

Legere and the nine Italians, and the little Polish woman, Zageyka Wladya—which is as close as the authorities could arrive at the proper spelling of her name—must stand trial also on additional charges of assault in the first degree, the penalty for which is as high as ten years in the penitentiary. They are alleged to be the persons who attacked the two policemen injured in a clash between the guardians of law and order and the strikers.

Mayor Lunn and his comrades arrived in Little Falls on Oct. 17 and began speaking in Clinton Park. This spot has since become so famous that persons unfamiliar with the town probably imagine that there is something peculiarly magnificent and sacred about it to cause the Little Falls authorities to forbid its defilement by Socialist speakers and working people out on strike. As a matter of fact Clinton Park is a commonplace plot of ground, measuring perhaps 200 by 300 feet and sparsely covered by reluctant grass and a few immature trees. The reason that it became *tabu* during the strike was that it is situated between two of the principal mills affected and actually runs up to the doorway of one of these mills. The company officials were not long in informing the police that this anti-capitalist agitation going on so near their doors was excessively annoying to them, besides having a distracting influence on the employes who remained at work.

The police were not slow to act. In fact, with the words of their chief—"we have kept these people in subjection in the past and mean to continue to do so"—ringing in their ears, they descended on the park with zest and manfully pulled off their boxes speakers who quoted from such anarchistic documents as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the Bible.

Flushed with success, the police next attacked a parade of peaceful pickets on the morning of October 30. Here, however, their clubs met with resistance and two of them were wounded, one by a knife and one in the leg by a bullet, which, witnesses declare, was fired by an excited special policeman. Following this affair the police indulged in a carnival of arrests until at one time forty-six strike prisoners were in jail.

Now the law, with its usual elasticity and looseness, defines a riot or riotous assemblage, in effect, as any assemblage of three or more persons which disturbs the peace, etc. and such an assemblage immediately becomes unlawful as soon as a public official has read a document pronouncing it so. Consequently any person who addresses such a throng or is unable to get away before a long-legged policeman can catch him is guilty either of inciting to riot or refusing to disperse from an unlawful assemblage. And there you are!

Under such a construction any Socialist or labor meeting may be declared unlawful whenever it annoys an exploiter of labor or

a person of conservative mind, and its speakers and participants may be thrown into jail as criminals. The indictment of Mayor Lunn et al. specifically charges them with the commission of "a crime." The police blotter, by the way, explained that Mayor Lunn was arrested—"For speaking."

When asked at a preliminary hearing if he had ever read the Constitution of the United States, Chief Long of the Little Falls police answered that he thought he "seen a copy once."

Evidently it was but a passing glance, and judging by the support Chief Long received from the business men and respectable citizens of Little Falls they started reading the Constitution backward, but stopped at the first paragraph.

Absolutely all constitutional and human rights were annulled and even made sport of by the authorities during the Little Falls strike. They now seek to fasten a conviction upon at least a few of the most active workers and sympathizers and thus set a precedent that will be most dangerous to the Socialist movement in this state and in other states in the future.

The Socialist movement must now determine, by the support it gives these defendants, whether this precedent shall be set.

SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM

(Concluded)

BY ANTON PANNEKOEK

(Translated by Richard Perin)

The organization of labor implies a certain measure of legal compulsion, that is to say, of the subordination of the will of the minority to that of the majority. But whence will this order of society obtain the force to execute its laws? Under capitalism the state has at its disposal a great mass of forcible means: police, prisons and courts, and finally the army; it is only through the physical means of force at its disposal that a minority is able to maintain its rule over the great mass of the people. These physical means of force are unnecessary to the rule of the mass, which will accomplish its purpose by moral force alone. The political system which the proletariat will introduce after its victory, and which may be designated as a consistent democracy, will be governed by the same principles which the workers now employ in their fighting organizations: equality of rights for all members, expression of the will of the whole in legal provisions and resolutions which each must obey, execution of the will of the majority by an executive. The means of compulsion that are employed here to impose the will of the majority upon the minority will probably also be employed in the future industrial democracy—namely, discipline.

This discipline consists in the voluntary subordination of the individual to the whole; it is the chief proletarian virtue, which the working masses have acquired in their struggle against capitalism. The workers will never be able to overthrow capitalism until they have brought this virtue to its highest development, the subordination of their personal desires and of their egoism to the interests of the whole class; this virtue they will carry with them into the new society, and there it will become the moral cement of the Socialist order. It will be the moral counterpart to political democracy; the latter will need no other means of force.

In any case, discipline means the overcoming of an existing instinct; the safeguarding of the interests of the whole does not, in this case, spring spontaneously from direct inclination, but from rational consideration. This instinct, which must be overcome, is egoism, self-interest, which has been fostered by the economic conditions of commodity production and competition until it has become the predominant instinct. Whoever does not possess this characteristic, or possesses it in insufficient measure, is hopelessly lost under capitalism. A characteristic that for countless generations has been ever necessary, and almost essential to life, and hence is firmly rooted in human nature, will require several generations of disuse to become weakened to a considerable degree and finally to disappear. Therefore, the Socialist order of society will be unable to uproot this impulse immediately; its advance over capitalism will consist in this, that egoism will be restrained by discipline (that is, by rational conviction grown into a habit), that the preservation of the common interest will become the most efficacious means of preserving the individual interest.

But the new order of society will itself foster far different traits of character. The common labor for a common end, the community of individual interests with those of society as a whole, will develop to an extraordinary degree the feeling of brotherhood and comradeship. It was economic necessity that made egoism the most prominent trait of men under capitalism; it was economic necessity that made solidarity and discipline the leading traits of the revolutionary labor movement; and it is economic necessity that will, to the same extent, develop the feeling of sociability above all other traits of character in the Socialist society. Men will regard themselves, first of all, not as individuals, but as members of society; the welfare of the whole will dominate all their thoughts and feelings. This tendency will then no longer rest upon the self-conquest of the individual, who sacrifices his inclination to that which he recognizes as necessary; it will rest upon direct inclination. Instead of having to overcome an inherited instinct, this tendency will rather consist in the active exercise of the newly born instinct.

This evolution of human instincts will also entail a change in the social organization. In the beginning, the organization of social labor will require special measures, which will be decided upon by the majority, executed with conscientious care by a central body, and faithfully observed by the individual. But as organized work becomes a habit, and as the interest of all becomes the highest aim of each, the deliberate organization and regulation of labor will gradually become superfluous. And to this extent the last vestiges of political authority will vanish, the authority which in the beginning, under the form of laws and controlling bodies, kept the minority in subordination to the majority. The organization of labor will then be no longer a product of external regulation, but of inner impulse. And when the enormous increase in productivity, due to the advance of science, becomes a reality, the results of labor will no longer have to be obtained through carefully planned organization. Thus the substitution of Socialism for capitalism signifies from the very beginning an enormous advance in liberty, since the rational force of discipline in behalf of individual and common interests takes the place of brutal compulsion in the service of alien and hostile interests; but in the further development of the Socialist society even the compulsion of discipline will gradually disappear, and no compulsion will remain other than that of the individual's own sense of sociability, the appreciation or the blame of his fellowmen.

It is self-evident that with greater or less probability much more can be inferred from the given premises in regard to the various phases of development of the future society: in regard to the technique of labor, artistic activity, the return to the land, etc., there are many valuable hints in our literature. The statements made here, however, suffice for an appreciation of the views of the modern Utopians.

3. MODERN UTOPIANISM.

As long as no working class movement was in existence, utopianism was the natural form of Socialism, of the aspiration for a form of society based upon common property. Until the appearance upon the stage of history of a class whose struggles had Socialism for their necessary goal, Socialism was bound to be an artfully contrived idea, of which hopes were entertained that it might be made sufficiently attractive to the rest of mankind. To have foreseen this goal, signified at that time a tremendous advance. Therefore the modern Socialistic working class holds in high honor the great Utopians of the early part of the nineteenth century, whom it regards as its precursors.

Even with the appearance of scientific communism and of the working class movement, Utopianism has not utterly vanished from the scene. The defects and faults of the existing social order are so plainly apparent to countless men outside the working class,

that the question is forced upon them: Could not society be better organized? But only an infinitesimal portion of them come into the workers' camp as allies; the conceptions of the Social Democracy remain foreign to them; and although some, after much difficulty and painful shedding of numberless prejudices, do finally find their way there, the great majority are prevented by bourgeois limitations. To these there is no other course left than to construct a better world in their own imagination and to try to gain adherents to it; to the professional vanity of clever literati it appears far more honorable to invent a "system" of their own, than to be incorporated recruits in the great army of the party of Labor.

Thus the two roots of modern Utopianism are the defects of capitalism and the great intellectual eminence of the Socialist movement, so sharply opposed to all conventional bourgeois conceptions and so far superior to them. But while the classical Utopianism was in advance of its time, modern Utopianism lags behind our age. It remains beneath the intellectual level of the present, because it has not freed itself of the intellectual backwardness of the bourgeois mode of thought. Within the latter, it is true, it occupies an honorable place because of its wider vision and keener critical attitude; this honorary testimonial must compensate it for the fact that it is practically without influence in society. A Utopia, an imagined best order of society, cannot form the program of a fighting class; a Utopia cannot gather around itself a party, it can only be the nucleus of a sect.

It is true that even Utopian social constructions can temporarily gain considerable influence. In America, after the publication of Bellamy's "Looking Backward," a group of people (it was even called a party) was formed, which set for itself the task of realizing the system of society described by Bellamy. Similarly, in the beginnings of the German working class movement the Utopian constructions of Eugen Dühring met with so much response that Engels was forced into the famous controversy with him.

Among all modern Utopian systems, Anarchism in its various forms has become the most influential and significant for the labor movement. In countries that have remained backward in capitalistic development, where the government is in the hands of a small, corrupt clique serving only special petty interests, instead of in the hands of an energetic capitalist class that has strongly organized the power of the State, the Anarchistic watchword, abstinence from corrupting politics, meets with ready response among the workers. Thus it was for a long time in Italy, thus it is still in Spain. As the logical successor to liberalism, it forces the latter's individualism—worship of abstract liberty and aver-

sion to the power of the State and all authority—into a complete opposite to capitalism. Its Socialism is Utopianism, that is, it has no idea of the necessary evolution of social formations upon the basis of the evolution of the forces of production, but places before itself the ideal of an absolutely just and best world, for which it seeks to win adherents by means of propaganda.

Regarded superficially, this ideal appears to have some features in common with the state of society which we have predicted above as the farthest result of evolution. The division of the means of consumption according to need and the absence of all compulsory authority, which we expect as the final consequence of evolution, is set up by the Anarchists as an absolute demand for society. This coincidence is the basis of the curious idea that the Anarchists are more logical and more radical than the Socialists, because they aspire to an order of society that is higher and further developed than the Socialist order of society.

This idea is ridiculous. In the first place, there is no such thing as a definite Socialist order of society. And in the second place the liberty demanded by the Anarchists takes no account of the foundation work—the highly developed productive forces—which alone makes that liberty possible. In Kropotkin's famous work, "The Conquest of Bread," the workers are advised, when the revolution breaks out, to throw off all authority and to establish no new authority, but to combine into free laboring groups. All that could result from this is co-operative, or private, petty industry. The Anarchistic ideal discloses itself here as a petty-bourgeois ideal, a yearning for the "liberty" of the small, independent producer; some Anarchists, who call themselves the most logical, even put their theory into practice and settle as hermits upon some small estate, far removed from the tumult of world conflicts and development.

However, this idea is easily comprehensible, because all those who have not freed themselves from the bourgeois conceptions, hence also the Anarchists, cannot conceive of Socialism and the striving for the abolition of capitalism, otherwise than as the realization of a Utopia. Therefore, they believe the Socialists to be the adherents of a definite future social order, one that has already been fixed and determined upon. This error is especially prevalent in France: the alleged ideal of the Socialists—the socialization of the means of production exclusively—is there called Collectivism, while the more radical, who demand the abolition of all private property, call themselves Communists. It is further said of the Collectivists that they advocate a division of goods according to service, while the Communists want them to be divided according to need.

This idea often prevails among those who seek exact defini-

tions of Socialism and Anarchism, in order to answer the question whether the Anarchists also belong to the great family of Socialists, and whether they are justly or unjustly rejected by the Social-Democrats as illegitimate "brothers." Practically, the question is not of the slightest importance; we fight the Anarchists most energetically, in spite of the fact that they call themselves enemies of capitalism, because they are enemies of the working class movement; because their propoganda always threatens to destroy organization and discipline, the chief weapons of the proletariat in its struggles, and tends to divert the workers from the most important part of their struggle, the conquest of the power of the State. And so it is not because of a formal definition, but in the interests of the practical struggle, that we regard the Anarchists as opponents who do not belong to our Socialist movement.

IN A LARGE CITY

BY DETLEV VON LILIENCRON.

Translated by Sasha Best.

To and fro in the great sea of the city,
Drifts this one and that one, hither and thither—
One glance in passing, and past and gone:
The organ-grinder plays his song!

Drops that fall into the great sea of the void,
This one and that one, hither and thither—
One glance at a hearse, and past and gone:
The organ-grinder plays his song!

Swims a funeral procession in the sea of the city,
This one and that one, hither and thither—
One glance at my coffin, and past and gone:
The organ-grinder plays his song!

SIVA ROCKEFELLER

BY MOSES OPPENHEIMER

The ancient mythology of the Hindus centers around a trinity: Brahma, the creator; Vishnu, the preserver; Siva, the destroyer of life. The greatest of the three is Siva. All the millions of years of Brahma's life are but one day in the life of Vishnu, all the millions of years of Vishnu are but one day in the life of Siva.

Deep truth is hidden beneath that concept of the riddle of the universe. Destruction must go on forever, pitilessly, so that there may be room for new life, new growth. Hence the importance of the destroyer in the scheme of things.

It is from some such high plane that we must assign to John D. Rockefeller his station in history. Rockefeller arrived upon the scene at a time when our economic structure was pregnant with new forms. Science and invention had harnessed mighty forces of nature. The old competitive system was getting outworn, obsolete. The silent forces of creative work were seeking, groping blindly, for greater usefulness, for a larger share in life. Men scarcely knew the direction in which they were being driven, nor the meaning of the new propelling forces. They were still devoted to old ideas, old laws, old concepts of morality.

Then appeared this man, a gigantic genius, one-sided, yet with clear vision of his own possibilities, free from qualms of conscience, endowed with an iron will. He was fated to become the Napoleon of economics, to sweep away the cumbrous ruins of the antiquated competitive order as relentlessly as the man from Corsica swept away the ruins of medieval feudalism. Evolution used both these giants as its iron brooms.

It is doubtful whether Rockefeller at the beginning of his career understood his own mission as that of the economic superman. Yet such he turned out to be, after Friedrich Nietzsche's own heart. Competitors stood in his way: he bought them out or he crushed them. It was all the same to him, as long as he could remove the obstacle. The law as well as the accepted tenets of morality were against him. He brushed them aside with a superior smile of contempt. To him counted only the means that would win. Success was its own justification. He must have room for new creation, for new construction. Hence destruction must clear the pathway.

In the words of Goethe, Rockefeller became "a part of that force which ever desires evil and ever creates the good."

So he worked as the gravedigger of the competitive system, ushering in the new era of combination and organization. He was the tool of destiny, indispensable in the scheme of evolution.

Siva Rockefeller as destroyer is the advance agent of a new order, a higher order. He is the forerunner of destructive and re-constructive Socialism. More than a score of the most eloquent Socialist agitators has he accomplished, in clearing old cobwebs out of the minds of the masses. He has made it plain to millions that the twilight of the gods of the old order is upon us.