTION OF<br>CIVILIZATION . . . . . | 118  |
| APPENDIX :   |      |
| SOVIET RUSSIA'S CODE OF LAWS . . . . .                               | 139  |
| MME. KOLLONTAY ON PROSTITUTION AND MAR-<br>RIAGE . . . . .           | 166  |

## THE SOCIALIST INDICTMENT

THE views of our socialist friends on any conceivable subject are most interesting, though rarely convincing. Their views on economics, politics, religion, morals, and the other questions that interest man contribute to that infinite variety, that interesting diversity of opinion, that is or should be relished in this too prosaic age.

It is not generally known that socialists have a well-defined moral program, just as they have a political and economic program, that may be studied with advantage, not only by those opposed to socialism but as well by the class-conscious socialist, who with all of his or her knowledge may yet be uninformed or misinformed on this vital phase of socialism.

Socialists ever have inveighed against the present system of society, holding it directly responsible for the "social evil," intemperance, crime, poverty—in fact, for every ill society suffers from at this time.

As for the social evil, so called, as well as for immorality in general, recognized socialist writers have gone into the matter in sufficient detail and have set forth in their rather voluminous literature on the subject what appears to them, if not to the better informed individual, an adequate remedy for such evil.

Socialists ever have claimed that the social evil is one of the direct results of poverty, of withholding from the female worker the greater share of the fruits of her industry. The socialist remedy for this particular social

disease, it goes without saying, is the elimination of poverty, and such elimination, according to the socialist view, can only be brought about by the entire socialization of industry.

If socialists and the other uninformed ones who believe that the present claimed epidemic of immorality is due to such cause were able to reason from cause to effect, they would very soon perceive, and possibly admit, that poverty no more is responsible for the immorality that exists than for some of the peculiar dress combinations women delight in at various times, and that now is in evidence on our public thoroughfares and those places where the "better-class people" congregate, or for some of the suggestive and immodest dances that delight society at different times.

If we ask our socialist friends to furnish a bill of particulars with the oft-repeated charge, publicly made, that immorality is due almost entirely to bad economic conditions, to show that such charge is based on something more than mere assertion, it is most certain that very little in the shape of real evidence will be forthcoming.

At a recent meeting of one of the Washington, D. C., organizations, where one of the reckless, soap-box type of socialist speakers was permitted to rave and rant for a spell, the claim once more was made that the virus of immorality was spreading at an alarming rate among the people. The speaker, as might be expected, gave it as his opinion that increasing poverty was the particular cause of the dreadful conditions he pictured.

At this point he was asked by one of his audience how he accounted for the known and proved fact that there was as much, if not more, immorality among the rich and middle classes as among the poor. If poverty was

the determining cause, logically continued the questioner, it stood to reason that those in comfortable financial circumstances should be models of morality while the poverty-stricken would be grossly immoral.

The further question was put to the speaker by another of his audience whether in the cloak and suit industries, for example, girls employed as models at good salaries were shown to be more moral than girls getting but a fraction of the salaries paid the former in those industries; whether manicure artists were shown to be more moral than their poorer paid sisters of the department stores; whether the women of the stage, in receipt of comparatively large salaries, were shown to be more moral than the girls of the factories—all in all, whether the girls in the various industries in receipt of small salaries were more prone to immorality than girls getting higher salaries in the same or other industries.

Our socialist friend, like others of his ilk when confronted with irritating facts or embarrassing questions, adroitly turned the discussion into other and less dangerous channels and left the questions put to him unanswered.

While those afflicted with socialism are content to rest their case on unproved and utterly false premises, many are determined to get at the facts, that a cure may be had, if a cure is at all possible. To mention but one of the many agencies at work for the improvement, at least, of the public morals, a volunteer committee of nationally prominent social workers met in New York City in April, 1913, to investigate the charge made at divers times that the social evil is directly due to the low wages paid the female workers in the stores and factories.

The committee was composed of the following men and women:

Sophie C. Barkley, superintendent of the Margaret J. Bennet Home, Baltimore, Md.; Kate Waller Barrett, president of the National Florence Crittenden Mission, Alexandria, Va.; Mary J. Bartelme, director of the Schmidlapp Bureau for Women and Girls, Cincinnati, Ohio; R. J. Gorwin, chairman of the special committee on public health problems of the American Medical Association, Pueblo, Colo.; Thomas Estill, commissioner of the Salvation Army, Chicago, Ill.; George J. Kneeland, director of the commission to investigate vice conditions, Chicago, Ill.; Graham Taylor, president of the School of Civics and Philanthropy, Chicago, Ill.; and Marion D. Shutter, chairman of the morals commission, Minneapolis, Minn.

After a most exhaustive investigation, after every possible clue had been followed to its source, the committee arrived at the only possible conclusion, "that it had not been satisfactorily demonstrated that low wages are a direct cause of loss of virtue in working girls."

In its report the committee called attention to the very important fact the many irresponsible ones spreading such unwarranted and false charge entirely overlook, that injustice is being done tens of thousands of thoroughly respectable working girls, especially the employees of department stores, "by the widespread publicity given to a mistaken view of industrial responsibility for the so-called 'white-slave' condition."

As to this phase of the question, the *Omaha Bee*, commenting editorially on the findings of the Kansas City commission, that also investigated the claimed connection between low wages and immorality, which com-

mission also found little evidence to substantiate the too popular charge, said as to the harm done by the direct or implied charge that a woman can not remain respectable on a low salary :

But the greatest wrong lies not in the false assumption so much as in its unjust imputations. In the first place, it is grossly wrong to assume that a level of low wages to girls implies immorality. As has already been said, it is unjust to thousands of good, honorable working girls and women. It was blunderbuss reasoning to affirm that the question of wages is wholly a moral question instead of mainly an economic one. Whatever problems are here involved can not possibly be solved by reckoning from the wrong basis, for we can never reach right conclusions from wrong premises.

The real causes of immorality among working girls, as set forth by the New York Committee follow :

Our observations and experience indicate that the most important contributing cause of immorality among girls are weakness of mind and will; individual temperament; immoral associates; lack of religious or ethical training; injurious home influences; cramped living conditions, rendering privacy difficult; lack of industrial efficiency; idleness; unwillingness to accept available employment; love of finery and pleasure; unwholesome amusements; inexperience and ignorance of social temptations.

In the category of causes mentioned by the committee to account for immorality in women the committee fails to mention certain potent causes that can not very well be overlooked; for example, the general freedom accorded the young of this day, particularly impressionable young girls, from parental restraint—freedom to go where they will and do those things they want to do, without so much as a word of caution from those who should be their guides and protectors. Another influence that certainly has a tendency to debauch the morals of the morally weak and irresponsible we see on all sides is the pernicious

teachings and equally pernicious examples of notorious moral perverses we have dished up to us daily in the sensational press as delectable morsels. Still another influence for evil, just beginning to be recognized, is the depraved sex literature—a great deal from socialist and feminist sources—and erotic plays and motion pictures offered for public consumption, seemingly with the consent and full concurrence of those delegated to enforce the laws against this very evil.

A further fact, generally overlooked by the social physician, is that the descent from virtue to open prostitution generally is a very gradual one. The average woman of the streets or brothel, it can not well be denied, had disposed of her person to some favored individual or individuals before definitely entering on a life of shame.

Pittsburgh, Pa., also had its appointed commission to inquire into the causes of immorality, which made its report in December, 1913, to the city council. The conclusions arrived at in the main agree with conclusions of commissions that investigated vice conditions in New York, Kansas City, Chicago, and other points in the United States and elsewhere. All held that parental neglect is possibly the principal cause of girls going wrong and fixed from 16 to 19 as the dangerous age for girls.

While poverty is mentioned as a contributing cause, the Pittsburgh commission affirms that poverty is in no sense an important cause. Underlying all causes, the report points out, is the predisposition to immorality on the part of the women dealt with. It was also pointed out that possibly 80 per cent of the prostitutes examined were feeble-minded, born with defective intelligence and shiftless tendencies.

The number of prostitutes that can be reformed, this report states, is very small, so small that out of 500 prostitutes examined not more than 20 have quit their immoral trade, though every inducement had been offered them to lead decent lives.

Which fact, if properly weighed, is sufficient to dispose of the socialist claim of the connection between commercialized immorality and economics.

It also was stated, to prove that the economic is but a minor factor in prostitution, that a general tendency exists among the women of loose virtue to squander their ill-gotten gains as fast as earned on useless finery and in other senseless ways. Less than 20 per cent of the prostitutes examined had any bank accounts at all, and those who saved did so, as a rule, to provide for the "regular holiday escapades of extravagance."

The commission also pointed out in its report:

Along with legislative and administrative efforts in this direction (better housing, cheaper living, and good family life) we should have educational movements to inculcate a saner philosophy of life. Not, indeed, the sort of education which by prolonging the period of men's dependency—without regard to their mental qualifications or the needs of the community—to nearly the thirtieth year causes marriage to be deferred and encourages prostitution, but the sort of education that makes young men self-supporting in honest industries, makes them producers instead of parasites, teaches young women the neglected domestic vocations and the forgotten virtue of economy, teaches them that true happiness is in the simple life and in the love of home.

Church and school and press—the three great educational agencies of our time—have all neglected their duty in this regard. Pastors are true shepherds no longer; educators have stimulated the overcrowding of the so-called learned professions, which tend to exploit the producers; newspapers, by catering to silly sentiment and parading the extravagances of the imbecile rich, stir up imitative envy and foster foolish ideals.



If we carefully examine the voluminous literature devoted to the subject of vice in general, we will find that where the matter is treated of in dispassionate, truly scientific fashion, the economic factor, that the unscientific socialist ever stresses, barely is considered. Scientific investigators are in agreement that commercialized immorality is due especially to liquor, habit-forming drugs, degeneracy, and other allied causes.

Thus in "Diseases of Society and Degeneracy" (p. 335), Dr. Frank Lydston, a recognized authority on the subject, classifies the especial causes. It is to be noted that what socialists and other uninformed ones claim to be the chief, if not the only cause, the economic, is not even mentioned:

1. Seduction is responsible for the primary fall from virtue of most prostitutes.

This in a measure is qualified by what follows:

2. There is a numerous class in which the woman is more than compliant, and perhaps seeks danger or even enacts the active rôle in the so-called seduction. This class of woman comprises the degenerates. The victims of nymphomania from nervous or sexual disease and most of the low-class prostitutes come under this head.

3. Necessity impels many women to prostitution. *It operates with especial stress upon women who have already fallen, who are prone to exaggerate their necessities in the face of the temptation to lead an easy and luxurious life.*

4. Prostitutes often adopt the life from choice and remain in it from choice. The clandestine prostitute is such as a matter of volition. The clandestine prostitute who under the cloak of respectability taints middle and upper tendom is a typic harlot, as a rule, who is to the manner born.

If further evidence is necessary to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that our socialist friends are unmeasured miles from the truth when they claim the

economic as the sole or even the principal cause of commercialized immorality, it can be found in the fact that generally girls are drawn into prostitution at a comparatively early age, as evidenced by every competent authority who has sought scientifically to deal with the subject.

Thus we have the oft-quoted tables of Dr. Pileur and Rev. G. P. Merrick, the first dealing with 582 prostitutes and the other with 7,365, which show that by far the greater number of those drawn into this hellish traffic are between the ages of 15 or 16 and 21.

That effectively disposes of the contention of shortsighted individuals that prostitution is due primarily to economic causes, to grinding poverty. Those who accept this latter view—and there are many such—utterly fail to show that poverty bears harder on girls from 15 to 21 than on their older sisters. Until they can show that beyond the shadow of a doubt those who view the matter scientifically will have to throw aside the economic as the sole or even the principal factor in the causation of this social disease.

The fact that there is a recognized critical period in the life of young women proves conclusively that other than economic conditions operate to debauch womanhood. The undisputed fact remains that the female continually faces pitfalls during the transition period from girlhood to womanhood that may engulf her if she is not continually on her guard. Because of inexperience in worldly matters and worldly temptations, because of almost complete ignorance of vital sex matters or distorted knowledge of the subject gleaned from questionable sources, because of lack of control over themselves and their unholy desires, many young women fall from grace between the ages of 15 to 21. These causes, operating either separately or

in combination, in the opinion of all who seriously have investigated this most important of social questions, are responsible more than any or all causes that may be mentioned for so many young women taking the fatal first step that in so many cases leads to the brothel or the streets.

Our socialist friends prove their utter dishonesty by seeking to capitalize immorality as one of their principal assets, as they ever capitalize economic discontent and dissatisfaction.

It hardly is necessary to show that which looms up so very plainly, that there is no honest attempt on their part to examine into the subject and to present an honest remedy. Like the medical quack, they ever find what they seek, if they do not give up the search when it leads in another direction.

While the new responsible leaders, those who really are able to think logically, are disposed to go slowly on the charge of economic conditions being the *causa causans* of immorality, they show political cowardice in not calling to account the less scientific of their movement for what they know to be unwarranted assertions. These are permitted to accuse capitalism of being responsible and to spread their charges *ad libitum* among the ignorant masses.

But it is not to be expected that they, the average among the socialists, who in other fields have shown the most childlike ignorance of the simplest and plainest facts, will show more proficiency in an examination of a subject that is most complex, that has been with us from the very dawn of civilization, and that promises to be with us, despite all that can and will be done by honest reformers, for a considerable time longer.

If our socialist friends are such poor social diagnosticians that they ever misread the plain symptoms exhibited by this social disease, we ask how it is possible for them effectively to prescribe for this and for our other social ills? Subsequent chapters plainly will show, citing the best evidence obtainable from socialist sources, that in this, too, they are not at all to be trusted.

Our investigations have almost led us to the belief that in the bright lexicon of socialism there is no such word as "morality;" that their evident purpose, as sagely stated by an English critic of socialism, is to "improve morality by abolishing occasions for its exercise."

## THE SOCIALIST CURE—IN THEORY

LET us now pass from the diagnosis of this hideous social disease, this noisome ulcer on the body of society, to the remedies proposed, first, by those rational ones who have interested themselves in the war on immorality and then by a certain branch of political and economic thought now unduly prominent by reason of the unceasing labors of those at the helm of such movement to keep in the limelight.

Some few there are who would adopt the logical and sensible method of fighting the disease by removing the cause. The cause being fairly well defined, it should not be an especially difficult task to put into effect measures that may at least help to minimize the evil.

To that end it is proposed to make woman more self-reliant through adequate training in the school and in the home, that she may when occasion demands be self-supporting, in a condition to help herself under reasonably normal conditions.

It further is proposed to put into effect a minimum-wage scale, at least for women, that women in the industries may not be exploited by conscienceless employers. Such movement, in its infancy at this time, is surely growing, and promises to be an important industrial factor in the near future.

The tendency in the direction of mothers' pensions may be cited in the war against immorality. This reform, as abundantly has been proven in all lands where such policy

has been adopted, enables women who have had thrust upon them the care of families to keep their flocks intact and properly to watch over the helpless ones committed to their care. Institutional care of orphans and others of our dependent young has fairly been tried and been found wanting in the majority of cases. The new policy deserves a fair trial, if for no other reason than that practically all other methods for dealing with this pressing social problem had been tried and had failed.

Sex instruction for those who most need it at present engages the attention of earnest individuals in all enlightened countries of the world. Properly confined within legitimate limits—that is, by having such instruction imparted by properly instructed parents in the home and not by paid instructors in the schools—such instruction surely must serve a good purpose. There is no question but that innocence or ignorance of sex matters never served as a protecting influence and never will. To be fully informed, it goes without saying, is fully to be protected at all points. At the present time such movement is in its infancy, and suffers as a consequence at the hands of some of its too-zealous friends. Hope, therefore, is entertained by those with the best interests of society at heart that some safe plan may be formulated for imparting sex instruction to those growing to manhood and womanhood, without undue risk to the morals of those of tender years who may receive such instruction.

It may also be mentioned that the double standard of morals that now prevails—judging man by a different standard from that employed to judge women—is destined soon to go by the boards. It is beginning to be recognized that even men may not sow their “wild oats” with impunity; that the after-effects of man’s sexual indiscretions

often are visited upon innocent wife and children, the latter to the "third and fourth generations." For that reason, if for no other, the male rake soon may be brought under the just condemnation of society, just as his erring sister now is.

Another fruitful source of commercialized immorality is rapidly being brought under the ban of state and nation. The Mann white-slave law, now in effect, makes it a felony to transport women from one state to another, or from a foreign country to any of the states, or from a state to a foreign country for immoral purposes, and visits severe and well-deserved punishment on those found guilty of such crime. The adoption of necessary local laws against the white-slave evil effectively to supplement the national law—and that is a work public-spirited women everywhere should strive to secure—may possibly have a deterrent effect on those who so employ weak women for their profit.

Last, and certainly not least, those who have entered the lists against this particular social evil may congratulate themselves that what has been rated as two of the principal factors in immorality and prostitution—alcohol and narcotic habit-forming drugs—have in the last few years been outlawed, the first by a constitutional amendment and supplementary laws and the other by a drastic national law, so these particular influences for evil have to a great extent been shorn of their sinister powers, even if, at the present time, it is impossible to eliminate them entirely as commodities in commerce.

To those of our socialist and radical friends who may contend that in the foregoing we have not provided a remedy for the social evil it is but necessary to reply that there is no real remedy for the disease. The only thing

we possibly can do is to minimize the evil. So long as there are women of loose morals—and such type of woman will be with us for a while longer—and men with abnormal sex appetites, such traffic will continue, if not in the present form certainly in another. So long as society provides something that will serve as a medium of exchange, just so long will purchasable women offer themselves for hire and impressionable men will continue to buy.

Some few of the more honest of the socialist fraternity admit in their writings and speeches that no real remedy is in prospect. To mention just one, Mrs. Snowden, a prominent British socialist (“The Woman Socialist”), said (p. 56) :

But if, as at present, the “unfortunate woman” be regarded as a necessity in these days of advanced thought and increased opportunities, then her status must be raised.

Prostitution, according to Mrs. Snowden, may not come to an end, even under socialism, but the woman engaged in such debasing and debased traffic will be accorded a “higher status,” because “she will be held as performing a necessary social service.” The remedy, therefore, of our socialist friend is merely to advance the social status of the prostitute, because it is recognized by the enlightened individuals of the new order that, after all, she is a necessary social factor, performing a “necessary social service.”

But some few others of our socialist friends contend that there is a remedy for this evil, one that effectively will cast out immorality from the haunts of men and enthrone morality in its place.

If we examine the published works of the acknowledged socialist authorities, where they touch on the subject of



morals at all, we can not help come to the conclusion that the socialist plan for bringing about a better moral atmosphere is the very ingenious one of abolishing for all time our present moral standards.

There seems to be general concurrence among socialist literary lights in the oft-repeated socialist view that morality, as we understand the term, is a "bourgeois virtue"; that the utter elimination of such virtue is to be commended than otherwise.

In order to minimize the force of the antisocialist contention that socialism, judged by its literature, advocates a type of morality much inferior to that which we now have, the claim is made that what had been published by socialists on the moral issue, just as the claim had been made in regard to religion, is to be regarded as the "private opinion" of its authors; that socialism no more is to be held responsible for the opinions of some of its advocates than the other political movements are to be saddled with the rash opinions of some of its overzealous advocates.

The comparison oftentimes is made by socialists between the opinions of Bebel, Engels, Deville, Bax, and others of the anointed ones of socialism, who in their books and articles in the radical press advocated a loose form of morality, and the published views of the wife of a former representative of the United States Congress from the State of New York, who in a book published some few years ago advocated "trial marriages," which book received fulsome notice in the "yellow" American press at the time. If socialists are to be held up to the scorn of all decent men and women because some of their leaders advocate what may be construed as immorality, they unwisely argue, so also should the Republican party be held

up to scorn because of the published views of the wife of one of its then recognized leaders.

The dragging in of the trial-marriage incident in this connection—and such argument was advanced by Mrs. Rose Pastor Stokes in a discussion had with the author before one of the New York organizations a few years ago—merely proves the desperate straits of our socialist friends. It will be a comparatively easy task to prove to all except those blinded by their socialist views that no similarity exists between the incidents cited.

To show that there is no real analogy between the socialist and the republican position it is but necessary to state that the fair author of the trial-marriage idea was not even a member of the republican party; that her connection with the republican party was due to the accident of marriage with one of its influential members; that such party never stood sponsor for the book containing the trial-marriage idea, or for anything therein contained, in any form or manner; that its author never so much as intimated that her startling idea was to be considered a republican idea. We may mention, if at all necessary, that not one of the 6,000 or more of the republican newspapers of the United States has to this day recommended the book or the idea in it that gave it undue prominence to their readers as good republican doctrine.

On the other hand, it can be shown without the slightest trouble that Marx, Engels, Bebel, Deville, Hillquit, and the other purveyors of the free-love idea are and ever have been looked up to as leaders in the socialist movement; that their views on that important subject are put forth by socialists as good socialist doctrine; and that the socialist organizations throughout the world practically put their stamp of approval on such views when they

gratuitously advertise books containing such views in official socialist publications, recommending the books to the membership as sound socialist doctrine, go even further and officially circulate such books to the membership from local and national socialist headquarters.

If organized socialism would clear its skirts from the muck of free love, let it sever the connection between the books complained of and the socialist organization by withholding its approval of such books; advise the publications it controls that free-love literature must stand on its own feet and not bear, as in the past and at present, the indorsement, express or implied, of the socialist organization; have one of the national conventions honestly repudiate the sex views of the socialist masters, past and present; and, if they dare, put a strong plank in their national programs that socialism stands, first and last, for the monogamic marriage and not for the "free union" of men and women—do that and we will most cheerfully admit and advertise to the world that socialism is sincere in its protestations and honest with its many dupes and with itself.

But it hardly is to be expected that organized socialism will take any such step. The literature end of the game is a paying one for the organization, and we do not for one moment imagine that the socialist organizations will dispense with the wealth secured from the sale of its salacious literature. Further, it is "good tactics"—and good tactics explains many otherwise unexplainable matters—to blow hot and cold at one and the same time, to preach free love to the free-love advocates and the strictest morality to the many in the socialist ranks who are not prepared to throw overboard our present moral code.

The views of Mr. Hillquit on the value of the socialist

authorities we shall quote may here be presented. In his debate with Prof. Ryan in *Everybody's Magazine*, October, 1913, issue, he very logically said:

For while the official statements and declarations of the organized socialist parties, national and international, constitute the most indisputable authority on the questions with which they deal, there are certain other sources which can not properly be left out of account in a comprehensive and intelligent discussion of socialism.

The practical socialist movement is supported by a social philosophy which was formulated by the "theoreticians" of the movement, and was and still is constantly elaborated by its students and writers. In its everyday work and struggles the socialist movement acts and speaks through its recognized representatives on the public platform, in legislative bodies, or administrative offices. *The utterances and acts of such writers and representatives, unless formally repudiated by their party, must be considered as legitimate expressions and manifestations of the socialist movement, and its opponents and defenders alike may properly refer to them in support of their contentions.* The same rule applies to the editorial attitude of the official publications of the socialist parties.

We recognize by such declaration that Mr. Hillquit places himself and the others of his party squarely between the two horns of the dilemma conjured up by themselves. Escape the one horn and they surely will impale themselves on the other. Publicly acknowledge that what had been published by socialist leaders are authoritative utterances on socialism, unless officially repudiated, and they risk losing the support of the public because of extreme radicalism; take away, on the other hand, every shred of authority from the socialist classics, and at that moment you deprive the socialist movement of every stable element, leaving it a shifting mass, ever at the mercy of the whims and caprices of whoever may be in temporary control of the party.

But, claims Mr. Hillquit with refreshing naïveté, the quotation which we had before taken the liberty of setting forth applies to the economics and politics of the movement and not to such unrelated matters as religion and morals. As to that he said:

It would obviously be preposterous to claim that Mr. Shaw's volumes of dramatic criticism represent the socialist view of the drama, and, perhaps, in a minor degree, it is similarly unwarranted to claim that Engels's religious beliefs or Bebel's views on the institution of the family represent the socialist conception of these subjects. Like the opinion of a judge on a subject not directly involved in a matter subject to his decision, such extraneous views are *obiter dicta*, and not binding on anybody but the author.

Mr. Hillquit slightly is in error as to this, as he is in other matters. The published views of Bebel on the family and morals, as well as the views on the subject by the other anointed ones of socialism that are often cited by those opposed to socialism, are not in any sense to be considered the personal opinions of their authors respecting such matters; rather are they personal interpretations and amplifications of the recognized socialist views on morals. Being on the inside, with full opportunity to see what is going on in their organizations, the views of Bebel and the others on this and other related matters should have some slight weight with socialists not so fortunately situated, as well as with the millions outside the socialist ranks, even if such views do not bear the stamp of official socialist approval.

Further, Mr. Hillquit shows an utter lack of consistency, like all true socialists, by declaring in one part of the debate that the moral issue is not to be considered as within the purview of a discussion on socialism and in another part of the same debate including as a legitimate

topic of discussion the claimed extraneous issue of morals and the family. Mr. Hillquit knows as a lawyer that he can not accept and debate an issue and then have the issue that he had accepted and debated as a legitimate issue ruled out as "*obiter dicta*, not binding on anybody but the authors," on his later motion.

I believe it can easily be shown that the moral issue looms up as most prominent in the socialist philosophy, despite the assertions of our usually well-informed friend. In that event it logically follows that the views of prominent socialists, to quote Mr. Hillquit, "unless formally repudiated by their party, must be considered as legitimate expressions and manifestations of the socialist movement, and its opponents and defenders alike may properly refer to them in support of their contentions."

In the same contribution in which is set forth Mr. Hillquit's views on the admissibility of Bebel's views on the family is contained the following as to what legitimately is embraced within the socialist philosophy:

The program implies radical changes in the existing industrial machinery, political structure, and social relations. The form of society which would result from such changes is usually designated in the literature on the subject as the socialist state or the socialist ideal.

Thus the dominant factors in the socialist thought, movement and ideal may be said to be of a politico-economic nature. *But socialism is not devoid of ethical and spiritual implications. The socialist philosophy involves certain definite views of right and wrong in the individual and social conduct of men, which are sometimes at variance with accepted standards;* and the socialist ideal is predicated on a change in the reciprocal relations of men and society which are bound to affect our conceptions of individual and social duty. The moral conceptions thus implied in the social program constitute the code of socialist ethics.

Further, if we accept the claimed socialist doctrine of

economic determinism—and the generality of socialists do accept this fallacious doctrine as an integral part of the socialist philosophy—we can no more repudiate the published socialist declarations on morals than we can the declarations from the same unholy source on politics and economics.

Socialism, it will be admitted by those qualified to speak on the subject, is more than a politico-economic movement, as contended by some few unthinking or dishonest socialists. It is, rather, a philosophy of life, as such touching every phase of human existence. Therefore the socialist movement presents a definite moral program, that we no more can overlook than the economic-political one, so very much in the limelight at this time. Thus it is permissible to cite in this discussion on morals the many socialist pronouncements on the moral issue, especially those which, as later will be shown, meet with the full approval of a large number—possibly a majority—of those enrolled in the socialist movement.

In "Woman and Socialism," by August Bebel, a book indorsed by practically every socialist publication in this and other countries, the socialist moral plan is duly set forth in the following very interesting paragraphs (pp. 466-467):

In the new society women will be entirely independent, both socially and economically. She will not be subjected to even a trace of domination and exploitation, but will be free and man's equal and mistress of her own lot. \* \* \*

In the choice of love she is as free and unhampered as man. She woos or is wooed, and enters into a union prompted by no other considerations than her own feelings. *The union is a private agreement, without the interference of a functionary, just as marriage had been a private agreement until far into the Middle Ages.* Here socialism will create nothing new; it will

merely reinstate on a higher level of civilization and under a different social form what generally prevailed before private property dominated society.

*Man shall dispose of his own person, provided that the gratification of the impulses is not harmful or detrimental to others. The satisfaction of the sexual impulse is as much the private concern of such individual as the satisfaction of any other natural impulse. No one is accountable to anyone else, and no third person has a right to interfere. What I eat and drink, how I sleep and dress, is my own private affair, and my private affair also is my intercourse with a person of the opposite sex.* Intelligence and culture, personal independence—qualities which will become natural, owing to education and conditions prevailing in the new society—will prevent persons from committing actions that will prove detrimental to themselves. Men and women of the future society will possess far more self-control and a better knowledge of their own natures than men and women of to-day. *The one fact that the foolish prudery and secrecy connected with sexual matters will disappear will make the relations of the sexes a far more natural and healthful one. If between a man and woman who have entered into a union incompatibility, disappointment, or revulsion should appear, morality commands a dissolution of the union which has become unnatural, and therefore immoral. As all these circumstances will have vanished that have so far compelled a great many women either to choose celibacy or prostitution, men can no longer dominate over women.* On the other hand, the completely changed social conditions will have removed the many hindrances and harmful influences that affect married life to-day and frequently prevent its full development or make it quite impossible.

At the present time, according to Bebel, we have a state of affairs such as he pictures, but unfortunately it is confined to but a few, those in favored financial or social circumstances. He would extend these blessings to all. So he follows that which before had been quoted with this (pp. 467-468):

The impediments, contradictions, and unnatural features in the present position of woman are being recognized by ever wider



circles, and find expression in our modern literature on social questions, as well as in modern fiction, only the form in which it is expressed sometimes fails to answer the purpose. That present-day marriage is not suited to its purpose is no longer denied by any thinking person. So it is not surprising that even such persons favor a free choice of love and a free dissolution of the marriage relation who are not inclined to draw the resulting conclusions that point to a change of the entire social system. They believe that freedom in sexual intercourse is justifiable among members of the privileged classes only.

He is, as will appear in another chapter, entirely correct in his assumption that some few progressive ones favor a "free choice of love" and a "free dissolution of the marriage relation" who are opposed to a change in the industrial system that Bebel considers should go hand in hand with marital change. But at that he is with them in the proposition of extension to all of that which now is enjoyed by the few. He says as to that (p. 469):

But why should only the "great souls" lay claim to this right and not also the others who are not great souls? If a Goethe and a George Sand, to select only these two from among the many who have done and are doing likewise, could follow the inclination of their hearts; if on Goethe's love affairs, especially, entire libraries are published that are devoured in a sort of reverent ecstasy by his admirers, why should we condemn in others what becomes an object of admiration in the case of a Goethe or a George Sand?

Of course, it is impossible to assert the free choice of love in bourgeois society, as we have shown by our entire line of argument, *but if the community were placed under similar social conditions as are enjoyed to-day only by the few who are materially and intellectually favored, all would have the possibility of a similar freedom.* In "Jacques" George Sand depicts a husband who judges the illicit relation of his wife with another man in the following manner:

"No human being can command love, and none is guilty if he feels or goes without it. What degrades the woman is the lie;

what constitutes the adultery is not the hour she grants to her lover but the night that she thereupon spends with her husband."

Men and women of to-day are hypocrites, according to Bebel (p. 470):

But the propertied and cultured classes do not venture even to-day openly to avow the principles of George Sand, although they actually live in accordance with them. They are hypocrites in marriage as they are hypocrites in morals and religion.

But with change in the industrial system will come a change in marriage:

So women will be free, and the children she may have will not impair her freedom; they will only increase her pleasure in life.

Bebel thus continues to the end of the chapter, thus to excite the fondest hopes of the dissolute of both sexes by a recital of what may be expected when socialists have come into their kingdom.

"Man shall dispose of his own person, provided that the gratification of his impulses is not harmful or detrimental to others. The satisfaction of the sexual impulse is as much the private concern of each individual as the satisfaction of any other natural impulse." What more does the libertine or the courtesan ask for at this time than that? What greater privilege does he or she, hampered by the "artificial restraints" that society has wisely—or, it seems, unwisely—imposed, beg for than what Bebel assures his dupes will be the portion of the free citizens of the socialist state?

Bebel, however, neglects to state who is to be the judge of what is to be considered a moderate or an immoderate gratification of the sexual impulses or when such gratification becomes detrimental to others. Possibly such minor matter will be left, with the other matters of like nature, to a board or commission, the members of which, also

having sinned in this particular respect, may be most lenient when passing judgment on others of no greater guilt.

It has been contended that the views of Bebel on sexual matters are his personal views; that organized socialism should not be called upon to shoulder any blame, if blame there be, for the publicly expressed views of Bebel and others of the socialist fraternity. While such contention in other circumstances may be considered a valid one, when we remember that "Woman and Socialism" received the warm indorsement of the socialist hierarchy, the omniscient and omnipotent inner circle that dominates the socialist movement to-day; that such book is recommended as good socialist doctrine by practically every socialist publication; further, that Bebel's classic and like literature circulates from socialist headquarters and are on sale at all socialist meeting places—that, in the opinion of all but our purblind socialist brethren, constitutes at least an indirect indorsement of such book and all therein contained.

Evidence in abundance may be found, if one will but look in the right direction, to support the contention of those opposed to socialism that the decadent sex views of Bebel and those of his kind are not, as claimed, the views of but an inconsequential minority of the socialist organizations, but rather the views of a large and influential portion of those in the socialist movement.

On the occasion of the seventieth birthday of August Bebel the national women's committee of the socialist party, composed of Meta L. Stern, Theresa Malkiel, Dr. Antoinette Kanikow, May Wood Simons, and Winnie Branstetter, names known to all in the socialist movement, sent on behalf of the socialist women of the United

States congratulations to Bebel and full indorsement of his book. They said in part:

We, too, feel privileged to say our August Bebel. Although the ocean rolls between his country and ours, although we belong to another nation and speak a different language, he is still ours in heart and spirit, for August Bebel and the *immortal* book that he has given to women are as international as socialism itself.

Perhaps the printer had juggled with the types. It may be that the word "immortal" had been inserted when "immoral" was intended. They continue:

Bebel's "Woman" has become the foundation of the proletarian woman's movement of all lands. Coming generations will recognize it as a historical document, recording the enslavement and the emancipation of women.

It is not at all surprising that the national women's committee had publicly commended Bebel's book, with its clearly immoral portions, when we consider that such committee was fully impregnated with the free-love idea that Bebel extols; but surprising, indeed, is the implied assent of the decent, thoroughly respectable women of the party—and they possibly constitute the majority of the socialist party—in permitting a committee of their party to align them with the sexually progressive element of the party in commendation of that which clearly is immoral. Until they publicly repudiate such leadership, until they publicly denounce the attempt of the national women's committee publicly to brand all women of the party as favorable to the erotic views of Bebel, the respectable women of socialism should bear without complaint the condemnation of all opposed to the free-love ideal and all it entails to the individual and to society for their action or nonaction in the premises.

The *Socialist Woman*, in its issue of October, 1907,

added its word of praise to the socialist encomiums freely showered on Bebel's classic when it said:

Bebel's book shows how the overthrow of the capitalist system and the inauguration of the socialist régime will give her the coveted place in social progress for which she vainly strives to-day.

This but adds insult to injury. The "coveted place" for which the women, socialist and other, are said to be striving for is that of the harlot, the clandestine prostitute, and the "kèpt woman," rather than that occupied by the decent women of to-day.

The editor of *Wiltshire's Magazine*, women's department, some time ago announced a course of study, the subject "Woman," with Bebel's masterpiece as the textbook. In its issue of September, 1910, it said:

No better basis could have been chosen for such a course of study than the book on woman by Bebel.

It might also be well to mention that practically all socialist publications, in addition to the indorsement of the book, place it with Engel's "The Origin of the Family" at the head of the list of books of "interest to women."

What appears to be an official indorsement of Bebel and his book is that a subcommittee of seven of the national executive committee of the national socialist party recommended such book to the membership, presumably as good socialist doctrine.

All of which is accepted by the unprejudiced observer as evidence fully to substantiate our charge that Bebel's "personal opinions" on morals properly had been transmuted into good socialist doctrine.

Frederic Engels's views on morals also may be studied with profit by socialist and nonsocialist alike. In "The Origin of the Family," considered by socialists the par-

ticular gem of their literature, occur these scintillating paragraphs (p. 91):

We are now approaching a social revolution, in which the old economic foundations of monogamy will disappear just as surely as those of its complement, prostitution. Monogamy arose through the concentration of considerable wealth in one hand—a man's hand—and from the endeavor to bequeath this wealth to the children of the man to the exclusion of all others. This necessitated monogamy on the woman's but not on the man's part. Hence this monogamy of woman in no way hindered open or secret polygamy of man. Now, the impending social revolution will reduce this whole care of inheritance to a minimum by changing at least the overwhelming part of permanent and inheritable wealth—the means of production—into social property. Since monogamy was caused by economic conditions, will it disappear when these causes are abolished?

One might reply, not without reason, not only will it not disappear but it will rather be perfectly realized. For with the transformation of the means of production into collective property wage labor will also disappear, and with it the proletariat and the necessity for a certain statistically ascertainable number of women to surrender for money. Prostitution disappears, and monogamy, instead of going out of existence, at last becomes a reality—for men also.

And this is the particular type of morality and monogamy that is to come with the cooperative commonwealth, on the authority of our friend Engels (pp. 91-92):

At all events the situation will be very much changed for men. But also that of women, and of all women, will be considerably altered. *With the transformation of the means of production into collective property the monogamous family ceases to be the unit of society. The private household changes to a social industry. The care and education of children becomes a public matter. Society cares equally well for all children, legal or illegal. This removes the care about the "consequences," which now forms the essential social factor—moral and economic—hindering a girl to surrender unconditionally to the beloved man.*

*Will not this be sufficient cause for a gradual rise of a more unconventional intercourse of the sexes and a more lenient public opinion regarding virgin honor and female shame? And finally, did we not see that in the modern world monogamy and prostitution, although antitheses, are inseparable and poles of the same social condition? Can prostitution disappear without engulfing at the same time monogamy?*

Here a new social element becomes active, an element which at best existed only in the germ at the time when monogamy developed—individual sex love.

According to the same exalted authority, this is the way the new monogamic order, that based entirely on "sex love," is expected to function in the new order (pp. 99-100):

The supremacy of man in marriage is simply the consequence of his economic superiority, and will fall with the abolition of the latter.

The indissolubility of marriage is partly the consequence of economic conditions, under which monogamy arose, partly tradition from the time where the connection between the economic situation and monogamy, not clearly understood, was carried to extremes by religion. To-day it has been perforated a thousand times. *If marriage founded on love is alone moral, then it follows that marriage is moral only as long as love lasts. The duration of an attack of individual sex love varies considerably according to individual disposition, especially in men. A positive cessation of fondness or its replacement by a new passionate love makes a separation a blessing for both parties and for society. But humanity will be spared the useless wading through the mire of a divorce court.*

Our very liberal friend is somewhat of a prophet and loves to indulge his prophetic bent on occasions to the limit. Thus we have this from his gifted pen (p. 100):

What we may anticipate about the adjustment of sexual relations after the impending downfall of capitalistic production is mainly of a negative nature, and mostly confined to elements that will disappear. But what will be added? That will be decided

after a new generation has come to maturity—a race of men who never in their lives have had occasion for buying with money or other economic means of power the surrender of a woman; a race of women who never had any occasion for surrendering to any man for any other reason but love or for refusing to surrender to their lover for fear of economic consequences. Once such people are in the world, they will not give a moment's thought to what we to-day believe should be their course. They will follow their own practice and fashion their own public opinion about the individual practice of every person—only this and nothing more.

If Engels but knew it, such a generation of people was in full flower in his time and exists to-day. In the Aleutian Islands we have this state of affairs, according to Dr. James Weir, Jr. ("Religion and Lust," p. 176):

Huddled about in their communal kachims, naked without any thought of immodesty, men, women, and children share the same fire and eat from the same pot. They recognize no immorality in the fact of the father cohabiting with his daughter—one of them naively remarking to Langsdorf, who reproached him for having committed this crime: "Why not; the otters do it." Later in life the men and women mate; but even then there is no sanctity in the marriage tie, for the Aleutian will freely offer his wife to the stranger within his gates, and will consider it an insult if he refuses to enjoy her company.

As with many savages and half-civilized people, the man who would not offer his guest the hospitality of the conjugal couch or the company of his best-looking daughter would be considered an ill-bred person.

Dr. Weir also stated (p. 177):

This laxity in sexual relations was at first common to all races of primitive men, but after a time there arose certain influences which modified to a certain extent this free and indiscriminate intercourse.

So we see that Engels's sex progress is in any but a forward direction.

In the paragraphs we have quoted from Engels we



have the familiar socialist claim that monogamic marriage, or the faults underlying it, and prostitution are due to capitalistic production and distribution, and an entire change will be had when capitalism is supplanted by socialist cooperation; we also have the gratuitous bracketing of marriage with prostitution, the one the claimed complement of the other; and we have the promise to those pulsating with sex love, who ever hunger after forbidden sex fruits, that along with the new economic conditions socialism will cause the fruition of their fondest sex hopes, and they will be permitted to satisfy their sexual cravings to satiety.

Socialists and nonsocialists alike, all who have mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters, well can afford to ask themselves whether the form of morality set forth by Engels in the paragraphs we have quoted—the morality of the brothel—is suited to their own homes and to society in general; whether it is well for society to throw overboard its present moral code for a “more lenient opinion regarding virgin honor and female shame.”

Again it will be claimed that the views of Engels on this subject are his views and not those of organized socialism. In reply we can only say that “The Origin of the Family,” said to represent the sex views of Karl Marx, the high priest of scientific socialism, as well as those of Frederick Engels, is indorsed by the socialist press as “one of the great classics of socialist literature” and recommended as such by prominent officials in the socialist organizations.

We present herewith a few of the many laudatory comments from socialist sources and leave it to the unprejudiced whether we are right in our contention that the “Origin of the Family” must be regarded as good socialist doctrine.

The *Internationalist Socialist Review* of September, 1902, said:

Any reader who masters this work of Engels will be rid, once for all, of the complacent notion that things have always been as they are, and therefore must always remain so. He will find himself better able to understand the complicated problem which must be faced of adjusting the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, to the radically different economic conditions which are at hand.

The same publication, in its issue of October, 1902, contained this:

The book is really one of the two or three great socialist classics, and now that it is in English it must find a place in the library of everyone who hopes to master the real fundamental philosophy underlying socialism.

The following is from the *Comrade* (John Spargo, editor), November, 1902. Mr. Spargo at that time was one of the most prominent socialists in the United States and looked up to as one of the authorities on socialism:

This book, first published in 1884, has been translated into almost every European language, and has long been regarded as one of the "classics" of socialist philosophic literature. That it has not heretofore been accessible to English readers is surprising, and too much can not be said in praise of the publishers who have supplied the movement with an admirable translation.

*The Worker*, in its issue of July, 1913, referring to Engels's *chef d'œuvre* and another like work, said that "these will be among the most important additions to the literature of socialism in the English language since the translation of 'Capital.'"

The *Appeal to Reason*, in its "special religious edition," February 21, 1913, recommended the "Communist Manifesto" and "The Origin of the Family" as authoritative utterances of socialism on morals and the family.

Just one more indorsement of such precious work of Engels, that contained in an editorial in that very influential socialist daily, the *New York Call*. In its issue of February 27, 1910, we find the following:

Woman, to fight effectively for her freedom, ought to know exactly how the present relations between men and women came into being. Never was a great movement so sadly handicapped by historical ignorance as is the woman suffrage movement of to-day. The book that contains in small compass "what every woman ought to know" is Frederick Engels's "The Origin of the Family." Every socialist woman should become a book agent to sell this book.

The socialist alliance of Geneva, Switzerland, not so very many years ago not only declared itself atheist and demanded the "abolition of all worship, the substitution of science for faith and divine practice"—whatever that may be—and "for human justice," but declared in emphatic terms for the "abolition of marriage, so far as it is a political, religious, judicial, or civil institution." In other words, for the same type of "private agreement" so alluringly set forth by Bebel, Engels, and the other master minds of socialism.

If we were called upon to cite an even more official declaration of organized socialism in proof of the charge that we bring against the movement that community of goods inevitably carries with it community of women, we have only to quote from the "Communist Manifesto." What socialist is so bold as to say that the "Manifesto" is but the personal opinions of Marx and Engels, co-authors, rather than a supreme socialist declaration? As is well known, no document in all the literature of socialism, not even excepting "Das Kapital," is more looked up to by socialists as an authoritative guide to all things

socialistic than the "Communist Manifesto." Says such inspired document anent marriage (pp. 37-38):

The bourgeois marriage will vanish as a matter of course when its complement (prostitution) vanishes, *and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.*

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a money relation.

Nothing is more ridiculous than the virtuous indignation of our bourgeois at the community of women, which, they pretend, is to be openly and officially established by the communists. The communists have no need to introduce community of women; it has existed almost from time immemorial.

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common, *and thus, at the most, what the communists might possibly be reproached with is that they desire to introduce in substitution for a hypocritically concealed an openly legalized community of women.* For the rest it is self-evident that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system, i.e., of prostitution, both public and private.

Prostitution the "complement" of marriage! To the astigmatic vision of the socialist that may appear as a fact, but to no one else. As well say that black is the complement of white or vice the complement of virtue.

In the "Communist Manifesto" it appears that socialists employ their usual shallow dodge in order to excuse their very loose brand of morals. Do we charge socialists with advocating wholesale theft, they reply that theft is rampant in capitalistic society, as if that is a sufficient answer. Do we charge them with advocating free love as a doctrine, they retort that love is bought and sold in the open market to-day. Do we charge them with conspiring to disrupt the family, they reply in true socialist fashion that we have no such institution as the family, that what appears as such is merely the complement of prostitution,

therefore the family—the capitalist family—is not worth preserving.

This very ingenious idea of the sexually emancipated of socialism of bracketing prostitution with marriage abundantly is made use of by the socialist *litterateurs*, as will be seen by other quotations from inspired socialist sources we are in position to drag into the light.

Prostitution, that vile traffic in women, entailing, as it does, the prostitution of women's noblest functions to the basest possible purposes, has never been glorified, even indirectly, in modern times, except by socialist or feminist writers. If we wish an indirect official justification for this most indefensible practice, we have but to refer to the documents issued by the socialist leaders and practically indorsed by the socialist organizations such as the "Communist Manifesto" and the quasi official utterances on morals by Bebel, Engels, Deville, Bax, Lafargue, Eleanor Marx, and a host of others of lesser light.

Says Deville, prominent French socialist, as quoted in the "Encyclopedia of Social Reform" (quoted in "Case Against Socialism," pp. 376-377) :

Marriage is a regulation of property. \* \* \* When property is transformed, and only after that transformation, marriage will lose its reason for existence, *and boys and girls may freely and without censure listen to the wants and promptings of their own nature.* \* \* \* There will be no room for prostitution or marriage, *which is nothing more than prostitution before the mayor.*

In an assembly of the German Workingmen's Union at Berlin Hasenclever (one of Lassalle's friends and a member of the German Reichstag) said (quoted in "Socialism and Communism" (Woolsey), p. 257) :

When the spoliation (of the working class by the capitalists) should cease, then first prostitution would cease, and the woman be given back to her calling—to the education of children. The

woman question would then be taken by the developed socialistic—or, more correctly speaking, communistic—state under its control; for in this state, where the community bears the obligation of educating and maintaining the children, where no private capital subsist but all instruments of production are common property, *the woman needs no longer, out of respect for her children, to be legally chained to one man.* The bond between the sexes will be simply a moral one; and then such a bond, if the characters did not harmonize, could be dissolved.

Commenting on this characteristic socialist utterance, Jager ("Socialismus") said (*Ibid.*, 257-258):

These words approach already pretty near to community of wives; but another orator, Jorissen, expressed more openly the removal of all barriers, in saying that a maiden who disposed of her love was no prostitute—*she was the free wife of the future.* In the state of the future only love would direct the unions of the sexes. Between the married wife and the so-called prostitute there was only a quantitative difference. *The children would necessarily belong to the state, and the state provide for both.* These views did not exactly meet with full approbation, *but they met with no opposition based on principle.*

Ernest Belford Bax, author of several inspired works on socialism, who is looked up to by socialists, not only in Great Britain but wherever socialism has any standing, as one of the great authorities on socialism, said as to marriage in his "Religion of Socialism" (p. 141):

*We defy any human being to point to a single reality, good or bad, in the composition of the family. It has the merits of being the most perfectly preserved specimen of the complete sham that history has preserved to the world.*

In his "Outlook from the New Standpoint," in the chapter on marriage, Bax gives a rather too frank opinion of marriage and its "complement," prostitution, in the following paragraph (p. 151):

*There are few points on which the advanced radical and the socialist are more completely in accord than in their theoretical*

*hostility to the modern legal monogamic marriage. The majority of them hold it, even at the present time and in the existing state of society, to be an evil. Yet, strange to say, they, most of them, contract these legalized monogamic unions, the excuse being the stigma on offspring and other inconveniences which are attendant upon the adoption of any other course. That there is considerable inconvenience in any other course can not be denied. It can not be denied that this is largely because persons who profess to be otherwise emancipated, and who ought to know better, pander to the current view by adopting an ostracizing attitude toward at least the female side of the illicit equation.*

That we may not be left in ignorance of what is a "monogamic marriage," Bax, in a footnote, gives to his readers this definition:

By the word "monogamy," as used below, is to be understood not merely the union, either temporary or permanent, of one man with one woman, but such union plus some form of legal compulsion or interference other than which obtains in ordinary cases of contracts.

In the concluding paragraphs of the same chapter Bax has this to say (pp. 159-160):

*Socialism will strike at the root at once of compulsory monogamy and prostitution by inaugurating an era of marriage based on free choice and intention and characterized by no external coercion.*

In this, as in other departments, the modern man, immersed in the categories of the bourgeois world, sees everything through them. For him, therefore, there exists only legalized monogamic marriage and prostitution, *both of which are based essentially on commercial considerations. The one is purchase and the other is hire.* He can not see the higher and only really moral form of the marriage relation, which transcends both, and which is based neither on sale nor hire. Prostitution is immoral as implying the taking advantage by the woman of a monopoly which costs her no labor for the sake of extorting money from the man. *But the condition of legal marriage—maintenance—does the same.*

If it be asked, Is marriage a failure? the answer of any impartial person must be monogamic marriage is a failure—the rest is silence. We know not what the new form of the family, the society of the future, in which men and women will be alike economically free, may evolve, and which may be generally adopted therein. *Meanwhile we ought to combat by every means within our power the metaphysical dogma of the inherent sanctity of the monogamic principle.*

We know not, and care not, whether Bax has wife, daughters, and sisters. He at least had a mother, and her views upon those of her eminent son that marriage is purchase and prostitution hire, and that thus is marriage—the monogamic marriage that she had entered into—to be distinguished from prostitution, may be of interest could they be secured. Bax has said the very last word on marriage and prostitution. It is useless to go further. He goes further, however, than any socialist ever dared to go when he puts his stamp of approval on prostitution. He said in the same book from which the other interesting quotation is taken (pp. 123-124):

Supposing that in Russia or elsewhere a sudden and urgent demand for material resources for party purposes arose, and that much hung on its being immediately satisfied. Suppose, again, that as a last resort a female member of the party were, without any hypocritical pretense, to sell her body to raise the money. *Would not this be a commendable act? Given the elimination of the mystical theory of the sexual relation, I would say, "Yes." Prostitution for private gain is morally repellent. But the same outward act done for a cause transcending individual interest loses its character of prostitution and acquires a new content.*

This particular paragraph, we are safe in saying, is possibly the most brazen defense of prostitution that appears in modern literature. To our overfrank friend and the many in the socialist organization who may subscribe



to his vile views prostitution the fruits of which are given to the socialist cause as one "transcending individual interest" loses its repellent character and becomes a positive virtue, one deserving the commendation of all with the best interests of the socialist cause at heart.

As the socialist organizations everywhere and at all times have been confronted by "sudden and urgent demands for material resources for party purposes, and that much hung on its being immediately satisfied," we may be pardoned for viewing in such statement an insinuating appeal to the more attractive of the females of the socialist organization to "take advantage of a monopoly which costs them no labor" to extort money from men within and without the socialist organizations in order that the movement may go forward. Without any desire to see Bax's interesting theory put to the test, we nevertheless are the least bit curious just how its application would be regarded by the general public as well as those not at present sexually emancipated within the socialist party.

Remember that the thrice-precious book from which these very interesting excerpts were taken, and which supposedly gives the socialist views of marriage, morals, and other related matters, has never officially been condemned in any of its parts by the socialist organizations, here or abroad; rather is such book included in the semi-official lists of "books of interest to socialists."

We have been quoting from the radicals of the radical socialist movement. Let us now briefly quote from a conservative socialist source—the same source, by the way, that tried to have incorporated in the socialist program or platform of 1908 a plank which declared that socialism "is not concerned with the institution of mar-

riage and religion." To show his consistency, a characteristic trait of all socialists, especially those who set out to teach an unregenerate public, Mr. Hillquit in his *Everybody's Magazine* debate, February, 1914, thought it necessary to modify his proposed platform declaration when he said:

Socialism will vastly raise the economic level of the masses and will put an end to the material dependence of adult normal human beings on others. It will thus remove all sordid mercenary motives from marriage, and will naturally leave but one basis of marital union. *It is a logical corollary that a marriage based on love can only endure so long as love continues. In other words, most socialists stand for the dissolubility of the marriage tie at the pleasure of the contracting parties.*

As most socialists stand for the "easy" marriage, that terminates at the "pleasure of the contracting parties," it is logical to assume that when they secure control of the state they will not be slow in putting such highly desirable and progressive plan into effective operation.

As Mr. Hillquit is perhaps the foremost socialist in this country, and as he has come into contact with and exchanges views on socialist ideals with all the leading socialists of the country and of the world, his statement that "most socialists" subscribe to these views must be accepted as an undeniable fact. His gratuitous declaration thus removes the punch from the statement officially made at divers times that the socialists who issue and have issued rather startling sex views are solely responsible therefor. Our friend carelessly "spills the beans" when he makes "most socialists" *particeps criminis* with the socialist sex emancipators.

Just one more contribution from an inspired socialist source on the subject of morals, this time from one of the founders of the National Socialist Party, George D.

Herron (ex-Rev.), appointed by President Wilson, along with William Allen White, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the satanic majesties, Lenin and Trotsky, rulers by grace of German autocracy and some deluded Russians over a large and populous part of Russia. This is taken from letter to Grinnell Church committee, that had him up on charges, dated New York, May 24, 1901 (quoted in Goldstein and Avery's "Socialism: The Nation of Fatherless Children," pp. 282-283):

In order that your action on this point may be complete, let me say to you that *I do not believe that the present marriage system is sacred or good. It rather seems to me to be the destruction of the liberty and love and truth which makes life sacred and worth living.* If love and truth are the basis of morality, then a marriage system which makes one human being the property of another, without regard to the well-being of either the owned or the owner, seems to me to be the very soul of blasphemy and immorality.

Like socialists and radicals everywhere, our ex-reverend friend conjures up an impossible premise, as the above certainly is, and proceeds to build on it. He continues in the same strain:

The family founded on force is a survival of slavery and one of the expressions of the slave principles on which our whole civilization is built. It is a mode of the superstition which thinks it good for human beings to own each other and good for the race to have all its sources and tools of life owned by the few who are strong and cunning enough to possess them. The ethics of the legally and ecclesiastically enforced family make it possible for a man to live a life of monstrous wrong, of ghastly falsehood, even of unbridled lust, and yet be highly moral according to the standards by which we are judged. The same standards condemn and disgrace the purest expressions of comradeship, if they cross the conventions or forget the decrees of custom. Free and truthful living is thus made a tragedy, to have overwhelming and revengeful retribution added unto it, while

slave living and falsehood may be rewarded with world blessings and ecclesiastical canonization. I thoroughly believe in the vital and abiding union of one man with one woman as a true basis of the family life. *But we shall have few such unions until we have a free family.* Men and women must be economically free—free to use their powers to the fullest extent—free from the interference of legal and ecclesiastical force, and *free to correct their mistakes*, before we can have a family that is noble, built on unions that are good.

Lives that are essentially one, cooperative in the love and truth that make oneness, *need not law of state or church to bind or keep them together.* Upon such the imposition of force is a destruction and a blasphemy. *On the other hand, no law in the universe has a right to keep together those who are not vitally and essentially one.* It is only in freedom that love can find its own, or truth blossom in the soul, or other than a slave individuality unfold. It is the business of society to see to it that every child is surrounded by the full and free resources of a complete life; it is the business of society to see to its own fatherhood and motherhood of every child, as well as to hold every parent responsible; it is the business of society to know every child of woman as a free and legitimate child of God, and welcome it as an inheritor of the reverence and resources of the earth; *but it is not the business of society to unite or separate men and women in the marriage relation.*

*Love must be set free and liberty must be trusted if noble and beautiful homes are to spring up to make the earth a garden of truth and gladness.* The coercive family system is filling the earth with falsehood and hypocrisy, misery and soul disintegration, and is perpetuating the morality of slaves and liars. In times past men have thrown away their lives in protest against what seemed to them tyranny and wrong. *There is a new world coming whose way can be made ready only by those who will throw away their good names and accept, perhaps, everlasting disgrace as the price of their protest.*

And if I willingly accept all the obloquy and retribution which church and society may visit upon me in making a protest against a system that seems to me destructive of all true morality, and

to the very citadel of the soul's integrity, then my protest has earned its right to be heard.

It seems useless and hopeless to speak to religious or moral custodians about the agony of the soul for self-revelation, about the increasing and intensifying struggle of man to outwardly express what he inwardly is. Our morality is so altogether based on appearances, on calculated action, and has so little to do with truth or reality, that the spectacle of a man trying to be simply honest with the world, in order to be honest with his soul, causes him to be taken for either a criminal or a madman. \* \* \*

Civilization, with its network of falsehood and suspicion, of retribution and revenge, is a sort of world conspiracy against the soul's integrity and against individuality. *Yet the right of a single soul to fully and freely express itself, to live out and show forth all the truth about itself, so that it need not have within itself any hid thing, but be naked before the universe and not be ashamed, is infinitely more important than the whole fabric of civilization.*

The travail of the soul to become honest, the whole struggle of man to come to himself, is far more vital and revolutionary, more menacing to what we call civilization, than any questioning of the marriage system or the questioning of any institution. *You may be sure that when the son of man rises out of the common life there will not be left a shred of any kind of institutional bond and there will be no sentinels on the walls of the soul's possibilities.*

There is more in this letter of the ravings and rantings that we have here set forth about the marriage state in society under capitalism, more of the perverted logic of one who once wore the cloth of a minister of God, but we have, we believe, set forth enough to show Dr. Heron's conceptions of the present marriage "slavery" and the "free union" that is to be a feature of socialism.

And with him it was not only a question of principle but of precept as well. He deserves full credit for living up to his convictions, even when they are, according to existing standards, of the basest possible sort, for as later

will be shown our ex-reverend friend carried out to the very letter the plan before set forth and with his female partner did not "fear to throw away their good names and accept, perhaps, everlasting disgrace as the price of their protest."

The foregoing rather interesting socialist sex expressions apply to occidental countries. Information, however, has reached us that such teachings have made decided progress in the claimed decadent orient.

There also socialism connotes antireligion and the loosest form of morality. Our slant-eyed, tradition-bound oriental finds both in the socialist philosophy, and may be expected to scrap both religion and morality as soon as the red revolution puts the class-conscious socialist in control of things political and industrial.

According to an illuminating article by Dora Russell in the "progressive" *Freeman*, issue of July 5, 1922, entitled "Feminism versus Christianity," the young women of China have gone ahead with a rush. Read and ponder this statement by the Non-Christian Student Federation of the Peking Women Teachers' College to the world conference of the Student Christian Movement, held in Peking in 1922:

Religion destroys true reason, obstructs progress, and disgraces human history. It has worked indefatigably against the growth of women's rights. \* \* \* The churches and the Y. M. C. A., whose pernicious influence seems burning as fiercely as ever, has led many of our youths astray. They are the tools of the tigers and willing to aid the evil. We who uphold truth, who maintain humanity, and are the enemy of capitalism stand in a belligerent position with these organs.

The manifesto concludes with the hope that all with the interest of New China at heart will "rise up and denounce the Student Christian Federation."

According to the fair author of this interesting article, the Christian Church is more of a hindrance than a help to the women of the Young China movement. The missions, it seems, emphasize "marriage and domestic work," whereas the Chinese woman, we are informed, "wants economic independence, the opportunity to obtain a free career in the world, and adequate intellectual and technical preparation for it." Following are some of the basic demands of these now emancipated women:

Complete equality of citizenship, education and opportunity for men and for women is the only program that the women of the Young China movement will recognize. *Nearly all of them are socialists, and they demand furthermore that children be supported by public grants, and that the state abstain from interfering in the relations between the sexes, except in so far as the welfare of children is concerned. Birth-control is another plank in their platform.*

Friend Russell complains that the majority of Christians in Europe and America have been rather negligent in "advocating women's rights, the abolition of capitalism, free love—or, at the least, free divorce—and birth-control. It is not likely, therefore, that they will give these *reforms* a prominent place in their programs for the uplift of China."

Christianity—or all religion, for that matter—is utterly without influence, say these reformers, on the China that is to be, or any other country earnestly seeking for the light.

Our fair deponent is silent as to the source of the "uplift" movement now on in China she but adumbrates, whether it came by way of Moscow or is a product of that socialist-feminist philosophy that in some measure is running wild among the enlightened and emancipated and sex-conscious women of America and Europe. Be that

as it is, the women of China seemingly are apt pupils, to an extent better the instruction, and stand a chance of getting a high mark whenever examinations are had to determine if the orient in any way had profited by the "moral" instruction so diligently pushed for years by socialist-feminist missionaries. If they continue to progress, the led may lead, and Young China may be called on to dispel the sex darkness that now, according to fully enlightened socialism and feminism, hangs over the Occident like a pall.

Socialists continually point to themselves as the conservators of morals and the family. Possibly the few quotations here set forth from the very many socialist expressions on the subject of like import may show the direction in which such conservation tends.

The very interesting quotations from the socialist classics before quoted are not, as some may claim, but isolated socialist expressions, the views of but an inconsequential and uninfluential few of the socialist authorities. If one has the inclination and the time to wade through the entire socialist literature on marriage and the family, he will find many other examples akin to the few rather interesting ones we have herein cited.

Though denied again and again by the slick socialist apologists, the student of socialism can not help but come to the conclusion that community of property necessarily and logically involves community of women.

The denial by socialists will not avail, for it easily is to be seen that denial is due to the fact that if the connection between socialism and the lowest possible morality were established, that of itself would have a most injurious effect on the propaganda for socialism going on in all quarters of the world and would of a certainty drive many



of the neophyte from the socialist ranks as well as scare away the near-socialists and the dissatisfied of society now nibbling at the socialist economic and political bait. Such individuals, as socialists well know, may tolerate even the most radical of political and economic reforms, but may be unalterably opposed to a civilization builded on the shifting sands of "sex love" and "sexual impulse."

In the early days of the socialist movement in this and other countries the forces organized to achieve the social reforms of Karl Marx and his school were more frank, more honest in setting forth for all the world to see their political, economic, religious, and moral views, that all might take due notice thereof and govern themselves accordingly.

But a decided change has come over the socialist host, though not necessarily over the particular "reforms" embodied in the unholy socialist creed. Remember that the socialists have entered the political arena; that they are now in the scramble for political office and the spoils that go with office; that the arts and artifices of the political trickster have been adopted by them in their unholy zeal for political office. Popular reforms have the call these days; the other "basic reforms," in a measure unpopular with the many socialists hope to reach, are glossed over or shunted to the rear for the moment.

Expediency operates these days; right dealing with the public through an honest expression of the fundamentals of socialism is for the moment forgotten by our socialist friends. The good ship *Socialism* sails the political seas stripped of everything that may impede her progress, that may prevent her from making the port for which she is headed—the coöperative commonwealth.

The pirate craft that formerly sailed the seas, on the

authority of our favorite romancers of other and more youthful days, the better to carry out its fell designs against the honest and unsuspecting merchantmen, was wont to conceal all that might reveal its true character. The black flag with its sinister design was for the nonce replaced by some honest ensign; the evil crew was sent below, to await the signal to set about their hellish work; the guns and other implements of murder were concealed until such time when concealment no longer was necessary, when the pirate's prey was wholly within range.

The long, rakish craft that plies the political seas, flying at its masthead the blood-red flag of riot and revolution, in like manner considers it necessary at times to appear as other than it really is. Its flag undergoes a transformation, appearing for the moment as the symbol of the brotherhood of men; the motley crew appears in other and more favorable guise; the assaults upon property by the syndicalist and I. W. W. corps, the sappers and miners of the socialist army, upon religion and morals, evolved in the countless centuries to their present stage, upon the most sacred and cherished institutions of men, the better to deceive the progressive elements of society and enlist the support of all who make war on the evils that menace society ceases for a time, again to be taken up when conditions become more favorable.

The pity of it all is that the very transparent scheme of organized socialism too often succeeds; that the unholy propaganda employed succeeds in deluding so large a portion of the public into the belief that the socialist philosophy has undergone an entire change, thus meriting the support of all who consider themselves socially progressive.

The socialist view of the marriage relation and of

divorce, before more or less fully set forth, well merits the attention of all who have the well-being of society at heart. The loose socialist marriage, if such union so can be dignified—"a private agreement, without the interference of a functionary," civil or religious—that appeals to so many who consider themselves sexually progressive, though not to those who are able to take a more reasonable view of the matter, and the facility with which such flimsy tie is to be dissolved, constitutes a menace society would do well to heed if our much vaunted civilization is to endure.

We are more than willing to concede that in the event that socialism institutes its "reforms" in the marriage relation prostitution practically will cease, for it is reasonable to assume that the average man will not pay for that which can be had practically for the asking.

In such thrice-blessed socialist age—to the men and some women afflicted with sexual lust—the man who conceives a momentary sexual passion for his neighbor's daughter merely goes through the mummeries of a socialist marriage, or an agreement is entered into without being recorded by a socialist functionary, and the maid is his for as long or short a period as he may desire. When he tires of her charms, when the other party to the contract ceases to please, when, perchance, broken on the matrimonial wheel, she loses that which made the man a willing captive in other days, or when his sex lust lights on another victim, the law affords him the means to dispense with his now irksome matrimonial burdens, to throw aside the old wife and take on the new, and to repeat—to him—such pleasant experience until he becomes thoroughly sated.

How long, think you, would our civilization last under

such conditions? Not very long, judged by the experience of other civilizations that followed a similar matrimonial plan. If we wish to get an insight into a civilization founded on private marriage "agreements," where divorce was to be had for the asking, we would do well to read up on Roman history in its palmiest days, for with certain modifications that is the particular type of civilization, as it applies to the home, our socialist friends would have us pattern after.

## THE SOCIALIST CURE—IN PRACTICE

BUT socialists are not, as many believe, content to indulge in mere theory, however interesting it may be. Wherever possible they have attempted to put some of their theories into practice.

It has not always been possible to carry out to the letter their economic and political plans, the socialist leaders realizing that slow change must be had if utter failure would be prevented at the very inception of the experiment. But with the moral issue no such self-imposed check was considered necessary. Quick dividends could be secured for those who ever lust for forbidden sex fruits, and these individuals hardly could be forced to forego that which they long had longed for just because the more squeamish of the membership or the more straight-laced outside world interposed objections.

Some of the more impatient of the membership could not even wait for the projected free-love paradise, so started out on their own hook to prove to doubting Thomases the feasibility and desirability of their thrice-precious scheme. We shall mention two or three especially interesting cases, involving those pretty close to the socialist throne of administration, and then pass on to where the socialist scheme was tried on a more extended scale.

Eleanor Marx, daughter of Karl Marx, was one of the many of the socialist fold who tried the free-love scheme and was compelled to acknowledge utter failure. She,

poor fool, thought she could brave convention and set at defiance the laws of God and man, and perished miserably as a result. Brought up in a socialist atmosphere, her views on morality, as we understand the term, and the marriage relation were in full accord with the socialist views of her time and now. Her sex philosophy, summed up in her own words, was as follows (from speech reported by *Chicago Tribune*, November 14, 1886):

*Love is the only recognized marriage in socialism; consequently no bonds of any kind would be recognized. Divorce would be impossible, as there would be nothing to divorce, for when love ceased separation would naturally ensue.*

She put such decadent philosophy to a personal test, and utterly failed to achieve her fondest hopes, as all others had failed in the past in like undertakings. Prompted by "sex love"—or was it "sexual impulse"—Eleanor entered into a "private agreement" with Dr. Aveling, friend of her father and translator into English of "Capital" and others of Marx's works. Dr. Aveling at that time had an invalid wife in England, of which fact Eleanor undoubtedly was aware. The "progressive union" of Eleanor and Aveling endured for but a short time. Disenchantment set in on the part of Aveling, though not on the part of his female partner to the arrangement. He left her and contracted another "private agreement," as he was free to do according to Eleanor's philosophy, leaving her to find solace in remembrance of possibly happy hours of the recent past. As with others who had drunk deeply of the socialist "gospel of despair," with its very destructive sex teachings, and suffered thereby, Eleanor, to quote the *Daily People*, an important socialist organ, "ended her own life, driven to the deed

through the unhappy and unfortunate ending of her marriage to Dr. Aveling."

The case of ex-Rev. George D. Herron is another very interesting one to both socialists and the unenlightened outside the socialist ranks. We will permit Col. George Harvey, editor of the *North American Review* and *Harvey's Weekly*, to state the case in his inimitable language (*Harvey's Weekly*, February 15, 1919):

It must be said for George that he practiced what he preached. In 1883 he courted Miss Mary Everhard, of Ripon, married her in the regular way, and lived with her for 17 years. Then he fell in with Mrs. E. D. Rand, a Wisconsin widow, who had both faith and money. The combination attracted George, but the impressionable widow was getting along in years too rapidly to suit his fancy. Fortunately she had a daughter of about the right age named Carrie, and George's heart went out to her. How Carrie felt about it nobody could tell, but the old lady was enchanted, and started in forthwith to clear the way for an ideal relationship.

For some reason or other George regarded his legalized wife as an obstacle, and for some other reason he did not care personally to undertake the task of removing it. Whereupon the widow approached the wife in a businesslike way and offered to buy George for Carrie. There was some haggling over the price, no two being able to agree as to what he really was worth, but finally the widow fixed the upset at \$50,000, and the wife accepted. She was sick and tired of George anyway. So she got a divorce, and the widow took George and Carrie away somewhere and hired a minister to "announce" that they were man and wife. It was not according to Hoyle, but neither was George nor the widow for that matter, and George said he felt just the same as if he had gone through a regular ceremony. Poor Carrie didn't say a word. She stood it as long as she could and then up and died.

Meanwhile the widow bought some land down in Metuchen, N. J., and George started a free-for-all love colony for those who had money, but recruits had barely begun to arrive when

the neighboring farmers' wives handed pitchforks to the hired men and told them to get busy. George saw them coming and didn't stop running till he got to Italy, where, having left the widow at home, he could develop his socialistic theories in peace and quiet.

As it happens, there always is to be found an element intent on taking the joy out of life for some people. So it was with George and his newly found affinity.

At the time the free-love partnership of George and Carrie was entered into the male member of such unusual union was a regularly ordained minister of the Congregational Church, and as such was amenable to the rules and regulations of the church. Further, as a minister he was expected not only to preach the Christian virtues, but as far as was humanly possible to exemplify them in his own person.

Instead of which he chose publicly to make an immoral spectacle of himself, and by so doing injuriously reflected upon the church of which he was supposed to be a shining light. There was only one thing for the church to do in the circumstances, and it wasted little time in doing it. Our very unreverend friend was charged with "immoral and un-Christian conduct," and a committee was appointed by the First Congregational Church of Grinnell, Iowa, to consider the charges and take testimony for and against.

The committee met, and on June 4, 1901, presented their findings to the parent body and to the general public. They found:

First. That "the charge of immoral and un-Christian conduct is sustained," based in part on the finding of the court which granted a divorce to Mary Everhard Herron on the grounds of "desertion and inhuman treatment."

Second. That the said George D. Herron was guilty



of "unfeeling and selfish indifference and—at least since 1896—of studied neglect, culminating in a heartless desertion and the final tragedy of divorce."

Third. The charge is sustained by the written confession of Herron submitted by him to the committee. "In this paper he denies the right of society to sanction or undo a marriage tie between man and woman and presents a view of the conjugal relation, of fatherhood, and the home which is abhorrent to enlightened Christian sentiment, and which confirms the council in the opinion that this action of George D. Herron is simply the criminal desertion of a worthy wife and devoted mother by a man who has deliberately falsified his marriage vows."

It was the view of the committee, and so was recommended, that the name of George D. Herron be dropped from the membership of the Grinnell Association and of the First Congregational Church of Grinnell, and the further opinion was expressed that "George D. Herron has forfeited all right to be known by the churches of our faith and order as a minister of the gospel, and that he is by vote of this council deposed from the Christian ministry."

Another member of the socialist party with a very interesting history is Lena Morris Lewis. According to the testimony of W. B. Slusser (letter to E. E. Carr, published in the *Christian Socialist*; quoted in "Socialism: The Nation of Fatherless Children") she had stayed at his house during her professional visits to Lakewood, Ohio, and "in the course of a few days of her stay she let us know that she believed in and was an advocate of free love, as the term is commonly used." She, it may be said, was one of those who did not fear to have her socialist

example square with socialist precept. The letter continues (p. 318):

She further told us that she had an intimate friend in San Francisco who ran an assignation house, and that she lived with her while in that place, *and justified not only her friend in the business but the frequenters of the place.*

According to a letter from Los Angeles, Cal., February 8, 1911, to Rev. Dr. Carr, signed by Bertha Wilkins Starkweather, an advocate of and worker for socialism, who presided at a meeting at Los Angeles, Cal., at which Mrs. Lewis spoke, previous to such meeting she had a conversation with Mrs. Lewis, the following, according to Mrs. Starkweather, being some of the questions and the answers thereto (*Ibid.*, p. 319):

"What, then, is your position on this sex question—this question of the relation of the sexes now—under capitalist conditions?

"In the last analysis it amounts to this," answered Mrs. Lewis; "*If the man 'makes good' to the woman, if he leaves her satisfied with the relation that has existed between them, then there has been no harm done. It matters not whether that relation was a simple handshake, a kiss, or the final sex act.*

"But suppose a poor girl is much in need of hard cash—is she not a prostitute if she submits to the last named for pay?

"*The woman must be satisfied with the relation—that is the sex problem in a single statement.* Capitalism has established a lot of ridiculous restrictions upon the personal conduct of individuals. *Socialists are in no way bound to consider these capitalistic institutions. Anyone who pries into the private affairs of Socialists is impertinent to the last degree.*

"So you are of the opinion that we are in no way bound to live as celibates, if we happen to be unmarried?

"*As such restrictions are a part of the capitalist system and as they are a contemptible interference with our private conduct, I insist that we are in no way bound by them.*

"But do you not feel that the socialists who hold representative positions in the party or those who draw salaries from the

party are in a way bound to consider these capitalistic institutions?

"Any one who pries into the private life of socialists is to the last degree impertinent."

But in an allied case there happened to be some who were "to the last degree impertinent," who considered it their duty to pry into "the private life of socialists," if they happened to be officers of the party. Rev. E. E. Carr, publisher of the *Christian Socialist*, was one of the "impertinent" ones. In his publication, issue of January 1, 1911, appeared the following:

Charges of the most serious character have been made before the national executive committee of the socialist party against the national secretary. If these charges are true, he should be relieved of all official responsibility to the party. If they are false, he should be cleared of them in a fair and unequivocal manner. Nothing but a full, fair trial can properly settle this matter.

The attempt to belittle those who make these charges is exceedingly unwise. Thomas J. Morgan is one of the most experienced, intelligent, and highly honored of Chicago socialists, who in spite of bitter opposition manifested against him recently was chosen by referendum as one of the four comrades to represent Chicago socialism in the national socialist congress.

"Mother Jones," the war eagle of the American labor struggle, who makes serious charges against the national secretary, can not be condemned with impunity nor successfully ignored. The deliberate effort to prevent the comrades at large from learning what is back of "Morgan's charges" looks rather dark.

To be sure, a socialist branch is not running a holiness class meeting, and no political party can require perfect characters of its rank and file; but certainly the vast majority of the comrades will desire sober, chaste men and women for their more important officials. Those who preach or practice "free love" should be kept in the rear.

The usual procedure in a case of this kind is to put the

accused on trial, so as to establish the truth or falsity of the charges. But socialists, being different, function along different lines. Instead they put one of the accusers, the Rev. Dr. Carr, on trial for publishing that which might injure the party. According to the committee investigating the matter:

It soon became evident that the motive of Dr. Carr was not the welfare of the party, but its disruption.

We further charge that the publication of the matter in the *Christian Socialist* has been used by enemies of the socialist party to discourage prospective members from joining the socialist party and to disrupt the party organization.

In the Socialist Party Official Bulletin, June, 1911, we have the verdict of the committee:

The socialist party of Cook County, Ill., represented by its delegate committee at a meeting held June 25, 1911, expelled from its membership the Rev. Edward Ellis Carr by a vote of 51 for the expulsion and 21 against.

Thus ended the matter, with all concerned satisfied—the socialist organization with its whitewashing verdict against the accused official and the accuser banished from the party, Rev. Dr. Carr possibly pleased to be rid of an immoral party, even by the expulsion route.

Our reverend friend finally, possibly, was convinced that he was entirely wrong; the "majority of the comrades," in accepting the verdict of the committee, officially going on record that they did not desire "sober, chaste men and women for their more important officials;" that those who preached or practiced "free love" instead would be chosen to lead the socialist procession.

With the free-love element thus serving as bull wethers to the socialist flock, it follows as night the day that the socialist state, when established, will function in an atmos-

phere not highly moral, judged by present-day standards.

Possibly cold and impartial history may supply us with some information regarding this, may plainly indicate what we may expect in the dread event that socialism is transferred from the realm of theory to that of fact.

History records that in the "dictatorship of the proletariat" in France in the closing years of the eighteenth century, known to us as the French Revolution, morality first had to walk the plank. The people, long kept in restraint by church and state, threw off their moral shackles and indulged themselves to the limit. Like those famished and brought within reaching distance of plenty, the French communards of such period indulged themselves to satiety.

A new faith we are informed ("English Socialism of To-day," H. O. Arnold-Forster, pp. 146-147), was born—that of "reason"—and such faith was established "throughout the length and breadth of French territory, from Antwerp in the north to Marseilles in the south." Such faith fittingly was typified by a common prostitute, "rouged, decked in an elaborate costume, and a republican cap, and installing her as the 'goddess of reason.' The goddess was borne into the convention by the leaders of the socialist party, escorted by a number of their supporters, dressed in grotesque costumes and dancing the 'carmagnole,' and most of them disgustingly drunk. The representatives of the people rose to the occasion; they each of them in turn bestowed a kiss upon their new divinity. The goddess was then borne off to the Cathedral of Notre Dame."

It is more than possible that with full freedom of worship each individual was free to indulge himself to the limit in the new worship and to install in his own

household his particular divinity, that could be changed with every change of his sentiments. The marriage laws were flouted, and it is hardly necessary to state that the communards regarded "female honor and virgin shame" more leniently than before.

History fails to record what was done with the children, the fruits of these free-love unions. If we were to hazard a guess, we would say that they either were left to shift for themselves or were thrust upon the maternal parents as interesting souvenirs of a very interesting experience.

The commune of Paris of 1871, the "one event," according to E. Belfort Bax, "which socialists throughout the world have agreed with single accord to celebrate," furnishes us with yet another interesting example of socialist morality in practice. The laws of God and man early were thrown into the discard and the "liberated" people did those things they wanted to do and scrupulously refrained from doing that which was distasteful to them. It hardly is to be expected that individuals who indulged in all manner of excesses seriously would consider a moral code that hampered them at every turn. "What is thine is mine" applied to property, and community of interests extended to men and women, both single and married. The French socialists, brought up on the moral diet of Marx and Engels, the socialist free-love advocates of their period, proved apt pupils and lost no time in putting their interesting sex theories to the test as soon as the revolution opened the way. History records in detail the excesses of that period, but discreetly is silent, possibly with good reason, about that particular phase of the experiment.

Free love in theory presupposes love from which restraint and coercion of every kind entirely are absent. In

practice that is not always possible. The other party may have likes and dislikes of her own or, it may be, with malice aforethought, she is content with and desires to adhere to laws some few still regard with respect. Some cases of that kind are on record of the communist period. According to Rev. Dr. W. S. Kress ("Questions of Socialists and their Answers," p. 166):

On the 29th of April, 1871, the communards took possession of an orphan asylum, drove out the sisters and kept back in the neighborhood of a hundred young girls. *By the time the nuns could again secure possession of their charges 5 of the girls had been deprived of their eyesight, several were lying at the point of death, 35 were infected with syphilis.* For official proof of these outrages see Maxime de Camp's "Convulsions of Paris."

It should be remembered that the work of de Camp on the commune of 1871, "a logical condemnation of its folly and ignorance," according to a biographer, "brought him gratitude from the French Academy and aided his election to that body in 1880."

If space permitted, many occurrences similar to that before set forth could be presented.

So, according to the best and most reliable authorities, to keep the yawning, ever-hungry hopper of the free-love mill supplied the mature and developed of the women were supplemented by young girls still in their teens, these last the victims of brute force.

Likewise in every state where progressive socialists secured the upper hand and managed for a time to get control of the machinery of government the free-love propensity of the flock soon asserted itself and disported itself to the limit.

In the free organizations that socialists established from time to time to a large extent they adopted the free-love

plan as soon as it was safe to do so. Possibly they adopted the simple plan of Plato, as set forth in his "Republic," that the women selected to continue the race were to be wives of no one in particular, but of all. Care was to be taken that when children were born to this or that woman no one shall be able to say, "This child is mine." All the children, according to the great Greek philosopher, were to belong to all, and thus "separate and exclusive relations to wives and children, the causes of disunion in a state, are to be obliterated." Or the socialists patterned after the examples abundantly set forth in socialist classics or took the advice of the "Communist Manifesto" and banished to the limbo of the useless and the outworn monogamic marriage and morality.

According to those responsible for the Owenite communities, established at various parts of the new and old world during the twenties of the last century, "private property, irrational religion, and marriage" were rated "the awful trinity of man's oppressors," and to smash this trinity into smithereens the various communities were established. If it were not for the untimely death of these experiments, it is reasonably certain that at least the last two of the trinity would have been lifted from the backs of the progressive Owenites.

A "conversation between a resident and a reporter" is set forth in Noyes's "History of American Socialisms," from which we quote the following. This by the resident (pp. 99-100):

We are protestants; we are liberals. We believe in the sovereignty of the individual. We protest against all laws which interfere with individual rights—hence we are protestants. We believe in perfect liberty of will and action—hence we are liberals. We have no compacts with each other, save the compact of in-



dividual happiness; and we hold that every man and every woman has a perfect and inalienable right to do and perform, all and singular, just exactly as he or she may choose, now or hereafter. But, gentlemen, this liberty to act must be exercised at the entire cost of the individuals so acting. They have no right to tax the community for the consequences of their deeds.

He was asked by the reporter, "Do you hold to marriage?" and replied (p. 101):

Oh, marriage! Well, folks ask no questions in regard to that among us. We—or, at least, some of us—do not believe in life partnerships, when the parties can not live happily. Every person here is supposed to know his or her own interests best. We don't interfere; there are no eaves-dropping or prying behind the curtain. Those are good members of society who are industrious and mind their own business. The individual is sovereign and independent, and all laws tending to restrict the liberty he or she should enjoy are founded in error, and should not be regarded.

Much of the above was italicized and small-capped. We omit such emphasis, as the quotations in the regular types fairly shriek to heaven.

It was said of Brook Farm:

They did not seek to interfere with marriage; nay, they guarded that holy state with reverence; *yet the spirit of fraternal association was found to weave itself with infinite subtleties into the most tender relations of man and woman. Fear came into the common dwelling.*

Could it be more delicately put? Marriage was not sought to be interfered with, but—the rest is left to the imagination, one fed to the limit on socialist moral teachings.

According to Stewart Grahame ("Where Socialism Failed," wherein is set forth in full detail an interesting account of the experiments in socialism by William Lane and his dupes in Paraguay in 1895):

The first trouble the communists had to face while on the ship that was to take them to their "paradise of the workingmen" was over morals and the full independence of the sexes. The female members of the party objected to being cooped up below decks, even in the interest of morals, and (p. 57) "many elected to spend the greater part of the night on deck discussing the beautiful principles of socialism with some kindred spirit under the open vault of heaven. If that kindred spirit happened to be of the opposite sex, there could be no logical objection, since sex equality under socialism implies the permissibility of the warmest comradeship between any man or woman, in spite of the fact that either or both may be married."

But Lane, heterodox in all other respects was most orthodox as to marriage and morals, and made his authority as leader felt during such critical period of the adventure. But the communards also had a will of their own (p. 58):

Breaking out in open rebellion, they stormed the hatchway and reminded their leader that they had an equal say with him in the conduct of affairs, and had as much right to order him to his cabin as he had to order them.

One indignant young lady, stepping over to the notice board, tore down William Lane's notice before his face and danced on it. Just to assert their rights, some of the married women openly incited the younger women to disobey, and a number made a point at once of spending the greater part of the night on deck in the future to prove their independence.

In the colony later on freedom of intercourse between the sexes must have been carried on rather openly, not only between the members of the colony but as well between the members of the colony and the natives, as witness the following from a letter that appeared in the

Sydney *Daily Telegraph* from Mrs. Mary Jane Gilmore, one of the communards (p. 151):

The Paraguayans and the New Australians live side by side, equal under the law, and equal socially. The Paraguayan gives a dance, and the white man attends it. The white man gives one, and the Paraguayan comes. A wedding is the signal for an all-around drunk, Paraguayans and Australians drinking out of the same bottle. Every one grows his own sugar and makes his own rum. *So far, though there are half-caste children, there have been no marriages with the Paraguayans.*

Though the constitution of this "paradise of the workingman" provided "that every child born into the state would be assured full opportunity to develop its brain and body as far as possible in our civilization," no provision was made, or expected to be made, for the fruits of free-love unions between the gallant Australians and the too-susceptible Paraguayan maids. There, as in more polite society, it happened that the innocent young ones were either left to shift for themselves or the native mothers were burdened with them. As in the homeland they had left, the man got off scot free while the woman was penalized to the limit.

## MODERN SOCIALIST PARADISES

But if we wish to get an insight into socialist morals at its best or worst, it is necessary to go to Russia after the revolution that overthrew the Czar, later the somewhat constitutional democracy that Kerensky was sponsor for, and then installed the "autocracy of the proletariat," with the precious Teutonized scamps,\* Lenin and Trotsky, at the head of the government.

According to Rheta Childe Dorr, self-proclaimed socialist and feminist, in her most interesting book "Inside the Russian Revolution" (p. 47):

"It's a free country," say a group of men, stripping off their clothes before a crowd of women and children and taking a bath in the Neva. This occurs frequently on the Admiralty Quay, a great pleasure resort in Petrograd.

\* As evidence that bolshevism is a made-in-Germany product, confession of Erich von Ludendorff, the chief of Germany's military dictators during the war period, may be cited ("Ludendorff's Own Story," vol. 2, p. 126): "By sending Lenin to Russia our government had, moreover, assumed a great responsibility. From a military point of view his journey was justified, for Russia had to be laid low. But our government should have seen to it that we also were not involved in her fall."

General William Hoffman, official representative of the German government at the Brest-Litovsk conference, also confesses (*New York Times*, December 23, 1920):

"As chief of staff of the east army, I directed the propaganda against the Russian army. The general staff made use of every possible means to break through the Russian front. One of these means was poison gas, another was Lenin. The imperial régime dispatched Lenin to Russia from the Swiss frontier in a sealed car. With our consent, Lenin and his friends disorganized the Russian army. Von Kühlman (former German secretary for foreign affairs), Count Czernin (Austro-Hungarian foreign minister), and I then closed the Brest-Litovsk treaty, so that we could throw our army against the west front."

"They called them Sans Culottes during the French Revolution," said a clever woman writer in one of the newspapers. "Our men will go down to fame as Sans Caleçons—the difference, perhaps, between a political and a social revolution." The first French phrase means without trousers. The second carries the denuding process to its concluding stage.

The too-free actions of the men were bound to exercise a sinister influence on the women, especially the feminist group that attained a rank growth in Russia even before the revolution, as well as on imitating girls of immature years, and soon we began to read of the caperings of the radical women of Russia and their imitators, sick almost to death of the tiresome conventionalities that before had obtained in the land of the czars.

Under the régime of Kerensky marriage and divorce laws were "liberalized" as much as it was considered safe to do; but under the new order a clean sweep was made, and all laws of church and state that might in any way hamper the sexual freedom of the individual were swept out of existence. In the former state, according to reliable official information that came from Russia, the people took full advantage of the altered conditions and diligently swapped old wives for new, or got rid of the old ones without entering into other entangling alliances.

But the bolshevik officials and their "liberated" subjects found such conditions not entirely to their liking. They therefore conveniently scrapped such laws as were on the statute books and started all over again.

According to our socialist friends the world long since had been steeped in economic darkness, and it became the self-appointed duty of enlightened bolshevik Russia to bring the light of socialism into these dark places. It also became necessary to scrap bourgeois laws and morals and to start the experiment with a clean slate. They had a

twofold function to perform—to redeem their own household and to induce the still unregenerate capitalist states to adopt a like course. In this laudable task example supplemented precept. Unlike most reformers, they did not say, "Do as we say, not as we do." They invited the benighted peoples of all lands to follow their example as well as their counsels.

We now reasonably are familiar with the Russian socialist theory as applied to the industries, of settling the age-long war between the "producing" and the "capitalist" classes by the very simple expedient of annihilating the latter class, and with the other measures that were put into effect soon after the "dictatorship of the proletariat" became an actuality, among the latter the revolutionary and revolting plan of nationalizing living men, women, and children.

Socialization of the industries the world expected; killing off some few of the resisting upper tendom of Russian society also was considered inevitable under the chaotic conditions, though certainly not on such a large scale and under such incredibly brutal conditions as actually were employed, but the marital plan sprung on an unsuspecting world, without anything in the shape of a reason, was so very different, so extreme, as to make the world fairly sit up and gasp.

It soon became evident to the apologists of bolshevik socialism in all lands, whose hands ever were on the public pulse, that this last move was not in any sense a popular one; that it must be counteracted if their plans in other lands was to succeed. Their press soon became filled with explanations and denials. The report that bolshevism had instituted nationalization of human beings was declared utterly untrue, spread by its enemies in

order to discredit the movement. Again, it was but a coarse jest of some with a distorted sense of humor. Again, while it was admitted that irresponsible communities may have inaugurated such a scheme, it was in no sense countenanced or approved by the central government.

Bolshevik apologists are adepts in the great American game of "passing the buck." When it finally was established that there was some little fire behind the cloud of smoke, the "buck" was passed along to the anarchists (it never has been established to reasoning individuals just what difference there might be between Russian anarchists and the bolsheviks); these precious individuals lost no time in passing it back again. It was explained that anarchists favor a condition of affairs calling for absolute liberty in all departments of life, therefore curtailing the choice of the individual in such a vital matter as marriage is foreign to the nature of true anarchists.

As to whether the charge of nationalization is true or false, we have the report of the Overman committee, whose scope was extended to include "German and bolshevik propaganda," published in Senate document 61, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session. The committee, after hearing every witness that could give light on the matter, came to this conclusion (p. 36):

Bolshevism accords to the family no such sacred place in society as modern civilization accords to it. Conflicting reports have been passing current during the last few months relative to the nationalization of women by the new Russian government. Two or three local soviets have, apparently, thus degraded the womanhood of their particular districts, but the central government has refrained from adopting any such policy in the whole nation. *They have, however, promulgated decrees relating to marriage and divorce which practically established a state of free love. Their effect has been to furnish a vehicle for the legalization of prostitution by permitting the annulment of the marriage*

*bonds at the whim of the parties, recognizing their collusive purposes as a ground for the severance of the matrimonial state.*

The testimony of Roger E. Simmons, trade commissioner, department of commerce, who was in Russia from July, 1917, to November, 1918, is of interest and value. He testified to having seen in the *Isvestija*, official bolshevik organ, the following decree issued by the local government of Vladimir (S. Doc. 62, pp. 354-355):

Every girl who has reached her eighteenth year is guaranteed by the local commissary of surveillance the full inviolability of her person.

Any offender against an 18-year-old girl by using insulting language or attempting to ravish her is subject to the full rigors of the revolutionary tribunal.

The injured, dishonored girl is given the right not to marry the ravisher if she does not so desire.

It is evident by the wholesale ravishing of females of all ages in Russia during the saturnalia of the reds that such law generally was not on the statute books of the bolshevik state, or if in effect was more honored in the breach than in the observance.

*A girl having reached her eighteenth year is to be considered as the property of the state.*

Any girl having reached her eighteenth year and not having married is obliged, subject to the most severe penalties, to register at the bureau of free love in the commissariat of surveillance.

Having registered at the bureau of free love, she has the right to choose from among men between the ages of 19 and 50 a cohabitant husband.

Remarks: (1) The consent of the man in the said choice is unnecessary; (2) the man on whom the choice falls has no right to make any protest whatever against the infringement.

This possibly was to sugar-coat the pill so that the woman might find little difficulty in swallowing the nauseous dose ladled out to her sex.



The right to choose from a number of girls who have reached their eighteenth year is also given to man.

The opportunity to choose a husband or a wife is to be presented once a month.

The bureau of free love is autonomous.

Men between the ages of 19 and 50 have the right to choose from among the registered women, *even without the consent of the latter*, in the interests of the state.

*Children who are the issues of these unions are to become the property of the state.*

The decree stated that it was based on the "excellent example" of similar decrees issued at Luga, Kolpin, and other places in Russia.

A decree issued at Saratov, a city of about 100,000 inhabitants, about March 15, 1918, also is of intense interest (*Id.*, 355-356):

Some people with their daughters have been excited into leaving the city, although the power is in the hands of the bolsheviki, and it is very doubtful if the anarchists can succeed in the enforcement of the proclamation.

#### DECREE

This decree is proclaimed by the free association of anarchists in the town of Saratov, in compliance with the decision of the soviet of peasant soldiers' and workmen's deputies of Kronstadt regarding the abolition of the private possession of women.

It should be remembered that Kronstadt is the birth-place of bolshevism, where it first took root, and whence it spread all over Russia.

Social inequalities and legitimate marriage having been a condition in the past which served as an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie, thanks to which the best species of all the beautiful women have been the property of the bourgeoisie, have prevented the proper continuation of the human race. Such ponderous arguments have induced the present organization to edict the present **decree**.

Here we have unanswerable argument. The beautiful among the females long had been the exclusive possession of the bourgeoisie; it now was the turn of the under dogs among the Russians to take their pick of womanhood, to satisfy their cravings for centuries. It would have been scant justice for the victorious proletariat to take to themselves as legitimate spoils of victory the mansions, lands, and possessions of their arch enemy, the capitalist class, and leave to them their most precious possession, its luscious womanhood.

From March 1 the right to possess woman having reached the age of 18 to 32 is abolished.

The age of woman shall be determined by birth certificates, of passports, or by testimony of witnesses, and on failure to produce documents their age shall be determined by the black committee, who shall judge them according to appearance.

This decree does not affect woman having five children.

The former owners may obtain the right of using their wives without their turn.

In case of resistance of the husband he shall forfeit the right of the former paragraph.

*All women according to this decree are exempted from private ownership and are proclaimed the property of the whole nation.*

The remaining paragraphs of this most remarkable decree deal with the distribution of the women concerned, who are obliged to appear at stated times before the proper authorities and give desired information. Citizens are required to report women failing to register and who try to escape "national service."

*Male citizens have the right to use one woman not oftener than three times a week for three hours, observing the rules specified below.*

Those eligible for this privilege shall "be a bearer of a certificate from the factories committee, professional

union, or workmen's, soldiers', and sailors' council, certifying that he belongs to the working-family class."

"Every working member is obliged to discount 2 per cent from his earnings to the fund of general public action"; it also is provided that "male citizens not belonging to the working class, in order to have the right equally with the proletariat, are obliged to pay 100 rubles monthly into the public funds"; all payments go to the "national generation fund," from which women proclaimed by this decree to be the "national property" will receive 238 rubles a month.

Provision is made for pregnant women; the issue from these temporary love unions are taken care of by state institutions and are to be trained and educated by the officials appointed by the state.

Health examinations are provided for weekly; "those guilty of spreading venereal diseases will be held responsible and severely punished." It may be that a measure of this sort had not been put on the statute books throughout Russia, or if enacted was regarded as a dead letter, for reports coming from all sections of bolshevik Russia are to the effect that venereal diseases had assumed the proportions of an epidemic, children of tender years not being exempt from the most loathsome of venereal diseases. Pensions are also provided for women "having lost their health."

It finally is provided that "all those refusing to recognize and support this decree will be proclaimed saboteurs, enemies of the people, and counter-anarchists, and will be held to the severest penalties." Such very interesting document was signed "Council of the City of Saratov, Russia."

It hardly is necessary to mention that the Saratov de-

cree, whether issued by bona fide anarchists or by bolshevists masquerading as such, received more than ample space in the American press.

And it is needless to mention that such comment as was had was unanimously adverse to the bestial bolshevik proposition. Even the socialist and near socialist press, while they endeavored to explain away what to American socialism was a most damaging document, were unwilling publicly to proclaim themselves defenders of such form of community of men and women.

Unsparring condemnation, both of the idea and those individuals responsible therefor, on the other hand was general in the nonsocialist press. Space will permit of but one of these adverse comments.

Mr. Arthur Brisbane, generalissimo of the Hearst editorial forces, thus scores the Saratov plan in his characteristic manner:

News comes from Russia that seems strange to those who do not know of old laws.

Anarchistic revolutionists in charge of the government at Saratov have made marriage illegal. The man who claims his wife as his own is guilty of sabotage, and must go to jail.

Is Mr. Brisbane positive that "Anarchistic revolutionists" are responsible for the Saratov decree? If so, who is responsible for decrees just as odious that were promulgated in other sections of Russia?

Children are the property of the state, and will be brought up in groups, like the small chickens you have seen in the tin brooders of Madison street shop windows.

Women having "more than five children" are supposed to have done their duty, and may do as they please. Others, when politely requested, must add to the population, which is multiplying T. R.'s race theories by a million and going very far indeed.

Babies one month old go to a people's crib, where they are raised by the state until 17 years of age.

The mother of twins gets a national gift of 200 rubles, worth just now about \$25 in real money [or in confederate money now]. The revolutions can't be accused of extravagance.

Workingmen must set aside 2 per cent of their earnings to help raise the nation's babies. The prosperous class must pay in 100 rubles per month, all must be careful about their health—and the revolution feels that it has made great strides toward democracy and general happiness.

We are getting civilized, for this announcement from Russia will cause more rage and disgust than would the news of a million murders.

Because men have always been murdering each other, for the last few centuries they have managed to respect women—or, at least, pretend respect.

War hurts and diminishes our slowly and painfully accumulated store of morality, as it reduces the store of cash.

If war only killed men, it would not matter. But it kills the sense of right and wrong, sends men galloping back to the methods of their monkey ancestors—highly proud of themselves.

Mr. Brisbane slightly is in error in this last. War does not have this effect; if it does, it is but temporary, and with peace comes a return to the old conditions. But socialism has this effect, and as long as socialist conditions exist the tendency ever is backward instead of forward.

Mr. Brisbane concludes his interesting comment on Russia with a paragraph or two from Plutarch's "Lives," showing that marital conditions in Sparta in the long ago were similar in some respects to that established in bolshevist Saratov, Russia.

Hon. David R. Francis, United States minister to Russia during the last days of the Romanoff Czar, Nicholas the Last, the full period of the limited democracy of the minimalist socialism of Kerensky, and a part of the bolshevik autocracy of Lenin and Trotsky, who

enjoys the respect and confidence of decent and law-abiding people everywhere, also gave important testimony before the Overman committee regarding conditions in Russia. While he absolved the central soviet from responsibility for and participation in the nationalization decrees of the local soviets of Luga, Kolpin, Vladimir, Saratov, Hvolinsk, Kronstadt, and other places, he charges such central soviet with direct responsibility for laws and edicts that made marriage a mockery and a sham throughout the bedlam that once was Russia.

Replying to a question whether he favored recognition of that government, he said emphatically (p. 957 of the hearings, S. Doc. 62) :

"Why, they do not merit recognition. They do not merit even business relations, because of their prejudices. They have instituted a reign of terror. They are killing everybody who wears a white collar or who is educated and is not a bolshevik. Several of their provinces have nationalized women. I have seen that the decree has been presented to you."

Senator Nelson. "You know that is true, do you, of your own observation and knowledge?"

Mr. Francis. "*I only know it because I have seen it in the official publications of the soviet government, the central newspapers. The central soviet has never nationalized women by a decree, but it has issued a decree, which I saw in Ivestia, the official publication of their government, making divorce and marriage so easy as to require only a notice to some man by a married couple that they had agreed to separate; and likewise a notice that two unmarried people had decided to marry. Now, there is no limit of time as to how long the marriage shall hold.*"

Senator Overman. "Or the cause of the divorce."

Mr. Francis. "Or the cause of the divorce."

Regarding the incriminating testimony of Mr. Simmons, Ambassador Francis, and others, we have corroborative testimony from a source especially favorable to

the bolshevik cause. Mrs. John Reed (or as she prefers to be called, Louise Bryant), radical socialist, picketing suffragist, feminist, and advanced woman, wife of one of the bolshevik officials, herself, as she was compelled to admit, for some time in the service of the bolshevik government, testified to having seen the official decrees calling for the emancipation of woman from bourgeois morality in the official soviet publications, but sought to break the force of her testimony by the gratuitous statement that such decrees merely were printed as news items, just as the capitalist newspapers of this country print the proceedings of socialist and anarchist conventions, without assuming any responsibility for or concurring in the views there expressed by explosive radicals.

Mrs. Reed knows, or should know by reason of her husband's position in official bolshevik circles, that in soviet Russia there was in effect an absolute control of the news and newspapers, that was far more oppressive and repressive than any put in effect during the czarist régime. Such being the case, it hardly is possible that the soviet officials would have permitted the publication of that which undoubtedly would have given aid and comfort to their enemies in other lands and seriously have undermined their cause, even among those who were expected to be friendly to the system they established.

She knows, or ought to know, that the soviet newspapers during the iron reign of the bolshevik dictatorship were in effect soviet bulletins, in which were printed from time to time important "successes" of the valiant red armies on all fronts, whether they occurred or not; uprisings of the downtrodden proletariat in the leading capitalist countries of the world; the decrees issued *ad libitum* by the high and mighty ones of the inner circles at Moscow and Petro-

grad for the information and guidance and caution of those unfortunate ones under the iron heel of the bolshevik autocracy; and such further information as it was necessary for them (the few who could read after the intelligent ones in their territory had wantonly been destroyed) to have. As newspapers—purveyors to the public of the news of the day—those permitted to be printed in those sections unfortunately under soviet domination for all intents and purposes practically ceased to exist.

By permitting such decrees to be printed a definite purpose undoubtedly was served; whatever it was we can but hazard a guess. It may be that the bolshevik masses needed to be informed of the latest styles of matrimony, so that they could be introduced in their own localities. In the event that it worked well on a small scale, it could be extended by a decree of the all-powerful central soviet, or the masters in supreme control, so as to cover the entire “federated republic.”

According to the supposedly well-informed *New Republic* (March 15, 1919), in sympathy with the ideals if not with all the aims and purposes of bolshevism, the decree of Saratov was published by the soviet authorities in their official publications in order, as the author of an article in such “progressive” magazine puts it, “to bring discredit and opprobrium on their most dangerous political opponents, the anarchists.” Thus Mr. Oliver M. Saylor says:

One solution, of course, is that which is suggested in the “answer” quoted above. (That until the question was settled by force, “even in Moscow their (the anarchists) desires and decisions were unquestioned by the bolsheviki, and they were free to issue their decrees and documents, even if they did not meet with the full approval of the bolshevik authorities.) It is not beyond the possibility that the bolsheviki themselves devised and



posted the original "decree" in the name of the anarchists in order to bring discredit and opprobrium on their most dangerous political opponents. Equally plausible to me is the supposition that a detached group of anarchists in the city of Saratov actually did advocate and promulgate this "decree," without possessing the power to carry it out. What authority such a group imagined they had in the matter from the Kronstadt soviet I was unable to determine. In the course of six months in Russia I was unable to find record or other allusion to any such document, although it was generally known that the Kronstadt soviet, a local body, rearranged human affairs periodically and not always seriously, and never with the authority of the central executive committee of the soviets.

Here we have a gem of radical reasoning. He did not see the Kronstadt decree, therefore it had no existence; if there was such a thing, we must not take it seriously, for the Kronstadt soviet did not amount to much anyway. The pity of it is that many may be found who read and accept the logic spread by literary simples in the pages of the "progressive press" of the type of the *New Republic* and the *Nation*. He continues:

Out of this astounding episode arises one conclusion of supreme importance to us in our effort to understand the bolshevik frame of mind, far overshadowing the obvious and revolting inferences which result naturally from a hasty consideration of the decree. In fact, I can think of nothing that would please the bolshevik leaders more than for us to absorb our minds and waste our indignation in attributing to them these ideas concerning the socialization of women. If Lenin and Trotsky are aware of the interpretation which has almost unanimously been placed on this decree in the United States, they are probably laughing deeply in their sleeves. To the extent that we are dissipating our attention on shocking and incidental and misinterpreted episodes like this we are playing directly into the hands of Lenin and Trotsky and the red guard.

A very ingenious theory and conclusion, it is true, but

one that hardly will hold water. Instead of, as Mr. Saylor would have us believe, the bolshevik authorities holding off and permitting us to waste our indignation on "shocking and incidental and misinterpreted episodes like this," the authorities of sovietdom themselves either were caught in their own net or really were indignant, if innocent of wrongdoing, at such stories being circulated about their form of government. Those who read the radical press or articles by radicals in the more conservative press are aware that the bolshevik advocates did not intend to let such statements go unchallenged. We are informed that a close connection existed between the radicals here and the soviet government of Russia. If that is so, the American bolsheviks either misinterpreted plain orders from their Russian masters or took the bit between their teeth and helped spoil the interesting game that our very veracious and extremely logical friend of the *New Republic* suggested the red régime of Russia then was playing to divert attention from other and possibly more important matters.

Further corroborative testimony as to nationalization of women is had in a letter to the *New York Times* of March 26, 1922, by a woman who claims to know of what she relates. The letter follows:

New York, March 2, 1922.

*To the Editor of the New York Times:*

In her recent book, "Marooned in Russia," Mrs. Marguerite B. Harrison states that no one in Moscow had ever heard a word about the project of the soviet government to nationalize all the women of Russia; that the sole mention of such a thing was contained in a small newspaper published at Saratov; that it was regarded as a joke even there.

Permit me to say that I think I can obtain for you, if desired, a copy of the official soviet circular posted on the walls of Saratov by way of informing the public as to the promulga-

tion of a new authoritative decree. It is in the hands of a man who procured it on the spot at the time, and is now in this city.

From a woman of the "intelligencia" class, who was in the category of the "nationalized," I have a statement which proves that there was nothing either humorous or provincial about it. The decree was promulgated also in Petrograd, where my friend and her husband lived. At a fixed date all women between the ages of 16 and 45 (I think) were to be mated, regardless of their own will in the matter.

The women affected in Petrograd, including my friend, went to the physicians and demanded poison. Each was furnished by these sensible physicians with a dose of cyanide of potassium, which she carried everywhere with her. Five days before the date fixed for the execution of the decree a new decree abrogated it. The most interesting and perhaps the most hopeful cause for the promulgation of that second decree was that the peasants had risen in wrath and declared that no such nationalization should take place.

ISABEL F. HAPGOOD.\*

But even if we were to throw aside as unfounded rumor or worse all the tales that were printed about nationalization of women by this or that community of Russia we have sufficient information from possibly more trustworthy sources to prove that determined efforts had been made utterly to destroy the institution of marriage as it had existed from time immemorial.

In the *New York Call* of February 13, 1920, an article was published "on the emancipation of Women in Russia, which previously appeared in *Le Populaire* (Paris) of January 10, from a brochure by Lenin, entitled 'The Great Beginning,' a study of the organization of work in

\* The author of the letter, one who is not accustomed to making rash and unprovable statements, was communicated with, and stated that the man referred to was a Y. M. C. A. representative, who was at Saratov at the time, and that the woman, after a short visit to the United States, returned to Russia and was there at the time the letter was sent.

soviet Russia." It will be admitted that it makes "mighty interesting reading." In part it is as follows:

It is a fact that in the course of the past ten years not a single democratic party in the world, not one among the leaders of the bourgeois republics, has undertaken for the emancipation of women the hundredth part of what has been realized by Russia in one year.

Then follows the achievement of Russia:

All the humiliating laws prejudicial to the rights of women have been abolished; *for example, those which made divorce difficult, the repugnant rules for inquiring into paternity, and other regulations relating to "illegitimate" children. Such laws are in force in all civilized states, to the shame of the bourgeoisie and of capitalism.* We are justly proud of our progress in this field. But as soon as we have destroyed the foundations of bourgeois laws and institutions we arrived at a clear conception of the preparatory nature of our work, destined solely to prepare the ground for the edifice which was to be built. We have not yet come to the construction of the building.

So according to the soviet Moses, Lenin himself, such laws or decrees published by the soviet authorities, that making divorce easy, the "repugnant rules" for inquiring into paternity, and regulations relating to illegitimacy abolished, are merely preparatory measures for the real social structure they hoped to build, not only in their own but in all civilized countries. We can but imagine what type of structure bolshevik plans call for if we fortify ourselves with the delectable literary outpourings of Bebel and Engels and the other inspired prophets of the socialist order set forth in another chapter. Further:

Woman remains, after all, the slave of the home. The emancipatory laws make no difference, for she is still subject to all the little household tasks which chain her to the kitchen and the

nursery and make her arduous and unproductive activity a bondage of petty torments, oppressive and degrading.

A true emancipation of women, a real communism, will be achieved only when the proletariat, taking the reins in its hands, shall organize the fight against domestic slavery—or, to put it better, when society shall be entirely reconstructed with a view to a general and socialistic organization of housekeeping.

This is in no sense a new departure; it had been set forth, to mention but one source, in the very interesting volume by Bebel, "Woman." The inspired article by Lenin closes with this promise, or, possibly, threat:

We have for the most part taken these institutions in hand, and they are beginning to lose their old character. We do not shout it in the streets, although the bourgeois understands very well how to sing the praises of his institutions. In contrast to the bourgeois press, with its large circulation, which extols bourgeois enterprises as worthy to exalt the national pride, our papers do not pass their time celebrating the merits of the community kitchens.

There is a particular reason for this, aside from over-modesty on the part of the Russian communards, and that reason is that the community kitchens and dining rooms, from which so much was expected, had not functioned nearly as well as the friends of communism had expected.

It is none the less true that they are based on these principles: Economize work, be saving of materials, improve sanitary conditions, and free women from slavery.

Freeing woman from the "slavery" of the kitchen and the nursery and the tasks allotted to the sex by the unemancipated civilization of the past is supposed to have one definite and glorious result, and that is with more time at her disposal she will be free, entirely so, to devote herself to free and unrestrained love—in the newer and emancipated sense.

Aside from the communal kitchens we have in the new and emancipated state an official "breaker of marriages" (possibly known by a more euphonious title); and we are informed by reliable authorities that he, or she or they are the officials more sought after than any of the others.

The net results of these practices, that were to bring about the emancipation of women, according to reliable reports that have come out of darkest soviet Russia, were such as not especially to hearten their friends in other countries. Women certainly were degraded, families demoralized, the children, the men and women of the morrow, almost hopelessly were spoiled—all in all, society distinctly was the loser and not the gainer by the new venture.

We have something in the nature of reliable information that this is a fact and not the fancy of overwrought opponents of socialism.

Thus we have a very interesting and instructive letter from Grand Duchess Marie, Princess Pontiantine, to a friend in New York, reprinted in the *New York Times Magazine* of February 1, 1920, that may be quoted in part, as it deals with bolshevism's malevolent and bestial assault on what should be pure and innocent childhood and gives us something explicit and definite on the mooted question of nationalization of women. Thus she says:

Oh, if I could tell every woman of the whole world—every mother, every daughter, every sister, every wife—what these last two years have been for us Russian women! What terrible humiliations we have been subjected to and how everything that is sacred to a woman's heart has been trampled upon and torn down. Honor, family, home, and all has the Russian woman been robbed of, and I pray to God that my words may be heard and listened to. \* \* \*

My country is at present the victim of the most appalling oppression and tyranny, the most horrible agony, the most heart-rending degradation that the world has ever known. Families have been separated and scattered, ruined and robbed of their worldly goods, from the most powerful and richest in the land to the poor, hard-working peasant—all are ruthlessly despoiled of the fruits of their care and labors, of all their earthly possessions. \* \* \*

As to socialization of women, emphatically denied in some respectable quarters, the writer of the letter has this to say:

You have heard of the socialization of women and girls. These are some of the facts: In Ekaterinodar in the spring of 1919 over 60 girls were socialized on mandates given out by red commissioners and red army chiefs. "Drives" were organized in the towns to capture the victims, after which they were delivered to the lust of the commissioners, soldiers and sailors of the reds. When they had done with them they killed their victims and threw their bodies into the river. And these atrocities have been committed by wretched, uneducated Russian people under the influence of a few leaders. These are the same Russian soldiers who during the war were known for their generosity and kindness toward women, children, and even the fallen foe.

The letter closes with this earnest plea:

The peasants are crying out for order, but being terrorized they remain passive for the time being.

I think I have told you enough to make the women of America respond to this appeal, addressed to the mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters of America. *May they put themselves in imagination for one moment in the place of the tormented and distracted Russian women and try to imagine the feelings of a Russian mother whose child has been torn from her, whose daughters have been violated, whose husband has been tortured to death.*

Full corroboration of every statement made by the grand duchess is had in the following official Russian docu-

ment issued by a special commission attached to the staff of the commander in chief of the armed forces of the south of Russia, dated June 25, 1919 (*Current History Magazine*, October, 1920):

Act of investigation concerning socialization of girls and women in the city of Ekaterinodar on permits issued by the soviet authority.

In the spring of 1918 the bolsheviki issued in the city of Ekaterinodar a decree, which was published in the soviet press and pasted on street posts, according to which young women from 16 to 25 years of age were subject to "socialization." Those who wished to avail themselves of this decree were to apply to the revolutionary institutions concerned therewith. The initiator of this "socialization" was the commissary of the interior, a man named Bronstein. He also was the one who issued "permits" for the "socialization." Identical permits were also issued by his subordinate, the commander of a bolshevist cavalry detachment, Kobzyrev, by the commander in chief, Ivashchev, and also by other soviet authorities. The permits were provided with the official seal of the staff of the "Revolutionary Troops of the North Caucasian Soviet Republic." Permits were issued both to red army soldiers and to soviet chiefs, as, for instance, to Karaseiev, the commandant of the palace where Bronstein resided. This permit (given below) granted the right of "socialization" of 10 young women:

PERMIT

The bearer, Comrade Karaseiev, is entitled to socialize in the city of Ekaterinodar 10 young women from 16 to 20 years of age, whomsoever Comrade Karaseiev may point out.

(Official seal.)

(Signed) IVASHCHEV,  
Commander in Chief.

On the strength of such permits red army soldiers seized more than 60 girls, young and pretty ones, chiefly from among the



bourgeois and the pupils of local educational institutions. Some of them were seized during a raid made by the red army soldiers on the city park, and four of the girls were raped on the spot in one of the booths. Others, numbering about 25, were taken to the palace of the Cassack Ataman, to Bronstein, and the rest to the Old Commercial Hotel, to Kobzyrev, and to Hotel Bristol, to the sailors, where they were raped. Several of the prisoners were afterwards freed, so, for instance, a girl who had been raped by the chief of the bolshevist "criminal detective force," Prokofiey. Others, however, were carried off by departing red army detachments, and their fate remains unknown. Finally, several, after various cruel tortures, were killed and cast into the Kuban and Karasun rivers. So, for instance, a pupil of the fifth class of one of the high schools of Ekaterinodar was subjected to violation for 12 days by a whole gang of red army soldiers; then the bolsheviki tied her to a tree, burned her with fire, and at last shot her dead.

The names of the victims are not published for obvious reasons.

The present facts have been obtained by the special commission under observance of the provisions of the statute of criminal law procedure.

Drawn up on the 25th of June, 1919, in the city of Ekaterinodar.

(Official seal.)

With the article was reproduced a facsimile of one of the permits.

In a very interesting though decidedly depressing article in the *Current History Magazine* for March, 1920, on "Bolshevist Horrors in Odessa," dealing with conditions in such unfortunate city during its first occupancy by the bolsheviki, Rev. R. Courtier-Forster, an eye witness of what he describes, tells of the particularly bestial type of communization of women that there prevailed:

Week by week the newspapers published articles for and against the nationalization of women. In South Russia the proposal did not become a legal measure, but in Odessa bands of

bolsheviki seized women and girls and carried them off to the port, to the timber yards, and the Alexandrovsky Park for their own purposes. Women used in this way were found in the morning either dead or mad or in a dying condition. Those found still alive were shot. One of the most awful of my own personal experiences of the new civilization was hearing at night from my bedroom windows the frantic shrieks of women being raped to death in the park opposite—screams of shrill terror and despair repeated at intervals, until they became the death calls of a dying animal. This happened not once or twice, but many times. Never to the day of my death shall I forget the horror of those dreadful shrieks of tortured women and one's own powerlessness to aid the victims or punish the bolshevik devils in their bestial orgies.

There is a unanimity about these letters and articles from widely separated sources absolutely to preclude the possibility of entire error. If we admit that due to the overwrought mental condition of those testifying the picture may somewhat be overdrawn, yet making all allowances for error and for exaggeration sufficient remains of the horrible picture fairly to astound those honestly seeking the truth, that hardly can be removed by interested propagandists for socialism here and elsewhere proclaiming and declaiming that all is lovely in the topsyturvy "federated republic" of Russia.

It was reported that the replica of the bolshevik government that was established in Hungary under the dictatorship of Bela Kun not only had adopted the economic program of Lenin as fast as it conveniently could, but seriously had considered putting into effect the delectable policy of nationalization of women. Reports in the public press were to the effect that the women who counted in the new régime, those of the official households, had been apprised of the proposed scheme in ample time, found that it would apply to them as well as to those further down

in the social order, and wasted no time in throwing a sizable monkey wrench into the well-oiled nationalization machinery. So according to what is said to be a reliable report, such interesting scheme "died a-borning."

At that marriage laws were "liberalized" in soviet Hungary, and the women whose sad fate it was to have their being in such country at that time were granted all the benefits that supposedly accrue from "full emancipation." Divorce practically was had for the asking, and the marriage relation lost to an extent its permanent character and became, as in soviet Russia, more of a transient affair, to be dissolved when the union became in the least degree irksome to either one of the contracting parties.

According to information that came out of Buda-Pesth, the system of Bela Kun as to marriage and divorce worked as follows:

With mutual consent divorce is granted almost automatically, and since the letter and spirit of the law alike ordains it, *without any investigation on the part of the judges. An application for divorce by one of the parties, even though there is opposition by the other party, is almost invariably granted.*

Most of the petitioners are middle-aged or elderly men. The explanation is simple and unpleasant. The Hungarian husband sees in the new divorce law an easy, legal way to break off the contract with the wearied and elderly woman who, as the case may be, for the past 20 or 30 years has been his partner and to form another union with one younger and more attractive. Hungarian women age rapidly, and whatever physical attraction there was in the marriage soon passes, and in the absence of any deeper and nobler feeling the men now flock to the divorce court to get release from their vows.

Another and equally potent motive explains the eagerness of Hungarian men to get divorces. In Hungary, as elsewhere on the continent, marriage is rather a commercial transaction than a romance. Even the beautiful woman, were she poor, found the doors to matrimony closed, and men married mainly not be-

cause they loved women but because they wanted their money. A dowry was the one thing essential for marriage, and an assured private income on the part of the wife was the safest guaranty of the husband's unfailing loyalty and devotion. The introduction of communism and the confiscation of all private property caused the foundations of most of such "common marriages" to collapse.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the women of Hungary are most violently opposed to the new marriage and divorce laws. The ideal aimed at by the communist framers of the law may be high and theoretically sound, but, in the main, as elsewhere in the movement, *no account of men's frailty is taken*. That vast change in the spirit which must precede great social revolutions is still a long way off.

It is theoretically possible for a man or a woman to get married and divorced six times a week. Marriage could be performed each weekday morning, and if the petition was a mutual one divorce could be obtained each weekday afternoon. On Sundays the courts do not sit.

Space, we regretfully are compelled to admit, is not available for further testimony (of which sufficient is on hand to fill several good-sized volumes) regarding socialist theory and practice in the moral field. At that sufficient has been published in this volume, we hope, to prove that our socialist friends no more are to be trusted with the morals of a community or state than with the political or economic machinery. In the one field disorganization and senseless destruction has been the inevitable result. In the other and far more vital field irreparable damage has resulted to such unfortunate countries that were brought under socialist domination. Tampering with the political and economic machinery by the clumsy theorists of socialism may possibly be repaired within a comparatively short period of time, but the Lord alone knows what the ultimate effect of socialist experiment in the moral field may be or how many generations of

people must pass away before the poison of socialist radicalism entirely can be eliminated from the social structure.

On what before has been presented the enlightened peoples of the world, constituted as an impartial jury, are in position to render a just decision, one based on the facts, that socialist teachings are subversive of morality; that socialist practice in those lands so unfortunate for a time to have their being under a socialist régime has had the effect of degrading womanhood and childhood and has corrupted human character—all in all, that socialism has been a force for evil, from which little of good has come or possibly can come.

## A VERITABLE "SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENTS"

WE have shown in the preceding chapter that socialism is destructive of morality, that pure womanhood no more can endure under socialism than can decency in an environment of bestiality and obscenity. Let us now devote some space to the position of childhood in the socialist state, and see whether the growing youth fares better than the matured in mind and body.

Socialism for ages has taught that childhood has no proper chance in the capitalist state, that character and originality effectively are blotted out by capitalism, and that only those in more fortunate circumstances, those belonging to what has been denominated the "master class," may show the mettle of which they are made.

Let us, therefore, examine, not into the theory of socialism but the historical facts, to learn just how what should be innocent childhood is affected by the bestial socialist environment.

In the pocket editions of socialism that had been tried in this and other countries in the last hundred years socialism, it can not and will not be denied, had entirely failed to live up to its roseate promises in bringing about a happier and more worthy childhood than that which it ever decried in civilized capitalistic states. Socialist theory was that the parents being in a measure freed from enslaving labor, their future taken in hand by a most paternalistic state, they would be in better position to take

care of their offspring than they now can. Or, better still, the state could take the young entirely in hand and bring them up, as they should be, to stalwart manhood and glorious womanhood.

It may be claimed that in the various socialist experiments that had been tried so many difficulties presented themselves during the brief periods during which the experiments sought to function that childhood in a measure was neglected and certain necessary features concerning the formative years could not be reached before the entire socialist structure collapsed. But such excuse will not avail as to Russia, where the "dictatorship of the proletariat" firmly was established, where the socialist state and those in absolute control had every opportunity to put their very interesting theories into practice.

With woman fully emancipated, freed from the "tie that binds" as well as the duties assigned to the tender sex by immemorial custom, many asked, "What about the children born to Russians in the unemancipated, capitalistic days of the long ago?" The children, according to reliable reports that have come from such much-harrassed country, also fully were emancipated—from home, from parental love and influence, from all that should surround them in their formative years—and bodily thrown into the vortex of the great experiment regnant socialism then was conducting on the all but dead body of Russia.

According to a special dispatch to the *New York Times* dated Geneva, Switzerland, June 11, 1919, by a Swiss woman school teacher, after an 11-year residence in Moscow:

The most diabolical of all measures conceived by the bolshevik rulers of Russia to perpetuate their dominion is the systematic corruption of coming generations to undermine and destroy family

life. To estrange children from their parents by encouraging them in unlimited indulgence of idleness and pleasure, to inculcate brutal and materialistic principles in the receptive minds of young boys and girls, is the surest method, the bolshevik dictators think, to assure the duration of bolshevism.

Then follows a comparison between the alleged bolshevik ideals and the bald facts:

Like all branches of the soviet administration, the department of public instruction in Moscow has two faces to the outer world. It presents a placid aspect of progressive socialism and modern pedagogic ideals calculated to impress foreign intellectuals favorably for Russia; it is a political machine driven by and engendering tyranny, cruelty, and corruption. Lunacharsky, commissary for public instruction, is a consummate comedian. Trading on his former reputation as an exiled idealist and man of letters, he issues decrees instituting a system of education based on Tolstoy's principles, and publishes articles in the soviet press expounding elevated theories and exhibiting a most tender solicitude for Russia's youth. All this to hoodwink unsuspecting pedagogues and win the sympathies of simple-minded enthusiasts in foreign countries.

Anyone reading Lunacharsky's decrees and articles would suppose that Russia had been transformed into a children's paradise. But the truth is altogether different. There exists but one type of school in Russia to-day. This is officially the common school. It has three preparatory and four higher classes. The highest, the eighth class of the old school, has been abolished. In each class there is an equal number of boys and girls, for coeducation is one of Lunacharsky's fundamental principles.

There are no longer any school books, not because the bolsheviks are opposed to their use, but for the simple reason that the old school books are considered counterrevolutionary and the department of public instruction has been too busy issuing decrees and instructions to teachers to issue new ones. The teachers are forbidden to give the children tasks to prepare at home and even to question them during the lessons. All schools are under the supervision of the educational department of the local soviets, which keep close watch over the political tenden-



cies of the teachers. Most of the old school teachers have been replaced by youths and young girls still in their teens, who themselves have barely graduated from the highest class. In some cases extremely illiterate supporters of the bolshevik régime have been appointed instructors.

It is stated that the lot of some of the former teachers, who loyally remained at their posts, is an unenviable one. They are continually spied upon and subjected to such forms of humiliation that enthroned bigoted ignorance can conceive. The report continues:

There being no schedule of lessons, the scholars in the four higher classes decide themselves every day what they shall be taught. All educational questions are decided by school councils, whose meetings are, to say the least, extremely original. Side by side with the teachers sit delegates of the scholars' committee, children from the age of 12 and upward, and the decisions of the latter are obligatory for the teachers.

Religious instruction, of course, is strictly forbidden, and even conversations upon philosophical and moral subjects are regarded by the soviet authorities as counterrevolutionary and prohibited. This prohibition is particularly fiendish because coeducation in "absolute liberty" as instituted by Lunacharsky must inevitably lead in a primitive country like Russia to revolting conditions if moral guidance is completely lacking. But it is a deliberate part of the bolshevik plan to corrupt and deprave the children in order to obtain a lasting hold over them and to train them as future propagandists of Lenin's materialistic and criminal doctrines.

To this satanic system of depravation belong "children's balls," which are arranged frequently in the schools by order of Lunacharsky. The parents are forced to send their children to these dances, which last until the early hours of the morning. Last winter, in the streets of Moscow and Petrograd, it was painful to see the miserable mothers waiting all night in the snow outside of brilliantly illuminated school buildings, where their boys and girls were dancing the tango and foxtrot. The teachers assist at these balls, but are not allowed to exercise any authority over the children.

With tears in their eyes the mothers of Russia will tell you, "There are no longer any children in Russia to-day, only vicious little brutes, whose talk is of money and pleasure."

The atmosphere of the bolshevik schools is impregnated with precocious criminal instincts and bestial jealousy. All of the children's time is taken up with flirtation and dancing lessons. In the state boarding school boys and girls are quartered in the same dormitory.

This last may serve the purpose of adequately training the coming generation for the rôle they are to play in the bolshevik state when they have arrived at full maturity. Teaching the young idea how to shoot straight at the mark of full equality of the sexes is expected well to serve them in the days to come when their apprenticeship period in bolshevism is over. This more than interesting article concludes with this:

The unfortunate children of Russia must be delivered from their bolshevik oppressors and seducers before it is too late, otherwise, though Lenin may be finally overthrown, there will remain in Russia thousands of boys and girls morally corrupted, victims of the bolshevik schools, who will be a future menace not only to Russia but to the entire civilized world.

According to the letter of Grand Duchess Marie, Princess Pontiantine, reprinted in part in the preceding paragraph:

In soviet Russia the central executive committee has decreed the socialization of children for the purpose of bringing them up in the "spirit of communism." They are taken from their parents before they can speak and placed in so-called "children's palaces." Thus in Tulsa 7,000 children under the age of 10 were recently taken from their families. The parents who protested against such aggression were arrested. Many of the unfortunate mothers became insane, others committed suicide. Owing to underfeeding and to the absence of proper care the death rate among these socialized children is extremely high.

These children are systematically taught to despise parental authority, to indulge in loathsome immorality, to spy on their parents, to denounce them to the soviet authorities, and to blaspheme their Maker.

Something in the nature of official confirmation of what before has been published is found in a report issued to the American public (*New York Times*, February 16, 1920) by the American Central Committee for Russian Relief. As stated by Lieut. Klieforth, former assistant military attaché in Russia, connected with the committee:

I was in Petrograd when Lenin came into power.

His first strategic move in the domestic policy was to begin the complete obliteration of the family as a social unit. Under soviet domination permits are necessary to travel from city to city. If you live in Petrograd and your mother is dying in Moscow, it is possible to go to her bedside only by getting a permit from the Petrograd soviet.

You say, "I want to visit my mother, who is dying in Moscow." The invariable reply is, "That is no excuse. Your mother has no more relation to you than any other woman citizen of the soviet republic."

If you want to visit your children—that is to say, those who were once your children—who have been removed to the communal schools, you will not get a permit, because the children are not really yours at all, but have become wards of the state. All the children have been deported from their homes to these schools. The younger generation in Petrograd is systematically herded into freight cars and sent away from 800 to 1,000 miles to completely isolated institutions, where they are trained in the principles of communism.

Deportation, however, is but the first step. Parents have a habit of loving their children, even if Lenin says they shouldn't, and by whatever influence or bribes they are able to bring to bear seek to discover and rejoin them. Therefore the soviet carefully destroys all records of births and relationships, leaving nothing undone to completely isolate every child in Russia from all human ties, except those relations advocated by bolshevism. In

spite of these measures, congregated in the village about each of these communal schools are hundreds of parents waiting to claim their children when bolshevism shall be overthrown.

Teachers for these schools are produced by an entirely new system of education known as "prolecult." To the prolecult school any student is admitted. The majority of them are illiterate red guards or peasant workmen.

Lieut. Klieforth testified that in one school he visited all the girls were required to change their dresses with each other at regular intervals in order to root out the idea of personal property. The system is reinforced in the adult population by regulations which forbid the carrying of private property from one place to another. Thus if you are moving from Petrograd to Moscow you may take only one change of clothing.

Still further testimony about nationalization of children may be adduced from testimony in publications by Russians, in which full information is had in all its disgusting details. In the *Volia Rossi*, of February 16, 1921, an article was published by Prof. Boris Sokoloff, leading member of the party of Socialists-Revolutionists and member of the first all-Russian constituent assembly. A Dr. Horn, we are informed, speaking at the Pirogoff medical congress in August, 1920, said :

I am prepared to forgive the bolsheviki a great many things, almost everything. \* \* \* But one thing there is which I cannot and will not forgive them, namely those experiments, positively criminal and worthy of the most savage tribes of the African jungle, which the bolsheviki have been making all this time with our young generation, with our children. This crime knows no parallel throughout the history of the world. They have destroyed, morally as well as physically, a whole Russian generation; they have destroyed it irretrievably and, alas, beyond remedy.

At the conference on public education held in 1918, the

bolshevik commissary Lilina is reported to have said (official journal of the commissariat of public education, "Narodnoye Prosvieschenie," No. 4):

We have to create out of the young generation a generation of communists. We must make good, real communists of the children, for they, like wax, are easily molded. And when we have grown tired and step aside our places will be taken by them—our new communists, who will have been brought up from childhood in the ideas of communism. Therefore, we must at once, without procrastination, commence the training of the children. This, however, requires first of all that we sweep from the schools and institutions, as with a broom, all this bourgeois tuft-hunting crowd, all these pedagogues and teachers who are thoroughly permeated with the poison of the bourgeois philosophy of life.

Then, warming up to her subject, she continued:

We must remove the children from the pernicious influence of the family. We must register the children, or, let us speak plainly, *nationalize them*. Thus they will from the very start remain under the beneficial influence of communist kindergartens and schools. Here they will absorb the alphabet of communism. Here they will grow up to be real communists. To compel the mother to surrender her child to us, to the soviet state, that is the practical task before us.

"In accordance with this 'idea fixe,'" says Prof. Sokoloff, the bolshevist power "set out in 1918 to inaugurate its 'childhood measures'":

These were definite, drastic measures, devoid of all foresight, and, of course, bringing altogether unexpected results for the bolsheviki. The persecution of the teachers and educators by the bolshevist authorities forced the most efficient and ideal elements among the pedagogical staffs to abandon their class-rooms and to seek other employment. Their places were taken by communists lacking not only experience but total strangers in the field of pedagogy and—this was the worst of all—openly hostile to it.

These policies, as will appear, had a destructive effect on the physical, mental, and moral welfare of the innocents brought under the control of the soviet state. Thus as to the physical well-being of children we have the following from the official report of the soviet inspection for February, 1920, referring to the institutions for child care to which parents were expected to deliver their children:

The thoroughgoing inspection of 16 children's nurseries in the city of Petrograd has revealed a criminal and disgraceful treatment of the young generation at the hands of the responsible persons. So we found the Rozdestvenskia Nursery, where more than 100 children, ranging in age from 1 to 4 years, were maintained (and most of them children of workers) in a condition which demanded its immediate closing. The children, left to their own devices, under the supervision of inexperienced and rough-spoken nurses, with filthy clothing, pale from lack of sufficient nourishment, made a painful impression. The place itself, unventilated and poorly heated, fostered all manner of diseases and contributed to the exceedingly high rate of mortality among the children. In the course of three months the child population of that institution renewed itself to the extent of 90 per cent. In other words, nearly all of them were sent to the hospital, or, having failed to reach the hospital, they perished while still at the nursery.

At the other nurseries the same awful conditions were met, in the provincial towns as well as in the former capital. Thus we read in the report of the congress on kindergarten training, held in July, 1920:

The joint inspection committee of the people's commissariats of education and public health has demanded the immediate closing of nurseries in five provincial capitals along the Volga owing to the abominable manner in which the children's training is carried on there and also because of the disproportionately large number of cases of illness.

Private nurseries largely are outlawed. The President, Dr. Kishkin, of the Children's Defense League, an organization working to save the childhood of Russia, was compelled to make this complaint:

In spite of the fact that the children's problem is very critical and notwithstanding that our league, the only remaining independent organization of its kind in Russia, renders a great amount of help to the government in this work, we are still treated as outcasts. We have been forced during these two years to spend more strength and energy on our self-preservation than, alas, on serving the cause of the children. The bolsheviks tolerate nothing which is not of the soviet, even though it be a beneficial and necessary thing for the Russian people.

But there are some of the soviet state with a touch of fiendish comedy in their make-up, for we are informed by Prof. Sokoloff, that in 1920 the few remaining private nurseries that managed miraculously to survive the various forms of bolshevist oppression suddenly became the objects of special attention on the part of officials of the Russian state:

But this solicitude of the soviet government turned out to have a sinister motive behind it. These private nurseries (Les-shaft, Dietskoie, and Solodovnikoff Nurseries), notwithstanding that they have been left in the hands of private individuals, have been called by the bolshevik authorities "Soviet Model Nurseries," and are now being shown to all foreign visitors and delegates as such.

The position of mothers in Russia, continues Prof. Sokoloff, is an unenviable one, and it is indeed astonishing that they are able to bear the strain:

A Russian mother is now living through a deep tragedy, indeed. Just look at the women you pass in the street; you will at once be able to point out a mother of an infant among them. She is the one with the pale, wan, careworn face. You can imagine what it means, the soviet government insistently demanding that the

mother turn over her little children to the official nurseries, when you have seen for yourself what a horror they are. And they are such horrors because they have been entrusted to people who do not love that work and are perfect strangers in it. As a matter of fact, the death rate among the nursery children is appalling, and to send your child there is almost certain death. So Russian mothers, even the most desperately poor and most unfortunate, do not care to surrender their children to the soviet nurseries. But here comes a new tragedy. The earnings of the husband are so triflingly small in soviet Russia that it compels the wife, especially the workingman's wife, to seek outside employment by all means.

This is the reason why mothers are compelled to leave at home, without any attendance, their 1-year-old, and frequently even younger infants. But that is only one side of the tragedy. On the other side, the soviet government, anxious to drive every child into its official nurseries, only reluctantly and very meagerly allows food on child's ration tickets. Very seldom it furnishes milk and very irregularly other foodstuffs.

Thus there stands again before the Russian mother the specter of death threatening her little one. For free commerce is suppressed and there is no place where she can buy milk.

All these conditions explain why it is that, according to the same authority, Russian mothers dread childbearing:

Assistants at the Gynæcological Institute at Petrograd told me that women are terrified at the thought of bearing a child, knowing perfectly well that if born alive it will in all probability shortly die.

The results of the criminal policy of the Russians in authority began to show already in 1919. The city children born within the period from 1917 to 1920 have shown themselves entirely unfit to survive, especially those held in the soviet nurseries, or, as they are called in Petrograd, "Morilki" (starvation houses). They have furnished an appalling rate of mortality, and those who survive are



said to be sickly and to bear the marks of physical degeneracy. Thus according to the Children's Defense League at the Pirogoff Medical Congress:

The soviet government has done practically nothing to alleviate the condition of the children. On the contrary, it has with its stupid measures frequently prevented private initiative from saving the newly born citizens of soviet Russia. By driving out experienced pedagogues and turning the work over to communists, who although they may be idealists, understand nothing about the raising of children, the soviet government has from the very first steps in the development of the children contributed an element of disintegration and degeneration.

The same thing practically is said by the Society of Child Specialists:

To us it is plain that so high a mortality rate among the children and such a marked decline in the birth rate is directly connected with the measures taken by the government, which is doing everything in its power to destroy the family and to nationalize the children, beginning with the 1-year-old infants. We have to note with sorrow that the young generation of this period does not exist for Russia.

What the society particularly has reference to are certain official figures published in the official bolshevist public health organ, *Isvestia Zdravookhranenia*, No. 11, in which are cited the following figures for the city of Moscow. These are considered of especial significance because the population of Moscow is said to have remained practically stationary:

| Marriages in— |        |
|---------------|--------|
| 1914 .....    | 12,000 |
| 1916 .....    | 7,500  |
| 1917 .....    | 9,900  |
| 1919 .....    | 18,780 |
| 1920 .....    | 20,000 |

The doubling of the figures for marriage during the period of bolshevik domination is attributed to the fact that divorce and remarriage now are more in evidence than before and to the further fact that marriage in soviet Russia carries with it so few responsibilities that men formerly marriage shy feel that now they can take a chance in the marital pool. Of more significance are the figures for births. Thus:

## Births in—

|            |        |
|------------|--------|
| 1913 ..... | 54,000 |
| 1915 ..... | 49,700 |
| 1916 ..... | 57,375 |
| 1918 ..... | 31,500 |
| 1919 ..... | 26,676 |
| 1920 ..... | 23,000 |

The figures above bear out the statement elsewhere made that women in soviet Russia fear to take a chance on bringing more children into the world, first because in their enfeebled condition it may mean death to them and, further, if the child is born alive the chances are against its ability to survive conditions as they are. We have, further, the mortality of children from birth to 16 years per 10,000 of population, as follows:

|            |     |
|------------|-----|
| 1913 ..... | 81  |
| 1915 ..... | 78  |
| 1918 ..... | 100 |
| 1919 ..... | 372 |
| 1920 ..... | 400 |

Remember that figures deal with ages up to 16. Eliminating the first five years, that is the most favorable period of life. If the period from birth to 1 year were dealt with, it would present a mortality rate positively appalling, one far greater than for any country on earth, even those

living under the most primitive conditions as to sanitation and health requirements. Of a fact, we have in soviet Russia a veritable "slaughter of the innocents."

But such state of affairs, as indicated by the three tables we present herewith, appalling as it is, is not the worst feature at that of soviet domination. We now have it on reliable authority that the most horrible types of immorality boldly stalk through what formerly was the land of the czars, bringing with it an inevitable crop of the most destructive social diseases.

We are informed that while the soviet government abolished open prostitution and the public brothels, the evil has but assumed a different form; that "there are more prostitutes than before, although Petrograd doctors do not report any increase in venereal disease." This last condition may be due to the fact that disease now is so common in soviet Russia, especially in doubly unfortunate Petrograd, that one more type of disease, even though of a serious nature, is borne without public complaint by the fatalist Russian.

We before had heard of the extension of venereal diseases among those of tender years; we now have something in the nature of circumstantial evidence that such is the sad fact. At one prominent hospital, we are informed by Prof. Boris Sokoloff ("Medicine in Soviet Russia," *Lancet* (London), April 23, 1921), where the number of children suffering from venereal diseases were never more than 15 per cent, now the percentage stands at 60 compared to 40 per cent for adults. Lack of control of parents over their children, added to the diabolical teachings of socialist visionaries, is thus seen to have most deplorable results.

Conditions being as stated, Prof. Sokoloff fully is justified when he says:

The actual destruction wrought by the revolution is nothing to the appalling moral degeneracy and criminality among children, which now stands out as the foremost evil in Russia.

In the *New York Times* of July 17, 1921, Sir Paul Dukas, who spent some time in Russia during the bolshevik domination of things, and who, we have been informed, speaks Russian like a native, and so gets his information direct and not at second hand through a more or less reliable interpreter, gives us some information about the criminality and immorality among the young. In such article he said:

Few people yet grasp the fact that the central tragedy of the bolshevist régime in Russia is an organized effort to subvert and corrupt the minds of the children. With official channels of information monopolized by the communist government, most surprising rumors are afloat as to the bolshevist attitude toward the growing children, while the difficulty of comprehending the situation is complicated by the literal accuracy of the bald statement that "the bolsheviki are doing all they can for children." The question which so few proceed to investigate is however, this: What is it the bolsheviki are trying so hard to do for Russian children?

It was after the communists had been in the saddle for about a year that their fears that this generation would not see communism established led them to turn their minds to the conversion of the children. As is well known, it has always been a bolshevist principle to fight the institution of the family. Mme. Kolontay's writings can leave no doubt on that score even in the minds of the skeptical. The idea is to remove children at an early age from parental care and bring them up in colonies where they will be free from the evil influence of all non-bolshevist currents of thought.

Hopes for the future are founded on an institution known as the Union of Youthful Communists, which all school childre

join. The juvenile members are denied access to any but bolshevist literature, are exempt from all moral training, allowed unbridled license, and so encouraged in a spirit of rebellion against parental authority and the influence of former preceptors that they are becoming completely demoralized. Moral training was ever one of the weakest sides of Russian life, and the elimination of whatever moral instruction there was is bound to have disastrous effects. This pernicious system is combated by the church and by parents as far as they can and dare, but open protest is impossible.

His statements as to the brand of bolshevik instruction but bears out what had been said by others. Thus:

To communize the teaching profession the soviet government resorted to abolition of all standards of education for teachers. The first qualification for appointment, especially to posts in elementary schools, became not an adequate education nor any moral qualifications but the possession of a ticket of membership in the communist party. The teachers, of course, protested, but were denounced as "counterrevolutionary." Pronounced opposition also was shown by them to the abolition of examinations and rewards for diligence, a measure which enabled the idlest to leave school on the same footing as the most assiduous.

The evils resulting from the system of compulsory mixed living in boarding schools, suddenly introduced in a land of weak morals, brought education in some cases completely to a standstill. The desirability or undesirability of the suppression of religion in Russian schools may be open to discussion, but there is nothing now to replace it, for the teachers are deliberately hampered in any attempt to exert moral influence over their pupils lest their admonitions should have a "counterrevolutionary" tendency. The figure of Lunacharsky, people's commissar for education and art, is one of the least unsympathetic—perhaps one should say one of the most pathetic—of the revolution, but such measures as the above have completely nullified whatever good intentions he ever had.

The primary object, therefore, of the bolshevist educational system, while conferring the benefits of elementary literacy, is

so to benumb the juvenile mind as to render it impervious in its later stages of development to every influence that leads to spontaneous initiative, independence of thought, or, above all, moral uplift. The attitude of the communist party toward the Russian church is that of a snarling dog. As a Russian workman whom I met in White Russia last November observed to me: "There is only one man in all Russia whom bolsheviki fear from the bottom of their hearts, and that is the Patriarch Tikon."

Every variety of persecution having failed, the communists have retreated to their present attitude of malicious tolerance, contenting themselves with employing the monopolized press to defame, abuse, and vilify Christianity on every conceivable occasion, but seeking especially to protect children from what they call "demoralizing religious influence." \* \* \*

At the close of 1920 the League for the Protection of Children prepared a report on the condition of children in Russian cities, portions of which, with other frank admissions, were published in the official bolshevist press early this year. The statistics presented form a tragic contrast to the propagandist concoctions designed for consumption abroad.

Says the District Pedagogic Report for Petrograd, December, 1920, quoted in *Volia Rosii*:

"We are powerless in face of a condition of things formerly unnoticeable in Russia, namely, the increase of juvenile immorality and prostitution. The former is the result of universal demoralization and experiments of the soviet government (such as combining boys' and girls' boarding schools), the latter is consequent upon the privations of present economic conditions. Immorality has become so prevalent in our schools that drastic measures will be needed to combat it. Yet we do not see how this is possible in view of the suppression of public philanthropy in matters concerning the care of children."

Says *Izvestia* of March 3, 1921:

"It is essential once again to point out the ever-increasing lack of care of children, with consequent infantile trading, theft, deceit, and more serious vices. \* \* \* There have been cases

when in a brothel on the Hiltrov Market Place as many as 50 children have been seized in a single day. \* \* \* The number of children now leading street life is colossal."

Under the caption "A Social Calamity" *Trud* of February, 1921, said:

"Children in the big cities dragged into the maelstrom of street speculation are becoming a social calamity. In the majority of cases they are the children of workers. They support themselves and earn for the family an additional income."

In view of what before had been printed we are left in no doubt as to the type of employment the children of the new Russia, especially the female element, so industrially apply themselves to. According to Sir Paul Dukes:

A special conference on children held in 1920 revealed the fact that juvenile prostitution has increased tenfold, or 1,000 per cent, since 1917. The interpellation of 5,300 girls of or about 15 years of age showed that no fewer than 4,100—that is, 88 per cent—indulge in prostitution. Sailors, red soldiers, and the vast class of profiteering speculators to which the bolshevist régime has given birth provide the custom for these girls' earnings.

He cites also the discouraging fact that according to the official figures from some of the hospitals children furnish by far the greater number of cases of social diseases. And he comes to the conclusion, as do all those who have studied the question, that if the coming generation is not speedily delivered from the "pale of all-vitiating bolshevist influence" we well may despair of the Russia of the future.

We have further testimony to the same effect, this time from a very friendly source, from H. G. Wells, inveterate friend of and chief apologizer for the criminal soviet conspiracy that masquerades as the Russian government. In his book "Russia in the Shadows," which we

are informed by its publishers is "the first authoritative account of Russia as it is to-day," we find this admission (pp. 122-124):

They (the schools) are open to all, and there is an attempt to make education compulsory. Of course, Russia has its peculiar difficulties. Many of the schools are understaffed, and it is difficult to secure the attendance of unwilling pupils. Numbers of children prefer to keep out of the schools and trade upon the streets. A large part of the illicit trading is done by bands of children. They are harder to catch than adults, and the spirit of Russian communism is against punishing them. And the Russian child is, for a northern child, remarkably precocious.

The common practice of coeducating youngsters up to 15 or 16 in a country as demoralized as Russia is now has brought peculiar evils in its train. My attention was called to this by the visit of Bokaiev, the former head of the Petersburg extraordinary commission, and his colleague Zalutsky to Gorky to consult him in the matter. They discussed their business in front of me quite frankly, and the whole conversation was translated to me as it went on. *The bolshevik authorities have collected and published very startling, very shocking figures of the moral condition of young people in Petersburg, which I have seen.*

\* \* \* Nor can I speculate how far these phenomena in Russia are the mechanical consequence of privation and overcrowding in a home atmosphere bordering on despair. But there can be no doubt that in the Russian towns, concurrently with increased educational effort and an enhanced intellectual stimulation of the young [we have more reliable information than can be furnished by the veracious and not too logical Wells of the type of such "intellectual stimulation," as before set forth] *there is also an increased lawlessness on their part, especially in sexual matters*, and that this is going on in a phase of unexampled sobriety and harsh puritanical decorum so far as adult life is concerned. *This hectic moral fever of the young is the dark side of the educational spectacle.* I think it is to be regarded mainly as an aspect of the general social collapse; every European country has noted a parallel moral relaxation of the young under the war strain; but the revolution itself, *in sweeping a*



*number of the old experienced teachers out of the schools and in making every moral standard a subject of debate, has no doubt contributed also to an as yet incalculable amount in the excessive disorder of these matters in present-day Russia.*

This from the chief apologist for red Russia in English-speaking countries is information indeed. It will be remembered that Mr. Wells is one of the few who were permitted to visit Russia while under bolshevik control, and because of his services as a propagandist for the red terror met with every consideration at the hands of Russia's masters.

We have what may be regarded as official confirmation of all that has been said by Prof. Sokoloff, Sir Paul Dukes, H. G. Wells, and the others from whose utterances we have quoted, from none other than A. Lunacharsky, bolshevist minister or commissar of education, into whose tender hands had been entrusted the young of soviet Russia. Lunacharsky, it may be said, is pretty close to the soviet throne of administration, and has been from the time the Teuton agents Lenin and Trotsky had been let loose upon defenseless Russia by their German masters to conduct at will their ruinous experiments in applied socialism, so because of that and of his official position he, of all men, can speak with authority.

In an article under his signature published in the official *Izvestia* of February 24, 1921, we find the following:

The children of the republic are in need of powerful and extraordinary protection. Any revolutionist understands that the revolution is made for the children. Imagine for one instant a revolution without the perspective of a future, without the perspective of history, and it loses at once its meaning.

So far so good. In what he says in the paragraph quoted Lunacharsky lines up with those who take a sane view of things. But did they, the children, get even a

reasonable amount of protection? He answers that in this wise:

The appalling poverty and chaos, inevitable companions of all revolutions, and the crisis from which the revolution will emerge victorious and ultimately lead the country to prosperity, could not help affecting the needs of these delicate human sprouts.

But in addition to this—partly legitimately and partly through the carelessness which is natural in harsh, tempestuous war times—we had to snatch away from the children their legitimate share of comforts in food, clothing, means of instruction, and housing accommodations.

We are not so familiar with the situation among the children living with their parents, but we do know the condition of the children cared for by the state, children whose fate depends solely upon the organs of the soviet power, the inmates of our children's homes of all types.

*Their condition is unspeakably bad. These children are crowded into unsuitable buildings, sleeping four on one bed, shivering in the cold, without a change of underwear, eaten by vermin, starved, and deprived of the opportunity to learn.*

To be sure, this appalling picture does not extend in an unbroken, black pall over the whole republic. In the course of my trip through the provinces—and I have already been in 18 of them—I came also across some brighter pictures, at times some well-managed children's homes, oasislike, rendering their surroundings only the darker by contrast, serving to show what we might have accomplished under tolerably favorable conditions. Nevertheless the somber colors predominate.

He neglected to state, as he might if he were inclined to tell "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," that the oases in the children's purgatory or hell were not in any sense soviet institutions, but were, as we have shown, the few private institutions that were permitted for some reason to exist. He continues:

The people's commissariat of education therefore decided to create a special children's defense council. I was unspeakably glad to learn that F. Dzerzhinsky, with his indomitable energy

and heart of gold, has agreed to assume the general management of such an organization. And now the all-Russian central executive committee has created a fully empowered commission headed by this authoritative administrator for aiding the people's commissariats of education and public health in their struggle in behalf of the children.

And who do you think is this man of "indomitable energy and heart of gold"? None other than the head of the notorious and ruthless extraordinary commission of the soviet state, the chief executioner of those parts of Russia where bolshevistic socialism held sway. And even our genial friend, Lunacharsky, has his doubts of the new head and those associated with him, for we read further:

We must only come to a precise agreement as to the direction to be given to the work of this commission. A very prominent part will be played there by the all-Russian extraordinary commission, whose chief administrator is also the chief administrator of our commission, while his substitute is a prominent member of the extraordinary commission. The organs of the latter, with their military precision in action, with their more perfect liaison organization as compared with any other, will undoubtedly become the most active apparatus of our commission. This is lovely. Even from a standpoint of revolutionary ethics we can not help welcoming it.

And, really, the work of the all-Russian extraordinary commission is grim, punitive work, and all of us are glad to think that now the sentinels of the revolution, having half finished their task and finding time to spare, are going to bestow their care on the children; that they are becoming imbued with the desire, first of all, to guard the children, those same children who only by their existence make worth while the revolution they have been defending.

However, the extraordinary commission has its peculiar habits of working; it is an investigating and punitive organization. And in some of the orders issued in connection with the creation of our commission a tone like the following has crept in, too often the teacher, pedagogue, and worker of the department of public

education is out of his proper element, being either a recent or present *saboteur* (obstructionist); these must be watched, guilty ones must be punished, and persons who have been charged with the care of children and have obviously failed to do their duty must be shaken up.

To allay the fears that can not help coming to the teachers when they hear that the blood-soaked extraordinary commission is to have supervisory powers over both them and the children committed to their care, he continues:

I, however, would say to the teacher: "Teacher, the all-Russian central executive committee is coming to your aid."

The condition of the teachers and pedagogues in schools and children's homes is horrible. Practically all of them are starving, destitute of clothing, and left without their salaries for months. Notwithstanding the decision adopted by the all-Russian central executive committee, we have been trying these two months in vain to make it understand that children and the people who cater to their needs constitute the most important element of a state, which it is inadmissible to restrict and pare down for the benefit of other requirements.

When I contemplate the nightmare that is the fate of our teachers, when I remember those heart-rending letters, facts, and meetings, I really have to ask myself, How is it possible that in spite of all this an army of nearly a million teachers remains loyal to the flag of the commissariat of education?

What have we given to the teacher? We have ruined him completely, and he is now living under incomparably worse conditions than those under which the elementary school teacher used to live prior to the revolution, terrible enough though they were.

Having considered all this, I must say most emphatically and positively that what we need is not at all some new Egyptian plague upon the teacher's head, to put him under extraordinary control, to drag him to the lock-up for mistakes or even delinquencies to which he is often driven by his terrible condition alone, but that we should offer him material assistance.

The organs of the all-Russian extraordinary commission are

absolutely inexperienced in pedagogical matters, and this \* \* \* can only lead to most undesirable consequences.

The first impression which some pedagogues gained from our commission was apparently unfavorable. The fear was expressed that the commission was liable to interpret its duties chiefly as an investigating and punitive part.

How very like the bungling, criminal soviet state. Having ruined the rising generation by methods they alone are responsible for putting into play, they seek to repair what they themselves are compelled to admit are destructive blunders by the appointment as a wrecking crew of an organization that least has the respect and confidence of those who were compelled to reside after the revolution in the soviet inferno—the extraordinary commission.

All in all their methods deserve full condemnation, and impartial history will not hesitate to place the blame for all the harm done to the generation that is and is to be. The squirmings and twistings of the “consummate comedian” Lunacharsky and the others in control of the children of soviet Russia will not avail to hide the hideous facts nor to prevent the blame from being fixed on those responsible, either directly or indirectly.

From what we before have presented in this chapter it will be seen that the blighting influence of soviet socialism has extended well into the domain of what should have been innocent, care-free, and happy childhood, effectively polluting and drying up the stream that is to supply the men and women of Russia of to-morrow. We have seen what socialism unrestrained and uncontrolled is capable of doing to the matured of a nation so criminally foolish as to adopt such atavistic political, economic, and social system. We now see that those of tender years especially

are sensitive to the destructive virus of socialism, and confronted with this fact those who have the well-being of society at heart, who labor for the continued advancement of man toward our most cherished ideals, who wish to see those who are to succeed the men and women of to-day of a higher and better grade, ought because of what socialism has shown itself to be to gird themselves anew for continued and most determined warfare on what, without a possible exception, is the most destructive philosophy preached by thinking men.

## SOCIALIST SUCCESS MEANS THE DESTRUCTION OF CIVILIZATION

IT never seems to have occurred to some of those advanced individuals who so glibly prate of radical reform in the marriage relation as now constituted that their so-called "progressive" ideas, if spread broadcast among the young and immature, or among those naturally inclined to immortality, may have deplorable results.

Monogamic marriage, with divorce granted only for good and sufficient reasons and not because one or both of the parties directly concerned tire of the union and desire a change, is the sheet anchor of our civilization, and anyone who seeks to injure or destroy such time-honored and respected institution must be regarded and treated as a foe to civilization.

The marital plan now in effect is not in any sense a perfect one, and no one with but a slight knowledge of the subject so will designate it. But it is the very best that so far we have been able to secure, for both the individual and for society, and the best plan immediately in prospect.

But some there are aside from unthinking socialists, not especially strong in numbers, who view this important matter from an entirely different angle. These claim that marriage is but a personal matter; that society is not concerned, or should not be, and should keep its hands off until called in by the parties directly interested. They also have decreed that what we now have in the marriage

relation is hopelessly out of date and wholly bad; that an entire change is necessary, for the salvation both of the individual and of society.

They claim that marriage as it is at present is but a part, and a strong part, of the plan for keeping women in subjection to the stronger sex, and have come out openly against such institution because of such claimed fact.

In the "Declaration of Sentiments" adopted by the first woman's rights convention, held at Seneca, N. Y., in 1848—the year of widespread agitation and revolution—the very first count in the 18 indictments against man was:

The history of mankind is the history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her.

The force of this particular indictment, and of others as well, somewhat is softened by the declaration of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the moving spirit of the convention, when she naïvely stated:

We know that women must have many more wrongs than men, but the difficulty was to state them properly, especially as we ourselves were all very well circumstanced.

The liberals among the women, it is seen from the foregoing, are in some respects similar to the dyed-in-the-wool socialists, they must lash themselves into a perfect rage over wrongs or pretended wrongs before setting out on their sacred mission to secure full liberty for their down-trodden sisters, for emancipation from the unjust burdens women uncomplainingly have borne through the centuries.

And the appeals for relief from the burdens that disturb their day and night dreams, it is intimated, have struck a responsive chord in the breasts of the more im-



pressionable and ebullient ones of society, who have taken up the appeal of their enslaved sisters and have made it their very own.

What further liberties, we may ask, are demanded by and for women? What burdens are there that so oppressively bear down on the female sex? To answer the last question first, for the burdens, if any there be, God or nature alone is responsible, and not man, as has been claimed. Those especially referred to by those who claim to speak for women from which women ask to be relieved—or some of them—are the bearing and rearing of children, the duties that pertain to the wife and mother, and those other women cheerfully should assume if society is to live.

These natural burdens against which some few members of the female sex are up in arms against were not put on women, as some few would have us believe, because of the desire of man to dominate the race, and necessarily to keep his sisters in a subordinate position. The laws against which the feminist rebels have had a very slow growth and have come to us as a result of bitter experience. And they must prevail in the numberless centuries yet to come because it is necessary for the good and welfare of man that they shall prevail.

The siren's song that is heard in the land, like that supposed to have been sung on the waterways in the fabled age of yesterday, that lured the susceptible mariner and his craft to destruction, if heeded by the women to whom addressed will have the result of luring them from sacred home duties to destruction and chaos.

"Liberty" is a term to conjure with, and has been juggled with *ad nauseam* by those reckless ones who be-

lieve they have a message to struggling men and women. Ibsen, Hauptmann, Mary Wollstoncraft, Ellen Key, George Bernard Shaw, Mrs. Beatrice Forbes Robertson Hale, Mrs. Elsie Clews Parsons, and others of the new and erotic school of literature, each have made their separate plea for liberty, and their influence has not been as negligible as some fatuous ones may believe.

We have space only for two short quotations from the pen of two of the leading radicals in the conjugal field, the irrepressible George Bernard Shaw, who seemingly never is as happy as when emitting that which startles and stuns society, and the acknowledged high priestess of marital radicalism, Ellen Key. This will give one an idea of the kind of stuff ladled out to and swallowed whole by an element of society that considers itself superintelligent.

According to the former, the present marital scheme is all wrong. Read and ponder on this choice bit of gratuitous advice by one of our modern self-appointed mentors (preface to "Getting Married," pp. 173-174):

Monogamy has a sentimental basis which is quite distinct from the political one of equal numbers of the sexes. Equal numbers in the sexes are quite compatible with a change of partners every day or every hour. Physically there is nothing to distinguish human society from the farmyard except that children are more troublesome and costly than chickens and calves and that men and women are not so completely enslaved as farm stock. Accordingly, the people whose conception of marriage is a farmyard or slave-quarter conception are always more or less in a panic lest the slightest relaxation of the marriage laws should utterly demoralize society, whilst those to whom marriage is a matter of more highly evolved sentiments and needs (sometimes said to be distinctly human, though birds and animals in a state of freedom evince them quite as touchingly as we) are much more liberal, knowing as they do that monogamy will

take care of itself provided the parties are free enough, and that promiscuity is a product of slavery and not of liberty.

And with characteristic Shavian abandon Shaw definitely disposes of the principal of the now accepted causes for divorce (*Id.*, pp. 178-179):

*Adultery, far from being the first and only ground for divorce, might reasonably be made the last or wholly excluded. \* \* \** The fact for us to seize is that in the eye of the law *adultery without consequences is merely a sentimental grievance*, whereas the planting on one man of another's offspring is a substantial one.

The last may be obviated by following the up-to-the-minute plan of the new school and have the state take care of all the offspring (if the state clinics for the prevention of conception fail properly to function), the illegitimate and the legitimate—pardon, it is decreed in the new order that there shall be no illegitimacy.

In her plea for "free divorce" Ellen Key sets forth her very temperate views of marriage as it is at present ("Love and Marriage," p. 20):

Whatever abuses free divorce may involve, they can not often be worse than those which marriage has produced and still produces—*marriage, which is degraded to the coarsest sexual habits, the most shameless traffic, the most agonizing soul murders, the most inhuman cruelties, and the grossest infringements of liberty that any department of modern life can show.*

This statement is so extreme, so very intemperate, so utterly untrue, as to carry its own refutation. It merely is presented to show the intellectual and moral fiber of those who regard themselves as sex progressives, would-be uplifters, and thus to reduce whatever output in the shape of remedy they may be responsible for to its proper value. Commenting on the above quotation, one of Miss

Key's critics, Horace J. Bridges ("Criticisms of Life"), very logically says (p. 180):

Whereupon one can only express a mild wonder that the revolted conscience of mankind has not long since risen and annihilated the abominable thing. But, again, we must keep our balance—we must remember the 11 couples out of 12 who are free to dissolve their bonds as the one couple in 12 that does so. How comes it that no glimmer of the ineffable spiritual refinement of Mr. Shaw and Miss Key has broken through the darkness of their souls? The truth is that this modern attack on marriage, in its one-sidedness and its failure either to remember the exceptionalness of the exceptional or to grasp the good points of what it attacks, is almost grotesque.

It not only is grotesque; it evidently, to be charitable, has its origin in hysteria, in a deranged nervous system, from which so many of these reformers suffer, and preferably should be viewed in that light.

Our distinguished feminist friends, who write so glibly on reform in the moral field and marriage relation, unconsciously, evidently, but take a leaf out of the erotic socialist literature. After all, their output resolves itself to the formula of Marx and Engels of a "more lenient public opinion regarding virgin honor and female shame," with "free unions" instead of the present hallowed monogamic relation, and a dash of Margaret Sanger's birth-control logic to make the nauseous dose more palatable to those who might be unable to swallow the mixture straight.

Many other pronouncements of like import to that quoted, from socialists and from those who are feminists first and socialists next, if at all, might be quoted if space permitted, but it hardly is necessary in order to convince anyone aware of what is going on that a determined attack is being made by some few misguided ones on the marriage relation.

Some of the eminent sex propagandists we have mentioned, notably George Bernard Shaw, are socialists of a kind and to some extent in accord with the economic program of present-day socialism; some few others consider the sex problem the one of paramount importance. Socialists have a decided advantage in their onslaught on the home and the family over the feminists, in that they supplement theory with organized effort, while the others patiently wait for an entire change of opinion on the part of the public in the matter, when those who feel thus disposed safely may put their interesting sex theories into practice.

So that in the event that socialists succeed in establishing their co-operative commonwealth, with its accompanying onslaught on the tenderest and holiest of human relationships, they will find some progressive ones in the camp of the enemy—that was the case in Russia and in Hungary—who may be willing, nay eager, to help them destroy the family, regarded by socialists as one of the main pillars of capitalism.

These supposed new and advanced theories on marriage, it may be asserted, are neither new nor advanced. They have been put forth by Plato, among others, twenty centuries and more ago, and by numerous sages and philosophers and reformers before his time and since. In the present age they remain but theories, except in isolated cases, as with Gorky with Mme. Andreyeff, Prof. Herron and Carrie Rand, Dr. Aveling and Eleanor Marx, and certain other cases that occasionally project themselves into the public print for the entertainment of the salacious minded. But in other days and in other lands loose unions were the vogue, had more than a fair trial, and were accounted entire failures. We would be justified

in saying they had more than failed, for the states that sanctified such free unions tottered and irretrievably fell.

History is replete with many of such failures due in the main to such cause, and we would be untrue both to ourselves and to those who are to come after us if we fail to heed the lessons writ so plain on history's page.

I know that one projected into the limelight by reason of his millions made in "flivvers," who was not at all averse to being referred to as an "ignorant idealist," in a public utterance not so long ago characterized history as "mere bunk"; that is to say, employing more refined language, that the experience of other people in the long ago can be of no especial concern to those of this day and age.

From this sage declaration we would most respectfully dissent. History is of some little importance to us. The struggles of other peoples in the dim and distant past is, or should be, of decided interest to forward-looking individuals of to-day, and may possibly help us in arriving at a satisfactory solution of many of the baffling problems that to-day confront us.

If the truth were but known, those of even 5,000 years ago were not so very different from the individuals who have their being in the present century. They in a measure were similarly constituted and had like elements of strength and weakness; their ideals and ambitions were not so very dissimilar; they were governed by the same natural laws, were as susceptible to adverse conditions and reacted to favorable influences—all in all, they were just like the humans of this day and age.

In some few instances they underwent similar experiences and were confronted by the same problems—economic, political, religious, and social—some immature

and uninformed ones consider peculiar to us and our times.

They, too, had their marital troubles. They also had their reformers, those whose mission, it seems, was to go into the highways and byways with their queer messages of liberty to the bound and shackled victims of the marriage customs of their time. And, be it remembered, their remedies when tried had the same effect like remedies would have had to-day if tried by the foolish ones who tire of convention and who ever seek the new and the unconventional.

In other words, they not only failed to cure the social disease to which their remedies were applied, but had the effect, like some modern medical remedies, of spreading the very disease they aimed at eradicating.

The peoples of Rome, Greece, Egypt, and of other of the ancient countries also fretted and chafed under the restraints upon their passions imposed by laws of church and state, and demanded and in some measure secured material modification of what to them were onerous laws. With what result? At terrible cost to themselves as individuals and to the state of which they were a part.

Those countries, it can not be denied, went down to irretrievable degradation and ruin because of alleged reforms instituted in the marriage relation by the alleged liberals of their period. Men and women were emancipated from conjugal ties, were in a measure freed from shackling bonds wisely ordained during the flood time of their nations' careers, and physical and moral enervation and degeneration resulted. All historians worth quoting agree that sex underwent a radical change, and not at all for the better. Men became more effeminate and women

more masculine—that is, to the extent of acquiring the vices and not the virtues of the other sex.

Briefly to mention Rome, Gibbons, Lecky, Seely, and other of the reliable historians to whose genius we owe what knowledge we have of imperial Rome, all point to the fact that the outstanding cause of the decay of the greatest of the ancient states was a moral and not a physical one; that yielding to the blandishments of the sex reformers of such period started the state on its decline and fall.

Lecky ("History of European Morals") tells us that the women of Rome, having acquired the independence and dignity for which some few alleged progressive ones in this country are fighting, marriage became so "intolerably disagreeable" that men shunned it as they would the plague. And it is to this he attributes, more than any other single cause, the undermining and eventual disappearance of the greatest of the ancient states. He said (p. 128, ed. Watts & Co.):

There had arisen, too, partly through vicious causes, and partly, I suppose, through the unfavorable influence which the attraction of the public institutions exercised on domestic life, a great and general indisposition toward marriage, which Augustus attempted in vain to arrest by his laws against celibacy and by conferring many privileges on the fathers of three children. A singularly curious speech is preserved, which is said to have been delivered on this subject shortly before the close of the republic by Metellus Numidicus, in order, he said, to overcome this indisposition. "If, Romans," he said, "we could live without wives, we should all keep from that source of trouble; but since nature has ordained that men can neither live sufficiently agreeable with wives nor at all without them, let us consider the perpetual endurance of our race than our own brief enjoyment."

In the midst of this torrent of corruption a great change was passing over the legal position of Roman women. They had at



first been in a condition of absolute subjection of subordination to their relations. They arrived during the empire at a point of freedom and dignity, which they subsequently lost and have never altogether regained.

These conditions, we are informed by the same authority (*Id.*, pp. 129-130) produced as its inevitable results a veritable avalanche of corruption and moral depravity:

There can be no question that the moral tone of the sex was extremely low—lower, probably, than in France under the regency or in England under the restoration—and it is also certain that the frightful excesses of unnatural passion, to which the most corrupt of modern courts present no parallel, were perpetuated, with but little concealment, on the Palatine.

And he, as do all the others, points out that woman was the chief loser by the altered conditions. "Women, with all her short-lived independence, dignity, and glory, soon sank beneath the ruins of the empire. She tasted the forbidden fruit, and it proved fatal to the glory for which God had intended her."

So with all the other ancient states that were, that also vanished from the ken of men primarily because of instituted "reforms" in the relations between the sexes, these inevitably bringing with them lechery and debauchery to the freed nationals and as a result the decay of the state.

We have like testimony regarding modern states, some of whom, if they but knew it, face the same perils that undermined and destroyed the states of other days.

And it is this destructive marital plan, that was responsible for the destruction of Rome and other of the ancient states and of the degradation of present-day bolshevist Russia, that our socialist and feminist friends would have us pattern after.

As to such alleged progressive plan, our very genial friend Bebel assures us "socialism will create nothing

new; it will merely reinstate on a higher level of civilization and under a different social form what generally prevailed before private property dominated society." The socialist improvement on the Roman order, according to this very reliable socialist authority, consists of a "private agreement, without the aid of a functionary"; the dissolution of this convenient union when disappointment, incompatibility, or revulsion sets in, the two parties to the agreement then being free to enter into other "private agreements"; the free gratification of the sexual impulse, without asking the permission of anyone but the other party; state care of the offspring of these transient unions, if state-endowed miscegenation slips a cog; and "more lenient opinion regarding virgin honor and female shame."

Judged by what had gone before in other civilizations that had adopted a like moral standard, a civilization builded on such bestial plan would soon perish from the earth because of its own vileness.

We have before us the example of imperial Rome, to mention but one great nation that went down to utter ruin because of a lax moral policy, and it will be our fault, and ours alone, if with eyes wide open we adopt a like plan.

It might be well to remind those short-sighted individuals who so glibly prate of more freedom for women in the matter of love that what they term love is responsible more than anything else for those very evils they continually inveigh against.

Such overenthusiastic individuals possibly are ignorant of the fact that our foundling asylums are filled with the living fruits of "sex love" and "sexual impulse," synonyms for love in the minds of our sexually progressive friends. It might also be well to mention that the many mulattoes

and other mongrels one can not help but meet, who bear on their faces for all the world to see the badge of their illegitimacy, ever advertise to the world the unholy, the carnal love that brought them into existence.

Dive and brothel, it may be said, contain the pitiable victims of their own weakness in yielding without thought of the inevitable consequences to the embraces of the "beloved man," while along the highways and byways of our cities and towns brazenly stroll those moral perverts, men and women, who have brought themselves under the condemnation of the fellows because of their unwillingness or inability to stifle or control the carnal "love" that was in them and that ever cried for expression.

Those foolish women who ever hearken to the siren voices of the preachers of sex liberty, who would that men and women should have the widest range of sexual liberty, would do well to heed the fact that the laws of society they ever decry are made to protect women more than men—yes; even from themselves and the consequences of yielding to their unholy desires.

Sexual promiscuity, the goal such sex progressives ever strive to reach, invariably visits its punishment on the women and leaves the men practically unscathed. Man loves, then rides away, leaving the woman to find solace for misplaced love as best she can.

The women who expect to gain a pronounced advantage from the order promised by socialists and feminists may awake to find, just as their sisters of Rome and the other states did centuries ago, that they had exchanged a favorable for a decidedly unfavorable condition.

At present women are protected by the strong arm of the law from injustice at the hands of the other sex, from

predatory men, from those who are utterly selfish, and pay little heed to the wreckage they may leave behind. With equality woman sacrifices needed protection and is forced to accommodate herself to the new and, if she but knew it, decidedly unfavorable order.

Women are radically different from men, not only in external appearance but temperamentally and psychically. Women's mind runs in a different channel, her impulses are different, her affections take an entirely different turn from men. One of our philosophers asserted that "man has sex; woman is sex." We see the truth of this assertion on every side, else we hopelessly are blind.

Man generally is inconstant, woman usually constant. Man's affections undergo too-frequent changes; woman, once her affections are centered on a male, generally remains steadfast.

Max Nordau, following the assertion that marriage was instituted primarily for the woman and child, that it is a "protective social institution for the benefit of the weaker part," states:

Man has not yet conquered and humanized his polygamous animal instincts to the same extent as woman. It would, for the most part, be quite agreeable to him to exchange the woman he possesses for a new one.

Men may dissent, but it can not be said that Mr. Nordau is wholly wrong in his statement. He may have overstated somewhat, but taking away all possible exaggerations a residum of truth remains.

It has well and truly been said, by Byron: "Man's love is of man a thing apart; 'tis woman's whole existence." Because of this fact, because of the difference of the sexes, recognized by all but those blinded by false sex teachings, for anyone to as much as attempt to disturb

those wise safeguards erected by society for those who most need protection is certain to invite disaster.

Rather should all with the best interests of society at heart stand by our present moral code, strengthen it in all ways, if we can, and not throw the whole code overboard as outworn and useless to gratify the whims and caprices of those blatant individuals who so very modestly consider themselves the pilots ordained by God Almighty to lead us into the paths we should follow.

The many enrolled in the socialist movement—the women especially—who may consider themselves unduly restricted by the strict marriage regulations enforced by present-day society, would do well to consider the case of Eleanor Marx, before fully set forth, before they embark on the same course.

Turn from the very convenient “private agreement” socialists and the other would-be emancipated ones believe eventually will supplant the present monogamic marriage state to the more ideal form sung of by our poets, that which the better element of society seeks to attain. Rather than the loose union Eleanor Marx and Dr. Aveling entered into, some few still are to be found in this too-prosaic age who believe in that form of marriage tie for their sons and daughters, disapproved of by Bebel, Engels, and the other saints of socialism, and that to endure for life, if that is at all possible; some few sufficiently old-fashioned to appreciate to the full and to hope for its realization the sentiments contained in those oft-quoted lines from Moore’s “Lalla Rookh”:

There’s a bliss beyond all that the minstrel has told,  
 When two that are link’d in one heavenly tie,  
 With heart never changing and brow never cold,  
 Love on through all ills, and love on till they die.

The family—the monogamous family—as at present constituted, generally is recognized as the keystone of the social arch. Therefore any weakening of the marriage tie must have an injurious effect on the whole social structure. That being admitted, it becomes our imperative duty to banish from our councils those reckless ones who spread afar their destructive philosophy calling for revolution in social and moral conditions.

There can be no question in the minds of all reasonable human beings that it is most risky at this late day to experiment with the so-called “progressive” plans for marriage and morals. Such plans had been put to a more than fair test in the centuries that had gone before and absolutely had failed, and their failure proved most destructive to the then social structure. Rather should we adopt rational policies, those experience has proved tend to conserve and strengthen the family, and thus make society at large stronger and better in all possible respects.

The proposition of the modern socialist philosopher and prophet, Morris Hillquit, that “a union based on love can only endure so long as love continues,” seems a reasonable one to other than shallow-pated individuals until they begin to figure just where society would land if such became the general practice. If we throw aside the safeguards that to-day surround the marriage relation, we will find only too soon that love under such conditions will be a very evanescent thing, ready to take flight after the first “tiff.” As for there being any gain for morals under such condition of affairs, we would too soon find that morality practically would disappear. Prof. Flint, Dr. Schaffle, and the other eminent ones who have dealt with this phase of socialism have taken this position, and their arguments never have successfully been answered.

In his very valuable "Socialism" Prof. Flint unreservedly condemns the loose union socialists contend for and comes to the wise conclusion that marriage should have some degree of stability. He says (p. 287):

To replace marriage by mere association between man and woman, terminable at the will of either, would not, as Morris and Bax imagine, be a "great gain in morality and sentiment," but an incalculable and irreparable loss. As long as the moral sense was so deadened and the better feelings of human nature so perverted as to tolerate the change, sexual promiscuity and hetairism would prevail. So-called free love is untrue and degrading love, love from which all the pure, permanent, and elevating elements are absent, love reduced to animal passions and imaginative illusions, the love which is powerful to destroy families but powerless to sustain and organize them.

The following sage remarks from Dr. Schaffle's "Impossibility of Social Democracy" are said by Dr. Flint to "supplement the preceding remarks as to the family" (pp. 147-151):

It is true, we are told, that things would remain for the most part as they are and marriage unions would still for the most part remain constant; free love would only be called into play for the loosening of unhappy marriages. Then why not let the stable marriage be the rule, with separation allowed in cases where the marriage union has become morally and physically impossible? Why not have at least the existing marriage law, as among Protestants? But the whole statement, even if made in good faith, will not stand examination.

What, then, is an "unhappy" or relatively "happy" marriage? No one is perfect, and, therefore, not a single marriage can ever hope to be entirely "happy." First love must always yield to sober reality, after the cunning of nature has secured its end for the preservation of the species. In the indissoluble life union of marriage, with the daily and hourly contact between the inevitable imperfections of both parties, there necessarily arise frictions and discords, which if severance is free will only too easily give rise to the most ill-considered separations from the effect of momen-

tary passions, all the more readily if the one party had begun to grow tedious to the other or pleasant to a third party. The very essential of the stable marriage tie is just this, that it secures the peaceable adjustment of numberless unavoidable disagreements; that it prevents the many sparrings and jarrings of private life from reaching the public eye; that it allows of openness on both sides and avoids the possibility of pretense; that it induces self-denial for the sake of others; that it insures a greater proportion of mutuality in both spiritual and physical cares for the general run of wedded couples—in short, that for the majority of cases a relative possibility of wedded happiness is obtainable. Therefore the indissoluble marriage tie must remain the rule and separation the exception, confined to cases where its persistence becomes a moral impossibility. *But it is clear that if once the emancipation of woman is made general for her to step out of the house into public life, and if once the bond of common love and common care for the offspring were loosened, or even weakened, frequent marriage changes would easily become the rule and permanent unions only the exceptions.* The training in self-conquest, in gentleness, in consideration for others, in fairness, and in patience which the present family and wedded relations entail would also be lost in entrance of all into public life outside the home. The gain to separate individuals in point of sensual gratification through fugitive unions would be very far from outweighing the loss of the ideal good obtainable by man, and by man only, through the channels of marriage. \* \* \* Existing marriage rights and married life are susceptible of further improvement, but this is not to say that the problem of their personal, moral, and social amelioration will be solved by facilitating for everyone the breaking of the marriage tie; we may rather look to solving it by restoring, perfecting, and generalizing the external and moral conditions of the highest possible happiness in binding unions. This can be done without social democracy and can not be done with it. The new hetairism of free love reduces man to a refined animal, society to a refined herd, a superior race to dogs and apes, even though all should become productive laborers and spend a few hours in manual labor.

As both Prof. Flint and Dr. Schaffle so clearly and convincingly have pointed out, little gain for morality is to



be expected from putting into effect the socialist scheme of "private agreements" and "free monogamy" in place of the existing marriage tie.

Of course, as has been pointed out, the present marriage system is not at all perfect. The mere fact that it is regarded as an established system does not free it from criticism and beneficent change. But any change that possibly may be suggested must be constructive rather than destructive, directed toward strengthening and building up rather than weakening and tearing down.

In some few cases divorce undoubtedly would be for the benefit of one or both parties to the union, possibly to society as well. Therefore a way out as well as a way into marriage will have to be provided for the exceptions who have found in marriage nothing but disappointment and sorrow. But we should not go to the length of entirely letting down the bars, removing all obstacles, permitting those so disposed to enter into "private agreements" and "free unions," so alluring to the sex progressives, permit the dissolution of such agreements when they become irksome to one or both of the parties concerned, without calling on the machinery of the state, and permit such procedure to continue indefinitely.

If such condition were permitted, public morals surely would have a serious setback, to such an extent that many years necessarily elapse before we could get back to where we are to-day.

It might further be said that the marital plan socialists and feminists ever are striving for, and the propaganda toward such end at this time, is bound to have a particularly detrimental effect on the morals of all, particularly those of tender years and those who have not as well as those who never will arrive at the age of discretion.

Our young, as is well known, are apt pupils—entirely too apt by far—and if they see all around them these loose unions, it can have no other effect than hopelessly to debauch their morals. Moral teachings they may receive in well-regulated homes will avail but little if they see such teachings continually set at naught in neighboring homes, publicly flouted at all times in the press and by those they are taught to look up to as public examples.

One bad apple in a barrel of perfectly sound ones will in time result in the loss of the entire lot. A few good apples in a barrel of bad ones will show the same result, but the decaying process will be much more rapid. As with apples, so with human beings. A girl of good moral upbringing put into dive or brothel may remain pure and undefiled, but the chances are against such result. It also will be admitted that a boy or girl of loose morals, if permitted freely to mingle with youths of good morals, will have a detrimental effect on the latter's morals. Some few of the good may be expected to fall by the wayside under such conditions. Much is learned in the home, but we must not lose sight of the fact that possibly more, for good or evil, is learned in the highways and byways of life.

For that reason, if for no other, we should see to it not only to inculcate the proper moral attitude in our growing boys and girls through lessons taught in the home, but we should, as far as possible, surround them in public with those influences that tend to promote rather than impair the moral teachings of the home, the school, and the church.

Our vision must be widened. We must not only do our full duty to those we love and cherish within the circumscribed limits of the home, but we should see that our influence reaches into the great world outside. We

must not only be insensible to the siren's song of the socialist and the feminist, but it is our duty, which we must not shirk, to those who are to take our places to expose on every occasion the false teachings of these proved enemies of our civilization and ever hold up such individuals and the evils for which they are responsible to the well-deserved contempt and scorn of honest and decent men and women.

## APPENDIX

### SOVIET RUSSIA'S CODE OF LAWS

THE people of this country and of the British Isles, those who are determined to hold on to that which is good and noble in our social structure, are indebted to the wide-awake publishers of the *Contemporary Review* for the publication in the March and April, 1920, issues of their very valuable magazine of the text of the laws enacted in the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic relating to marriage, divorce, the family, and related matters.\*

The laws referred to are there published, practically without embellishment in the way of editorial comment, just as originally they were published by the People's Commissariat of Justice. They stand alone, stark naked, in all their hideous suggestiveness, with but a short introductory paragraph by the editor.

Presentation is made in two parts, the first part being a translation of an explanatory preface to the laws by

\* Publication also was had as a soviet document ("Soviet Russia Pamphlets, No. 2, The Marriage Laws of Soviet Russia," published by the Russian Soviet Government Bureau, New York City). As this last evidently was published for propaganda purposes, it was deemed advisable to omit therefrom the very frank and incriminating preface of A. G. Hoichbarg, thus invalidating the entire document.

It had logically been stated that a lie consists not only of a misstatement of facts but as well any statement of a truth, especially of a half truth, issued with intention to deceive. Thus judged, the interesting though misleading pamphlet issued by the American branch of the Russian soviet government is branded at its birth with the stamp of Ananias.

Alexander Hoichbarg, who styles himself chief editor of the Law Bureau, ordinary member of the Soviet Academy of Socialist Sciences. The second part deals with the laws proper relating to marriage and the family.

In this chapter we have made a careful selection of the salient features of these interesting documents, rejecting the chaff, that portion of no particular value, mere verbiage, literary bulk and dressing, of no particular interest to the average individual. And we have taken the liberty here and there of commenting on certain portions that, we believe, call for such treatment.

After a short statement calling attention to the coming first anniversary of the "proletarian revolution of October" and the necessity for the new state to "exert all her strength to repel unexampled attacks of the utmost fury from within and without," Mr. Hoichbarg says:

Nevertheless, while sustaining this fierce defensive struggle against a whole world of enemies, the Russian proletariat has also found enough strength for the work of creative construction in the direction of the realization of socialism. During this short period so much has been done, far more than other classes have succeeded in doing under far more favorable conditions in the course of years and years. One has only to glance through the "Collection of Laws of the Workers' and Peasants' Government" in order to convince oneself of this with astonishment and joy.

The expected feeling of "astonishment and joy" that is to come to the individual after wading through these remarkable documents will be confined to very few, those who label themselves progressives and radicals, and to none others. The average individual will be wholly unmoved, just as much so as when apprised of the economic, political and social reforms instituted by the bungling bolshevik mercenaries in what formerly was the land of the czars.

We learn first that there is to be no particular stability to these laws; that they are, after all, but temporary measures to cover the "transition" period from the bloodless bolshevik revolution to such time when the socialist paradise firmly will be established: As to that we have this testimony from our omniscient friend:

The proletarian government constructs its codes, like all its laws, in a logical fashion; *it constructs them in such a manner that every day of their existence diminishes the necessity for their existence as state laws; it proposes as the object of its laws the rendering useless of laws*, like the philosopher Fichte, who set up as the aim of every government the rendering useless of government. Thus, for instance, the constitution of the soviets, established on the principles of the unity of political power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, is so established that every day of its existence, every day of its application, by breaking the resistance and the organization of the former oppressing classes and by unifying the former oppressed class, by organizing economic life in accordance with socialist principles, lessens the need for the unified, coercive power of the proletariat, and for political power in general. In precisely the same way all other proletarian laws and codes of law must be so constructed that every day of their existence diminishes the period of transition from the old order to the socialist order, and that in this way every day of their existence vigorously eats away their existence.

The government can not, therefore, desire that their codes and collections of codes should have the same character, should be marked by the same rocklike fixity which distinguished ancient collections of codes. \* \* \*

The proletarian authorities are distinctly aware that their codes ought not to be eternal, *that they have been created only for a transition period of short duration, which they passionately desire to shorten by all possible means*. But this transition period is inevitable; it is impossible to dispense with it; one may try to shorten it by certain measures, but it is impossible to leap over it.

If reasonably plain words have any meaning at all, the

above-quoted paragraphs can mean nothing else but that the ultimate aim and purpose of bolshevik socialism is the utter abolition of all coercive agencies, especially laws and governments. Thus it appears that in this laudable aim they are not far removed from anarchists, who in some measure reasonably will indorse the further proposition stated by our bolshevik friend that the principles of socialist organization as it is worked out in Russia will in time "transform themselves into habits acting instinctively, unconsciously, and automatically, or else become unnecessary, thanks to that universal plenty in all spheres of human life which socialist society will create."

The promise of universal plenty hardly is for the near future, for it is evident to all who have eyes to see the plain situation that instead of plenty the deluded Russians have dire want and famine; instead of a perfect industrial machine, functioning for all the people, as the dupes of the bolshevik generously were promised, they have demoralization, disintegration, and imminent destruction of the productive and distributive processes seized by the socialists after the revolution that put them in supreme power in their unhappy country.

Bureaus, we are informed, are provided for the registration of births, marriages, and deaths, also "continuous statistics of all the living population of the socialist state." Our socialist friends hope, however, to dispense with some of these shortly, for we are informed:

Perhaps in the near future it will be possible to abolish part of these registers; for instance, that of the registry of marriages, of absent persons, of changes in family names, if more rational, more intelligent methods of distinguishing people are established in place of family names.

It will be seen from this last that our revolutionary friends, not content with abolishing the family, so far as lies in their power, also seek eventually to abolish family names, and industriously are engaged in a search for "more rational, more intelligent methods of distinguishing people."

A revolutionary change also is proposed in the matter of guardianship. We learn that:

Guardianship in this code is wholly within the province of the Bureau of Social Welfare. Guardianship under our old system was a feudal institution belonging to the Middle Ages, a class institution. Each class—the nobility, the bourgeoisie, the priests, the peasants—had its own rules for the guardianship of wards and its guardians proper to its class.

In the socialist state they order things better, for we read:

So long as the individual family exists, children in the care of their relatives are not as a general rule placed under public guardianship (with the exception of compulsory education and other provisions of the same kind). But, on the other hand, all children who are deprived of the care of their family, without regard to their possession or nonpossession of property, to their wealth or poverty, are placed under guardianship, under the care of the public state institutions, the Bureau of Social Welfare. These institutions exercise such guardianship, and take all the measures pertaining to guardianship, preferably without the intervention of agents, and may, only in special cases, entrust their duties to individual persons, appointing them guardians, whether of single wards or of whole groups of wards. Consequently, guardianship is so organized and established that it can be preserved, even in a definitely established socialist society, on a broader basis; that it so say, functioning for the benefit, not of some but of all persons who need the care of the social community. Further, the institution of guardianship ought in the actual period of transition to play the part of educator, model, example; it should show the parents that the care of society lavished upon children gives far better results than the private, individual, un-



scientific, and irrational care of particular parents, "loving" but ignorant, lacking the resources, the means, the methods which society has at its disposal; *this institution should thus break the parents of the habit of that narrow and unintelligent love for their children which finds its outward expression in the tendency to keep the children near themselves, not to let them leave the narrow circle of the family, to make their outlook narrow, and to bring them up not as members of the great society called humanity, but as beings selfish as themselves, individualists, who place their personal interests in the foreground, to the serious injury of the interests of society.* Guardianship so instituted is revolutionary, for it breaks abruptly with the previous system, and it is socialistic, for it prepares and facilitates the measures which must be taken in the socialist society.

Two things militate against the present institution of guardianship, according to our very practical and far-seeing socialist friends, one the foolish tendency of parents to love their children, to the lasting harm of those so loved, and the other, that the children are left after the death of parents to the care of relatives, who, we are informed by the same reliable authority, "do not feel paternal or maternal love for their wards, though they constantly have a direct interest, as heir, not in preserving the life but in the speedy death of the children, or those of unsound mind, for whom it is their duty to care."

To be loved or not to be loved, according to our socialist logician, has its perils for innocent childhood; with parents or without, under the old and, according to him, vanishing order the child is certain to suffer. The socialist state solves the problem by its Bureau of Social Welfare, which is guaranteed not to spoil the child or other dependent by ignorant, irrational love, but will give just the requisite amount of care called for in each individual case, so as to preserve him or her for the perfect society they expect shortly to establish.

That portion of the socialist preface that relates to marriage will of a certainty unpleasantly surprise those fatuous ones within the socialist ranks or those just outside who ever have insisted that socialism, when established, will not disturb the existing monogamic marital relation. It starts with an apology, seemingly for its moderation:

Certain other principles of this first code, for instance, those of the marriage law, may at first sight not appear socialistic in the sense we have just described. Especially lively criticism has been leveled during the discussion of the code at the institution of the registration of marriage by the civil, lay authorities (the soviets). Registration of marriage, official marriage—what kind of socialism is that? people cried. No registration is necessary. Indeed, in a socialist society, to use the expression of Kautsky (see his book, "Reproduction and Development in Nature and in Society," German edition, p. 255), *the legal fettering of husband and wife becomes useless.*

Ye official apologist for the code, however, seeks to allay the fears of all true socialists, who thought that Russian bolshevik socialism had strayed far from the beaten socialist path by its registration of marriage.

But that is the case in a firmly established socialist society. And we live in a period of transition. And it is just here that it becomes plain, as we have said above, that the desire to take a direct leap into the future, which at first sight seems to be a radical step, proves itself to be a marking time on the same spot or a leap backward.

We have only to remember that we live in a period of transition; we have also to remember that the Russian proletariat began to take action when the bourgeoisie, being afraid of them, ceased to be a revolutionary class when they were ready to accept all that survived of the feudal Middle Ages; that for this reason the proletariat has to make a whole series of revolutionary changes which the bourgeoisie ought to have made; that the proletariat has to wage a fierce war, not only against the bour-

geoisie but also, in place of it, against what remains (with us a great deal) of the prebourgeois régime. In Russia the proletariat has had to be the first to deprive the church and religion of their importance in the state. *And what socialist will dispute that to deliver the people from the domination of the clergy, of religion, and of the church is not only a revolutionary aim but also a socialist aim? For it helps them to grasp the ideas of socialism, ideas which can not be reconciled with the supernatural and the beyond, but drive out the supernatural, the divine, and the beyond from all the recesses where they conceal themselves—* from philosophy, from history, etc. And what is proposed in the place of civil registration by the proletarian authorities? No registration of the state is necessary, it is said, but the observance of religious practices and ceremonies must be allowed when the two contracting parties wish it. In other words, it is proposed instead of maintaining the struggle against religious marriage (the divine mystery) to leave everything as it was before, to leave in existence only one kind of marriage—religious marriage at church. This is how a proposal which is radical on paper proves itself reactionary in fact.

If this deluge of words and phrases means anything at all, the Russians under bolshevik domination had come to such a pass in their onward progress toward the millennial society where a proposal for "religious marriage at church" is referred to as a radical proposal.

But the marriage law is not only a means of counteracting clerical-religious influences upon the people. That law is revolutionary and socialistic. It not only breaks abruptly with the old régime of our prebourgeois matrimonial relations. It sweeps away all the patriarchal and feudal hindrances to marriage—differences of religion between man and woman, religious prohibition to the contraction of marriage, etc. It establishes complete equality between man and woman, in so far as this depends upon the provisions of the marriage law. It liberates the woman in so far as her liberation is possible in the transition period before the definite establishment of the socialist order, and by so doing leads the woman better to assimilate the ideas of socialism, which will liberate her finally. It does not make the aim of marriage to

be the birth of children. *The family is based, not upon marriage, as it was formerly, but upon actual parentage. Not only the law of guardianship but also the law of the family is separated from the law of marriage. It establishes complete freedom of divorce, thus refraining from making marriage a life-long institution. In a word, every day of the existence of these marriage laws is an assault, so far as a law can be that in general, upon the individualistic view of marriage, "the legal fettering of husband and wife."*

In the province of family law our first code rejects all fictions, places in the foreground the true state of affairs, actual parentage, accustoms people to truth telling, frees them from superstition, not in words but in fact, *places all children on an equal footing as regards their rights*, without distinction of birth, and enables them easily to make use of this equality.

Kautsky says in the passage referred to above:

*"So long as the exchange of goods continues the legal ties of the man to the family will always provide better conditions for the education of the children than an irregular sexual connection, which may be severed at any moment at the will of either party, which imposes upon the father no obligation, or else imposes a minimum of obligation. This state of affairs will change only when communal production is established and when paternal care of the children shall be replaced by the care of the community. Simultaneously the legal fettering of the man and the woman will become useless. It is true that capitalist society has been able to make this fettering unbearable and in many cases inapplicable but not useless."*

We live in a time when capitalist society is passing into socialist society. And the code for the transition period prepares the conditions, in so far as these depend upon law, under which the fettering of the husband and wife will become wholly useless. *On the one hand it renders extremely easy the rupture of the tie of affection at any moment in accordance with the wish of one of the parties, even when it has been officially registered. But on the other hand, equal duties, certainly not light ones, are imposed upon the father toward the children in the case of such a connection and in the case of an irregular connection.*

The complete equality of rights between all the children, without distinction of parentage, is moreover a measure of social psychology, preparing the way for applying the care of the community to all children, preparing the socialist régime in this sphere, *removing the last foundation of bourgeois marriage, with its privileges, its narrow family interests, its isolation, and its patriarchal limitations.*

Commenting on this last paragraph, which it wrongly attributes to Kautsky, the *Current History Magazine*, in its issue of June, 1920, says:

This frank avowal of the intent to destroy the family and the home indicates the extent and nature of the revolution which the Moscow international is trying to force on the rest of the world.

The rest of the official preface is taken up with the socialist procedure toward inheritances. In view of the fact that the socialist régime of Russia had so dealt with industries and wealth that inheritances were of slight value even before the formulation of a definite code of laws, the code in this respect can have but an academic interest for the average individual. The last days of the parent during the bolshevik administration of affairs were almost certainly spent in want and penury, in poverty that well beggars description, with everything of value that could be hidden from the thieving bolshevik officials going for scraps of food in order that the spark of life might be kept in the bodies of the parents and those dear ones who managed to survive the criminal maladministration of affairs that organized socialism perpetrated on unfortunate Russia, so practically nothing of value could be bequeathed to dear ones.

Nothing that the bolshevik supermen have done since the *coup d'état* that projected them into leadership of Russian affairs would lead one to believe that conditions

in this respect will materially improve in the future. Dire want and distress, a veritable plague of epidemic disease (article in *Lancet* (London) of April, 1921, by Dr. Boris Sokoloff mentions 31,789,230 cases, with from 5 to 7 per cent of deaths), has been the customary portion of the denizens of the bolshevik state from the very beginning. And in 1921 and 1922, due primarily to official incompetence, Russia had the unenviable distinction of staging possibly the most widespread and hopeless famine of modern times, and this in a land formerly regarded as the "granary of Europe."

The situation getting entirely beyond their control, the banditry in control of soviet affairs were compelled to swallow their pride and to call on those same capitalist states they ever were plotting to destroy, especially the United States, to save the tens of millions of their nationals from death from starvation. And America generously responded with food and medicines from both government and private sources to the value of \$60,000,000, saving both the millions from starvation and epidemic disease and the government directly responsible for all the horrors heaped in generous measure on Russia.

The Russian Manufacturers, Merchants, and Bankers Association, then sheltered in Paris, representing 80 per cent of Russia's industrial and financial interests, issued this appeal to the nations of the world (Bulletin, Russian Information Bureau, August 20, 1921:

A terrible calamity has overtaken the long-suffering Russian people. Famine has stricken Russia's most fertile provinces. Already death by starvation is mowing down hundreds of thousands of victims. Cholera and spotted typhus, these faithful allies of hunger, are growing to terrible proportions. The populace of the famine-stricken regions has abandoned its homes and is fleeing, seeking bread, and strewing its path with corpses. Hor-

ror and death now reign in Russia. It is hard to imagine the picture of the fearful sufferings of the Russian people in the approaching long, cold winter. Russia's misfortune is the misfortune of the entire world. Not alone the Russian people but all the nations and all the governments of the world can not help responding to the appeal for help, seeing that a whole nation is perishing.

We, representatives of the Russian business and industrial classes, appeal to the nations and governments of the world, to all humanitarian organizations, and to all those in whose breasts the feeling of humanity is alive to help save the great Russian people from perdition.

*This famine is the inevitable result of communist misrule and the unfailing companion of the bolshevist power.*

In Russia there have been destroyed to the very roots all foundations of civilized life and economic activity; private property has been abolished, individual initiative has disappeared, working efficiency has been killed, former surpluses are exhausted, the tools of production are scattered and destroyed, transportation has perished, and savage lawlessness is reigning supreme. \* \* \*

The soviet government, instead of helping to the limit, actually hindered relief by transparent schemes to secure political capital out of the nationwide misery they themselves were responsible for.

Such being the admitted conditions, it hardly is possible that inheritances will have sufficient value to be the subject even of academic discussion.

The government parasites, on the other hand, who of a certainty will feather their nests while they have the opportunity, will manage, it goes without saying, to have their wealth in convertible form, in such shape that it may conveniently be carried here and there, out of soviet bounds if conditions become too warm for these precious scoundrels, so the laws of inheritance can hardly have practical application to them.

And yet we can not wholly ignore certain significant

paragraphs, with the plainly indicated purpose that inheritances are wholly to be destroyed to bring about the new social order. After fully considering the matter the bolsheviks arrived at this conclusion:

The proletariat, having attained power, the proletarian authorities, who are certainly not afraid of causing the downfall of thrones and upsetting the bourgeois régime, develop to its logical conclusion the tendency implied in the points indicated above and abolish altogether the right of private inheritance, whether by law or by will. This is just what is done in the decree of the central executive committee of April 27, 1918, which abolishes the right of inheritances.

The decree deals a mortal blow at the institution of private property. It ceases to be something ethical in inception, passing from one family to another, according to the principle of individual right. Private property is transformed at most into a life interest; the property remains attached to a particular person at most for his lifetime and no longer. But after the death of each individual owner it becomes the property not of the individual but of a community—of the proletarian state. *By means of this abolition of the right of private inheritance we suspend a sword of Damocles over the institution of private property, giving it a short duration and an importance only relative.* That is why this abolition of the right of inheritance should have an exceedingly important social and psychological educational influence on socialist labors; it should contribute very largely to destroy the instincts of individual ownership. That is why the proletarian authorities, who have not yet decreed the general nationalization of all undertakings, have decreed the abolition of the transmission of private property by inheritance without exception.

It must be remembered that since the promulgation of the law decreeing the abolition of inheritances, nothing has remained of the institution of private inheritance; the institution has not survived in any form, in any manner, in any of its parts; the property of deceased persons in totality and of all kinds becomes the property of the Russian Socialist Federal Republic of Soviets. Nor is there any exception to this rule established among us.

Patrimonies of small value (up to 1,000 rubles) are



exempt from the operation of the law, because the burdens such course would entail upon the state if these were included would hardly make it worth while.

This latter scheme, we are informed, fits into the socialist plan of abolishing the family, for according to Marx, Kautsky, and all the other socialist authorities, private property is the keystone of the family arch, the removal of which will cause the entire structure to fall.

Following this most interesting and significant preface that we have been dealing with we have the code proper. That is divided into various articles, each one dealing with some particular phase of the new family conditions. Some of these are of sufficient importance to be set forth more or less fully, while those of no especial importance are entirely disregarded.

Under the head "Formalities relating to marriage" we have this:

52. Only civil (lay) marriage, entered on the official registers, shall create the rights and obligations of married people, as enumerated in this section.

A marriage solemnized according to the religious rites and with the assistance of ministers of any sect shall create no rights or obligations for the contracting parties unless it shall have been registered in due form.

53. Marriage shall be contracted in the local registry offices, or in the notary offices attached to the local soviets.

Marriages contracted abroad by Russian nationals must be registered with the central bureau for the registration of marriages by the soviet representatives abroad.

57. Marriages shall be contracted on fixed days and at fixed hours, previously determined and published by the public official whose duty it is to supervise the solemnization of marriage.

\* \* \* \* \*

62. The marriage shall be held to be concluded as soon as the record of it is inscribed on the register of marriages.

63. If any person shall declare before the record of the marriage is inscribed on the register that a legal impediment exists to the conclusion of the marriage, the public official shall be required to postpone the inscription until the case shall have been judged by the local tribunal. If objection is raised which is clearly without proper foundation, it may be rejected by the public officials without further formalities.

Note.—The local tribunal shall judge cases of objection raised to marriage summarily and within three days. The judgments of the local tribunal in such matters shall not be subject to appeal.

64. Persons found guilty of having knowingly made false statements for the purpose of preventing the solemnization of a marriage shall be punished for bearing false witness and sentenced to pay damages.

The above fails to mention whether damages these individuals are to pay are to be in real money or in the worthless currency circulated *ad libitum* by the bolshevik government in the sections under their control.

66. Those who contract a marriage shall have attained the age proper for marriage. The age proper for marriage shall be 16 years for women and 18 years for men.

Then it is provided that the contracting parties, or either of them, must be of sound mind—as if a sound mind can be found in soviet Russia, especially in government circles—must not have contracted a previous marriage, and must not be “ascendants or descendants in a direct line, and collaterally between brothers and sisters, whether german or having one parent in common.” This applies as well to the issue of illegitimate (or “natural,” as they term them) relations between men and women.

Violation of any of the provisions of the foregoing sections may cause the marriage to be declared invalid by the proper reviewing authorities.

82. *Marriages contracted at church and by religious forms shall be valid if entered into before the 20th of December, 1917,*

in contravention of the regulations laid down in articles 3, 5, 12, 28, 30, and 31 of the former civil laws (Code of Laws, vol. X, pt. 1, 1914 edition).

These particular articles are not specified, so we are left in the dark as to what they really are.

That would indicate that "marriages contracted at church" after the date mentioned are illegal and without the sanction of the soviet officials, and those who foolishly contract such marriages are held to be in an illegitimate relationship.

It is also provided that "marriages contracted at church" before the date mentioned shall be declared valid if the contracting parties are not ascendants or descendants as before provided.

As before officially set forth, regulations covering marriage are only to cover the transition period, and probably entirely will be dispensed with when the socialist state firmly is established. Russian socialists are adjured to have patience, to bear with the evils and annoyances of registered marriage and legal forms until such happy day arrives, which confidently is expected within the very near future.

Concerning the dissolution of marriage, or divorce, some interesting sections are discovered in the code.

85. Marriage is dissolved by the death of the partners to the marriage and by the judicial declaration of death.

So the married man and woman, in the event of death of judicial declaration of death, is freed from his or her spouse, without applying to the legal authorities. That certainly is a valuable concession to liberalism, for which all ought to be thankful.

86. Marriage may be dissolved during the lifetime of the partners by means of divorce.

Note.—All the provisions of the present law concerning divorce are equally applicable to legal marriages celebrated in church and by religious ceremony, and contracted before December 20, 1917.

Marriage at church after that fateful date, having no legal status, evidently need not be terminated by divorce.

87. *The grounds for divorce may be either the mutual consent of the parties or the desire of one of them.*

88. The demand for a dissolution of marriage may be made either in writing or verbally, and in the latter case it shall be reduced to writing.

The local judge, who "shall announce at least one sitting a week at a fixed hour," is to be the judge whether the application of divorce shall be granted. If the domicile of the parties is unknown or in case of mutual consent of both parties, the chief of the bureau for the registration of births, marriages, and deaths shall assume the responsibility for the provisions of the above sections.

Appeals from the decision of the local judge may be made to the supreme court.

To get the full significance of these rather tame sections dealing with divorce they must be read with the official statements before set forth by the chief editor of the Russian Law Bureau, especially where he makes the damaging admissions that their laws "establish the complete freedom of divorce, thus refraining from making marriage a lifelong institution. In a word, every day of the existence of these marriage laws is an assault, so far as a law can be that in general, upon the individualistic view of marriage, 'the legal fettering of husband and wife'; also the statement that the laws "render extremely easy the rupture of the tie of affection at any moment in accordance with the wish of one of the parties, even when it has been officially registered."

From this we may well conclude that the laws are far

more "liberal" than they appear or that the officials, local and national, selected by the powers in control to enforce the laws bring to their chosen tasks minds so exceedingly liberal that they may be expected fully to please all but the most captious of the free-love population of the soviet "republic."

But the soviet officials have not stopped with rights and privileges. The citizen and the sojourner in bolshevik Russia, if he be married, also is saddled with certain duties and obligations. Thus we learn:

100. Persons united in marriage shall bear a family name (the conjugal family name). At the time of the solemnization of the marriage the married persons have the right to declare what name they will bear—the family name of the husband (the bridegroom), or of the wife (the bride), or the joint family name.

101. The partners to the marriage shall retain the family name for the whole period of the duration of the marriage and after the dissolution of marriage by death, or the judicial declaration of death, of one of them.

\* \* \* \* \*

104. Change of domicile by one partner to a marriage shall not oblige the other party to follow.

105. Marriage shall not involve community of possessions between the partners to the marriage.

106. Partners to a marriage shall be at liberty to enter into any mutual obligations which the law permits. Contracts between the partners to a marriage having the intent of infringing the rights of ownership of the wife or the husband shall be void, and shall be in no way binding upon third parties or upon the partners to the marriage, who shall always retain the right to refuse performance of the said contracts.

In these last three sections we have the retention of full independence that some few advocates of progress in the marriage relation had been contending for for years. Freedom to live or not to live with the partner of one's joys and sorrows; full control of one's possessions, even

if married; these rights buttressed by the declaration that the partners may not contract between themselves or with outside parties to infringe any of these rights—what more can radicalism and progressivism ask for? But there happens to be a good-sized fly in the ointment. In the very next section we have this:

107. If one partner to a marriage is necessitous (that is to say, if he lacks the minimum necessities of life) and infirm, he shall have the right to demand maintenance from the other partner, if the latter is in a position to render him assistance.

108. If one of the partners to a marriage refuses to maintain the necessitous and infirm partner, the latter shall have the right to apply to the Bureau of Social Welfare attached to the soviet of the district where the defendant partner is resident for maintenance by the other partner.

In such case the bureau is empowered to summon the interested parties to appear before it and to have the matters in dispute adjudicated. The decision of the board "shall be binding upon all persons and all institutions, and shall have the force of a judgment, and shall be carried out in accordance with the usual procedure." Appeal may, however, be made to the local tribunal from the decision of the bureau.

Note.—Minors and men who have attained the age of 55 years and women who have attained the age of 50 years shall be recognized as incapable of work without special proof.

130. The right of a partner in marriage who is necessitous and incapable of work to maintenance by the other partner in marriage shall continue even after the dissolution of the marriage by divorce until such time as the conditions shall be changed which serve as the basis for the receipt of maintenance (art. 107).

The man who marries late in life in bolshevik Russia has an advantage over his brother in less civilized and advanced countries. After attaining the age of 55 years,

in the event that his spouse had not then arrived at the half-century mark, he may legally claim maintenance from the other, and divorce does not in any sense invalidate such right. Verily in Russia under the new dispensation what appears to be full equality between the sexes has been achieved.

There are some "mighty interesting" sections in the chapter dealing with the family, especially that portion which deals with parentage.

133. The basis of the family shall be actual parentage; no distinction shall be established between natural parentage and legitimate parentage.

The term "natural parentage" thus officially takes the place of "illegitimate parentage," another step toward onward progress.

Observation 1. Children not born in matrimony shall have the same rights as children born to persons whose marriage has been registered.

Observation 2. The regulation contained in this article shall apply equally to illegitimate children born before the publication of the decree concerning civil marriage (of Dec. 20, 1917).

134. The persons entered in the register as father and mother shall be held as the father and mother of the child.

135. Failing the registration of the father and mother, or in the case of a false entry in the registry, or an entry lacking sufficient detail, the interested persons shall have the right to prove paternity and maternity by judicial means.

Observation. Questions of parentage shall be within the competence of the local popular tribunal.

136. The right of proving the actual parentage of a child shall belong to the interested persons, and to the mother among them; and those persons shall be registered as father and mother of the child who at the time of its conception or of its birth are united in registered marriage or in a marriage which has the validity of a registered marriage.

137. If during an inquiry into the matter, the tribunal shall

prove that the entry in the register is false and based upon the false evidence of the persons who have passed themselves off as the father and mother, the persons guilty of false evidence shall be prosecuted under the criminal law, and the entry in the register shall be declared void.

138. Within three days of the passing of the sentence the tribunal shall advise the registry office where the birth is registered of the declaration of nullity of the entry, and of the proof of actual parentage of the child, after having made the appropriate alterations in the entry.

139. In cases where the child is not acknowledged by the father, paternity shall be proved in accordance with the forms prescribed in articles 140-145.

Solomon gained an enduring reputation for uncommon wisdom by proving maternity in an interesting case brought before him. The soviet solons are in position to throw the biblical exploit entirely "in the shade" by proving paternity, a matter, it will be admitted, somewhat more difficult.

140. An unmarried pregnant woman shall make a declaration at the registry office not later than three months before the birth of the child indicating the date of conception, the name and domicile of the child's father.

*Observation. A married woman may make a like declaration if the father of the child conceived is not her registered husband.*

Morality must indeed be at a low ebb in soviet Russia, or is expected to sink very low, under the new order if such last section is considered necessary.

141. The register shall advise the person named in the declaration as the father of that declaration (art. 140), and the said person shall have the right, within two weeks of the day upon which he receives the notice, to initiate an action for the nullification of the mother's declaration. Failure to dispute the declaration within the stated period shall be equivalent to the recognition of the child as his.



If the man happens to be out of town or city at the time the declaration is made, or fails to receive the official notice, or is unable to read or to understand the notice that is sent to him, or if at the time he happens to be physically or mentally incapacitated, or for other good and sufficient reasons he is unable to make suitable reply within the brief time limit to the charge of the woman, he is, in the words of the man in the street, "out of luck," and will be compelled publicly to acknowledge and provide for some child that is not his, or not entirely so.

142. Questions of the establishment of paternity shall be examined in accordance with the usual forms, but the parties shall be required to speak the truth [an unnecessary requirement, for the Russian is noted for his passion always to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth], and if they do not fulfill this duty they shall be held responsible as for giving false evidence.

143. If it shall be established that the connection of the persons mentioned in article 141 with the mother of the child was such that in the natural course of things that person would be the father of the child, the tribunal shall pronounce judgment, recognizing that person as the father, and at the same time shall decree that he shall bear a share of all expenditure caused by pregnancy, confinement, birth, and maintenance of the child.

144. If during an inquiry into the matter the tribunal shall establish that at the time of the conception of the child the person mentioned in article 141 had intimate relations with the mother of the child, but at the same time as other persons, the tribunal shall order them all to be summoned as defendants, and shall charge them with a share of the expenses provided in article 143.

How very interesting! A trial along the lines of the sections before mentioned must prove more than interesting, and should furnish even more thrills to the prurient-minded and the sex perverts of Russia than our highly delectable divorce and murder cases, and the testimony

that would be adduced in the course of one of these trials would of a certainty make "mighty interesting reading."

Under the head "Concerning the rights and obligations of children and parents" some quotable sections are found:

145. Children whose parents are not united in registered marriage may bear the name of their father, of their mother, and their united names. The names of such children shall be established by agreement between the parents, and, failing such agreement, by the tribunal.

146. In case of the dissolution of marriage by divorce, or by the nullity of the marriage, the parents shall have the right to decide which of the three names indicated in article 100 the children shall bear. Failing agreement between the parents, the judge alone shall decide, and in case his decision is disputed by the parties, the local tribunal with several judges.

\* \* \* \* \*

149. Parents shall exercise their rights as parents toward male children until the age of 18 years and toward female children until the age of 16 years.

\* \* \* \* \*

153. The rights of parents shall be exercised solely in the interests of the children, and where they are exercised in an unjustifiable manner the tribunal shall have the right to deprive the parents of their rights.

This is rather a stout club for the recalcitrant ones among the supporters of the old order. If nothing else will bring them into line, or if at the time they show a tendency to wander from the bolshevik reservation, they can be charged, if they have children, with exercising their rights as parents in an "unjustifiable manner," and the all-powerful local tribunal may be relied upon to do the rest.

159. In cases where parents have been deprived of their rights the tribunal shall allow the parents meeting with their children, *unless it should be proved that such meetings have a harmful and injurious effect upon the children.*

160. Children shall have no rights to the property of the parents; similarly the parents shall have no right to the property of their children.

It further is provided that parents must furnish "maintenance and support to children who are under age, disabled, and necessitous"; likewise children "shall be required to supply maintenance for their disabled and necessitous parents," unless the latter are in receipt of a state pension. These rights survive the death of one of the parents, or divorce, or the annulment of the marriage.

168. In judging cases concerning the maintenance of children the tribunal shall take into consideration the means of the two parents and their capacity for work, and in the case of a mother capable of work the impossibility for her to earn on account of the care she must devote to her children or on account of pregnancy.

169. Deprivation of the rights of parents shall not excuse them from furnishing the cost of maintenance of their children.

Under the head "Rights and duties of persons who are related" the bolshevik lawmakers have in some of their enactments wandered far from the beaten bourgeois order.

172. Ascendants and descendants, brothers and sisters german and of half blood, shall have the right to receive maintenance from the well-to-do relatives if they are necessitous and disabled.

Observation. *No distinction shall be drawn between legitimate and illegitimate relationships.*

Just at present, according to reliable reports that have filtered out from distracted Russia, the well-to-do are just over the border line of the starving, the cold, and shelterless, without sufficient rags to cover their nakedness and protect them from the pitiless elements, unless they happen to be in the fortunate governmental inner clique, in which case the sections regarding maintenance of a certainty will not apply.

175. Persons sharing the duty of maintenance shall be held responsible for equal amounts, unless the tribunal shall ascertain

any difference in the economic positions of the parents under obligation or unless absence or some other serious cause shall intervene, and the tribunal shall prescribe some other proportion between the shares.

176. The tribunal shall also be empowered, in cases where it is impossible to claim maintenance immediately for the persons from whom it is directly due, to place the same obligation upon persons who occupy a more remote position in the line of persons under obligation for maintenance, reserving to them the right of appeal against those persons who are under obligation to furnish maintenance.

In the superstate the very intelligent and more than civilized Russians had established on the ruins of the capitalist state of the czars the prudent, the able, the intelligent, the energetic, and the ambitious—if such qualities are able to survive the deadening influence of bolshevism—are compelled to furnish maintenance and support to the chronic out-of-works, the shiftless, the lazy, the ne'er-do-wells of society who may claim near relationship, even illegitimate, or, as set forth in section 176, from those “who occupy a more remote position” in the family line.

177. Payments for maintenance may be guaranteed by the award of the tribunal from the property of the persons from whom they are due. Measures may also be taken for the purpose of guaranty before final judgment has been passed upon the claim for maintenance.

After dealing with the matter of death of a parent, or judicial declaration of his death or absence—in free Russia those absent without the permission of the high and mighty ones of the state have the status of the dead and buried—it is provided that “if property left is not sufficient to furnish maintenance to all the rightful claimants, satisfaction shall be given in the first instance to the most necessitous.”

The wishes of those who long may have slaved for the property left behind are not at all to be considered. The needs of those, in a direct or indirect line, who have little or nothing at all alone is to be considered. As the most necessitous in the majority of instances are the least worthy, it goes without saying that injustice rather than justice inevitably must follow the carrying out of such rather remarkable plan.

The rest of the published code furnishes nothing particularly startling or especially out of accord with established laws and customs, so need not be considered. Sufficient has been published, it will be admitted, to give one a line on the mental processes of those mighty ones responsible for the new socialist paradise established in Russia, especially as concerns their attitude toward the family.

It may and possibly will be claimed that the bolshevik revolutionists had not gone so very far, judged by their code, toward real socialism; that registration of marriage, divorce granted by legal bodies of officials of the state after hearing, care and custody of children by parents or guardians, maintenance and support of one citizen by another, private ownership of property, limited inheritances—all these do not quite square with socialist teachings, that had sought for years to impress upon the impressionable that marriage and divorce concerned only the two parties in interest, in which the state should not and as a matter of right could not interfere; that children are the property of the whole community and not of their parents, and the community should see to their maintenance and education; that in the matter of production and distribution the good old socialist rule would prevail, "from each according to his ability, to each according to

his needs"; that private ownership of property—private theft from the community, as many socialists have claimed—would cease and community of goods take its place and therefore there would be nothing to inherit or to bequeath.

These will claim that the old bourgeois or capitalist order is but modified and not destroyed, as had been promised when the socialists sought to secure the upper hand in Russia.

These few doubting ones are requested to have patience, to wait until the proletarian state firmly will be established, when the laws that some few red ones complain of, and possibly justly so, will pass and the necessity for them as well. We can but repeat what had been stated in their preface:

The proletarian government constructs its codes, like all its laws, in a logical fashion; it constructs them in such manner that every day of their existence diminishes the necessity for their existence as state laws; it proposes as the object of its laws the rendering useless of all laws.

These laws, we are informed, cover merely the transition period between the passing out of the old and decadent and the incoming of the new and progressive. Thus they will last only until the cooperative commonwealth that so many visionaries have dreamed of in the dread days of the past becomes an accomplished fact. In that event the free citizen of the socialist state will do the right and proper thing by his fellows and by the state without coercive laws and enactments. Until such blessed time comes laws are a necessity, and will dutifully be observed by all who claim a part in the socialist state of Russia and patiently will be regarded by the socialist comrades in the other lands.

## MME. KOLLONTAY\* ON PROSTITUTION AND MARRIAGE

SOCIALISM in practice (bolshevik Russia) is responsible for yet another official document, that may be studied with advantage by those few benighted and nonprogressive individuals who believe in the existing monogamic marriage system and the present relations between the sexes.

According to *Soviet Russia*, the organ of bolshevism published in New York City by the Russian soviet forces, the women sections of the communist party of Russia were at the third congress addressed by Alexandra Kollontay, chief of the Russian bureau of public welfare and "long the head of the Russian women's movement," on "The fight against prostitution." And we further were informed by the same very reliable authority on

\* Mme. Alexandra Kollontay (War Information Series, No. 20, October, 1918, issued by the U. S. Committee on Public Information) was in a sense in the employ of the imperial German government, and with the other trusted bolshevik agents was relied on to effect Russia's withdrawal from the Great War. "She was sent abroad (to Germany's enemies) for foreign propaganda in February (1918), but did not get beyond Scandinavia, and later returned to Russia."

Document 7 of the series, dated January 12, 1918, addressed to the Commissar of Foreign Affairs (indorsed "Deliver to Comrade Zinovieff and to Secret Department"), and signed "Agfar," identified as Maj. Luberts, head of the German Bureau, is as follows:

"By order of the local department of the German General Staff the intelligence department has reported the names and characteristics of the main candidates for the reelection of the Central Executive Committee. The General Staff orders us to insist on the election of the following persons."

Then follow the names of 25 individuals, among which were Trotsky, Lenin, Zinovieff, Lunarcharsky, *Kollontay* (the only woman on the list), Peters (the "executioner"), and others it is not necessary to mention here. Obedient to "his master's voice," those in control of Russia's affairs at the time reelected the entire lot.

things bolshevik that the soviet government evidently considered such address of sufficient importance to have 40,000 copies printed for general circulation.

Publication is had complete in two issues of *Soviet Russia* (August and September, 1921), from which the following illuminating paragraphs quoted in this paragraph have been taken.

Admission is made at the outset of the address that the question of prostitution is not as simple a one as we had been led to believe by socialist visionaries. We learn also that such evil has the unpleasant habit of cropping up even within the sacred precincts of the socialist state; that it even is "assuming large and intolerably extensive proportions." After the statement that socialism has proven impotent to abolish this evil Mme. Kollontay makes the unpleasant confession:

In our workers' republic there has hitherto been a lack not only of laws aimed at an eradication of this evil, but also of a clear expression of our attitude toward prostitution as an evil harmful to the general good. We know that prostitution is an evil; we even understand that now, in this extremely difficult transition period, prostitution is assuming large and intolerably extensive proportions, but we simply wave it aside, we are silent on this phenomenon, partly through a remnant of hypocrisy that is still with us as the heritage of the bourgeois view of life, partly through inability to properly grasp and become conscious of the damage which a widely developed prostitution is inflicting upon the working society. To this is to be ascribed the neglect of the question of prostitution and of the ways of combating it which has been manifest hitherto in our legislation.

Up to the present time the collection of our laws has been lacking in any kind of legislation touching upon prostitution as a dangerous social phenomenon. When the old tsarist laws were annulled by the council of people's commissars all the legislation on prostitution was abolished together with them. But there were not introduced as a substitution for the abolished measures any



new laws in the interest of the workers' society. This is because of the unnaturally motley nature of our measures, of the contradiction that characterizes the policy of the soviet power in various places on the subject of prostitution and the prostitutes themselves. In certain places there have been carried out regular hunts for prostitutes, conducted "in the old style" with the aid of militia. In other places the disorderly houses exist openly (in the interdepartmental commission for combating prostitution actual data on this subject are available). In other places still the prostitutes were declared to have the same status as criminals, and were interned in hard labor camps. All this shows that the absence of a clearly formulated legislation creates an extremely confused relation between the local powers and this complicated social phenomenon, producing a number of varied and harmful deviations from our principles of legislation and morality.

It is necessary, therefore, not only to approach the question of prostitution directly, but also to seek a solution of it that would be in accordance with the fundamental principles and postulates of the social and national economic program of the communist party.

At this point it occurs to our learned friend to propound the query that should have been had at the beginning of her address, "What is prostitution?" And her answer thereto enlightens us not only on that but as well on the "fundamental principles and postulates of the social \* \* \* program of the communist party":

It is first of all necessary precisely to define what is prostitution. Prostitution is a phenomenon closely bound up with an income not earned by labor, and it therefore flourished in the epoch of the rule of capitalism and private property.

This is but a restatement of the proposition of Bax that the prostitute is immoral because she takes advantage "of a monopoly which costs her no labor for the sake of extorting money from the man." Mme. Kollontay continues:

Prostitutes from our standpoint are all women who sell their caresses, their bodies, for temporary or extended periods for the advantage of men, in return for material compensation, for fine food, clothes, trinkets, or adornments, and for the right obtained by selling themselves to men, not to undertake any labor, not to subject themselves to work of any kind.

Prostitution in our soviet republic of workers is an outright inheritance of the bourgeois capitalist past, in which only an insignificant number of women *were occupied with productive labor in the national economy*, while an enormous number, more than half of the entire female population, lived from the labor of their husbands or their fathers—their “meal tickets.”

Further along in her address our friend is honest enough to inform her hearers that in the eyes of socialist officialdom the married woman who goes about her household duties is of a class with the prostitute; that the only way in which she can be redeemed is to let the private household go hang and busy herself in productive labor for the socialized state. We believe we are justified in this conception by the following:

All women who desert their labor, who take no part in the obligatory work, and who are not performing any work for small children at home are placed on an equal footing with the prostitute—they must be forced to work. *And we can not make any distinction here between the prostitute and the most lawful wife who lives on her husband's sustenance, whoever her husband may be, even though he be a “commissar.”*

And when called on to fight this evil the same degree of frankness is shown. It is clearly indicated that the fight is not on immorality *per se*, but only that form which withdraws woman from productive labor for the state:

But when we consider the prostitutes and fight them as a nonproductive element of society we are not placing them in a special category. For us, for the republic of the workers, *it is absolutely a matter of indifference whether a woman sells her-*

*self to one man or to many, whether she is a professional prostitute living by some other source than her own useful labor or by the sale of her caresses to a legal husband or to an occasional purchaser of female flesh, whose identity may vary from day to day. \* \* \**

In other words, we are going to introduce equal treatment for all deserters from labor. From the standpoint of the workers' collective a woman is to be condemned, *not for selling her body but for the fact that, just like a legally married woman, she does no useful work for the collective.* This new, absolutely new, procedure with prostitution is dictated by the interest of the workers' collective.

There is another reason why war is to be made on this form of immorality, and that is for the practical one of protecting the public health:

Soviet Russia is interested in preventing the disorganization and lowering of the working powers of the population, as well as their capacity for work, by sickness and indispositions.

We have the admission that the red army is a potent factor in the spread of venereal diseases. Thus:

Besides, in our extremely agitated transition period, as far as moral views are concerned, owing to the constant gathering and uninterrupted transfer of the army from one place to another, *venereal diseases are spread to a remarkable extent, quite independently of the agency of commercial prostitution.* For instance, in the southern fruitful provinces civil war has been in progress. The male cossack population has been scattered, driven out, has gone off with the whites, or been scattered to the winds. In the settlements there remain only the women. They had enough of everything, but there were no men. Red armies advance and take the town, they are billeted out, and remain in the city for weeks at a time. As a result there are mutual attractions, free alliances, having no similarity whatever with prostitution, since the women in this case voluntarily associate with the men, as a result of inclination and without any calculation of material gain on their side.

For examples of these "free alliances" the reader respectfully is directed to read again the official proclamation of the forces that drove out the reds from Ekaterinodar, or statements from impartial non-Russian observers at Odessa and other points.

It is not the red army man who feeds the woman, but the reverse; it is she who takes care of him, mends his clothes, shelters him as long as the army is quartered in the settlement. But the army departs, and as a consequence the settlement has become infected with venereal diseases. The same thing has been repeated with cities and villages which are taken by the whites.

A general contamination is constantly going on. The diseases are spread, increased and threaten to wipe out the entire unborn generation. In the joint session of the Motherhood Protection Society and the Provincial Women's Sections Prof. Koltsov spoke on hygiene, the science of healing and perfecting mankind. Closely related with this task is the question of the struggle against prostitution, which is one of the most active causes of infection from person to person.

There still is another reason than that before set forth why the "workers' republic" is asked unceasingly and relentlessly to make war on prostitutes and prostitution. With true socialist logic Mme. Kollontay continues in the following strain:

The third reason why prostitution is inadmissible in a soviet workers' republic is that it prevents the development and solidification of the fundamental class qualities of the proletariat, of its new morality. What is the fundamental property of the working class, the most powerful moral weapon in its struggle? The feeling of comradeship, of solidarity. Solidarity is the foundation of communism. Without this strongly established feeling among the mankind of the workers it is inconceivable that we shall erect a new truly communist society. Of course, it is self-evident that conscious communists must with all their powers aid in the development of this feeling, and, conversely, must with all their

might struggle with those forces that would hinder this development and prevent the solidification of such qualities and characteristics of the working class of the toiling population.

What is it that follows in the wake of prostitution? A debasement of the feeling of equality, of solidarity, and comradeship between the sexes; in other words, between the two halves of the working class. The man who purchases the caresses of women begins to look upon women as a commodity. He regards women as dependent upon himself; in other words, as creatures of a lower order, not entitled to equal rights, not of equal value to the workers' government. His contemptuous attitude to the prostitute whose attentions he has purchased for her material gain he transfers to all women. Instead of a growth of the feeling of comradeship, equality, and solidarity we shall have, if prostitution should further develop, a strengthening of the conditions of inequality between the sexes, of the feeling of the superiority of man, the dependence of woman on him—in other words, a decrease in the solidarity of the whole working class.

To achieve this "feeling of comradeship, equality, and solidarity" prostitution (hire) must give way to the community (free gift) of women to those who zealously follow in the footsteps of a Lenin and a Trotsky. The red comrade is expected to have the proper communistic feeling toward his helpless comrade of the other sex delivered to his lust, as were tens of thousands in the sections where the bolshevik blight had fallen.

Mme. Kollontay, as a Marxian socialist, harbors, of course, the current "scientific" socialist obsession that the monogamic marriage ("legal sale" of the female to the male) is inextricably linked with prostitution ("hire" of one by the other). Both, to them, are evils, and both most go and will of a certainty go when socialism really finds itself.

First, according to her, prostitution must be eliminated in all its forms; then it is expected that the communist

authorities will adequately deal with the "kept woman," she who is wife to the man and mistress of his household.

Prostitution as practiced in other civilizations, we are informed, is "very little developed among us and is of very slight extent." It has assumed this new form:

The second form of prostitution, although it is highly developed and extremely extensive in bourgeois capitalistic countries, \* \* \* also assumes a great variety of forms in our country. Prostitution is practiced by the soviet office employees, in order to obtain by the sale of their caresses boots that go up to the knee; *prostitution is resorted to by mothers of families, working women, peasant women, who are out after flour for their children, and sell their bodies to the manager of the rations division in order to obtain from him a full bag of the precious flour. Sometimes the girls in the offices associate with their male superiors not for manifestly material gains—for rations, shoes, etc.—but in the hope of advancement in office. And there is an additional form of prostitution—"careerist prostitution"—which is also based, in the last analysis, however, on material calculations.*

Our very voluble friend next takes up the proposition of prevention and punishment:

How shall we fight these conditions? There was proposed to the interdepartmental commission the question of a punishment of prostitution by law. Many of the representatives in the interdepartmental commission were inclined to favor the method of subjecting the prostitute to legal prosecution, *by reason of the fact that the professional prostitute is a rank deserter from work.* A recognition of the culpability of the prostitute logically led to an admission of the legality of the hunts for prostitutes, of their interment in concentration camps, etc.

The central organ came out clearly and resolutely against this conception of the matter. If it is proper to permit hunts for prostitutes, *it follows that similar hunts should be made for such lawful wives as are existing on the means of their husbands and are of no use to the state. The latter are just as much deserters from work as are the prostitutes. It is proper and logical to put*

*prostitutes into concentration camps only in cases where lawful wives, not occupied with productive labor, are also interned for similar reasons.*

Such was the standpoint of the central organ, *which was supported by the representatives of the people's commissariat of justice. If we take the factor of desertion from labor as the defining element of the crime, we shall have no outlet; all the forms of desertion from labor will be rendered equal by the punishment.*

The factor of conjugal relations, of a relation between the sexes, is eliminated. *That factor can not serve as the defining element of a crime in the workers' republic.*

With logic typical of the dyed-in-the-wool socialist, Mme. Kollontay would have her hearers believe that the particular crime of the prostitute in the bourgeois state was not because of the "informality of her conjugal relationship," but "for the shortness of its duration." The legality of the marriage relation, it naturally follows, was because of its permanent or semi-permanent form—"until death do us part," or the courts. This brings this chunk of philosophic wisdom:

Can the short duration, the informality, the freedom of the relation between the sexes be regarded, from the standpoint of working humanity, as a crime, as an act that should be subject to punishment? Of course not. *The freedom of relations between the sexes does not contradict the ideology of communism. The interests of the commonwealth of the workers are not in any way disturbed by the fact that marriage is of a short or prolonged duration, whether its basis is love, passion, or even a transitory physical attraction.*

The *only thing* that is harmful to the workers' collective, and therefore inadmissible, *is the element of material calculation between the sexes*, whether it be in the form of prostitution, *in the form of legal marriage*—the substitution of a crassly materialistic calculation of gain for a free association of the sexes on the basis of mutual attraction.

This factor is harmful, is inadmissible, will cut a breach in the

feeling of equality and solidarity between the sexes. And from this standpoint we must condemn prostitution, as a trade, in all its shapes and forms, *even that of the legal "wives," who maintain their sad part, so intolerable in the workers' republic.*

Though the question of punishment of the "women who have labor books, but who still engage in prostitution as an underground trade, as well as all the women who are supported by their husbands," was ruled out by the inter-departmental commission, backed up by the commissariat of justice and the other worth-while sections of the communist state, it was not to be supposed that other weapons would not be employed:

But much can be done and much must be done.

The women's sections in the provinces also must enter into contact with the national educators, *in order to push into the foreground the question of proper provision for sexual enlightenment in the schools.* In addition a number of conversations and lessons must be introduced of social-scientific or scientific-hygienic character as to questions of marriage, the family, the history of the form of the relationship between the sexes, the dependence of these forms and of sexual morality itself on purely economic, material causes.

It is time to introduce clearness into the question of the relationship between the sexes. It is time to preach with merciless and rigidly scientific criticism.

With the youth of the socialist state well grounded in the "new morality" through lessons taught in such schools as they have, it is expected that socialist moral teachings will have greater stability than they would have if the matured only were the pupils.

The old psychology, we are informed, fast is crumbling away and is all but outlawed in the socialist state. A new psychology has been proclaimed, and ruthlessly must be defended, not only in the sacrosanct socialist state but wherever socialism has any force, any vitality.



Our task is to reeducate the psychology of the working commonwealth, to bring it into correspondence with the economic tasks of the working class. We must without reservation discard our old outlawed conceptions, to which we are attached as to a bad habit. Economics have now defined our ideology. Look about you and behold the foundations of the former economic institutions crumbling. *With them there go down also the foundations of the earlier form of marriage.* And yet we are chained to the early marriage system, to the bourgeois form of the family. We are ready to renounce all the accustomed forms of life, ready to hail the revolution in every field, and yet are afraid to touch the family! Only do not touch the marriage system! Even conscious communists are afraid to look the truth in the face and wave aside those fundamentals which bear witness to the fact that the former family ties are breaking, *as the new economic forms dictate also new forms of association between the sexes.* This results in outright abnormalities.

The soviet power *has recognized woman as a working unit, valued by national economy,* has placed her, as a working, toiling force, on the same footing with man, but in the actual conditions of life we are still maintaining the "old régime" and are ready to acknowledge the normality of marriages based on the material dependence of women on men. But if we wage a struggle against prostitution *we should also introduce clearness into these conjugal relations that are still built on the old principle of "purchase and sale."* We must learn to be ruthless, to fear no sentimental outcries as to the fact that "by our criticism, our preaching of scientific truths, we violate the sanctity of family ties."

Replying to her own query, "Is the family doomed?" Mme. Kollontay frankly says:

It is necessary to declare the truth outright, *the old form of the family is passing away; the communist society has no use for it.* The bourgeois world celebrated the isolation, the cutting off of the married pair from the collective weal; in the scattered and disjointed individual bourgeois society, full of struggle and destruction, the family was the sole anchor of hope in the storms of life, the peaceful haven in the ocean of hostilities and competi-

tions between persons. The family represented an independent class in the collective unit. *There can and must be no such thing in the communist society.* For communist society as a whole represents such a fortress of the collective life, precluding any possibility of the existence of an isolated class of family bodies, existing by itself, with its ties of birth, with its female egoism, its love of family honor, its absolute segregation.

Already ties of blood, of birth, *and even of the relationship of conjugal love,* are weakening in our eyes; in their turn there are growing, spreading, and deepening new ties, ties of the working family, the profound feeling of comradeship of solidarity, of community of interests, the creation of a collective responsibility, of a belief in the collective welfare as the highest moral-legislative good.

What marriage is to become in the future or, more properly, what are to be the forms of relationship between the sexes in the future it would be difficult to foretell. But one thing is beyond doubt; that is, that under communism there will be lacking in the conjugal relationship not only all material calculation, all economic dependence of woman on man, but also all the other considerations of "convenience" which frequently characterize present-day marriage. \* \* \*

Prostitution under communism is passing into the domain of the forgotten past, *together with the morbid forms of the present-day family. In its place there are growing healthy, joyful, and free relations between the sexes.* A new generation is growing up to replace the old, with more developed social feelings, *with greater mutual independence, with more freedom, health, and courage,* a generation for whom the welfare of the whole will stand higher than anything else. \* \* \*

Comrades! Our task is to destroy the roots that nourish prostitution. Our task is to wage relentless warfare on the vestiges of individualism, which has hitherto been the moral basis of marriage. Our task is to revolutionize thought in the field of marriage relations and to clear the way for a new, healthy conjugal morality that shall correspond with the interests of the workers' commonwealth. After it has outlived the morality and conjugal forms of the present day the communist commonwealth will have disposed also of prostitution.

We must all put our shoulders to the wheel, comrades! In the place of the family which is passing away, the family of the past, there is already arising, solidifying, and spreading the new family—the great workers' family of the victorious world proletariat.

Taken in connection with the "Marriage laws of soviet Russia," especially its official explanatory preface by Mr. Hoichbarg, Mme. Kollontay's address as a valued official of the soviet state to a recognized section of the third communist congress, must be regarded as an indorsement of the position of antisocialists that the success of socialism inevitably will bring about the destruction of the present-day family and the substitution of the "free union" of the sexes, sung of by Bebel, Engels, and the other anointed ones of socialism in those blessed days when socialism was but a theory instead of, as in bankrupt Russia, a sad fact.