

130
A
1

"The Word" Library—No. 6.

STUDIES

— IN —

COMMUNISM

By

GUY A. ALDRED

Price - 6d.

1940

GLASGOW:

The Strickland Press, 104 George Street, C.1.

Bakunin Press, Bakunin Hall, 29 Castle St., C.4.

KIRKWOOD
(PRINTERS) LTD.
152 CLYDE ST., GLASGOW

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Author's General Foreword | 3 |
| I.—The Case For Anarchism | 5 |
| This essay consists of 4 chapters. | |
| II.—Representation And The State | 12 |
| This essay consists of 2 lengthy chapters. | |
| III.—Trade Unionism And The Class War— | |
| Author's Note (1919) | 26 |
| I.—Trade Unionism and Revolution | 26 |
| II.—The Case For Trade Unionism | 28 |
| III.—The Workers' Case Against Trade Unionism | 30 |
| IV.—The Question of Representation | 33 |
| IV.—Socialism and Marriage— | |
| Foreword (1940) | 38 |
| This pamphlet consists of 6 chapters and an Author's Note (1939). | |
| V.—Against Terrorism In The Workers' Struggle | 53 |
| Appendices— | |
| Pamphlet 3—Trades Unionism Against Armageddon | 58 |
| Pamphlet 4—1936 Committee on Law of Scotland Relating to Marriage | 59 |

Author's General Foreword

This book consists of five pamphlets, previously published as follows:—

(1) THE CASE FOR ANARCHISM.

This pamphlet consisted of two essays reprinted from the London Anarchist paper, *Freedom*, 1906. It was published as No. 1 in the *Pamphlets For The Proletarian* library that year, from 133 Goswell Road, London, E.C. The title then used was: *The Possibility and Philosophy of Anarchist Communism*. It was very slightly revised and re-published in *The Spur Series, No. 3* as *The Case For Communism*, from 17 Richmond Gardens, in 1919.

Soviet Russia has identified Communism completely with authority. It seems reasonable to change the title to *The Case For Anarchism*.

(2) REPRESENTATION AND THE STATE.

Pamphlets For The Proletarian, No. 10. Printed and Published by the Bakunin Press at 64 Minford Gardens, Shepherds Bush, London, W., 1910. In the title page, the author was described as: "Minister of the Gospel of Revolt, Late Prisoner for Sedition."

This pamphlet is unaltered.

(3) TRADE UNIONISM AND THE CLASS WAR.

Pamphlets For The Proletarian, No. 11. Printed and Published by the Bakunin Press, 17 Richmond Gardens, Shepherds Bush, London, W., 1911. Second Edition, published, same address, 1919. The *Spur Series, No. 4.* Last Chapter, on Representation, was omitted, now restored. A few phrases are made simpler. No matter added or excised.

(4) SOCIALISM AND MARRIAGE.

(The Spur Series, No. 1, Published by the Author at 17 Richmond Gardens, Shepherds Bush, London, W., 1914. Revised from "The Religion and Economics of Sex Oppression," Published in 1907.)

(5) AGAINST TERRORISM IN THE WORKERS' STRUGGLE.

This is the only one of these pamphlets to which the author's name was not attached. The reason is, it was issued for a committee and the members were opposed to the author's name being pub-

Author's General Foreword

lished. Particulars of publication and date (March, 1938) are found in text of the pamphlet.

The 1919 Foreword to *Trade Unionism* will be found at the beginning of that pamphlet. I have written a 1940 Foreword to *Socialism and Marriage*.

Except to the very slight extent explained in this general introduction, there has been no alteration made in the text of these essays. My desire has been to bring them together as a contribution to the propaganda literature of the working class movement. Radical alteration would have defeated that purpose.

The reader will understand that the author termed himself "a Communist" in 1906. He uses the term in the sense he then employed it, in the sense that William Morris employed it, the sense of world harmony, social love, service, and commonweal. Soviet Terrorism has made the term "Communism" identical with dictatorship and totalitarian oppression, assassination, and darkness. To this, the author is opposed. To Communism as thus understood, he pledges his uncompromising hostility and denies that it is Communism in the true, historic sense of the term. The pioneers of Socialism and working-class struggle never intended to inaugurate a reign of terror. Their aim was to destroy war, uproot violence, remove injustice, establish freedom, and make the world at once a garden, a playground, and a workshop. One day, this dream will become reality. Meantime, I gaze towards the promised land. Perhaps, like others who went before me, I shall die ere humanity ends its march of travail and homicide by entry into the long-sought commonweal. That matters little, so long, as after many false dawns, the true dawn comes at last.

Generations of humanity have hungered long and wearily. The night must end. The day of freedom and security, of calm well-being, must arrive at last.

Glasgow, May 15, 1940.

GUY A. ALDRED.

The Case for Anarchism

I.

The prophet of despair is ever with us; and to him there is no silver lining to any cloud, no promise of sunshine after the storm, no people so fair and upright as to be able to act honourably unless force or fear are brought to bear upon them. To him the whole social horizon is shrouded in darkness, and not a ray of freedom's sun is there to separate cloud from cloud. Humanity is inherently bad, and is for ever doomed to be divided into dominated and dominators. Governments based on fraud and coercion, a representative system founded on legislative corruption, a poverty to offer the contrast to an equally immoral bestial luxury: these things are the ends of all being, the tombs of all aspirations, the alpha and omega of the social serf's existence. To dream of a society not founded on the "law of constructive murder," of a social state in which all are brethren and peace and good fellowship prevail, of a society founded on truth and freedom, is to become an enemy of the society that is, and to be regarded as a dreamer of the most fanatical type. And in the eyes of your "practical" and "business man," no less so than in the eyes of any other prophet of despair, to dream of anything other than of personal success or Mammon is an unforgivable offence, socially, like unto the theological sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

What these deprecators of idealism fail to realise is that all social progress turns upon the continual striving of the individual and the community after something better, the continual being and becoming of the whole of Nature, the eternal discontent underlying the most practical of human endeavour. It follows, therefore, from a recognition of this fact that no serious argument can be urged against the propaganda of the Communist on the score of his idealism. For, if by idealism be understood the yearning after some state of society or of individual being, and the moulding of the present to realise your dream in the future, then surely there is a touch of the impracticability of idealism about the operation of Wall Street and Stock Exchange financiers. And yet they realise their dreams. Why, then, if the socially maleficent dream of the millionaire can be realised, cannot the socially beneficent dream of the Communist be realised? Is it that behind the forces of Nature there exists an omnipotent power for evil, and that not God, but Devil, reigns o'er all? If so, whence the sweet fragrance of the flowers, the artistic culture of the race, the rich verdure of the fields, the impressive heights of mountain ranges, the beauties of the undulating plains, the luxury of Nature's foliage? Does not the evil in Nature counteract the good? Is it not obvious

Studies in Communism

to the student that the whole of being is reducible to no explanation that turns upon the existence of either moral or immoral conscious sources of being, but that the basis of all physical and social activity is an *un-moral* tendency to be?

If this be granted, as needs it reasonably must, then we are faced with the fact of man not merely being a social animal, but also a selfish one; the development of the selfish instinct being of such a kind as to increasingly occasion the production of those types of character which serve to give an ethical turn to the survival of the fittest, and to make for a state of society in which the purest and ethically fittest can survive. This assertion is founded on no mere Anarchist's dream, but is the substance of the well-reasoned address on "Evolution and Ethics" which Professor Huxley delivered as the Romanes Lecture for 1893. And even though this distinguished scientist and veteran philosopher confessed that "strict Anarchy may be the highest conceivable grade of perfection of social existence," no one will accuse him of basing his expositions of ethical evolution on romantic musings, or on data other than that which he had submitted to severe analysis. Nor is it necessary to rely on Huxley's testimony. It is sufficient that we trace up the evolution of species, watch the development of the social spirit in man, examine the basis of "duty," and read pages of history. All these studies will but serve to vindicate the truth of Huxley's contention.

What, then, is man as we know him in the highest stage of actual and potential development? What is his relation as actual or potential being, respectively to his present environment and Communist state of society? Let us see.

Man as we know him, in the highest actual stage of development, loves learning, yearns after truth, and identifies his personal happiness with the realisation and maintenance of his ideals. The vast number of artists, poets, philosophers, and scientists who have suffered penury and persecution for their principles prove this. The numerous pioneers of Freethought and social liberty who have been burned at the stake, murdered by the Inquisition, racked, tortured, hanged and strangled, bear a like testimony. The willingness of the mother to suffer for her children lends further testimony to the inherent social idealism of the individual. Whilst the fact that those who would prey on their fellows do so in the name of justice, of spirituality, and of truth, supplies the final emphasis. Hence we see humanity is not ruled, at bottom, by coercion, nor by fear, nor yet by injustice. That these things should exist but means that ignorance abounds. Let ignorance be removed, and it will be seen that knowledge is virtue as well as power. Knowledge spells justice, freedom, happiness. But neither justice, nor freedom, nor happi-

The Case For Anarchism

ness can exist where the many are dominated by the few. For, self-contained as each individual should be, loyal unto the internal canons of thought as opposed to external authority, man is, nevertheless, so far as his sense impressions and social existence is concerned, a part of the social organism, an ethical unit, and an intellectual cellular activity acting and reacting upon the society of which he is a part, and upon the cellular activities to which he is related. Each of these activities or social atoms is dominated by the will to be, adaptation to and of the being. Hence we find that adaptation to and of the environments is continual, those organisms surviving longest which adapt themselves the more readily to their environment.

This process of development tends to become an ethical one and to identify individual ability and power to survive with the evolution of the social instinct and desire to serve. It follows, most distinctly, that capitalist environment not only favours, but creates the Communist.

Our right to live, is conditioned by the intellectual and economic forces which surround us. These forces demand that each organism shall perform certain social functions in order to maintain its own right to existence. To exhibit vitality the primordial law of life. But it is impossible to obey this law, without which being cannot be manifested, unless we harmonise with our environment. It is impossible to live and to impoverish. The law of life is that, only by enriching our environment, by rendering it more vital and depriving it of death and decay, can we survive. Only by nourishing can we gather nourishment. Selfishness teaches us to discharge duties as well as to preserve rights.

The logical expression of this selfishness of the individual is the doing of good because it is good. We incline to abolish suffering because pain to others occasions agony for ourselves. We are impelled to produce the best of which we are capable because our natures demand thoroughness in the discharge of those functions for which our organisms are fitted. Equally, we are compelled to take from the community all that is necessary to the maintenance of our being, because the welfare of all requires that the individual craving or appetite should be satisfied. Thus rights involve duties and duties proclaim rights.

Idiosyncrasies vary and cannot be crushed. Men and women insist on discovering hobbies with which to amuse themselves after having sweated for a master. Does it not follow that, in a free society, not only would each work for all, but each would toil with earnest devotion at that which best suited and expressed his or her temperament? There would exist, in consequence, not merely a purer and freer society, not only happier and nobler individuals,

Studies in Communism

but a practical individualism, a sound and sane collectivism. The forms and modes of productivity and distribution would tend to good food, healthy living, decent clothing, and equal intellectual and moral liberty for all. Hence the thoroughness of production and distribution would be co-existent with a minimum of labour and a maximum of pleasure. Liberty would co-exist with social service, because the power to dictate and the desire to invade would be abolished.

It may be said that this is mere theory. Quite so. But what if it is only theory? Have we not reasoned together logically from data scientifically collected? All the data relevant to the problem under discussion has been considered. None has been ignored or overlooked. There exists no facts which militate either against the basic assumptions or main contentions of the theory.

Communist theory, is but an anticipation in thought of what will occur inevitably in reality. It is a correct outlining of the future.

II.

Had there been no pioneers who died for Truth, Communism would be impossible of realisation. If none had been burned for Liberty, then there could be no Anarchy. Were there no mother-love, then the Earth would not be our common mother, and the sun would not shine to give warmth and light to us all. But there is an idealism of the past and of the present which conditions the future. There have been Brunos and Spinozas and Chicago Martyrs. Isaiah has triumphed over Moses. Within the most depraved breast, there does exist a spark of chivalry which often consumes the entire being of the outcast sinner; there dwells many a virtuous inclination which the surrounding world of respectability conspires to crush and to decline. Modern society seems to thrive on an acquired taste for sordid criminality. But even society is moved, at its respectable worst, by something nobler than an instinct and aptitude for crime.

The world is governed even to-day by its impulse towards liberty and love. "Truth" and "Honour" are not empty sounds, but the dearest of the world's ideals. So much we know. Then let us be logical and recognise that the Free Society of which we dream is something beyond a mere possibility. It is not a vain imagining of the better things that might be. But the inevitable goal of our social revolution.

III.

With the advent of capitalism, theological speculation entered upon its period of decline. The dark serpent of theological superstition lost its hold over the minds of children and adults.

The Case For Anarchism

Influenced by its growing sense of power over nature, humanity lost its fear of god. The world ceased to be a battle-ground for unknown divinities. It was a mystery wonder land no more. It became a realm of established fact and experience, of scientific investigation and regulated discovery. Its philosophy, in consequence, became utilitarian.

Underlying all social progress is the first law of Nature, the law of self-preservation. So long as man could safely live unto himself, he paid little attention to the wants of his fellows. Experience taught him the folly of isolation. He realised that, from time to time, he ran risks of being deprived of his existence. Alone, he sometimes lacked the means to sustain his being. Each day convinced him of his ever-increasing indebtedness to his fellows. He consented to recognise his obligations and so became a social animal. But it was self-interest which dictated his growth in wisdom and in understanding and in moral righteousness. Selfishness lies at the root of all social and industrial development.

The apparent growth in the Altruistic mode of expressing our individual selfishness tends to belie the primary selfishness of our individual desires. Thus we find in the tribal state a slow decay in the massacring of prisoners of war in order to turn them to account as slaves. Chattel slavery gives way to free slavery when the economic interests demand the change. To retain power a dominant class ever concedes advantages to those under the yoke of its oppression.

Altruism plays no part in the march of industrial progress. The utilitarian instinct or self-preservation desire is the deciding factor. Not a dualistic crossing of Altruism and Egotism, but a naturally evolved egoism explains the nature of the individual's progress in Communistic inclinations.

IV.

The nature of a species can be changed completely as a result of the modifications resulting from the passage through a series of environments. But *only the expression* is modified in the case of the effect of factors operative in the environment on the nature of an individual member of the species. By adding to or subtracting from the ethical factors in a human being's environment, it is possible to divert his inclinations from one channel to another. Meantime, economic conditions are tending constantly to alter the individual's attitude towards abstract ideas. Hence, in our maturity, we respond not only to intellectual truth but also to the ever-increasing pressure of economic interest. Our rectitude is modified by the action and reaction which exists between the idealism of philosophy and the determinism of industrial conditions.

In the fact of this action and re-action so existing is to be found the cause of our present chaos and uncertainty in all revolutionary propaganda. Our only emancipation from the resulting apparent confusion will be found in the intellectual and economic destinies which constitute the logic shaping the ends of communities as well as of individuals. Whilst individually, man may be said by virtue of his heredity to largely mould his environment to his own ends, the ideals and inclinations of the race are moulded by external conditions. Hence, socially a creature of circumstances, man is individually a free being capable of influencing his environment, as also of adapting it to his own ends. Only in so far, as he is a member of a society which recognises his natural freedom can he identify his interests with that of society. Only in proportion as he realises the influence society exercises in the moulding of the character of the race can he consciously contribute to the securement of his own freedom and that of his posterity, along the lines of least resistance. Hence the natural evolution of man, his place in society and his attitude towards abstract problems which have often supplied an excuse for reaction, only serve to emphasise humanity's potential capacity for Communism. Mankind's present activity is a certain promise of its inevitable arrival at that state of society which shall witness the combination of absolute individual liberty with the greatest amount of social order. With the many coerced by the few, the only "order" existent at present is that of disorder. With all enjoying the advantages of a social order based on an enlightened social expression of individual happiness.

In order that we might understand this phase of our subject, it is well to note Spencer's contribution to the consideration of society as a social organism. Referring to the individual as a unit in society, he notes the tribal tendency to a small aggregation of individual units, augmenting insensibly in mass. At first, the communities thus formed seem structureless, so simple is the nature of their structure. In the course of their development, however, they become more and more complex, and the mutual dependence of their component parts or units becomes more and more firmly established, until at last the life of each unit is only made possible by the consent and activity of the remaining parts. To complete his analogy, Spencer shows that the life of society is interdependent of, and far more prolonged than the lives of any of its component units, which are conceived only to grow, work, reproduce and die, while the body politic, which is composed of them, survives generation after generation, increasing in mass, in completeness of structure and in functional activity. This is society as we know it; the state in which the individual is made by schoolmaster and nurse, by priest and politician, a unit existing merely for the well-being, not of the whole organism, but of the consumptive or para-

sitical portion of the organism. Or, to vary our conception, in which the working section enjoys sufficient food to keep the central stomach of the organism in activity, whilst the vitals of the organism are being eaten away by the parasitic growths living in luxury on its activity.

Up to the point named the analogy between society and biological organism would seem to be complete. But the comparison entirely breaks down in that the body cells are of no importance in themselves, but are only of value in so far as they contribute to the well-being of the whole; whilst, in the case of the State, it having no corporate consciousness, its existence is only of importance in so far as it contributes to the happiness of the individual. In the case of the animal, it is well that the directive power should be central, inasmuch as the cellular consciousness is corporate, and therefore central. But as the consciousness in society of its units is individual, the directive force must be individual, and hence all central authority is artificial and an impertinent imposition. Only by the operation of internal canons of thought, only by the individual's growth in the direction of social feeling, by virtue of his own experience and observation, can he learn to identify his own interests with that of the community's well-being. A central activity, devoid of conscious control, cannot do this, for there exist no nervous tissues to convey the results of central legislative effort to all parts of the body politic and inspire the units with legislative vitality. Moral suasion, educative endeavour, rational conviction—these are the only forces which will contribute to this desirable end. Inasmuch as Anarchist society alone can develop these forces, Anarchists need have no fear of submitting their principles to analysis in the mental laboratory of reason.

Representation and the State

"The State! Whatever the State saith is a lie; whatever it hath is a theft: all is counterfeit in it, the gnawing sanguinary, insatiate monster. It even bites with stolen teeth. Its very bowels are counterfeit."—FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE.

"*Communism in material production, anarchy in the intellectual*,—that is the type of a Socialist mode of production, as it will develop from the rule of the proletariat—in other words, from the Social Revolution, through the logic of economic facts, whatever might be the wishes, intentions, and theories of the proletariat."

—KARL KAUTSKY.

I.

The argument that Socialism involves State tyranny of a type with which the worker is not unacquainted under present day society is one which the opponents of Socialism regard as being not the least valuable in their somewhat limited armoury. This fact, coupled with the somewhat hazy notions which even some Socialists seem to have as to the position of the State in future society, warrants an examination of the part the State plays in Capitalist society, an enquiry into its transient elements, and a recognition of what constitutes its permanent character. The matter is one which must be considered in the light of society's evolution. We must note how the Central Directing Authority in society has evolved its threefold function of legislative, judicial, and administrative power.

From living in a tribal state and gathering whatever nature offered him spontaneously, man slowly came to invent one weapon and tool after another, in order to aid him in his struggle for existence. Each instrument was more delicate and complex than its predecessor, and corresponded with the development of his skill as fisherman, hunter, and cattle raiser. The latter occupation carried with it a negation of primitive Communism, wherein no class struggle existed, and led to the private ownership of the land and instruments of labour which were the necessary basis of a final settling down to agriculture and handicraft. As pasture farming involved Communism, so cattle breeding on the one hand, carrying with it handicraft on the other, required individual skill, a negation of associated labour, and consequently private ownership of the means of production employed by the craftsman, and of the products which he created. Thus began petty industry based upon the individuality, the skill, industry, and perseverance of the worker, demanding, requiring, and securing unto himself private property. These were the basis of bourgeois society. From satisfying its own requirements only, the peasant family, owing to the progress of

Representation And The State

agriculture beyond the needs of the family, began to produce a surplus of food, tools, and garments. The situation of the family governing largely the nature of the surplus they produced and the differing implements required and tastes acquired, the basis for exchange was laid, specialization of industry was established, and goods were produced both for consumption within the establishment in which they were produced, and for the purpose of exchange for the products of another establishment.

Goods now became commodities, barter was established, and the necessity for some standard commodity or exchange value—such as gold—realised. As the handicraftsman had produced primarily for exchange purposes, so the peasant, in the course of industrial development, was brought to be a producer of commodities. The division of labour which these conditions necessitated took the form of every single concern producing a different class of goods, and the private ownership of the goods exchanged by those who exchanged them. Mutual independence in society, side by side with private property, became increasingly the main conditions of society. As production for personal consumption was more and more superseded by production of commodities, buying and selling became an art, and merchant trading arose, the success of which was founded on buying cheaply and selling dearly. How these economic conditions made for monopoly, on the one hand, in the course of time, and for the creation of a proletariat on the other, is known now to every student.

The rapidity of industrial development in the terms of an ever-increasing velocity, and its financial reflex in the present generation of steam, electricity, and centralization, is apparent to the eyes of all. With the story of its daily unfoldment before him, let the reader but reflect how the peasant who produced goods for his own consumption gave place to the peasant who exchanged these commodities for other articles for his own use; how he, in turn, made way for the merchant who neither produced for his own use nor bought articles for his own use exclusively, but bought and exchanged commodities with the intention of making a profit.

Removal from the manufacture and production of commodities constituted the road to wealth. The merchant prince gave way to the financier, and the latter made for present day monopoly.

The political reflex of this industrial development is found in the story of a social passage from Communism through tribalism to nationalism founded on feudalism and vassalage, to Imperialism and Colonial developments. As the commercial class laid the basis of imperial developments, so the financial class pursued the exploitation of other lands within that development, and identified successful share-mongering with national prosperity, and consol returns, and Imperial debts, with the opening out of Colonial civilization. The courage of the soldier, the nautical equipment of the sailor, the scholarship of the scientist, the permanent value of

literature, were all subservient to Capital's idol—finance, its only standard of success.

The anomalies were strange and disastrous. The little shareholder to live had to invest, and the success of his investment made only for his own buying out by the director king, who could then render his money useless as being no longer capital. On the other hand, the investment failing, the shares could still be foisted upon the financial public, and the director retire the gainer. The standard of wealth, gold, concentrated into fewer and fewer hands, and with it the control of the means and instruments of production which nature had begotten and labour power created. Trade unions, to realise the value of their funds, had to invest in capitalist concerns. Their officials, as a dependent official caste, opposed strong industrial action against the capitalist class, because such activity depleted—both by direct call and loss of interest on capital invested—the funds of the unions and so hazarded the jobs of the union officials. So that labour became more enslaved as men drawn from the ranks of labour became more and more the interested officials, and legal administrators of capitalism, in their official capacity as representatives of share-holding interests, preachers, legislators, and capitalistic philosophers.

The growing competition of women industrially, and the reduction of the standard age of the worker owing to specialization made for a negation of skilled labour. The advocate of woman's suffrage on the same basis as man's suffrage hastened to secure the propertied enfranchisement of woman, whilst working men witnessed the formation of Women's Trade Unions and Universal Adult Suffrage Societies. The Parliamentary Revisionist sought to secure representation. The financial credit reformer blamed monopoly and the State. The proletarian was driven to enquire what should constitute his attitude towards the State and its machinery. The worker fully recognised that the fact of women having the vote did not render them more open to bribery than men, since that was an impossibility in view of the history of the pocket boroughs, the capitalistic proclivities of men, and the corruption of male Poor Law Guardians. On the other hand, in view of the perpetuation of misery and exploitation in those countries where women have the vote, he had to confess that the vote of women did not aid him in giving political expression to the class struggle so long as women voters failed to understand the economic conditions. The enfranchisement of a number of women who belonged to the parasite class seriously affected him in the securing of such a political expression of the industrial struggle. So far, therefore, as the woman's political enfranchisement was concerned, the proletarian could only note that, both as a question of abstract justice, and a matter of expressing politically the true industrial relations, absolute adult suffrage irrespective of sex and property qualifications was the only solution of the problem.

This would carry with it the right, so long denied, of women to be returned to Parliament. Whilst the basis of society's recognition of this right, so far as working women are concerned, would be industrial fear, its realisation would have no different effect from the return to Parliament of working men—a fact that is demonstrated by the women trade union officials being neither worse nor better than the men trade union officials in the question of palliative effort rather than of Socialist endeavour. It would still leave, furthermore, the question of true representation untouched so long as the political machine was controlled in the interests of class society, and governed by the present system of representation on the lines of party voting.

This brings us directly to the question of what the State is and does, as a prelude to this difficulty of majority or minority rule—a difficulty which belongs purely to bourgeois society. Of the intimate connection existent between economic and political freedom we have already spoken. Each fresh economic development carrying with it a corresponding political transformation, it follows that as absolute monarchy in the political world is mated with personal slavery and vassalage in economics, so representative government in politics goes along with the economic system of commercialism. In the course of this transformation, the social purpose of the State has been so evolving as to show the radical reconstruction which was—or is—in store for it in the future. As the aristocracy freed itself from the domination of the Monarchy, as the bourgeois secured their emancipation from their feudal oppressors, so the State has become less and less powerfully essential as an engine of oppression and more and more established as a vehicle of administration. Greater than all the decrees of despotism, Dame Nature's Constitutionalism has decided that the lot of the State for the domination of man by man must cease, and the *function* of the State as a machine for the management of production must be raised and developed.

As an instrument of domination it took its rise as a necessity at a certain stage of economic development, necessarily linked with the division of society into classes. It was the official representative of society as a whole, its personification in a visible body, but inasmuch as it was the State it only stood for the class which represented in itself the whole of society. According to the philosophic conception it was "the realization of the idea" of the kingdom of God upon earth, the domain where eternal truth and eternal justice realized themselves or ought to have done. The result was a superstitious reverence for the State and for everything in connection with it, which was all the more evident from the fact that his insignificance, the individual, was taught from childhood to suppose that public business and the common interest of society could not be cared for in any other way than through the State and its well-paid employees.

It was fondly thought that a great step had been made in advance when faith was lost in an hereditary monarchy and claims laid to a democratic republic. But even the necessity for such claims was only to be found in the fact that the State's function was mainly legislative and judicial, not industrially administrative. An instrument of oppression used by one class over another, and quite as much so under a democratic republic as under a monarchy, its capture by the bourgeoisie, subsequent to the republican agitation only meant that its existence was becoming less an absolute and more a representative one—and therefore more anonymous and changeable in character—its position was becoming more and more hazardous in view of the advancing industrial conditions in the direction of social production and distribution. Thus as economic conditions have made for Socialism, the political reflex has made less and less for the success of State tyranny. Let us analyze what the failure of the Capitalist State—as the last political reflex of class society—means.

Of late years, the cry for proportional representation, second ballot, etc., has grown in volume. The reason for it has been the obvious failure of the House of Commons, or Chamber of Deputies, as the case may be, throughout capitalist civilization to represent what is termed the opinion of the country. In other words, a majority on the Government benches of the People's Chamber may actually represent a minority of opinion in the country, and generally does not represent the true proportional majority in the country. The historic failure has long been pointing in this direction. On the other hand, the Capitalist State existing as a reflex of economic conditions, it can be seen that whilst the cost of its management is being paid for by the capitalist class out of the surplus value, the basis of its recognition of working-class representation is the growing class consciousness of the latter class and the growth of revolutionary endeavour on its part. Even, therefore, as a palliative, and out of sheer despair of curtailing the growth of this spirit, the Capitalist State must give heed to the question of electoral reform, in its various phases of proportional representation, adult suffrage, etc., and even to the question of the abolition of the House of Lords.

Now, on all these questions, the division is rapidly becoming a class, and not an individual one. Bourgeois Radicalism, with its theoretical belief in the modification of the State structure in every particular, and antagonism to Imperial development, has found that the continuance of the society to whose support it looks, demands that their foreign policy shall be a continuation of Tory traditions, and their modifications of State structure exceedingly slow, timid, and expedient. Conversely, in matters of foreign policy and on questions of State structure, the Tory would adopt an attitude of absolute autocracy and non-negation of the *status quo*. On either of these rocks, capitalism would be bound to split, Radicalism

meaning the undoing of its political power to oppress, and Conservatism the centralization of the power to such an extent that its very menace would be its own undoing. Hence, whilst the political rewards and family traditions have formed the basis of individual adherence to this or that party, concessions to social expediency have been the basis of their political continuance and securement of the stability of the system. But this has meant the gradual but certain coming-together of the two parties for the defence of the profit-mongering system, the equally certain emphasising of their class-basis, the taking of common action against strikers at home and empire-disrupters in the colonies or abroad. The Liberal Statesmen has vied with his Tory confrère in oppression in Egypt, South Africa, and in India, as well as in shooting down the workers at home.

The growing evidence of the hypocrisy of this party system, its essential class unity, has been the cause of Labour, from relying on mere trade union activity, taking to political action. In *the whole* of that action compromise has been more apparent than stern defiance. But even so it has presented to the capitalist politician some evidences of the inherent tendency of class-society to undo itself.

To counteract such a possibility, all that capitalist politicians can do, with safety, is to concentrate their endeavours on the political reforms of adult suffrage, second ballot, and proportional representation as already indicated. Yet even so, to so extend the franchise and to secure a larger continuance of power, the task of the capitalist politician is no easy one, for to hunt the devil of corruption from parliament to people by an extension of the franchise, is only to more readily expose the basic rottenness of capitalist society and bring about the downfall of its empire.

More and more would it become apparent that the M.P.s were but the puppets of the Party Whips and of the Cabinet, which were but the agents of the desires of trust-magnates, whose growing financial power would involve the corruption of business, politics, and citizenship; the easy punishment and bossing of Premiers, Senates, Titular Monarchs, and Republican Presidents; the ruin of the little middle-class whose affected contempt of the manual labourer would thus slowly vanish together with their position. Carrying with it, as can already be seen, the negation of legislative and judicial dignity, by rendering justice a farce and legislation chicanery, it would inevitably reveal the State's function as one coercive of persons and not administrative of things, and show that the instability of a corrupt society demanding, the stability of a free society would not require, the punishment of persons for evils which were socially produced and not individually malicious. It would also show, that the punishment or coercion of persons was no guarantee of social calm.

Side by side with this would be the further fact—awaiting a social recognition—of the powerlessness of the State to do the one thing which would abolish, or at least check, all revolutionary endeavour—to abolish pauperism. Its only power, so far as it could concern itself with pauperism, would be seen to consist in police regulations, charity, etc. To abolish poverty it would have to abolish those conditions responsible for its own existence, and hence to abolish itself. As the abolition of ancient slavery involved the abolition of the Ancient State, so the abolition of modern capitalist slavery would involve the abolition of the bourgeois Representative State. As soon as it evolved to being the representative of the whole of society in a *complete* society, the judicial and legislative functions of the State would become superfluous, with the result that the State, as class society has historically known it, would become superfluous. Equally superfluous would become the anti-statism or voluntaristic production which partakes of the same representative character as the State, and is equally corrupt under class society. Growing out of the industrial conditions which necessitated the negation of private ownership, would be social ownership based on social production and distribution. Individually this would mean social freedom, whilst socially it would embody all the efficiency that a historically evolved administrative function, having its basis deep down in society's foundations, could alone carry with it. This, however, the opponents of Socialism tell us, would involve tyranny and expertism. Let us see.

Its erection being on a ruins of a society where production had been for profit and not for use, wherein the coercion of man had been at a premium against which the growing social consciousness had revolted, this would hardly appear to be the case. The failure of legislative and judicial activity being amongst its progenitors, Socialism could hardly perpetuate that coercion which its very coming into existence must necessarily negate. But now we have to consider the basis of expertism under capitalism in order to show it to be impossible under Socialism. Our preliminary shall be a statement of the attitude of the newly found individualist opponents of Socialism, who tell us that every State is a despotism, because, whether the despot be one or many, whether the State be monarchical or republican, solely from the principle that all *right* or *authority* belong to the collectivity of *the people*—and the collectivity represents the *status quo*, whether autocratic or democratic—its existence as a State implies the oppression of the individual, against whose interests the State arraigns itself. Agreeing that the historic rôle of the State has been that of a despotism, and that violence against State authority is no more criminal than legal violence against the individual, the proletarian must needs seek an explanation for the being of State authority. "How is it that, whether by apathy or indifference, the *collective will of the people* supports the State against the individual well-being of the majority of the people?"

Why does the property owner pay taxes and duties to the State, and the oppressed worker seek its benediction?" asks this economical enquirer. "Education by the State," is the voluntarist reply. "But," pursues the investigator, "the State is but an anonymous reflex of the collective will of the people. If, therefore, the State create that will, it must be at least co-existent with it, if not, as the creative agency, prior to it. But it cannot be created by a will it creates, nor can it be a reflex of the collective will. If it is only a reflex of the collective will, how is that will formed? If the collective will is the outcome of statism, we must seek elsewhere for the latter's origin." Let us investigate.

Accepting the principles of the materialistic conception of history, we learn that, if the engineer is paid twenty times more than the navvy, it is because the cost necessary to produce an engineer is more considerable than that necessary to produce a navvy by nineteen times the cost of the latter's production. Now, it having cost society twenty times as much to produce the engineer than it did to produce the navvy, the engineer is twenty times more indebted to society than the navvy. Instead, therefore, of taxing society for greater privileges he should return more to society. As he does not, under the system under which the engineer flourishes because of advantages of education, the navvy is dispossessed of his rights; and therefore the capitalist system—which is at once society and the wage system—has established the technical education of the navvy's children in order to protect itself against the expertism of the engineer. In working its own undoing, once more, in a vain attempt to secure temporary relief, capitalist society is abolishing the expert in the interests of social progress. In the face of these facts to pretend that the expert will become a parasite and tyrant under Socialism is absurd. With his numbers growing his occupation is going, because—as an intellectual—he is rapidly becoming the rule and not the exception.

It may, however, be contended that, under capitalist society, it is the extent of monopoly in education and in industry, and not their various costs of production, which has enabled the engineer, the scientist, and the doctor, to draw from society ten or a hundred times more than the labourer, and the weaver to earn three times as much as the toiler in the fields, and ten times as much as the match-girl. Were this correct, it might, of course, justify the inference that under Socialism, the representatives of administration would so control industry and education as to become the monopolisers of its advantage, and hence impose upon the people a bureaucratic expertism. In order to expose the fallacious nature of this contention, it is only necessary to enquire more fully into what is the industrial basis of that monopoly which enables the engineer, the scientist, and the doctor to simply draw their profits from their own sort of capital—their degrees and their certificates—just as

the manufacturer draws a profit from a mill, or as a nobleman used to do from his birth and title.

The first in our enquiry will be to note that in modern capitalist society, as we have already shown, a bourgeois minority control and direct the means and production of social livelihood for the great majority—the vile mass of workers who toil to live and live to toil in the interests of the minority. Degraded, they receive the bare means of subsistence for preserving themselves and rearing other wage-slaves—their children—whose education also is in the hands of the capitalist class. Now, the sooner the children begin to work the greater is the commodity, labour-power, which is offered for sale; and the less the price required, owing to competition. The longer the child is kept from work—*i.e.*, the longer the time spent in his education—the greater is his cost since his parents are receiving money from the capitalist class in excess of their immediate personal needs of subsistence. Consequently, having more time devoted to its education, it has to study and to live, be fed and clothed, for a longer period than children not so fortunately placed. It accordingly has to experience less competition at a later stage when offering its labour power to the capitalist class, and consequently demands a higher wage *necessary to the preservation of its position and knowledge*; and it is so placed because it has cost society more to develop its technical knowledge. If “monopoly in education and industry” be the cause of this discrepancy only, now, as the “nobleman’s birth and title” was formerly how came the one cause to change into the other cause? The answer can only be, because of material development on the industrial plane; not the title, the educational privilege, nor the monopoly, but the industrial conditions necessitating these reflexes as sequences, the causes or cause. The privilege of a monopolised education, therefore, represents immunity from labouring at the expense of others who are rendered industrially immune from intellectual development. But here a strange factor enters in. As the feudalistic contempt for defending themselves, believing this to be the duty of bourgeois society, lay the basis of its downfall, so the bourgeois contempt for the studies as well as for the manual labour it gratefully abandons to the proletariat, is forming the basis for its own overthrow. Not only so; but its very evolution is a splendid object-lesson not merely in the tyranny but also in the ignorance of expertism. And so well has bourgeois society placed the hall-mark of its disciplinarian mediocrity upon all professions, that slowly but surely, genius is being forced to enlist in the class army of the proletariat.

Here, however, it is being taught to despise expertism as the bourgeoisie—in its days of revolution—was taught to despise titles. That contempt has remained its consistent characteristic where its success has been most unquestioned. And it has paved the way

for the similar contempt of proletarian genius for bourgeois profit-mongering to become the characteristic of future society. Thus, the evolution of the capitalistic educational system, has prepared a minimum educational basis for the future society to start from, which is founded on an ever-increasing negation of expertism; the development of its judicial and legislative machinery has shown not merely its class-basis but also the impracticability of judging and condemning men as criminals; the pursuit of its science has shown the basic psychological idealism of humanity, with its records of martyrs, and its social history showing that the greatest crimes of class-rule have been done in the name of lofty sentiment—in the name of justice, righteousness, and equality; and its giving birth to a class which is inspired by the lofty sentiment of freeing society from all class domination.

Thus, economically, politically, and psychologically the whole of the trend of social evolution shows that Socialism can only have its social expression in an era of freedom, and its political expression in a State which shall treat of the management of production instead of the control of persons*. The psychological guarantee against expertism will be found in the contempt with which all men will regard it, and the tendency to excellence of administration will be reposed in the admiration which all men will have for efficiency. Should this possibility still meet with opposition on the ground that such a central directing authority, finding its embodiment in a collective will, would not find legal oppression incongruous with its industrial basis, one can only conclude that either humanity is inherently bad and progress an impossibility, or else that in a system of absolute individualism must humanity’s hope lie.

If in the latter alternative, then its basis must be that all social relationship is an impossibility since where co-operation takes place, management coming in, there must be some centralization of directive authority. But the whole trend of civilization serves to negate this assumption. Teacher and scholar, pulpit and pew, orator and audience, editor and readers, in their growing approximation to each other are emphasising the passing of capitalistic professionalism, and the development of Socialist simplicity. Even the military is being infected with the spirit of the revolutionary consciousness which is undermining the foundations of the Capitalist state. And amid the growing volume of its expression, is drowned the echoes of the sectarianism so common to class society. Men and women, seeking the spirit of the highest impulses, rather than the letter of the narrow dogmas of meaningless import, are seeing in its arrival the realisation of those impulses in the social Brahm, the communistic Nirvana. In this evidence of its philosophic har-

*Here the term “State” is used in a sense entirely unhistorical. Such a political order is Anarchy, and can only be termed “a state,” in the sense of being a social condition.

mony of movement may be caught a glimpse of the lofty impulses which have served to direct its evolution. It is this philosophic essence of unity which supplies us with a quintessential index to the meaning of the evidence I have adduced in the present essay, showing the failure of the bourgeois representative system, the inevitable collapse of its state, and the erection on its ruins of a social system which shall in truth be apostrophied as the Commonwealth! For it would be the intelligence of the community that would select the most capable administrators of its workings, instead of the plutocratic administration deciding the limits of its representation.

II.

Happy augury of the liberty which will exist under the Socialist Commonwealth, we see that as the agencies of production and distribution have become increasingly social, despite the fact that control has been private, political freedom has become more and more a reality. Thus recognising the growing incongruity of its rôle of legal oppressor and its mischievousness to capitalistic production, the State has more and more concerned itself with the distribution of the armed forces, the duties of the secret police, the appointment of arbitration and conciliation boards, the feeding of necessitous children as a palliative. On the other hand, thus realising its administrative character on questions of penal reform and criminal punishment, its attitude has become "more humane"—as the bourgeoisie say—the decentralisation of its authority becoming synonymous with the growth of economic oppression, and the failure of the Party system. On all hands it is, therefore, being recognised that the social problem is rapidly resolving itself into an economic rather than narrowing itself down to a political issue. The duel is between the financier and the business man on the one side, representative of private profit; and the proletarian on the other, symbolical of production for use and not for profit. To these combatants, Liberal and Tory have given way; and significant of the change, their avowed capitalist successors, under the guise of individual freedom, have assumed a chastening attitude towards the State wherein their ideals have hitherto found a safe embodiment. Their fear is lest Socialism should involve majority tyranny. Their hope is that of impressing the workers with a consciousness of the essential liberty of capitalism. The better to remove their fear, let us outline and examine the basis of their hope.

The latter's foundations are laid deep down in the social life of the bourgeoisie. It had its corner stone in the right of individuals to privately own articles or instruments of production which constitute capital. Its edifice is to be found in a social structure which seeks the elevation of his insignificance, the individual, at the expense of his collective unconsciousness, society. Its science

of being, subsists in the growing recognition by the bourgeoisie of the necessity of mastering political economy, and the adaptation of its state-organisation to a harmonious incorporation of the rules evolved in the study. Its expression of its consciousness of its destiny is seen in the bourgeois appreciation of Buckle's very true declaration that the only good done by modern legislation was the repeal of the old. Prior to the bourgeois recognition of the importance of right opinions on political economy the State carefully sought to supervise—in direct contravention of economic laws—the price of corn, the wages of labourers, the importation of corn, the manufacture of beer, the rate of interest on loans, attendance at divine service, the apprenticeship of children, the combination of workmen, etc. All this was done in the interest of a governing and established class, conscious of its security. But economic facts made for its undoing through the medium of the very laws thus passed in its own interests. A statute of Henry VIII. went so far as to forbid the use of machinery in the manufacture of broadcloth, and the woollen trade threatened to take refuge in Holland, where the "divers devilish contrivances" were under no law. In order to encourage sheep-breeding, a law was passed that the dead should be buried in woollen garments, it being urged that since sheep would be bred, wool would rise in price, and mutton be cheaper. But economic laws re-established their inevitable social equation, and the artificial stimulant became an absurdity. All usury being urged as wrong on religious grounds, and it being thought that 10% represented the maximum interest which was compatible with a non-injury to trade, this was the interest fixed, in Henry VIII.'s reign, on loans. As economic laws asserted themselves, the anomalies this law created made for numerous modifications, until sound sense prevailed and any amount became allowable in the early half of the nineteenth century. Similarly, the State obtruded into the marital relations, and similarly its functions have become more and more anomalous, until now the right of Free Love, under the pressure of economical backing, is being recognised as valid by the bourgeoisie. Laws are to be found on the Statute Book setting forth with what amount of energy and thoroughness the ploughman shall plough each furrow. Regrating and forestalling were crimes, the laws against them being aptly said, by Adam Smith, to be laws against providence and thrift.

Recognising the general trend of economic law to assert itself, and realising the impossibility of averting the tendency, bourgeois society has made for the workman being, politically, a free man. It allows him the right to employ himself in any work he can get entrusted to him, so long as he recognises the right of the employer to employ whom he likes. He may demand any wages he thinks right, and take advantage of the favour of supply and demand in his direction, so long as he recognises the right of similar activities on the part of the employer. He may combine and boycott so long

as he allows the right of his master to combine and boycott. Out of this right of employer and employed the wage system itself springs as a form of mutual convenience, arising out of a co-operation in which, as Henry George might have it, one of the parties prefers a certain to a contingent result. Consequently, there is no "iron law of wages," but a natural and healthy reward, within capitalist society, for all human exertion employed in the production of wealth! So much for the capitalistic appearance of liberty for employer and employed!

Did matters thus stand still, and petty enterprise thrive in bourgeois society, this equal right of master and serf might thus form the basis of a certain amount of social sordidness, but never permit of matters coming to a head. But nature abhors such a contingency as certainly as she abhors a vacuum. And so it comes about that from time to time we hear of some Sugar King, or Railway Magnate, owner of some vast stretch of land, complaining at the uncontrollable character of the wealth and the industrial conditions which have made him. In America, the home of Trusts, no less so than in England where combinations are thinly disguised under various names, a few men control more money than does the Government. Their power being absolute, the bourgeoisie, mistaking itself for the whole of the people, plead that such individuals are corrupting business, politics, and citizenship, and in evidence of this assertion point to how titles are obtained in England, and how political power is controlled by millionaires in America. This plutocratic element, an increasing one under capitalism, judges men not by their principles but by their price. It regards public office as an article of merchandise, to be bought and sold the same as dry goods or railroad shares. The strongest political argument it can offer is a thumping cheque. Its very being evidences the failure of democratic government, and shows that there is no difference beyond that of form between the crowned Monarch in England, the sceptred Emperor in German, and the uncrowned President of the United States. It means that even if in other details democratic representation was not a farce, the affirmative usages of government were controlled by plutocracy. To its offices were elected the sons of the plutocrats. Affirmatively, therefore, the State is but a bureaucratic institution, the official representatives of which tax or blackmail the capitalist class to the tune of several millions per annum for the privilege of being supplied with a standing army, navy, judicial bench, etc., for the purposes of enabling the capitalist class to pocket its surplus value—the unearned profit which it derives from the exploitation of the proletariat. A reflection of industrial conditions, the State is thus seen to be controlled by, and managed in the interests of, the capitalist class, whose turn the government must always serve, since government officialism is paid for directly by the capitalist class out of the surplus value. In other words, the cost of the army, navy, charitable institutions,

police, bench, bar, and the whole judicial machinery, represents the cost of the capitalists' class's insurance policy. Labour produces the wealth and capital pays the insurance. Official mismanagement is, in some directions, causing capital to resent the terms of its insurance and long for "Voluntarism"; in other directions, to long for better centralised control—and the nationalisation of the land, the mines, and the railways.

To the capitalistic advocates of the voluntaristic philosophy, who assure the world that one cannot get more intelligence out of the administrative or legislative machine than one puts into it, the proletarian—remembering that genius is also the mental characteristic of a revolutionary class during the period of outlawed existence—will lend a sympathy not unaccompanied with the reservation that, however true the statement, it does not concern the proletaire, in whose interests, Government, so long as the capitalist system lasts, will not, and cannot, be administered. When that system has departed, class interests will have vanished, and Government will be unnecessary. Antagonistic to the spirit and letter of government, the mastering of the industrial principle of the class war, will have supplied the proletarian with an explanation of its existence which will but serve to add a flippant contempt for government decrees to an intellectual scorn of its methods, and an intense hatred of conventional morality—so dear to drawing-room prudes living on the unearned increment which makes for prostitution—as being but the vicious profit-mongering pretences of an anonymous slave-society.

Trade Unionism and The Class War

AUTHOR'S NOTE (1919 Edition).

Trade Unionism and The Class War was published first in 1911. It met with a great deal of criticism and received one complimentary notice. This was from "Dangle" in the *Clarion*! It was reprinted in 1914 in the *Herald of Revolt*.

The present edition is revised. The introductory section is expanded into a chapter. The third section of the original pamphlet—which would have been the fourth as the essay now stands—treating with the question of representation is omitted. This properly belongs to the companion essay, *Representation and the State*, and will be embodied in it when that pamphlet is revised.

Many persons object to the reasoning of this essay because they consider its logic fatal to all idea of action. This criticism is based on a misunderstanding. I do not deny that men and women must function under capitalism and engage constantly in petty disputes. I only insist that such disputes are not vital. By preaching up dissatisfaction, I am removing the tendency to engage in worthless palliative effort, and hastening the crisis. After all, action which accomplishes nothing, is not of much moment. And trade unionism has accomplished nothing so far as the well-being of the *entire* working-class is concerned. The plea for revolution is not pedantry. It is a simple statement of stern necessity. The second and third chapters are unaltered, except for a passing word here and there, from the original pamphlet.

London, W., June, 1919.

G. A. A.

I.—TRADE UNIONISM AND REVOLUTION.

The struggle of the Tolpuddle Martyrs for the right of combination under the Reform Ministry of 1832, marks the beginnings of British Trade Unionism. The glamour of romance which belongs to its origin has contributed to its successful development as a social institution. Eight years after the Repeal of the Combination laws, Trade Unionism was deemed an illegal conspiracy. To-day, it is a bulwark of the capitalist system. Something more than tradition is necessary to explain this passage from outlawry

Trade Unionism And The Class War

to respectability. The explanation is an economic one. Trade Unionism has conquered social power and commanded influence in so far as it satisfied and arose from the social necessities of the capitalist epoch. Because it has answered capitalist needs, the Trade Union has qualified for its modern position as the sign manual of skilled labour.

But the growth in social and political importance of the Trade Union leader has not menaced the foundations of capitalist society. He has been cited more and more as the friend of reform and the enemy of revolution. It has been urged that he is a sober and responsible member of capitalist society. Consequently, capitalist apologists have been obliged to acknowledge that he discharged useful and important functions in society.

This admission has forced them to assert that the law of supply and demand does *not* determine, with exactness, the nominal—or even the actual—price of the commodity, labour power. Hence it has been allowed that Trade Unions enable their members to increase the amount of the price received for their labour-power, without being hurtful to the interests of the commonwealth—*i.e.*, the capitalist class—when conducted with moderation and fairness.

Modern Trade Unionism enjoys this respectable reputation to a very large extent because it has sacrificed its original vitality. This was inevitable, since, in its very origin, it was reformist and not revolutionary. Trade Unionism has sacrificed no economic principle during its century's development. It has surrendered no industrial or political consistency. But it has not maintained its early earnestness or sentiment of solidarity. Had it done so, it would have been compelled to have evolved socially and politically. Instead of stagnating in reform, it would have had to progress towards revolution.

The Trade Union apologist, consistently with his reformist outlook, has had to defend the restrictive tendencies of sectional organisation. He has had to deny the revolutionary solidarity of labour in order to defend the Union manufacture of blacklegs. He has rejoiced in a craft organisation that materially injures the interests of labour as a whole, without even benefiting it sectionally. He has shown no qualms about supporting a representative system of administration which betrays the worker to capitalist interests.

All this activity proceeds inevitably from the belief that Trade Unionism benefits the worker economically. It follows naturally from the notion that the worker can improve his social and economic status under capitalism.

Trade Unionism, therefore, is intelligible only on the ground that reform is possible and revolution unnecessary. Industrial palliation, like political palliation, is based on the understanding that no epoch ever attains to a crisis. This is the best that can be said for the necessity of Trade Unionism.

But suppose that the law of supply and demand *does* determine, with exactness, the nominal as well as the actual price of the commodity, labour power?

Then the best that can be said for the necessity of Trade Unionism as opposed to revolutionary communist organisation and action has ceased to possess any meaning.

To develop this economic argument in favour of the social revolution, and against Trade Union reform, is my purpose in writing the present brochure.

II.—THE CASE FOR TRADE UNIONISM.

Nominal wages are actually received in cash, irrespective of the conditions of employment. Actual wages are nominal wages, plus the conditions of employment, hours of labour, etc.

What is the basis of wages?

Marx has asked us to suppose that an average hour of labour be realised in a value equal to sixpence, or twelve average hours of labour realised in six shillings. If, then, in the raw material, machinery and so forth, used up in a commodity, twenty-four hours of average labour were realised, its value would amount to twelve shillings. If, moreover, the workman employed by the capitalist added twelve hours of labour to these means of production these twelve hours would be realised in an additional value of six shillings. The total value of the production would, therefore, amount to thirty-six hours of realised labour-power, and be equal to eighteen shillings. But as the value of labour-power, or the wages paid to the workman, would be three shillings only, no equivalent would have been paid by the capitalist for the six hours of surplus value worked by the workman and realised in the value of the commodity. By selling this commodity at its value for eighteen shillings, the capitalist would, therefore, realise a value of three shillings for which he had paid no equivalent. These three shillings would constitute the surplus value or profit pocketed by him. Any increase in the wages of the workers must reduce the amount of his surplus value, since that is the only fund out of which such increase could be obtained. It is possible for the wages of the workman to rise so high as not only approximately to equal the value of his product, but *actually* to equal it. In a word, if the law of supply and demand works with the inexactness assumed by the Trade Unionist to be the case, palliation is not merely justifiable on the grounds of expediency; it is the direct path to emancipation.

Is it true that the law of supply and demand fixes the price with so little exactness, that supply and demand become equal not at an exact point of price? May it be that several prices, or a range of prices, will satisfy the requirements of the law? That there is, or may be, a kind of table-land within which the law does not operate? Let us take the Trade Union political economists' typical example. A hundredweight of fish is sold by Dutch Auction, *i.e.*, the seller bidding down instead of the buyers bidding up. One buyer may be willing to give 20s. for the lot, and no other buyer willing to give more than 18s., and the man who is willing to give 20s. will get the fish at 18s. or a fraction over it. So that in the same market, with the same quantity of fish for sale, and with customers in number and every other respect the same, the same lot of fish might fetch two very different prices, the law of supply and demand being equally and completely fulfilled by either of these prices. Within a limit of 2s. the law is inoperative.

It is claimed, that in a case such as this, much depends on who has the initiative in bargaining. In the instance given, the possessor of the initiative gives to the seller a distinct gain of 2s., not accounted for by the law of supply and demand. Supposing the price of labour-power to fall within a similarly excepted category, the same principle as operated against the buyer in the case of the Dutch Auction will now operate against the seller in the labour market. It is the buyer who has the initiative in fixing the price. The employer, the purchaser of labour-power, makes the offer of wages. The dealer or seller, *i.e.*, the labourer, accepts or refuses. The advantage of the initiative is with the employer therefore. This can only be modified by a close combination among the employed, whereby they may place a reserve price on their labour. Under these circumstances Organised Labour may secure a larger positive amount of the produce of its labour-power, within the limits not covered by the law of supply and demand. It may, therefore, secure the economic equivalent of culture by virtue of its organised status.

Outside of this table-land the law of supply and demand remains intact. The more numerous the competitors for employment the lower will the wages be, other things being equal. This fact forces on the attention of the Trade Unionists the necessity for restrictive rules, forbidding the employment of non-unionists and limiting the number of apprentices. Such rules are indispensable to the complete efficacy of Trade Unionism. They make the Trade Unionist the apologist for an aristocracy of skilled labour.

Trade Unionism's final refuge is Malthusianism. Its specious pretence is that the ignorant and untrained part of the proletariat will people up to the point that will keep their wages at that miserable rate which the low scale of their ideas and habits makes endurable to them. As long as their minds remain in such a state,

the Unionist claims that he does them no real injury in preventing them from competing with him for employment. He only saves himself from being brought down to their level. He does no wrong by entrenching himself behind a barrier to exclude those whose competition would bring down his wages, without more than momentarily raising theirs.

Again, even were it to be shown that Trade Unionism did not increase the nominal rate of wages, it has to be admitted (says the Unionist) that it is able to do much by raising the actual rate of wages. Its least accomplishment is to successfully resist irritating, arbitrary, and oppressive conditions of employment.

But the power of the organisation of labour in this direction turns upon its recognition. In times of dispute there may be room for negotiations between employers and employed upon the question of maximum or minimum demands. For the Trade Union to be effectual there can be no room for compromise on the question of recognising the Union and receiving the Union official representatives. This limits all need or apprehension of a strike to such recognition. So that the right of combination recognised, the men's demands become a matter of amicable arrangement.

Such is the case for Trade Unionism. We now propose to expose its fallacies, and lay bare its hypocrisies.

III.—THE WORKERS' CASE AGAINST TRADE UNIONISM.

The reply to the argument which I have developed in defence of Trade Unionism in the foregoing section, naturally divides itself into the following division:—

(1) *The operation of the economic law against the possibility of palliation, so far as the entire working-class is concerned:—* Although it is true that the law of supply and demand does not fix the terms of any particular bargain, the operation of that law does not finish with the conclusion of that particular bargain. This has been clearly demonstrated by Cree in his reply to Mill. According to whether buyer or seller secures what is termed "a bargain," demand or supply is checked or stimulated. This applies to the Dutch Auction Fish Sale. A sale of 20s. would tend to stimulate future supply and check demand. The consequent tendency would be towards a fall in price. A sale of 18s. would tend to bring out more buyers and reduce the inducement to go to sea. The consequent tendency would be towards a rise in price. This would bring out more sellers and reduce the number of buyers once more. This is true also of the wages of labour. Higher wages bring out more workers but reduce the employer's profits. So that the employer becomes less anxious to secure workers. A lower wage has

the reverse effect. The worker now becomes less anxious to be employed. But the employer is more willing to employ. Once more there is repetition. Working by tendency only, the economic law approaches exactitude over a multiplicity of cases, but not in any particular case. The means of the oscillations of price is now an exact point, not a range of prices. The terms of any particular bargain are, consequently, only of the most transient importance even to those immediately concerned. But they are of little or no importance to the workers or employers as a class, since they are constantly being brought back to their true economical point. The compensating influences being inevitable and automatic, it will be seen that, in its position as a class, the working-class has nothing to gain from Trade Union Palliative activity. Its only practical hope, as well as its beautiful day-dream, is, first, last, and all-the-time, Socialism—the Communal Individualism of which Oscar Wilde made himself the prophet in that magnificent book, *The Soul of Man*.

(2) *The impossibility of raising actual wages without regard to nominal wages:—*Mavor has put the case in a nutshell. If a reduction of the hours of labour results in decreased production, wages will fall, other things being equal. If reduction of hours results in maintenance of production per man there will be no additional employment, other things being equal. The equality of other things turn upon the law of supply and demand which palliative combination does not effect. Consequently, Trade Unionism can neither effect wages nor yet the question of employment.

(3) *The impossibility of organising the whole of labour on the basis of Trade Unionism:—*The Trade Unionist, when excluding the blackleg and manufacturing him, pretends to look forward to a complete federation of labour. But if all labour stands upon the platform of palliative combination—a very different thing from revolutionary solidarity—the effect will be nil, in view of the operations of the law of supply and demand. A union of all labour is as good as no union at all from the palliationist viewpoint. Even a "minimum wage" of higher rate than at present established means only the decreased purchasing power of money. Between labour-power as a commodity and other commodities there exists a definite ratio of exchange. So that a "minimum wage" is meaningless. But a union of all labour on the basis of Trade Unionism is impossible. With all trades organised on a restricted basis it would be impossible for any trade to rid itself of its surplus by causing them to be absorbed into any other trade. But for Trade Unionism to succeed—with the increasing use of machinery and the consequent reduction of skilled to unskilled labour—it must also organise unskilled labour. Such organisation to succeed must be even more restrictive than in the case of skilled labour. Unskilled labour

cannot, therefore, absorb the surplus from all the skilled trades. Not only so, but to this surplus it would add an enormous surplus of its own. So that restrictive Unionism can only result in first deluding the working-class, then betraying it, and finally reducing the greater portion of it to blacklegs in the present and future.

(4) *The menace of Trade Union Representation; A question of Labour Leading:*—Trade Unionism embodies the menace of the representative system in its constitution no less certainly than the legislative machine. Its elected leaders conclude strikes and disputes by consenting to terms of compromise offered by Capitalistic Ministers for Labour, and Presidents of the Board of Trade. To pretend that such terms of agreement are antagonistic to capitalist interests, is to be disturbed by a bogey. On the other hand, for what does the strike-leader generally strive? To get his authority recognised. This is the first step to position and power. It is pretended that the greater the support given to the labour-leader the greater the concession he can wring from the capitalist class. It is forgotten that the greater the confidence reposed in him, the more effectually he can betray that confidence. Consequently, your "official" strike-leader is always for "enthusiasm and earnestness" of the "slow and sure" variety. His plea is for caution, which means that he is to be allowed to do the bargaining but not to be submitted to criticism. Criticism he regards as a menace to his authority. It certainly reduces his selling-out value.

(5) *The Initiative Absurdity:*—The Trade Unionist argument that the unorganised worker suffers from not having the initiative is nonsense. Rather—if it really counted, which it does not—one's sympathy should be with the employer who uses it against the unorganised worker. In the case of the *organised* Trade Unionist, it should be with the worker who is menaced by having it used on his behalf by the labour leader who generally succeeds in misrepresenting him. Everyone knows that employers often throw the onus of initiative on the worker. In a bargain both buyer and seller are anxious only to avoid it. "What do you want?" says the buyer. "That is not the question, what will you give?" replies the seller. Both parties are desirous of securing a bargain, and consequently avoid the initiative. It has no advantages although it operates very little one way or the other in the labour market. So that Trade Unionism has nothing to offer the worker in this respect.

On these counts, therefore, and for these reasons, Trade Unionism must go. The only hope of the workers on the industrial, as on the political field, is Revolutionary Socialism.

IV.

THE QUESTION OF REPRESENTATION.

Much that has been urged in the present brochure has tended to negate the idea of majority rule, as also the representation principle. Like most rebels—and, for that matter, most students of history—I have no faith in the majority, less unbelief in the minority, and most reliance in the individual. Thomas Paine regarded Government as being, like dress, a badge of lost innocence. He also looked upon the abolition of formal government as the beginning of true association. This seems to me to be incontrovertible. Consequently, if my opinion be correct, representation, as an expression of formal government, can have no weight, and must necessarily play a small part in the revolutionary birth-struggle of the proletarian commonweal.

To bring this theory down to the realm of the practical, I want the reader to consider the following case which has often been put to me in the course of debates and discussions in which I have played the part of principal. It has been said that if a certain individual was working in a shop where sixty men were employed, and fifty wished to come out on strike whilst ten wished to remain in, the author of this hypothetical case was in favour of coercing the ten and making them come out, whilst the fifty fought the "boss." Such coercion, it is urged, alone will rid the proletariat of their subjection to the capitalist and Capitalism.

From this opinion I venture to differ. Indeed, I repeat in print what I have often urged on the platform in reply to the hypothetical case already enunciated that the majority have no more right to coerce a minority than the minority have to coerce a majority. The fifty have no more right to coerce the ten, than the ten have to coerce the fifty, since in relation to society, the hypothetical fifty strikers are but a small minority, and if it be true that many are right where few are wrong, then the presence of seventy strike-breakers in the neighbourhood of the strike plus seventy soldiers, would entitle the "majority" of 150 men, as opposed to the minority of fifty, to "coerce them" out of the neighbourhood. Herein lies the capitalist apology for Mitchelstown, Featherstone, Homestead, Belfast, and every other scene of the patriotic murder of the working-class by the hired assassins of profit mongers. For it must be remembered, that we are not treating of the ethics of coercion in relation to oppressed minorities, but of the economics of apparent majorities' rights to coerce a minority.

If we were to consent to deal with probabilities rather than with fact, it would be urged that the one hundred and fifty men do not represent society, nor the whole working-class, for it is probable that the latter would stand by the fifty. Yet every worker, as also every employer, knows that the news of the strike could be flashed throughout the length and breadth of the land,

without the official scoundrelism which imported blacklegs being denounced to the extent of all the workers striking in sympathy and thus threatening to coerce the blacklegs who were in a minority. With all their feelings of sympathy and faithful devotion to the cause of united endeavour it would be impossible for the whole working-class organisations to exhibit industrial solidarity.

If all the workers were willing to strike, they need only stay in work and take over the means and instruments of production for their own use. Revolution would replace a mere industrial struggle. The workers would not be concerned with craft or industrial divisional organisation, nor with the local coercion of blacklegs, nor with the propaganda-strike even, but with the emancipation of their class only. The struggle would be constructive, not negative. There would be no necessity for "physical force" coercion of blacklegs, since the economic existence of gentlemen of this fraternity would be impossible under such circumstances. If all the workers were educated up to that stage of economic solidarity, that they were willing to strike in sympathy and massacre blacklegs according to Union-laid regulations, the working-class revolution would be international and spontaneous. There would be no strike for higher nominal, or for higher actual, wages; only the coming together of the workers internationally for the political and industrial overthrow of the bourgeoisie, and the taking of whatever united industrial and political activity the Class War demanded by way of its culminating expression.

If the workers declined to strike in sympathy, it would be because they did not sympathise industrially with the revolting fifty. Yet, as consumers and fellow wage slaves, by the logic of economic production and distribution, they would be affected alike by the existence of the strike and its termination. The question as to whether they were right in passively siding with the employees does not enter into the problem as stated by the pseudo-proletarian defender of representation. The only question is the right of the majority.

By refusal, the majority have shown that they are opposed to this gentleman and his forty-nine imaginary colleagues. His position is altered slightly, and the manifesto of the resolute fifty now is addressed to the whole of the rest of the working-class, which is engaged not in striking in sympathy, but in passively siding with local minority of blacklegs and the Capitalist class. The manifesto, therefore, should run: "Being in a shop where sixty men are at work, and fifty of us want to strike, and ten do not, I am in favour of coercing the ten and making them come out, while we fifty fight the 'boss.' As the rest of the working-class and the whole of the Capitalist class side with the 'boss' and the ten non-strikers, I am in favour of coercing the majority of my own class and the whole of the Capitalist class also."

What would be society's answer? Why, that of the Trade Union-apologist-or-strike-believer-in-majority righteousness! Thus, a worker who was not in favour of the striker would say:—"If I am in a society where a vast majority of the proletariat can have their present ill-being intensified, and poverty added to their poverty, by fifty men going on strike, I am in favour of coercing the fifty and making them go back to work, whilst we, the majority of the workers, meet the 'boss' through our representatives on arbitration and conciliation boards, and through peaceful agencies, secure higher wages and better conditions."

Maybe the revolting strike defender would turn aside, with his sturdy band of followers, numbering forty-nine all told, and, sighing somewhat critically, relieve his feelings by giving utterance to the following piece of philosophy: "The majority have no more right to coerce a minority than the minority have to coerce a majority. The fifty have no more right to coerce the ten than the ten have to coerce the fifty. Society has no more right to coerce the fifty strikers than the fifty strikers have to coerce society. But the minority has as much right to coerce the majority as the majority has to coerce the minority. Ten strikers have as much right to coerce fifty non-strikers as fifty strikers have to coerce ten non-strikers. And society has as much right, and no more, to coerce fifty strikers as fifty strikers have to coerce society. Where might reigns rights do not exist. Where the political reflex of industrial complexity is centralization of control and administration, individual autonomy is impossible. The only question is: Seeing that the emancipation of the working-class means the emancipation of the world, and that we base our argument on logic and reason; that by quiet and resolute activity the workers can be brought together in one revolutionary 'Impossibilist' movement to tie up the workshops of the world, amid the anathemas and violence of impotent Capitalism struggling in its death-throes; that violence against our own class can never atone for the violence of the capitalist against us, but only make for an orgie of bloodshed which will delay the sure and certain overthrow of parasitism; seeing, in fact, that Socialism is inevitable and that the very oppression of the working-class constitutes its final economic and political strength, is extraneous violence, *i.e.*, an interference with the liberty of the strike-breaker by virtue of physical force above and beyond the law of economic effect in production, distribution, and consumption, advisable in the interests of the workers to-day, and the securement of the commonweal for which they are striving?"

This, I repeat, is the question which our physical force constitutional palliationist, supposing he understood the situation, would ask himself.

My reply—since I own no arsenals, have no monopoly of gatling or Maxim guns, and am not a Nonconformist Cabinet Minister—would be "no," especially since, in accordance with the

law of social evolution, I believe in conserving all the principles of past progress in the direction of liberty. And freedom, so far as economic tendencies permit, I hold to be such a principle. Indeed, the fact that I have to so qualify it, means that the right of freedom is admitted, with rare, if any, exceptions, so long as the economic *status quo* is not disturbed.

Though the expression of the Class struggle will be political, its basis will be economic, so that it can no longer be willed into a physical force one. It does not require that the reader should agree with me on this point for him to realise that no prerogative to murder, boycott, or coerce is specially invested in the majority, because the deity of abstract rights has decided that the majority is the majority. If coercion be right, its successfulness must decide its employment. Successful or otherwise, it is no more right for the minority than the majority to coerce, and neither more nor less obligatory upon it not to do so.

This is my position—as a Socialist—of equal rights for majority and minority, which, being recognised, would not lead to the hopeless confusion that majority rule does. It is a confusion of bourgeois begetting, leading to the experiences of Motherwell, Hull, Grimsby, Featherstone, Penrhyn, Mitchelstown, and Belfast. The negation of the alleged right of majority violence is based upon the economics of the Class War.

Our Trade Unionist friend, with his loose revolutionary violence and threatening, as opposed to a sound revolutionary activity, finding himself either consciously or unconsciously on the side of bourgeois society, will insist that there must be representation and delegation of authority.

To this I reply with the statement of Marxian philosophy, that every industrial epoch has its own system of representation. The fact that minority and majority rule find their harmonious expression in the political bureaucratic autocracy of capitalism signifies that its negation in the terms of Socialism shall embody a counter affirmative which embody the principle of true organisation and freedom of the individual idiosyncrasy. What the details of that organisation will be shall be made the subject of discussion in another essay. That it will not be “a Socialist majority” can be seen from the fact that democracy usually signifies the surrender of majority incompetence and mis-education to the interests of minority expertism and bourgeois concentration of its power over the lives and destinies of the exploited proletarians, no less through the medium of the worker’s Trade and Industrial Union, than through that of the Capitalist State.

Marx truly conceived of the bourgeois State as being but an executive committee for administering the affairs of the whole bourgeois class, which has stripped of its halo every profession previously venerated and regarded as honourable, and thus turned

doctor, lawyer, priest, poet, philosopher, and labour leader into its paid wage workers. The Trade Union becomes daily more and more an essential department or expression of the bourgeois State.

Out of the class or property social system there cannot emerge a “representation” which signifies an honest attempt to secure just exposition of principles and expressions of antagonistic interests. Where there is no social or economic equality, there can be no democracy and no representation. The barren wilderness of money-juggling “freedom” cannot secure real personal liberty of being to any citizen. True organisation like true liberty belongs to the future—and the Socialist Commonwealth; or, as I have termed it elsewhere, the Anarchist Republic.

I.

The Bible is not a divinely inspired book. Its every line is not sacred. Its very periods are not inspired. Its whole prospect is not awful. Penetrate the gloom with which the Christian centuries have surrounded the ancient "book above books," and you will discover nothing more than an old-time "book of books." In this literary miscellany, it is impossible to discover an even distribution of talent. The books are not equally good. Every passage is not expressive of a common level of ability on the part of the authors. Many sentences challenge publication. As many merit oblivion. Outlooks, it has in abundance from that of Moses, gluttonous for power, to that of Isaiah, stern for the righteousness of liberty. Minor priests rub shoulders with minor prophets. Drama is found in Job, cynical materialism in Ecclesiastes, and the championship of secular authority only in Saul. Pentateuchal polygamy is mingled with much divine imbecility. Sinai storms at sense. But the captivity is followed by denunciations of useless ritual and canting ceremony. The God with "back parts" gives place to the God of spirit; the jealous to the zealous deity. His holiness hungers not for sacrifice from the strong, but thirsts to sustain the weak. It abandons dominion to cast out oppression. Works recording so radical a transformation of the divine character or characters must boast a little genius in places. Suspicion of such cannot be avoided entirely.

Of this natural magazine of literature, or collection of writings, no mention will be made in this essay. We shall write only of a supernatural "books of books." This is a circumspect "line in literature" which time has rendered acceptable to the kirk elder and the bethel deacon. Since it is treated to no variety of appreciation, it is discovered to possess no divergency of style, nor lights or shades of merit. It is the book. Not a fossil, but a whole geological stratum.

This is what the Hebrew literary museum has been hallowed into being by the Church, which has disciplined the intellect of man to stagnation. One day we shall understand the stratum so well that we shall discover not merely fossils but living forms—the living forms of past struggles for freedom. In the fetish, we shall glimpse the truth. At present, we can see nothing beyond a rod of authority, which narrows our vision, curbs our liberty, and commands our slavish devotion.

Mankind evolved and embraced this rod of authority in the ages when darkness was its only light. Rod and victim experienced a common degradation. Where all was divine equally, the vulgar was divine mostly. The power of the rod consisted in its rudeness. The subjection of the people lay in their lewdness. Wisdom was the flourish of accidence, which ornamented the ecclesiastical crook. The Bible itself was its most imbecile portions. Pearls were refuse

Socialism and Marriage

FOREWORD.

This pamphlet was published at Shepherds Bush in 1914. It was revised from *The Religion and Economics of Sex Oppression*, which was printed and published by the Bakunin Press, at the Goswell Road address in 1907. The purpose of the original pamphlet was described on the title page as follows:—

"Being a consideration of the principles of Socialism and Free-thought in relation to Women, The Suffrage, Free Love, and Neo-Malthusian, together with an examination of scriptural precepts and injunctions, the teaching of the Christian Fathers, and of the Latter Day Saints upon the questions of polygamy and the position of woman."

The Foreword mentions how the pamphlet owed its inception to a lecture delivered before the Southwark Socialist Club (S.D.F.) on January 7th, 1906, on "Socialism and Woman." It concludes by dedicating "my present effort to my comrade, Rose Witcop." Subsequently, my relationship with Rose Witcop became an interesting legal question and gave rise to much newspaper comment. That relationship and the legal question merit discussion in a separate work. The original preface can be reproduced later.

The 1911 rewritten essay omitted the Mormon satire on Marriage Relations and sermon on Jesus as a polygamist. This ought not to have been deleted but should have been reviewed more thoroughly. A considerable section of the 1907 pamphlet that was deleted from the 1911 revision ought to have been removed to an appendix. In 1912 in the *Herald of Revolt*, and later, in *The Spur*, the author discussed at greater length the various aspects of the question of woman's emancipation. It is my intention to bring all these essays together in another pamphlet.

The full (1907) reference to the Church Fathers and their views on woman has been restored in place of the more general summary published in the revised pamphlet.

Glasgow, May 9, 1940.

G. A. A.

because husks were gems. God's "blind mouths" secured social sanctuary, whilst power destroyed perspective, and interest nursed misery.

We are devout neither about nor towards this Bible of despotism. We dare not pretend a respect for the Bible of reality, for the Christian world knows of no reality outside of the Bible of pretence. Its worthlessness calls for exposure. We will discuss its relation towards woman's freedom, because our social greatness, involving woman's subjection, is held to be founded upon the said holy writ.

God's word treats woman not to a lesson, but to a dirge. It compliments our mothers and sisters by insisting on their vicious curiosity and ambition. Woman's inherently corrupt nature is presumed to corrupt all her male posterity. In the female line, there is so much spontaneous sin that no room remains for any inherited taint. Fatherhood is virtue, whilst motherhood is vice. It is unclean to suffer the pain of "presenting" one's masculine proprietor, called husband, with a child. It is clean to have been the cause of the presentation. But it is doubly unclean to bear a female instead of a male child. One wonders how the father escapes contamination in this event.

What the Jewish Code of Leviticus says in this connection, the Anglican Service for the Churcing of Woman retains. Female hysteria applauds the lie.

God decreed that woman should be subject unto man. He destined her for child-bearing at her husband's will and domestic drudgery on his behalf. Obedience must be paid to his every whim, care given to his comforts, ministering to his passions, and submission to his castigation. The most exemplary attention to the servitude of this underpaid housekeeping is rewarded with pain and sorrow. From Eve to Dorcas, the records of the chief woman characters in the Bible, preach the same dreary morality.

Even when exercising the virtue of most complete humility, woman remains an abomination. Even when exhibiting no initiative, she exerts an evil influence. Good dwelt in Nazareth, but it has never dwelt in woman.

Leah and Rachel were so much cattle given in wedlock to Jacob as a reward for seven years' service each. On the most flattering estimate they were but good wages. Maybe their lord and master often viewed them less charitably.

The Jewish Lord of Hosts was a God of Rape. In Deuteronomy, he bade the Hebrews force beautiful captives from among their fallen enemies—unto whom they might have a desire—to be their wives. In Judges, he has the sons of Benjamin waylay the daughters of Shihol.

Man was the human being. Woman was the female. She completed that sex nature, which was incidental to his physical make-up. After Constantine, the Church Fathers, who relished

sacred writ, gravely discovered that she had no soul, and noted, without alarm, that she died like a dog.

To this day, a similar dictum prevails. Man is mankind and woman is the sex. It is the function of man to dispose of her body, as his own dependence on the laws of brute force, fraud, and purchase decide. She has no right to object, no need to consent. Everything is done for her. Man proposes, man disposes, and the woman changes hands. What will be, will be.

When a man dies, his "relict" is permitted to survive. She continues his shadow until she completes another human being's sex. Instead of a relic, she is now an appendage.

In the Jewish ritual, she is permitted to discharge no functions requiring individual initiative. In the framing of the creed, canons, and codes of Christendom her voice has never been heard.

Jesus denied the God of Abraham and placed woman on terms of equality with her accusers. The heresiarchs—Cerdon, Carpocrates, and Paul of Samosata—applauded this view and repudiated Old Testament authority. Visiting them with excommunication, the Church accepted Constantine and Jehovah, and treated the world to those councils, doctrines, relics, monastic institutions, and forgeries which have been the wonders of sixteen centuries.

It invented the story of the resurrection. Thomas felt the wounds in Christ's side. Mary was not good enough to touch "the risen saviour." Since he was man, an eternal soul, the testimony of Thomas counted. Since she was woman, the sex instrument of man, the evidence of Mary was of no moment. What she saw or heard could have no weight in the decision of the Church.

Much is made of the alleged fact, that Christianity has "honoured" woman. Much, also, is said of the historical authenticity of the Christian Scriptures. In support of which authenticity, defenders of the saintly faith refer us to the Pagan Christian fathers.

Some of these fathers may be quoted in favour of Communism and they are not always completely heterodox. Did the faithful folk, who cite these worthies without question, believe in Jesus and understand the story of his teaching and its historic perversion and negation, they would be given less to this weakness. In the main, despite their varying degree of heresy, these gentlemen were mostly ecclesiastical time-servers. Each is the voice of the Church, not when he proclaims the truth of his particular heresy, but only in his appalling declaration of allegiance to superstition and oppression. The arrogance and ignorance has, of these Church Fathers, combined to become the gospel of Christendom. Some of them may have urged Communism. All opposed the freedom of woman, denied her equity and justice in her relations with the male human.

St. Chrysostom describes woman as "a necessary evil, a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic peril, a deadly fascination, and a painted ill." Obviously, cosmetics, lip-stick, sun-tan,

rouge, are as ancient as the Church Fathers! The same saint asserted that "through woman the Devil has triumphed, through her paradise has been lost; of all wild beasts, the most dangerous." Equally worthy of a Christian thinker, and similar in letter and in spirit to this sweetly sympathetic dictum is that of Tertullian, who addressed woman as "the Devil's gateway," and "unsealer of the forbidden tree," "the first deserter of the divine law," "who destroyed so easily God's image, man." Then there is the declaration of St. Gregory the Great, to the effect that "woman has the poison of the asp, and the malice of a dragon." St. Jerome, who invented the doctrine of heavenly salvation and substituted it for the doctrine of mental health, eulogised woman in his quaint style as "the gate of the devil, the road of iniquity, the dart of the scorpion." This vies, in strength of declaration, with the word picture created by the Christian genius of Clement of Alexandria. This noble soul denounces affection for a woman as leading "to the fire that will never cease in consequence of sin." Gregory Thaumaturgus placed it on record, that, "verily, a person may find one man chaste among a thousand, but a woman never." St. Bernard apostrophised her as "the organ of the Devil." St. John Damascene contented himself with the comparatively mild description: "the daughter of falsehood, a sentinel of Hell, the enemy of Peace," through whom "Adam lost his paradise."

Similar testimony is borne by St. Antony, Bonaventure and Cyprian, who regarded woman, respectively, as "the fountain of sin, the arm of the Devil, her voice the hissing of the serpent"; "the scorpion, ever ready to sting, the lance of the demon"; and "the instrument which the devil uses to gain possession of our souls."

This is "the good news" that woman has welcomed down the Christian centuries! For a thousand years, the insane and inane denunciation of woman has been the teaching of Christendom. Even when it was no longer as the gospel of Christian civilization, this teaching inspires secretly the approach to woman as something uncanny if not positively socially unclean in herself. The parade of gallantry conceals the real attitude. Whoever believes that the church fathers voice "the truth" of Christianity must accept the degradation of woman as a divine decree. Whoever regards the god of Abraham as the heavenly pater of Jesus, must look upon polygamy as compatible with God's law. Holy writ boasts no express discharge against it, and the holy spirit often commends it.

II.

The dutifully pious young lady of to-day does not believe in polygamy. When she sells her chastity in the marriage market, she is guaranteed a legal monopoly. That satisfies her conscience.

She does not inquire whether or not the man is offering her damaged goods. Indeed, she half suspects that he has sown wild oats in the company of other women. Henceforth, these are to have no claim on him. So her jealous sense of honour is satisfied.

Polygamy, though Biblically sanctioned, dishonours woman, by making her the property of man. It lays it down that one man has the right to own a number of women as his lawful wives, and have connection with others as his unlawful passions dictate. Under polygamy, the aim of every woman is to be a lawful wife if she would be counted "respectable."

Monogamy, though legally established, dishonours woman, by making her the property of man. It lays it down that one man has the right to own one woman as his lawful wife, and have connection with others as his unlawful passions dictate. Under monogamy, the aim of every woman is to be a lawful wife if she would be counted "respectable."

The position of the wife under both systems is the same. She purchases her position by her chastity. The chastity of the man is another matter. A wife cannot be divorced from her husband through his having committed adultery alone. There must be, in addition, the proven charges of cruelty and desertion. Should the wife commit adultery, the husband can obtain a divorce, and monetary damages against the co-respondent, as a solatium for his injured feelings.

Woman is the property of man. In marriage, she has no name of her own, no right of parentage. Any man who, being unmarried to a woman, attempts to force caresses on her is penalised for assault. Judge and jury have decided, however, that a husband is entitled to a show of his wife's affections. He has purchased that right, and may abuse her body, in consequence, for years.

Not a few atheists attack the Bible for its polygamous teachings, on the ground that they degrade woman. They denounce Mormonism for putting the teachings into practice, as a "horrible example" to other Christian systems. Of course, they deny that marriage is a sacrament of the church. To-day, after years of struggle, the State has been compelled to accept their view, that marriage is only a secular contract. What good has this "reformed outlook" done woman? In what way has it affected the hypocrisy of marriage?

Let no man, says the Church sacrament, put asunder those whom God hath joined together. In other words, let the God-fearing lawyers do it, if you are rich enough to pay them. Surely if God exists, it should be left to him to join the chosen ones together. Only blasphemy can expect the priest, who does not know God's will, to do it. Only impiety can dread, that, without an idle ceremony, God cannot join together those whom he wishes to have united.

The secular contract is as binding as the Church sacrament. It is as substantially dishonouring to woman. It is equally false. To object to mentioning God's name in the ceremony, when you do not object to the slavish covenant it involves, is cant of the worst possible description. To demand secular instead of ecclesiastical marriage, when virtue demands the abolition of all marriage, is humbug. Marriage gave a Christian preacher the power to deprive Annie Besant of her children. Had she been unmarried, she would have owned both herself and her children. As it was she was his property, and her children belonged to him. It was not ecclesiastical marriage that did this, as distinct from secular marriage, but marriage—the legalised sex relationship. Yet Annie Besant, in an eloquent pamphlet on "Marriage: As it Was, As it Is, and As it Should Be," published in 1882, pleaded for a written contract between the parties to a marriage union.

Annie Besant urges marriage reform, and simple divorce on the grounds of incompatibility. Simple divorce is merely a legalised form of pure and simple mating in the terms of free love, for it is marriage and separation at will. Only the mating and separating are registered. This timid, incomplete, and hypocritical approach to the solution of the problem is the last hopeless gesture of property society. The need for divorce means that monogamy is no more satisfactory to mankind than polygamy. Actually, different mating systems should exist side by side in a sane and civilized society.

It is the woman's place to take care of the children. She must bear unwanted children, and care for them amidst much misery. If she neglects this duty, she is sent to prison, and her children to the workhouse. Her husband can plead that he was not responsible for his wife's neglect. Woman suffers all the penalties of a parent. She enjoys none of the rights.

Under a promise of marriage, a young woman consents to cohabit with the man to whom she has been engaged for a number of years. He fails to make good, and the victim of his lust becomes a social outcast at a moment when she needs most friendship. No one owns her or her offspring. Were there no marriage laws, such callous outrage would be impossible.

Dissenting cant views her as an "unfortunate." It is wrong. Moral conventionalism follows suit. It is wrong. The secular marriage has no meaning if it is not destined to serve the same end. It is as hypocritical as the ecclesiastical sacrament.

If woman did not lose her identity when she married, no one could object to her bearing children in her own right. If she owned her body in marriage, there would be no shame attached to owning it out of marriage.

But if woman owned her body, the marriage profession would be gone. There would be no harlots to sell their bodies for a night.

There would be no respectable women to sell their bodies for life. Children could not be labelled bastards for a fictitious offence, and women would be betrayed no more. Rape would disappear, both by contract, and without it.

Men and women would not commit adultery and practise desertion to escape a wedded prostitution that did not exist. Irrational promises would not be terminated by unnecessary divorces. Papers would not carry notices of men and women's intentions to sleep together. They would not announce the abandonment of the practice, or record reasons for changing partners.

Women's boast of marriage respectability is man's exhibition of his dishonour. If the father, son, husband, and sweetheart, did not outrage some women, other women would not be able to avow their honourable unions. Marriage bribes some women and degrades others, that man may parade his sex infamy.

Human nature is shamed and dishonoured not by this or that ceremony of marriage. It is outraged by the institution itself. The moral of well-being of mankind demands the abolition of marriage. Woman must own her own body. She must choose the father or fathers of her children. If name they must have, that name should be hers. Only this means not reform but revolution.

III.

"Marriage," wrote the late Dr. E. P. McLoughlin, "is not an empty form; it is an indissoluble, untruthful, and unfounded contract, terminable only by death or dishonour. Untruthful and unfounded because the contractor saith, 'I will love.' He cannot do this; to love is beyond the power or domain of will. He may say, 'I do love.' But 'I will love,' he cannot and ought not to say. 'The law which would make her his.' I neither acknowledge the righteousness, nor even the possibility of any law save that of mutual consent—that is, affection. I do not desire to make any woman mine; it must be her love for me, and my love for her, which alone can dictate an inviolable relationship between us. In the presence of that love, either soluble or indissoluble bond, other than the influence of that love, is as insulting as it is necessary; in the absence of that love, any bond is as untruthful and useless as it is immoral."

The foregoing argument is unanswerable. Whenever it or any similar line of reasoning is advanced, no one attempts to reply to it. Every defender of the legal institution will admit its validity, and then proceed to question its morality.

First, do we believe that one man should possess a woman or that she should be common property? This is supposed to bring the blush of shame to the cheek, and expression of horror to the eyes. A little calm reflection will dispose of it.

We have not proposed that woman should be common property. That is polyandry. Under polyandry, a woman no more owns her

body than under polygamy or monogamy. All three systems decline to entertain the notion that woman should dispose of her own body as she thinks fit. In every case, it is the man's not the woman's desire, which counts. The woman may desire to have connection with only one man, with no man at all, or with several men at different times. That is her own affair. We propose that she should dispose of her body accordingly. To no man would belong the privilege of invading this right. How then can one talk of no ownership but self-ownership being collective ownership?

Next it will be urged that this involves promiscuity. But does not the division of woman into two camps—"respectable" and otherwise—argue the existence of promiscuity? If promiscuity does not degrade man to-day, why should it degrade woman to-morrow? At least, it would be an honest promiscuity, and woman could select a healthy parent for her child. Since the free woman could never be run to the marriage cover, her body could never be outraged or her person degraded.

Having urged that freedom involves promiscuity, the defender of legal marriage takes a lofty attitude. Promiscuity would degrade human nature. Maybe; but if human nature is above promiscuity, how could freedom reduce it to this condition? If monogamy is the result of personal dignity, and cultured feeling, freedom can give only full and free expression to that dignity and feeling. Then only those alliances not based on either dignity or culture will disappear in a state of freedom. If the woman lives with a man because she loves him, not because she is tied to him, given freedom to decide, her choice will be unaffected. Wherein, then, is it wrong for a woman to own her body not up to the time she sleeps with a certain sex-mate, but for all time?

Let us canvass, fully, the significance of this word, "promiscuity." Annie Besant, pleading for monogamy, has pointed out, how, in the lower ranges of animal life, difference of sex is enough to excite passion. Here there is no individuality of choice. Among savages, this is negated. It is still the female that is loved, but individual beauty decides the connection. We rise to the civilised man, and find that he needs, in addition to sex difference, and beauty of form, completion of his higher nature. He needs satisfaction for heart, mind, and tastes.

From this it is argued that, the more civilised the nature, the more durable does the marriage relationship become. It may easily prove otherwise. The exclusive marriage union is a standard set up by the prudery which objects to mixed bathing and a pre-nuptial knowledge of sex physiology. It implies that the joy of sex can never be known unless, in every instance, it results in a certain act. Behind this view, is the idea of the hunter, of courtship, of the slavery of woman. As men and women mix more freely, as the charm of health and the lights and shades of character express

themselves more variously, in wider and wider circles of social intercourse, it does not follow that monogamy will disappear entirely. But it does follow that the prime consideration will be healthy minds and healthy bodies, joy, laughter, romping children, and social service. That a man has been father of one woman's child, is no reason why, if his character completes that of another woman, he should not be father of her child. It will not affect the pain of bearing the child, or the pleasure of caring for him.

"What about the children?" asks the moralist of to-day. Well, what about them? Is the child's right to live to turn upon the fact that he needs food, clothing, shelter, and attention? Or, is it to be decided by the fact that his father had had sex connection with but one woman? Where consideration for the children is supreme, the moral code of the parents does not matter. But if the question is the legality of some birth over others, it is sheer cant to talk about the children. Nature never created bastards. It was social respectability and prurient prudery.

That the matter has an economic aspect we are aware. Its discussion will destroy the moral pretensions of the upholders of marriage, and bring us down to the materialistic factor. We shall discover then that injustices attributed to free love, are common to class society. Marriage will be revealed as a vice, reflecting vicious economic circumstances.

IV.

"That a man and woman should occupy the same house, and daily enjoy each other's company—so long as such an association gives birth to virtuous feelings, to kindness, to mutual forbearance, to courtesy, to disinterested affection—I consider right and proper," wrote Robert Dale Owen in the *Boston Trumpet*, in May, 1831. "That they should continue to inhabit the same house and to meet daily, in case such intercourse should give birth to vicious feelings, to dislike, to ill-temper, to scolding, to carelessness of each other's comfort, and a want of respect for each other's feelings—this, I consider, when the two individuals alone are concerned, neither right nor proper; neither conducive to good order nor virtue. I do not think it well, therefore, to promise, at all hazards to live together for life."

Most persons will agree with the above plea for divorce. It asserts the immorality of the marriage tie. It puts all contracts out of the question. Once the right to disregard laws in the part is admitted, the duty of ignoring them in their entirety is implied. And every fresh concession made in the direction of rendering divorce easier—for the wealthy, and not for the poor, however—is a confession of the failure morally of the laws to secure that harmony of being they are presumed to effect. For laws are but the

perpetuation of past errors. To realise this fact is to believe in divorce. To subscribe to divorce is to accept free love. If free love involves promiscuity, divorce involves it. The issue is between anarchy in love and compulsory loveless connection.

"When the two individuals alone are concerned," qualifies R. D. Owen. Can any sane person believe that it is either right or proper, either conducive to good order or virtue on the part of the children to be brought up in a loveless home? Do not the children learn to hate their parents, and leave home at the earliest possible date in consequence?

Family life is the great lie of civilisation. Parents sacrifice their honour for their children, and children destroy their genius for their parents.

What of the children? Are there no foundling hospitals? Are there no mothers denied the right to bring their children up tenderly, because they, the mothers, were not wedded to the fathers? What of these children? Since when has God told man it was justice to oppress the weak? If the foundling home is good enough for some children, it is good enough for all.

Under free love, all men would desert their children. Of course the argument is nonsense. Nothing of the kind would take place. All men are not scoundrels. Admitting that the present financial system continued, and that all fathers deserted the children, woman would cease to be the household drudge, man would become his own domestic serf, and the children, at the worst, would become all foundlings. They would be clothed and fed, as to-day they are educated, by the state or else the community. If they are not pauperised by receiving common free education, they will not be pauperised by receiving common free clothing and food. If they are, then illegitimates should not be pauperised in this way. The marriage laws should go, in the interest of the illegitimate.

This would have an economic effect. The workers' wages are governed by his cost of production. When the luxury of family life ceased to enter into that cost, his wages would decline. The children, heirs of the commonwealth, would be kept still out of the workers' labour power.

We have said the question is an economic one. It is. No man has the right to help a woman because she needs help. If she has children by another man, however great her suffering, his chivalry must not lend a helping hand. Only where he has assaulted the woman's chastity is he permitted to assist her. It is not justice, not the sufferings of the woman, not the tears of the children. It is the owning of the woman's person that counts. Men who believe in marriage laws laugh at the idea of "keeping" another man's children. Why? Does the worker not keep the children of the rich—and the parents into the bargain?

Analyse it, and this family life plea becomes individualism run mad. Driven by the wants of his family, the dock-worker

fighters for his job. Does he care about the family life of the weaker man he has ousted? Hunger and misery evolve a thief. The need to live manufactures the detective. Both have families. Both fight for them. The limb of the law wins—and his family is happy. The thief loses—and a family tragedy is enacted. What of the children? Does the wedding-ring give them food?

"When the Scottish miners came out on strike in 1894," wrote Mr. Chisholm Robertson recently in the *Glasgow Evening Times*, "and throughout the strike the miners of England and Wales continued at work, filled the markets depleted by the abstention from work of the Scottish miners. This was a veritable harvest to the miners over the border. It prolonged, however, the fight, finally defeating it, with much suffering to the families of the men on strike, great hardship to the workers of kindred trades, and entailed years of hurt to the Scottish coal trade."

The English miners were thinking of their wives and children. Their family considerations prevented them being just to all women and children of their class in whom they had no property. Good husbands can make poor citizens. Good fathers make poor fighters against class injustice. Surely the marriage which reduces a man to a scab should go. Surely we are less than brutes if we cannot realise that our lives are mean and narrow if we do not secure happiness and joy to others. When we realise that, the class-struggle is substituted for the family struggle. We are no longer husbands, wives, and children—but comrades and chums, freely associating as the propaganda and our interest in it demands.

V.

Mother Grundy believes that the two sexes cannot smile, without contemplating the sex-act. That a pleasant day cannot be spent without a similar consequence. That mixed bathing leads to suggestion. That a handclasp is fatal, and, even in moments either of extreme sorrow or extreme joy, the most humble kiss of sympathy is dangerous. At one time, no man was allowed to speak to a woman unless he had "honourable intentions." Properly translated, this meant dishonourable ones.

This is changed now, and Mother Grundy is wrong. The function of woman is not to share barracks with man, and bear him children. She is entitled to get all the health out of life possible. Free association gives that health; and as we mix no longer in the presence of a sex mystery, but understanding each other's physiology, sex may give charm to our friendship. It does not rush us into sex-connection. Knowing our freedom, we are lured on by no forbidden fruit, and only at supreme moments of passion will intercourse result.

We are speaking of Socialism, not of Capitalism, where intercourse is a daily habit. Whilst full freedom belongs to Socialism, it would be wrong not to embrace its teachings and endeavour to live up to some of them to-day. To do so, is to break fundamentally with class-society; and even though we enter upon free-marriage rather than into free-love relationships, it is but a step to the other, and prepares the philistine imagination for the dawn of matriarchal society.

In free marriage, both parties retain their identities. But the man, feeling bound by honour and duty, should his love cool, hesitates to avow the fact. Woman, owing to her inherited position in slave society, when emancipated even, too often experiences a jealousy which the free man does not experience. But his regard for his friend, and the children, if any, fetters his expression of his feelings. This is wrong—and must go. The ecclesiastical marriage, the secular marriage, and the free marriage must go. Patriarchal society must disappear, that freedom may be inaugurated.

VI.

Free love is impossible under capitalism. Yes: so is honour or truth of any description. Is that any reason why we should ask the priest to bless our sex-relationship, or the law to license our associations?

Woman is now a wage-earner. She suffers all the misery of free labour. She bears all the chains of the past. Reduces her male colleague's wages by competition, and then maintains his existence on the lesser income. Legally, she remains his inferior.

In order to remove these anomalies, some middle-class women have been urging on the State their right to vote, and thus assist in the making of the laws that govern them. Superficially, the claim is incontrovertible. There is no reason why woman should not enjoy the same social rights as man. If men boast a property franchise, so should women. If a small set of male parasites vote, not according to their intelligence, but in ratio to the houses they own, logically a select clique of female parasites should be entitled to the same privileges. If a man can sit in the House of Pretence, woman can also. The sexes are equal in honour and dishonour.

The property male vote is not the enfranchisement of men. The limited equal enfranchisement of women is not suffrage for women. To pretend so, is ridiculous. Short of out and out adult suffrage, women suffrage is impossible.

Whilst one is securing the part, one can be realising the whole. It is as easy to win "adult suffrage" as its palliative, "woman suffrage." The more loudly you demand the former, the more likely you are to secure the latter.

Adult suffrage, in its turn, is only a palliation—the shadow of political power which will be granted, one day, to prevent the surrender of the substance of economic power. There is a futility in

striving for anything short of Socialism; and the suffrage struggle embodies that futility.

So long as the workers are dominated by the capitalist class, so long as they remain the economic slaves of society, so long will they lack that industrial liberty, without which all suffrage is a farce. Economic determinism, the slow but sure awakening of the masses to their real position, are the factors governing the nature of capitalistic concession; so that the nearer the people come to the realisation of their condition, the more advanced will be the nature of the palliatives we shall secure. Hence there is no necessity to concentrate our energies upon the securing of palliatives. Let us come out for Socialism, and as the Bible has it, "these other things shall be added unto us." As with the limited franchise, so with adult franchise, both are equally absurd without economic conditions prevail that guarantee freedom from want, and are equally fraudulent, therefore, as battle-cries.

Free-love propaganda, if not discussed in the terms of its economic basis, may become an Utopian cause. Anti-State activity may prove the same. So may Atheist agitation. But free love is not a palliative. It is an expression of our Socialism, an avowal of our revolt. Anarchism is not a palliative. It either compromises to "direct action" and reforms itself into an abstraction, or remains revolutionary—a statement of what Socialism politically and socially involves. Atheism is not a palliative. Either it degenerates into a lifeless superstition of unreasoning reason, or just summarises the materialism of Socialism.

Socialism, then does not believe in votes under capitalism, petitioning to administer the capitalist system, either for men or women. It urges social freedom for both instead—a new economic order of living, social and industrial democracy.

These facts are commended to the attention of those who desire to hasten the dawn of the day when woman shall stand forth freed from the fetters of theological superstition and economic bondage. Let them but—

"See the blasting, burning shame of sex-oppression now,
And with hearts and hands uplifted, swear a grand and God-like vow,
That despite the fangs of custom, and despite the Church's frown,
Womanhood shall wield its sceptre, womanhood shall wear its crown.
She hath borne with man his crosses, she has worn with him his chains,
She hath shared in all his losses, she hath suffered all his pains.
She shall stand with him co-equal, on the pure-exalted plains."

In the 1907 pamphlet, the piety theme is developed in detail. The women characters of the Bible are listed by name and comment made, that their several stories "are included in the hope of inculcating in the woman's mind the propriety of her 'modest'(!) retirement to the privacy of domestic life, performing, in an exemplary manner, the duties of a domestic serf, studying his desires like a subject, whilst extolling him for his strength of mind, and power of acquiring knowledge and enforcing his will. To these disgusting precepts, we find even the boasted saviour of Christendom made, by priestly tradition, to lend his aid."

This passage stands: but it would interfere with the re-written text of the 1914 edition to restore it to its place in the main essay.

Against Terrorism in The Workers' Struggle

(As this pamphlet goes to press, some of the leading men of the Bolshevik Revolution, including Bukharin, Rykov, Yagoda, Krestinsky, and Rakovsky, the heroic founder of the 3rd International, are awaiting death in another Stalin frame-up. The S.A.C. calls upon the workers to organise to destroy Communist Party and Stalin Terrorism, and to rank it with Fascism and all other terrorism.)

Issued 5th March, 1938. Published by the Socialist Anti-Terror Committee, Glasgow.

STALIN'S FRAME-UPS.

The rise of Capitalism, with the growth of the factory and the resulting supremacy in society of the manufacturer and financier, gave cohesion and class purpose to the workers driven from the soil and forced to live under the worst possible conditions near the place where they were exploited in herds. This development created a new class struggle and gave birth to the propaganda of Socialism. Since this term was first employed, Socialist thought has experienced many evolutions. To-day, it is more and more associated in men's minds with futility and with terrorism. Such association of ideas would have appalled those who pioneered the struggle towards Socialism and saw in its propaganda the conquest of the workers of bread and freedom.

Bread and freedom! This is exactly what Socialism meant to the working men whom it first inspired. Never once did the pioneers of Socialism think of the Red Flag except as the symbol of liberty: liberty from economic exploitation and liberty from political oppression. When one looks back on the history of Socialist thought and propaganda in Britain, when one thinks of the meetings, crowds roused by the fate of the Chicago martyrs, when one turns back to the writings of William Morris and whether one reads the old Social Democratic publications or Anarchist sheets, always one is brought in contact with the atmosphere of freedom. It is impossible to believe that the working men who rallied round John Burns at Trafalgar Square or marched in procession past the Carlton Club, conceived of Socialism meaning the perpetuation of persecution, firing squads, and the supremacy of the State. Least of all did one associate that with the struggle in Russia.

At the various meetings held in London in the nineties of the last century, to welcome exiles from the Czar's oppression, and to

be horrified by stories of the White Terror in Russia, programmes were put forward far less extreme than that of the Bolsheviks of 1917, but not a single programme excluded the all-important item of political liberty. Socialism meant a new world, a world of international well-being bathed in freedom.

This was the dream and the ambition. When Bakunin wrote of two Communisms, an authoritarian Communism that would persecute like an autocratic or bureaucratic State, and of a free Communism that would produce freedom, his remarks were viewed with scepticism. In those days no Socialist dreamt that one Socialist would take power in order to murder another. It is true that anti-Socialist writings sneered at Socialism and avowed that Socialism meant State persecution. No Socialist would accept this statement but replied that it was a gross and malignant slander invented for the purpose of perpetuating the evils of property society.

To-day, if Stalinism and the Communist Party are correct, the anti-Socialist arguments of yesterday must be acknowledged as being right in their anticipation. In the Soviet Union and in Spain, wherever the Third International and the Communist Party has developed power, irresponsible ruling Terrorism is the order of the day. What was once termed scientific Socialism has been reduced to an expression of medieval terror. The Inquisition that the Catholic Church was compelled to abandon owing to the progress of thought and knowledge has been re-established by the Stalinists with audacity and a brutal claim to authority almost unbelievable in the name of Communism and Socialism. The strange and appalling fact is that by a process of hireling propaganda this terrorism is defended throughout the working class movement in every land as being the quintessence of revolution. The victims of this terror are termed counter-revolutionists all the time that the promoters of the terror actively develop counter-revolution and defeatism wherever they develop their power. In China; in Germany; in France with its Popular Front tactics; in Spain, also with its Popular Front and its definite repudiation of Socialism and working class struggle; in Britain, at the time of the General Strike, and later in its compromises with the Labour Party and the Transport Workers' Union; in Britain also, with its urge towards a war policy, and in America with its defence of the Roosevelt administration and its attack of the Ludlow War Referendum Bill on the ground that it would impede the power of the American Government to make war; in all these countries the Communist Party paved the way for Fascism, destroyed the class consciousness and ideals of the Working class. Similarly, in Italy, the Communist Party aided actively the development of Mussolini's Fascism. To criticise its policy to persuade the workers to think for themselves on these points was to invite persecution or exclusion from the workers' movement.

All this is not to say that the pioneers of Socialism were wrong. It does mean, however, that if these pioneers are to be justified and if Socialist thought and propaganda are to mean anything to the workers, those who call themselves Socialists must rally against this terrorism and denounce it in the name of Socialism and the workers' struggle. Which necessity explains the formation of the Socialist Anti-Terror Committee and its present appeal to the workers.

The Socialist Anti-Terror Committee accuses the Communist Party of three crimes against the workers' struggle: (1) terrorism; (2) imperialist opportunism and counter-revolution; (3) corrupt destruction of working class propaganda throughout the world.

It is not possible within the space of this small pamphlet to develop details of these charges. The facts are there and can be published in full at some later time. It is possible, however, to indicate some of the terrorism of which this so-called Communism has been guilty. Those who followed the Russian struggle will know how Zinoviev, with Stalin, played a part in hiding Lenin under the Kerensky Provisional Government. They will recall how Zinoviev and Lenin returned from exile together and the speech that Zinoviev made at the station before Moscow saluting the Russian Fatherland and glorying the triumph of Socialism. We all know how Zinoviev, with Kamenev, denounced Trotsky, only to be driven afterwards by the logic of events to support that opposition. To-day, Zinoviev and Kamenev are buried as political felons for crimes they did not commit and by the movement they helped to create. Had they been murdered by the Czar the Socialist press of the world would have been loud in protest. But they were murdered by "Communism," by Stalinism, and those who once played the part of lick-spittles to them in Great Britain and other countries applaud their murder. Then there is Rakovsky, who at one time was Soviet Ambassador to Great Britain and afterwards Soviet Ambassador to France. At the beginning of the Russian Revolution the Communist Party papers described his great "thirty years' continuous fight for Socialism, undaunted by police, prisons or victimisation." This description is taken from the *Sunday Worker* for November 15th, 1925, describing his great send-off from Victoria when he went to take up his position as Ambassador to France. The *Sunday Worker* added: "In the British Labour movement, two years of his championship of the workers' cause have been sufficient to win him universal admiration and esteem. We send him our heartiest good wishes for new and still greater successes."

Down to this date the Communist Party organ describes his tremendous work for Socialism in Rumania and in other parts of Europe. It also pointed out how he founded the Third International in 1916. Two years after the Communist Party eulogised

him, namely November, 1927, Rakovsky was expelled from the Central Committee of the Communist Party with Kamenev and others as being a counter-revolutionist. Since that time he suffered arrest, torture, persecution, and finally we have the report of his trial. All his eulogists in the Communist Party, including those who were never known to be Communists until after the Russian Revolution and Communism paid dividends from the blood and sweat of the Russian peasants and workers, wiped aside his thirty years' activity and suggested that he had always been a counter-revolutionist. There is no need to bother about the other names. Many of them are public property and the story of confessions with bogus facts is too well known to require repetition.

Under the pretence of making war on counter-revolution, the Third International has not only attacked Stalin's critics in the Soviet Union but has conducted a campaign against every other phase of Socialist thought and culture in other countries. Its activity in Spain is notorious in this respect. The destruction of the P.O.U.M., the murder of the great Italian Anarchist Camillo Berneri, and of Andres Nin, the murders and exilings that followed the May Days in Barcelona are all attributable to this sectarian love of power.

We have examples of Italian Communists being returned to Fascist Italy to their death at the hands of Mussolini by the Soviet Government, and we have Eric Muchsam's widow invited to Soviet Russia for asylum only to be imprisoned and tortured there as her husband was in Nazi Germany. Other names are listed at the end of this pamphlet. Sufficient has been said to show what the purpose of the Socialist Anti-Terror Committee is.

There can be no freedom and there can be no well-being for the working class, there can be no security against war and persecution and hunger unless Socialism is established. But Socialism cannot be established in one country whilst the surrounding world is imperialistic. Socialism cannot be established and maintained by methods of State militarism, State bureaucracy, and opportunist diplomacy. Socialism must be international. It must express the class struggle. It must be united to the workshops and express the ideas of the conquest of bread and freedom. Socialism means the conquest by the worker of bread, but it means that conquest in freedom and means the conquest of freedom.

Because the various individual Socialists and groups affiliated to the Socialist Anti-Terror Committee hold that this truth must be propagated as part and parcel of Socialist propaganda, the Committee has come into existence. Its members are pledged to see that it remains in existence until its work is accomplished and terrorism banished from our movement.

Among the thousands of victims are the following:—Erwin Wolfe (or Braun, Secretary to Trotsky); Gonzales Moreno, Secre-

tary of Mascaraque C.N.T.; Ignace Reiss, O.G.P.U. Agent who resigned; Camilo Berneri, Italian Anarchist; Andres Nin, Leader, P.O.U.M.; Alfredo Martinez, Domingo Ascaso, Kurt Landaur, Mark Rein.

“So far as Catalonia is concerned, the cleaning up of Trotskyist and Anarcho-Syndicalist elements there has already begun, and it will be carried out there with the same energy as in the U.S.S.R.”
—*Pravda*, December 17, 1936.

APPENDICES

PAMPHLET 3.

I.—TRADES UNIONISM.

TRADES UNIONISM IMPOTENT AGAINST ARMAGEDDON.

The Great War shattered the illusion that Trades Unionism played any part in the working-class struggle towards social emancipation or menaced the predatory instincts of class-society. In every country, every Trade Union leader and organisation was bent on the organised servitude of the working-class to the murder interests of warring Imperialisms. Then came peace, reparations, and wholesale unemployment. Then came the organised retreat of trades unionism; the studied betrayal of the miners from 1921 to 1926, ending in the General Strike debacle: and, finally, the General Council stand for "Industrial Peace" surrender to Capitalist "Co-Partnership"! Thus what Anti-Parliamentarism alone has maintained in this country since 1906 is seen to be true: Trades Unionism is the counter-revolution, the organised invasion of the workers' rights on the Industrial field.

Churches may maintain a visionless unscrupulous priestcraft. But they always hearken back to prophets. Trades Unions may mean careers for unscrupulous panderers and fakirs. But the careerists rejoice in the story of earlier martyrdom. It lends a suggestion of poetry to their careerism, and enables them to trade on an epic illusion.

The social necessities of the capitalist epoch rendered Trades Unionism inevitable. Down to the outbreak of the Great War, it was supposed to be the necessity of the workers. But closer investigation reveals the strange fact that Trades Unionism was the desperate need of the boss-class. It is the ruling-class that demand "organised" curb labour. The workers can *dispense with curbing*.

When war broke out in August, 1914, Trades Unionism was strongly established in all the European nations. This fact is brought out effectively, and in much detail, in my work, *At Grips With War*. Trades Unionism was most powerful in Germany under the Kaiser. The German Trades Unionist was as definitely pro-war as the Nazi-controlled conscript of to-day. Without vision or imagination of any kind, absolutely blind to the fundamental criminal nature of capitalist society, the Trade Unionist apologist, in every country concerned, saw war approaching and willed no opposition to such outrage.

Then came the criminal aftermath of war, the preparation for further war. The impotence and futility of International Trades Unionism during that period calls for no comment. Had Trades Unionism been equal to its task, had the organised workers of all

Appendices

lands so willed, war would have been impossible. To-day's terrible disaster would have been averted and the pageant of peace would have been witnessed, instead of the world march of homicide. Harmony would have been achieved without a toll of tragedy.

II.—PAMPHLET 4. "SOCIALISM AND MARRIAGE."

(a) COMMITTEE ON LAW OF SCOTLAND RELATING TO MARRIAGE.
PRECIS OF EVIDENCE Submitted by GUY A. ALDRED.

—Monday, February 24, 1936.

I wish to place before the Committee, evidence, suggestions and opinions, in defence of the principle of the Scottish Law of Irregular Marriage, as at present recognised, against the attacks being made upon it.

(1) It is not a principle of Scots Law that those who marry in irregular ways should have the marriage registered. Any attempt to make registration compulsory would be a total negation of the fundamental principle of the Scottish Law of Marriage. It is said that there are disadvantages attached to irregular marriage, owing to the law not requiring compulsory registration. These alleged disadvantages can be overcome very simply. All that is required is that a very short Act should be passed to be known as Marriage (Scotland) Act, 1936. This act should declare that in the event of two persons claiming to be married, either by declaration or consent, or by habit and repute, the word of each person should be accepted as conclusive for all practical purposes and for all legal requirements, short of evidence to the contrary. In the event of either person knowingly being under a legal disability, the statement should be regarded as perjury and should be treated accordingly. For purpose of evidence, this Act should apply to England, as well as Scotland, whenever the parties claim to have been married in Scotland irregularly.

(2) I suggest that a clause in this Act should apply to England, as well as Scotland, because whilst the irregular marriage may be contracted in Scotland, it is very hard to have its principle recognised in England without definite reference to some Act of Parliament. The prejudices of the English Law of Marriage are invoked always to the detriment of the sane and correct Scots Law. It has been stated before this Committee that irregular marriage by habit and repute obtains in England. This is incorrect. I may refer to my own case to establish this fact. I would refer the Committee to the case of Rex versus Aldred, which was heard in the West London Police Court during April and May, 1916. The decision in this case held that, although I had contracted a marriage by habit and repute in London, from January, 1907, onwards, and although that marriage became definitely, through residence in Scotland, a marriage of declaration and consent, in conformity with the

Appendices

1856 Act, and notwithstanding expert legal evidence from Scotland, no marriage had been contracted. The Home Office reviewed the question again in 1926, with the result that a new marriage by declaration became compulsory. This, of course, was duly registered. The Act I have suggested would overcome all these difficulties.

(3) This Act would also meet with the difficulty of Gretna Green marriages. It would make the declaration at Gretna Green, where people were so foolish as to travel to this place unnecessarily, and the certificates then issued definite evidence of marriage, to be used whenever challenged, without requiring compulsory registration. At the same time, this Act would not interfere with the liberties of those who desire to have their marriages registered.

(4) It is my view that births and deaths should be registered. It is equally my view that marriage should not be registered, unless the parties desire to do so. In the case of births and deaths, it is not only necessary that registration should take place, but it is absolutely essential that the registration should be truthful. There are cases where neither births nor deaths are registered truthfully and this seems to me to be a crime against the community. With marriage it is different. Marriage is a fact and, according to Scots Law, the parties actually marry themselves, or each other. The Act of the State is merely an Act of Registration. It should remain such, because this proceeds from the highest conception of morality. The insistence on marriage being registered before it can be recognised is not merely opposed to Scots Law but to all sound views of marriage, whether ancient or modern. This insistence on registration prepares the way for loose moral conceptions, and really makes marriage not a fact but a matter of technical procedure. Compulsory registration of marriage paves the way for illegitimate births. It may be said that sex relations should not occur outside of marriage. The answer to this is that no male has any right to indulge in sex relations without serious thought to the consequences to himself, to the woman, to any possible offspring, and to the community. Viewed from this angle, the Scots Law of Irregular marriage, as it stands, is on a higher plane than the English concept of marriage. For this reason it should be maintained. If it is to be noticed or regulated by any statutory enactment, the regulation should maintain its absolute integrity, and should be for purpose of clear definition and not for those of restriction or invasion.

(5) I would suggest that this Committee, even though some of the data may be viewed as historical only, should issue an appendix to its findings, carefully summarising all the decisions in the Court of Session, in cases of irregular marriage; giving exact legal references where necessary citing passages from the decisions of the judges.

Appendices

(6) With reference to Poor Law Administration in Scotland, it is a fact that in Glasgow the P.A.C. prosecuted one person within recent years for bigamy. This person had contracted an irregular marriage which was never registered. Nor was it made a subject of an action of declarator. Subsequently, the person contracted a marriage in a regular way with another person. The P.A.C. succeeded in its charge of bigamy before the Sheriff and now treats the wife of the second union as a bigamous wife. I hold that this decision is correct but the same P.A.C. has definitely informed this very individual since, that in another case in the same district, where a man has deserted his wife and family by an irregular union, the first wife is being treated as unmarried and the second wife is being deemed to be the legal wife. This is wrong. But the error is not due to the principle of the Scots Law of Irregular Marriage but rather to the official desire to deny the operations of that law and to substitute for it the English Law of Marriage. The first case mentioned is that of Thomas Reid, who lives in Bridgeton. The details of this could be obtained by reference to the proceedings in the Glasgow Sheriff Court in 1934.

(7) The Irregular Marriage Law of Scotland is intended to be simple. The idea of compulsory registration is not simple. Bound up with the principle of compulsory registration is the interpretation given to the Solicitors' (Scotland) Act of 1933, whereby the registration of irregular marriage is held to be a petition to be presented by a solicitor within the meaning of that Act. This interpretation should be changed and it should be enacted that the petition to register irregular marriage should be the right of the parties themselves, acting in conjunction with their witnesses, and should be protected under Part VII., Section 48 of the said Solicitors' Act. This would make it unnecessary for the petition to be drawn up by a solicitor and would so simplify the proceedings, which is so necessary from a working-class viewpoint.

(8) The case for the Scots Law of Irregular Marriage, that is, the case for marriage by consent of the parties themselves, is this:—It compels the parties to reflect seriously on their conduct; it renders the association of the sexes free from the suggestion of carelessness, and tends to abolish clandestine and irresponsible association. Much has been said against the Scots Law of Marriage, implying that it represents a low moral outlook. On the contrary, it represents the very highest moral outlook. It is a false view that ceremonies of any kind, that vows made in the presence of witnesses, that the consent or blessing of any third person are necessary to the marriage of two individuals. Essentially, marriage is a private and individual matter. The greater the privacy accorded to it, the higher the respect the two parties bring to the association. Because of this, the Scots Law of Marriage should be extended, ramified and maintained in every possible way. Its importance should be made known to the people, and its history

Appendices

should be deemed one of which the people of Scotland ought to be proud.

(b) LONE PROTEST: PRESS REPORTS.

There was too much heresy contained in my memorandum for it to secure a good press. Yet it followed, closely, the lines of repeated statements made over generations by successive Senators of the College of Justice sitting judicially in the Court of Session at Edinburgh.

The *Evening Times*, Monday, February 24, 1936, in its final edition, published the following summary:—

Mr. Guy Aldred's Memorandum

"Mr. Guy A. Aldred submitted a memorandum giving suggestions and opinions in defence of the Scottish law of irregular marriage. It was not, he stated, a principle of Scots law that those who married in irregular ways should have the marriage registered. Any attempt to make registration compulsory would be a total negation of the fundamental principle of the Scottish law of marriage.

"All that was required was that an Act should be passed which should declare that in the event of two persons claiming to be married either by declaration or consent or by habit and repute the word of each person should be accepted as conclusive for all practical purposes and for all requirements short of evidence to the contrary. In the event of either person knowingly being under a legal disability, the statement should be regarded as perjury, and should be treated accordingly.

"For purposes of evidence this Act should apply to England as well as Scotland whenever the parties claimed to have been married in Scotland irregularly. Such an act would also meet with the difficulty of Gretna Green marriages."

The Glasgow *Evening Citizen*, for the same date, published a summary of three lines that was false in fact and erroneous in grammatical construction:—

"Mr. Guy Aldred, Glasgow, submitting proposals for a marriage being registered upon the statement of the two parties."

My proposal negated the necessity for compulsory registration.

The *Glasgow Herald*, Tuesday, February 25, 1936, abridged the *Evening Times* report, but added a sentence, bringing out correctly my attitude towards the question of registering births and deaths:—

"Mr. Guy A. Aldred submitted a memorandum giving suggestion and opinions in defence of the Scottish law of irregular marriage. It was not, he stated, a principle of Scots law that those who married in irregular ways should have the marriage registered. Any attempt to make registration compulsory would be a total negation of the fundamental principles of the Scottish law of marriage.

"It was his view that births and deaths should be registered. It was equally his view that marriage should not be registered unless the parties desired to do so.

Appendices

The *Daily Record*, Glasgow, for the same date, reported the memorandum beneath headings as follows:—

SCOTS PRINCIPLE DEFENDED

New Act to overcome difficulties

"A defender of the principle of Scots 'irregular' marriage law appeared before the Committee during the afternoon session in the person of Mr. Guy Aldred.

"His memorandum stated that any attempt to make the registration of 'irregular' marriages compulsory would be a total negation of the fundamental principle of the Scottish law of marriage.

"The alleged disadvantages of 'irregular' marriages could be overcome very simply.

A New Act

"All that was required was that a very short Act should be passed to be known as Marriage (Scotland) Act, 1936, declaring that in the event of two persons claiming to be married by declaration or consent or by habit and repute the word of each person should be accepted as conclusive for all practical purposes and for all legal requirements, short of evidence to the contrary.

"Such an Act would also meet the difficulty of Gretna Green marriages. It would make the declaration at Gretna Green, to which people were so foolish as to travel unnecessarily, and the certificates there issued, evidence of marriage, to be used whenever challenged."

This report seems fair, but the opening sentence insinuates that there was something wrong or odd about anyone standing forth to defend the principle of Scots "irregular" marriage. The intention was to convey this idea of oddity. The editorial policy of the *Record* was against Scots marriage continuing. It was all for the English marriage system.

It should be explained that, at the morning session of the Committee, on the day I read my memorandum and gave evidence, Lord Morrison, the chairman, referred to the death of William Adamson, a member of the Committee. That very orthodox Labour ex-M.P., ex-Miners' Leader, and ex-Cabinet Minister, was depicted in glowing terms, and the very stupid and dull Labour fakirs on the Committee applauded the eulogy. The question ought never to have been submitted to such dreary minds.

The Committee was incapable, intellectually and emotionally. Its decision was dulled by its several complacent interests. It had no capacity to enquire into the Scots Law of Marriage and its Chairman never ventured any illuminating guidance. The deliberate massacre of the principle of the Scots Law of Marriage was one of the minor outrages of political development and pointed to the growing reaction of the epoch.

I stood alone in my protest. Behind me were the shades of some of the greatest jurists Scotland had produced. The Law Books of Scotland upheld my contentions in vain. So did the common-sense of the people.

This subject is considered further in *Dogmas Discarded* and *Letters To The Editor*.

Author's Appeal

TO EDITORS, READERS AND LIBRARIANS.

[It was the author's intention to collect his pamphlets and publish them in one volume. The war may make this impossible. But each pamphlet in **The Word Library** will be sent round as suggested. So the appeal stands, applied to the entire series. Collection in one volume is postponed.]

This collection of essays will be sent to a number of papers in all parts of the world for review. It will be sent specially to the press in Britain, America, the American Colonies, and the British Dominions. Editors are asked, as a favour, to send copies of their papers containing review notices to the author.

The volume will be sent, also, to the chief public libraries in Britain and the United States. It will be sent post free to any public library in the world on the receipt of an application from the librarian. Readers are reminded that the first editions of each of the pamphlets, revised and collected in this volume, can be consulted in the British Museum. Some of them are to be found in the Public Library at New York.

Readers are asked to purchase several copies of the work and to circulate the copies among their friends. Order small quantities at reduced rates. The struggle for bread and freedom, for culture and liberty as well as security, must be revived and rewaged. If the reader belongs to some organisation that conducts meetings, he should arrange for the author to visit his town, and to be afforded a free platform from which to define his position. The author may be wrong on a thousand points, but the revival of thought and discussion must be right. The Glasgow Clarion Society did this in 1912. Why not your organisation to-day?

The widespread circulation of this work, apart from its cost of printing, will be an expensive business. It will be followed by other books that will be circulated in the same way. If the reader has enjoyed reading *Essays in Revolt*, and if he can assist in the cost of popularising the book, he or she should do so. The author welcomes donations in the struggle and the money so received will be used in the public interest and to further the cause of thought and freedom to which he has dedicated his energies. A thousand people, helping from a thousand quarters, are an organisation of strength and energy for progress, the force of which cannot be estimated. Help now.

Also, if you are critical, send along your criticisms. If you see a notice of this book, friendly or unfriendly, send it along.

Whatever your communication, address it to the author at his private address: GUY ALDRED, 5 BALIOL STREET, GLASGOW, C.3., SCOTLAND.

Personal and Incidental

Author's Other Works Include:

SOCIALISM AND PARLIAMENT.—Part I.—Socialism or Parliament. 1934. Rewritten and Revised Edition. Out of Print. Shortly to be reprinted. 16 chapters and 8 appendices.

SOCIALISM AND PARLIAMENT.—Part II.—Government by Labour. 3rd Edition. Rewritten and Revised. Shortly to be published.

FOR COMMUNISM. (1935.) 21 chapters and 12 appendices. Shortly to be reprinted, with slight revisions and corrections.

These booklets will be issued in popular form, for wide circulation, at absurdly cheap prices, to stimulate purchase and study.

WHY JESUS WEPT. A series of historical essays.

BAKUNIN. The life story of the great agitator. With his collected writings.

RICHARD CARLILE, AGITATOR. Enlarged, to include selections from Carlile's writings.

These books will be issued rapidly from the Press—in slightly less popular form than the works previously mentioned, because they belong to study rather than to ordinary propaganda. The interest in these writings will be special rather than general.

AT GRIPS WITH WAR. First Edition, 1929. Second Edition, 1932. This work will be re-issued at an early date.

"THE WORD" LIBRARY

Pamphlets by

GUY A. ALDRED

1. SOCIALISM AND THE POPE.
2. THE REBEL—OR HIS DISCIPLES?
3. JOHN MACLEAN: MARTYR OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE.
4. TO THE EDITOR: 30 Years' Correspondence on Subjects of Varying Interest.
5. HISTORICAL AND TRADITIONAL CHRISTIANITY.
6. STUDIES IN COMMUNISM.
7. PIONEERS OF ANTI-PARLIAMENTARISM.
8. DOGMAS DISCARDED — Part I.
(Stages of Thought: 1886-1908.)
9. DOGMAS DISCARDED — Part II.
(Stages of Thought: 1902-1908.)

Other Pamphlets are being prepared and other Reprints issued. This will bring the Author's writings up to date and restore to circulation essays too long out of print.

YOU SHOULD READ...

"THE WORD"

*A monthly journal devoted to Anti-Militarism
and the cause of the Conscientious Objector.*

To rouse the people, to combat war, and to
speed commonweal.

Obtainable from:

The Strickland Press and the Bakunin Press.

On sale at all U.S.M. meetings.

Single copies, 2d.; postage ½d. Annual Sub., 2s. 6d.

All comrades interested in *THE WORD* and the pamphlets now being published, are invited to join the United Socialist Movement. Group meetings are held every Monday, at 8 p.m., at Bakunin Hall, 29 Castle Street, Glasgow, C.4