

BULLETIN No. 5

Socialism vs. Legal Marriage

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION

OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

1523 DEARBORN AVENUE

CHICAGO

103269

THE PUBLISHER

SEP 6 1910

Socialism vs. Legal Marriage.

IT is well to notice that every platform issued by the Socialistic party, for the last thirty years, commences by demanding universal suffrage for all persons over twenty-one years of age, without distinction of color or Sex. It thus appears that while every suffragist may not be a socialist, though many of them are, every socialist is necessarily a woman suffragist. Indeed, it does not require very exhaustive study of Socialism to show that woman suffrage is the corner-stone of the whole fabric, which is the reason that socialists insist so strongly upon it in all their platforms. So long as family life, the law of inheritance, and parental affection endure, so long will it be impossible to bring in the day of equality of classes, State care of children and that total disregard of the divine law which Socialism inculcates. The walls that nature has been so busy building up from the very foundations of life must all be levelled, the processes of evolution be revolutionized, and, as a noted Socialist freely confesses, a new method of development be devised and executed before the theories of Socialism can be realized. Equal work, equal pay, and equal political privileges do not in any way harmonize with woman's inalienable work, which is the reason that the Socialistic state is appointed the guardian of children. Who is to *bear* those necessary children is a question which is carefully thrust out of sight in most Socialistic manifestoes.

It is just here that the difference between Republicanism and Socialism becomes prominent. Our Fathers founded this Republic, the best that the world has ever seen, upon the family as the unit of Society. Socialism declares the individual, without reference to sex, to be that unit; thus ignoring the dual nature of humanity and making the birth of the child, which is in reality the crowning event of human life, a matter of no account; an incident to be ignored so far as the individual is concerned. The men who founded this Republic believed that the relations between men and women were of the first importance to the welfare of Society; that they were as much the subject of law as any other propensity, which wrongly indulged, leads to acts that are prejudicial to Society. Lying, stealing, murder, and adultery, at least as far back as the time of Moses, were recognized as social sins of the first class. Perjury and stealing are still states-prison offences. Murder is a capital crime, in most states, and at the very least involves a

life-long penalty. Legal marriage carefully defines what relations between men and women shall be upheld by law. Marriage can only be assumed or ended by legal process. The father is made responsible by law for the material welfare of the child; and in case the marriage-bond is legally broken through his fault, he must pay alimony for the support of both mother and child, if there be issue. The distinction which the law makes is clear and strong. It gives to the mother and her lawful child privileges in this respect which it bestowes upon no others. The mother pays no alimony, because she is not supposed to be in any case responsible for the child's material welfare. The responsibility of the mother, however, for the nurture and upbringing of the child which is the mutual offspring of herself and her husband, is expressed in her entire exemption from political duties. This is not because of her incapacity, nor weakness in any but a physical sense, but because of the onerous and important duties of the mother. It is quite apparent to any thoughtful observer that if she neglects this duty in the first decade of her child's life nothing which she may do in its later years can atone for the short-coming. And these are duties which no one can perform but herself.

Such are some of the "rights" established by law which women give up when they discard civil marriage—which they must do if Socialism prevails—and accept instead the "emancipation" which Socialism offers. Women have not yet been made to believe that this exchange is a safe or desirable one.

What this emancipation from the bonds of matrimony really is, is well known. Lest there may be any doubt upon the subject, I refer briefly to the opinion of two well-known women, as expressed in their own words. On page 496, Vol. I of Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony's "History of Woman Suffrage," Mrs. Stanton is recorded as saying:

"A union of souls constitutes and sanctifies true marriage; and * * any law or public sentiment that forces two immortal and high-born souls to live together as husband and wife unless held there by love, is false to God and humanity."

Mrs. Stanton's views on marriage and divorce and the source from which they are derived are well known. They plainly indicate how academic is Socialism and how eminently practical is the opposition to it.

Eleanor, daughter of Karl Marx and the unmarried wife of Dr. Edward Aveling, her father's intimate friend and translator of his chief work, *Das Kapital*, is reported and editorially commented upon by the *Chicago Tribune* of November 14-15, 1886, as saying in Chicago before many witnesses, that:

"Love is the only marriage recognized in Socialism, consequently no bonds of any kind would be required; that divorces would be impossible because there would be nothing to divorce, for when love ceased separation would naturally ensue."

For the tragic ending of Eleanor Mark's life, see "One Woman's Experience of Emancipation," published by the Illinois Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. Aside from being a matter of newspaper notoriety, these events were brought to the notice of this Association by a woman of international literary reputation, then residing in London and familiar with the facts. In late years, there has been no question that Socialism either repudiates marriage altogether, or advocates the popular notion of unlimited divorce.

Socialism, instead of holding the father responsible for his child, consigns it to the care of the State, thus reducing man far below the status of the more intelligent animals, removing every restraint from his predatory instincts, and thrusting out from the nature of woman, that maternal love from which, it is the unalterable dictum of science, every other altruistic sentiment flows. What then becomes of the affection, self-sacrifice, devotion, which are confessedly the highest attributes of human nature and from which have been developed the noblest characteristics of the race?

The pleasures of love are evanescent; but the duties of love do not end with fruition. Neither is the nature of mankind so immaculate in this respect that it may safely be left unrestrained by law. The birth of the child is the one important event of race history, because it insures the perpetuity of Man. The nurture and education of the child thus become of vital importance, and the highest degree of this nurture, all social history declares to be the outcome of the well-ordered home.

This education devolves largely upon the mother because in the first decade of the child's life she is almost the only power to which it is either morally or legally responsible. In all this time, she has far more important duties to attend to, duties whose consequences she can not evade, however she may ignore them, than those of politics. She is rightly exempted therefore from the cares of State.

There are no economic questions which may not be discussed and settled, to the advantage of all concerned, without the votes of women; but when a proposed change of government involves, as this does, a radical departure from the civilized, we may say the Christian ideal of the home as the unit of the State, it becomes revolutionary and should be sharply questioned by both men and women before being adopted. It is to this point that the doctrine of Woman Suffrage brings the modern Republic.

September, 1910.