

The Beacon.

DEVOTED TO THE SOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

VOL. I.

SAN FRANCISCO, SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1890.

NO. 12.

THE BEACON.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,
AT 319 FIFTH STREET.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE,—PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

One Year	\$1 00
Six Months	65
Three months	35
Single Copies	5

SIGISMUND DANIELEWICZ,
Editor and Proprietor.

Expediency requires the adoption of the principle of non-aggression in all the relations between man.—Carl Gleeser.

ON DECK AGAIN.

A "shrinkage in the volume of currency"—not a very uncommon occurrence in the history of radical journals—caused the suspension of THE BEACON. In San Diego, some eight months ago, in such an abrupt manner, that there was no chance left to make the customary announcements, funeral arrangements, etc. My means, at the time, were even too limited to procure the necessary postage stamps for the dispatch, to subscribers and friends, of a notification of the "calamity," which I had printed for the occasion. It will therefore undoubtedly be so much greater a surprise to the friends of THE BEACON to learn that "like a Phoenix, it rises from its ashes" with renewed vigor and a more promising future than my modest expectations during its previous existence entitled it to.

Mr. Carl Gleeser from Grand Junction, Colorado, an old and staunch comrade whose name will be familiar to the readers of the radical press, has kindly placed a printing outfit, comprising type and press, at the service of THE BEACON. He also generously advanced the means for the establishment of a barber shop, the profits out of which will be devoted to the benefit of the paper. These arrangements will reduce the expense of

the paper far below that of the San Diego publication, and will, with a little assistance of the comrades, insure its existence.

The shifting of the headquarters from San Diego to San Francisco is an advantageous step in many respects, and cannot affect the aspect of the paper, as truly "the world is our country" as well as our battleground.

As to its principles, THE BEACON will continue what it set out to be when I took possession of it. It will endeavor to weed out the superstition of government—majority—or any other kind of rule; it will contend for the right of the individual to genuine freedom of thought, speech and action; it will urge the people on to the assertion of their equal rights to the free use of the unused natural resources and the creations of their industry; it will insist upon the justice and expediency of the repulsion of the invader upon these their equal rights by physical force, if required, and upon the necessity of their preparation for such emergencies. In short, it will attempt, in plain, unvarnished language, to show his condition to the unconscious slave, to rouse the conscious slave from his slumbers, and to inspire both to action.

ANARCHISTS "WHO THINK" AND "PHILOSOPHIC" ANARCHISTS.

Henry George, at one of his "cross-examinations" during his recent visit at Los Angeles, California, in explanation of the respective theories of Anarchism and State Socialism, saw fit to introduce his remarks with the qualification: "Anarchists, who think," etc., etc.

Strictly taken, the conception of an Anarchist who does not think is an absurdity, for it requires a degree of mental capability to study any theory of social science, and perhaps a little more so for the study of Anarchy. Hence George's qualification was unscientific.

It may be thought, however, that Mr. George used this qualification in order to distinguish between the close and the loose reasoner of that school of Socialists. If so, why did Mr. George not make the same qualification with respect to the advocates of other schools, for instance, the State-Socialists or Single-Taxers? Certainly there are as many shades of reasoners in the ranks of these as among the Anarchists. Think for a moment of the absurdity of Mr. George's speaking of a Single-Taxer who thinks!

Evidently Mr. George was animated in his discrimination by a motive which is common to many other mortals, that of spite. He was anxious, by that attack, by inference, upon a certain shade of Anarchists to belittle the Anarchist movement in general.

When Henry George, in his work, "Progress and Poverty," popularized Mr. Dove's single-tax theory and in this connection pointed out some of the sources of the ills of society, he rendered a service to humanity; he was a humanitarian.

When Henry George attempted to lead his followers into the political arena and attach them to the old corrupt and purifying "parties," he descended from the lofty position of a humanitarian to that of a politician whose legitimate business it is, according to the striking definition of Bro. Pentecost: to do what one knows to be wrong in order to possibly pave the way for what he thinks is right.

When Henry George seeks to drag down a school of social science which stands in the van of progress and true civilization; that commands the sympathy and co-operation of some of the deepest thinkers of the world, simply by resorting to the small methods of the regular professional politician, to mud-throwing, he—why, then he simply descends another step.

Int. Instituut
Soc. Geschiedenis
Amsterdam

While Henry George's tricks to belittle the Anarchist movement may prove ineffectual, some of the very best friends and advocates of that movement are unconsciously trying to become his allies by their ludicrous actions. When Henry George speaks of Anarchists "who think", he but touches the other extreme of the actions of our good friends in insisting upon calling themselves "scientific" and "philosophic" Anarchists. Anarchy is a science, a philosophy. Hence a "scientific" or "philosophic" Anarchist is a "scientific scientist" or a "philosophic philosopher." Surely this sounds neither scientific nor philosophic.

Yet the real aim of these well-meaning friends in using such terms is not so much to bolster up the principles of Anarchy, if I judge correctly, as the rather comical anxiety not to be considered revolutionists.

This brings me to a point upon which I have been attacked by a number of people to whose careful perusal the following exposition of my convictions is especially recommended:

Revolution, as defined by Webster means, in a general sense, "A total or radical change." With reference to politics it is defined as: "The act of renouncing authority of government; a revolt successfully or completely accomplished; a fundamental change in political organization." Is there an Anarchist in creation whose objects are not contained in this definition? If so, I should like to hear from and place upon exhibition this anomaly that has or claims to have divested himself or herself of the very essence of his or her existence.

The fact is that these good friends when speaking of revolution have in mind the popular misconception of the term, namely, "injury to persons and property." Now, this, as will be plainly perceived by the definition of Webster given in the foregoing paragraph, is by no means included in the term "revolution." If during the progress of revolution it occurs, it is a co-incident and not necessarily a concomitant. Perfectly bloodless revolutions have taken place in history, only recently such an one occurred in Brazil.

I made my position upon this point clear enough in an article of the previous issue of THE BEACON headed "Plain English." I stated that when the peo-

ple attempted to gain their equal rights to the natural resources and possession of their creations of which they had been robbed, and when during such a revolution the privileged legalized robbers made opposition to such just demands and courted a physical contest, they, the robbers themselves, who were the real invaders, and not the revolutionists who were simply forced, in self-defense, to repel the invaders, were responsible for the consequences.

Whether the coming revolution will be solved peaceably or forcibly, no one knows or is able to foretell. I hope, peaceably, for I hate to fight. I cling tenaciously to the few spans of life that are allotted to me, and there is no one who more appreciates the few sweet pleasures and enjoyments that may be picked out of the bitter cup of adversity, than I. But while I hope that the great final contest for genuine Liberty and Justice may be won by peaceful methods, I believe in preparing for the worst. And I furthermore believe that this sanctimonious howl against revolution is a disgrace to the spirit of American institutions whose few comparative liberties have been wrested from tyrants by revolution and which caused the engrafting upon our fundamental laws of the injunction that "the right of the people to carry arms shall never be abridged," which, translated into plain English, means:

If you are a man, assert your rights, and if you are a wise man be prepared to fight for them.

FARE THEE WELL.

Comrade Gleeser, to whose rare example of unselfishness and devotion to the cause of progress the resumption of THE BEACON is partly due, is now on his way to Australia, where he expects to find more congenial surroundings and a more fertile field for his labors in "the vineyards." Comrade Gleeser, during his sojourn in this city, addressed a number of progressive meetings and proved to be a ready debater, a sound legislator, an indefatigable worker, and above all a close student of the social question, who is thoroughly posted on all the phases of the movement. He will prove a valuable acquisition to our Australian comrades, which is the only consolation for the loss our comrades in this country have sustained by his departure. Success to him.

Beware of the "Workers' Paradise."

An article appeared in No. 20 of the San Francisco *Labor Herald*, headed "A Paradise for workers," in which it was attempted to picture the conditions of the workingpeople of Australia, and particularly of Victoria, as a veritable Garden of Eden. As unsophisticated workingpeople might be led to sell their homes here and spend their hard earnings in expensive trips to Australia, with the possibility of sad disappointments, I call attention to the following inadvertent passage of that same article:

"A workingman in Victoria can sell or mortgage his homestead as speedily as he can dispose of his household chattels."

That is indeed a fine paradise for a worker, where one of the principal inducements offered is the facility to "sell or mortgage his homestead!" Some people may call such a place a worker's paradise; if so, their conception of a paradise singularly corresponds with mine of a WORKERS' HELL.

Good Things in Store

"The Egoist," an eight page monthly Anarchist journal, published by the "Egoist Publishing Co." in this city will be issued May 1. Judging from the reputation of its publishers it will be a valuable ally in the work of genuine emancipation. Look out for it.

"Catechism on the Science of a Universal Religion, or: What we all can and must do in Co-operation with each other to secure a True Religion and Universal Happiness," is the title of a pamphlet by Comrade Gabriel Z. Wacht, shortly to appear in this city. It traces society to its first known causes, illustrating the law of harmony, and building upon that law attempts the solution of the social problem by a voluntary productive and distributive economic system, which is gradually to undermine the present. It is interesting and instructive.

Push Hard.

Now is the time for those friends and comrades whose subscriptions I was obliged to return from San Diego on account of the suspension of THE BEACON, to subscribe. And now is also the time for others to subscribe who are in sympathy with the sentiments of the paper and wish to insure its success.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN.

A LECTURE DELIVERED BEFORE THE FREE-THOUGHT SOCIETY OF SAN FRANCISCO, BY GEO. CUMMING.

The rights of man comprehend the 'Science of Justice', the 'Science of Society.' If there be such a science, then it must be like any other science. It must be founded on axioms which are simply self evident truths, and on principles that are immutable, and from them you can deduce the laws by which man can live in harmony with his fellows.

Political and Social philosophers have disputed over the Social problem for ages, and today men suffer and complain without knowing what to do.

On a former occasion in this hall, some one lamented the fact that there was such a divergence of opinion as to the best mode of reform, and the seeming impossibility to get the masses to concentrate on any particular one.

I quoted from Mr Proudhon to show this was the case with all sciences and giving the rationale of it. He showed that man was the only animal that had the privilege of being mistaken. The bee builds its hive and gathers its honey without trouble with its fellow; it does not trouble itself about who is to consume its product; all of them work in harmony.

For they work by instinct which is never mistaken. Now, there is only one thing that would bring discord into that family, it is, to endow each bee with reason, and as each one would exercise that faculty, each one from its own standpoint and little or no knowledge of facts to reason from, they will reason erroneously, and each would come to a different conclusion; one would want to build his comb conical, another round, etc., and war would be the result.

Man, in his primitive state, endowed with reason, limited in his knowledge of facts, reasons imperfectly; by slow and painful experiences he accumulates a knowledge of the phenomena around him and, reasoning on them, he discovers the relation these facts bear to each other, reduces it all to a science, which is only systematized knowledge, and discovers the law, and all disputes cease, for in the conflict of opinion and by free thought and speech truth and progress have been evolved.

Such has been the history of the science of the universe, over which mankind disputed for thousands of years. There is none now.

The physical sciences to-day are far in advance of social science. From the progress of the mechanical and chemical knowledge great wealth has been created.

But from an ignorance of the science of justice and the knowledge of man's rights, this wealth, which should have been the cause of unmixed happiness to all, is more often the cause of oppression and misery to the great mass of mankind.

This I will not stop to show, as it is evident to any thinking person.

Then it is a necessity to bring up the social science abreast of the material sciences.

For, as Count Tolstoi has said, nothing that does not benefit mankind, is entitled to be called a science.

Let us now glance at the cause of causes that has retarded the progress of this social science; it is not far to seek.

There is a law of human nature, enunciated by philosophers and referred to by Mr. George; it is, that mankind always seek to gratify their desires with the least possible amount of exertion.

This law has impelled men in gratifying their desires at the expense of others and endeavor to convince their fellow man that this was just and a natural state of affairs, and as long as ignorance of man's rights prevails, they will succeed.

Bastiat, a French writer on political economy, in explaining the origin of the power by which some one manages to live on other men's labor, says: Man in his primitive state, ignorant of the cause of the phenomena of nature, possessed of the faculties of wonder and veneration, heard the thunder, saw the lightning and the hurricane; felt the earthquake, naturally ascribed the cause to some being, to him unseen, far above his reach, to him a mystery.

Among the infinite variety of the capacities of men in any society, there are always some who possess more shrewdness than others; now this shrewd man desiring to gratify his desires at the expense of others, as the easiest mode of living, schemes how he can do it. He knows very well, if he asks any one to give him some of his product, such as a measure of grain, promising to give him in exchange for it a measure of something else, such as fruit, he would be obliged to fulfill his promise, for if he did not do so, he would be put down as a cheat and could not repeat the trick.

He knows, his fellow men are ignorant and credulous; if he can convince them, that he is an agent from this mysterious, unseen power, and when they die, he can sell them a homestead lot in the next world for some of their goods in this, he knows they will never come back to find out what a fraud he is and he lives on the fat of the land.

Society cannot exist unless certain natural laws are observed (I might as well observe here, in passing, that the foundation of society rests on truth and honesty.) For you may imagine a condition in which every man was entirely destitute of either, no one could believe a word the other said, and would cheat and steal at every opportunity, there could be absolutely no society, it would simply be a state of war.

We have some truth and some honesty now, we have some society.

Now, this man calling himself a prophet or priest, institutes a lot of ceremonies, and drawing up a code of morals, embracing all these necessary social laws which

have always been observed more or less and always acknowledged, but interwoven with laws commanding obedience to his edicts as of divine origin. So as, should any Freethinker come forward and ask for this man's credentials from this mysterious being, he is condemned for a new crime called blasphemy, and as being opposed to morality, and a foe to social order, and put to death, this priest asserting that mankind would never have known what morality was unless revealed through him by this great unknown.

Barbarous nations are generally at war with one another, and in war a leader is necessary; but this priest, though as eager for the spoils as any one, has a fat thing of it, and the struggle and fatigue of war is not to his liking, he has a revelation, to select a leader, which he does with mysterious ceremonies; having found him, he greases his head whether he is bald headed or not, puts a stick in his hand called a scepter, and a hat with some prongs on it, called a crown and calls him the Lord's anointed and says he rules by divine right.

These two frauds have cursed the earth for thousands of years, each one giving support to the other and gratifying their desires at the expense of others, and it is to their interest and has been for all ages to retard the progress of free thought on all social questions. This accounts, in a great measure, for the backward state of the science.

Herbert Spencer in 'Social Statics' says: "There is a general equilibrium between the institutions and the ideas of society, and hence, if error pervades our institutions, it must similarly pervade our ideas." It is now our duty to find out where this error lies.

Almost all men agree that society should be founded on justice, though some deny there is such a thing as justice and say all the rights that a man has are given to him by society; but when or how society got the rights it confers on individuals, no one has shown.

Now, if there is no such a thing as justice, there can be no such a thing as injustice, and all talk about man's rights is idle. But if there be such a principle as justice, it must be a natural principle and immutable, and must be the highest that can be applied to all social questions that arise, and can no more be added to or taken from by Legislatures, than the science of chemistry or geometry can be added to or taken from by the same means. Now the question naturally arises: what is justice, what does it consist of, what are its attributes?

I will endeavor to give you some of Mr. Proudhon's ideas of justice, though not in his words or mode of illustration as that would take too long.

Imagine, if you can, a man living in some isolated place, monarch of all he surveyed, no fear of molestation, he

(Continued on sixth page.)

A DREAM OF THE PAST AND PRESENT.

BY LIZZIE M. HOLMES.

It was at the close of an evening in May of the present year. The damp, uncomfortable cloud had melted away and left the slow rain to fall on the slippery pavements uninterrupted; the dreary square where creaky wagons, meek old horses, slow farmers and enterprising buyers were wont to throng, lay empty and silent, as the night closed in, save for the tinkling of carbells and the tread of a lone watchman's feet. In the center, where the tracks curved apart, leaving an oblong space, a tall object gleamed clearly against the background of dark warehouses and somber skies; a pile of rocks, and above, a form—a manly form, with uplifted hand and awe inspiring presence. The sky arched over the uncovered figure for the first time. A vague, white shape, like a ghost, had stood there many a night, frightening timid horses and belated wanderers, but now uncovered, revealed—a policeman rampant on a great block of stone. The night grew heavier and blacker; the rain turned to a thick mist, from which wavering forms seemed to gather; the cars crept into the light of the dim lamps and out like ghosts of long departed vehicles; the one watchman, excusable amid such dismal conditions, sought shelter in hospitable "all night" retreats; nothing real or living looked upon the motionless form out in the wierd night.

Then the gathering forms from out the mists seemed to take shape and being. They became more dense and frequent and hovered about the huge figure, the pedestal and the stone steps. They were more than shadows—they were men—tall strongly-formed, stern-visaged men in quaint dress of 100 years ago. A majestic figure with the familiar face of Washington, stood gazing at the statue with wondering, frowning expression; a little lower, Jefferson leaned, staring in perplexed sternness; Benjamin Franklin peered through one rounded hand to read the inscriptions on the base, referring occasionally to a manuscript he held in the other; Patrick Henry stood upright at the foot with folded arms and stern demeanor. The "unknown orator" gazed upon it sadly, while Randolph, Adams, Hancock, Jonathan Parsons and

other patriotic heroes of that time were grouped about. Behind them hovered a shadowy form with a Liberty cap above her brow and a countenance very sad and dejected. The musical voice of Washington broke the silence.—"So, this, in America, after one hundred years! A strange figure to represent a free, prosperous and moral people, and set up for a strange purpose, it seems to me." "Adams," spoke Jefferson quite abruptly, "is this a specimen of that federal army, you so determinedly organized against the wishes of the people?" "It is not," replied Adams with stately courtesy. "That army was for the defense and dignity of the nation in its relations with other countries. It was not intended as a threat against our own people." "A state militia was instituted later on—perhaps this is a representative." "No sir, for you will remember the militia consisted of every able bodied man in the state. All citizens drilled and carried arms. So well did we comprehend the menace to liberty an armed class over a defenseless would prove, that it was made a constitutional right for every man to keep and bear arms. What have they done with that clause? With one comprehensive sweep of your spiritual gaze you can take in the sleeping thousands around us who lack everything that makes life enjoyable; they possess no arms—they dare not. Yet over here is an army and a well filled arsenal—ready to meet—an invader? a foreign foe? Ready to spring to the aid of the poor and weak? Ready at the call of the useful portion of society to protect their rights? No, indeed. They go into action only at the command of wealth, when laboring men grow discontented with their poverty. There is no other enemy in the field—none but these disarmed and helpless people who toil. Look farther away where restlessly sleep thousands of starving workers thrust out of the mines in which they would gladly toil while strength remained. They have labored all their lives for barely enough to sustain existence and now they are denied that privilege. They are pitifully hungry and pitifully humble. And yet they are threatened with an armed militia if they moan too loudly. They are driven to desperation while their masters say: 'Be desperate if you dare.' The one or two guns that some of them possessed

have been 'confiscated,' property rights are sacred only when millions of unearned wealth are considered. Could we have foreseen such scenes could be possible, either our struggle would have been more deadly and determined or it would not have been made at all." "Many believed we had secured the rights of man in that crisis that tried men's souls," said Paine. "But I knew that sooner or later the masses of the people would suffer when human rights were made of less consideration than property rights. Through such a principle, a class like this, became possible," pointing to the statue which had strangely taken on an intense, a listening expression. "A class coming out from the people themselves, but endowed with extraordinary powers, surrounded by all the possibilities of despotism and every incentive to corruption, whose existence depends on the thriving of vice and crime; which grows on the misery it is supposed to suppress, breathes easily only in an atmosphere of corruption, is unlimited in power, answerable to nothing, responsible to no being on earth, or out of it. Does such a class harmonize with a society organized on free and equal principles?" A queer, hard little voice came from the bronzed lips above them: "Now, you fellows are having it all your own way going for us, down there. Maybe we've got a word or two to say for our side; and by your leave I'll rest my arm a bit, for it's mighty tired I tell you." "Tired commanding peace, when there is no peace," said Patrick Henry.

The statue assumed a more comfortable position and continued:

"Seems to me you are pretty free in criticizing my existence. Now I know your names—I've heard of you frequently and you're quite an honor to the great and prosperous nation that created me, but you're behind the times. You don't appear to understand I am a necessity of modern civilization. In me you see represented the whole police force of the State of Illinois—and I am proud of it. We are a great institution—one of the great institutions we're fond of saying you men founded, and which furiners can't understand. To be sure none of us were born here, but we know how to protect Americans' liberties; we do it with a club and a dark cell. You fellows lived in a primitive age—we are prosper-

ing, enterprising, driving. Property interests are very important and it is absolutely necessary to preserve law and order." "Yes, your modern juggernaut drives desperately over the thousand devotees in its track, and you are created to keep the wrecks thus made from clogging the wheels. Of course you are necessary—you must pile the mangled victims out of the way that the car may go on undisturbed."

"Is tyranny ever necessary?" queried Henry.

"Yes, to enforce a wrong. When good is to be accomplished, the freer the people, the better," answered Jefferson.

"I am afraid you don't appreciate me," said the policeman. "No one is louder in praising the forefathers than we; indeed we carry on our work in the name of the law and order you established. We go in for patriotism, and free institutions heavy. Did't you see us marching for you, not long ago?"

"We repudiate you," said they one and all. "We made no place for you when we founded free and equal institutions. Liberty does not exist where classes are maintained by such as you."

The policeman looked astonished and nearly toppled over.

"Well, you'll admit, I represent a worthy object in standing where I do," he faintly said.

"Hm-m!" Jefferson began when Franklin interposed.

"I find this inscription in front of the pedestal:

"Dedicated by the people of Chicago May 4, 1889, to the memory of the brave defenders at the riot May 4, 1886" and at the back—did this personage address these words to some one behind him, I wonder?—is this inscription:

"In the name of the State of Illinois I command peace!"

"Knowing the circumstances as we intuitively do, said Washington with a delicate irony in his voice," "I would ask—was there a riot on the night specified?"

"Why sir, there was an outdoor meeting—a large crowd of working people and common citizens, and some speakers were ranting about their wrongs, as they called them—"

"Which looks like making use of the right to meet and state grievances" interrupted Jefferson.

"And there were some loud and bitter

ejaculations from the audience, when a speaker mentioned that a few working-men had been killed by the police."

"Was there any fighting?"

"No; but their temper—"

"Any attempt at violence?"

"No; but their passions were excited."

"Any direct threats made?"

"No; but they endangered—"

"The privileges of a few despoilers. The people were dispersing, were they not?"

"Over one-half were gone; but the rest might have meant mischief."

"When your police marched upon them, what were they doing?"

"Standing about and listening to the closing words of the speaker."

"What does the word 'riot' mean here if this is the case? Never repeat the mockery of the 30th of April in my name, while this remains. I refuse to father a country harboring a lie like that. Erase it."

"By your own showing" said Thomas Paine, seizing the opportunity to speak, "you broke up a peaceful meeting of citizens, met according to constitutional rights, to discuss grievances. Twice before in this city you have committed the same outrage and citizens have been clubbed to death. You have violated our most sacred principles. The people ought to resist such attacks; some one believed in the rights we sought to secure to the people, when they forcibly repelled your invasion."

"We only did as we were ordered," rather meekly murmured the "representative."

"Willingly enough, I dare say."

"We thought we were putting down a dangerous element."

"You were creating one. Repressed thought will result in an explosion as surely as will confined steam. We used to be sure this country never would suffer from that evil, for freedom of speech was our dearest hope. You but commemorate its death, I fear, instead of keeping in memory the names of a few men who died while blindly obeying the commands of their superior officers. Were that your only object we would not be here. But your existence only perpetuates the memory of an act for which you should forever hang your heads in shame."

"And who are these" asked Washington "whom you put to death in revenge?"

A thick mist rolled away like a curtain, and disclosed the white robed forms of Parsons, Spies, Fischer, Engel, with bright enraptured faces as they appeared on that last fatal morning; a little farther stood Lingg, beautiful and sad, driven to his death by persecution as surely as the others had been.

"Did these men kill the officers you commemorate?"

"Well, not directly, but their talk might have incited—"

"Their talk was what ours was a hundred years ago," said the old heroes in a voice. "King George would have put us to death if he could; you have killed the forefathers of a new century—the new regime of liberty. But their names will live, as ours have."

"Ah! there is strong need for speech," said Washington. "A few days ago, my country, you celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of the first presidency. You uttered many loud boasts, rejoiced greatly over your prosperity. But I look around at your enormous, disorderly, hotbeds of corruption called cities, your poorly-tilled, mortgaged farms, your struggling farmers, your miserable women and children, your tramps, your criminals, your destitute poor everywhere, and bow my head in sorrow for your one hundred years work."

"I pitied the people that should be without a revolution for twenty-five years. I do to-day. You have a government based on the right to alter or abolish it, yet you have made it a crime to criticize it. You are losing liberties—not gaining them." Then Jefferson retired.

Once more Thomas Paine spoke "You have made martyrs—they shall not have died in vain. Already the dawn is approaching."

Then over the head of Liberty, who looked up with hopeful eyes, there came a great light, that increased until the revolutionary heroes, the form of John Brown, the figures of the five who died, and the dim pale faces of Fielden, Neebe and Schwab, who looked out from prison bars, were bathed in its radiance. None fell on the statue which had assumed its old position; in the darkness it stood with uplifted hand always forbidding the people to speak.

A silence more powerful than the voices strangled that day fell on the assemblage; until a voice far away clear and ringing cried "Let the voice of the people be heard!" Then the vision melted away.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN.

(Continued from third page.)

could do just as he pleased, as far as his natural powers allowed him; though perfectly free from any extraneous force, he would still be subject to all the natural physical law of his being. If he eat any poisonous substance, or was burnt with fire, he would suffer the penalty, but to him the word justice or injustice would have no meaning, the social laws exist in him only potentially, they are there in him and can be brought into action when the occasion arises.

If another man makes his appearance at this place, the question would naturally arise, how can these two men adjust their relations with one another so as to live in peace and harmony.

Now, there are two conditions on which these men can live together and only two.

In one case the first can say to the second, or the second to the first: "You are here only by my permission, you must obey me, you must submit your will to mine, I am master!" In that case this subject man is not an associate, he is only a slave, he is the same as his horse or dog, but being differently constituted from these animals, being possessed of reason, he will assert his liberty and war and discord is the result. This is not society.

On the other hand either one can say to the other: "You are in the world as well as I am, you have an equal right to nature, you are at perfect liberty as well as I am. You have no right to control my actions, nor I yours; your right is only bounded by my equal right. If we associate together, we must associate honestly. I must not gain at your expense nor you at mine." This is society, which means peace and justice, it is equality and liberty.

There can be no justice between a slave and his master, for equality and liberty do not in this case exist. No more can there be justice between man and the lower animals, for man does not trouble himself whether he makes one horse work more than another, or he shears one sheep closer than another; he may be kind and loving to them, but he works his will on them nevertheless.

Neither can there be justice between God and man; man must supplicate, cringe and beg for his mercy and never asks for justice, but always ends his prayer with "Thy will be done."

It is said that Voltaire who was a deist said: "If God did not exist, we would have to invent him."

Bakounine, the celebrated Russian nihilist said: "If God existed, he would have to be abolished, before man could be free."

If justice means liberty and equality, it is only the same statement made in that grand Declaration, that all men are born free and equal and entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, my friends, so far most of you have agreed with me in my deductions, but now I approach the great superstition of our age and country, and the cause why this principle of society and justice, liberty and equality, does not prevail, and is, according to the sneering remarks of some of our politicians, when speaking of the Declaration of Independence, only a glittering generality.

You have seen, in the case of those two men I used in my illustration, that, in order to arrange their harmonious relations, Equality and Liberty were the law of Justice. For, if the relation of master and slave was to be the condition, war would naturally ensue, each contending for the mastery, which would never cease, for the subjected man would eventually revolt, and the same round would be repeated until justice was established.

We will now imagine a third man seeks this location to live and enjoy his natural rights. Any one, not influenced by preconceived opinions, would naturally suppose the same conditions would now prevail. Not so. One of these three men is now deprived of his will, and is told he must submit to the will of the other two, who shall regulate his movements and tell him what he shall do and what he shall not do, what he shall have and what he shall not have.

Now, this subjected man asks by what right they exercise such authority over him.

"Because we are two and you are only one; we are a majority," they answer.

"I acknowledge your excess of numbers," says the new comer, "but I fail to see how numbers can alter principles. I can only see you have an excess of physical force over me, but no more right over me than I have over you. This is injustice."

"But," respond the two, "you will have a vote on all subjects, as well as we."

"Which, however, is but an empty form that does not alter the matter," says the subjected man. "I therefore cannot consent, and demand my natural right to liberty."

"Well," rejoins the Majority, "you must either submit to the majority or leave the country."

"But," asks the New Man, "are you using all this land?"

"Oh, no; not one thousandth part of it; but we claim it all."

"Did you make the land?"

"No."

"How, then, do you claim the right to exclude me from it?"

"By the same right that all vacant land is held to-day all over the globe—by the right of brute force."

My friends, this right of majority rule is a relic of ancient barbarism that is supported only by a custom which is the outcome of ignorance of social law. You can easily imagine the conditions in semi-barbarous times, when men lived in tribes or cities, eagerly striving for the

reins of power. You can understand the internecine strife and the destruction of life and property by the contending parties. They would naturally grow tired of the strife and endeavor to find a better way than fighting a carnage to determine who should rule, and find some mode by which the relative power of contending parties could be ascertained without the loss of men and property. The weaker then submitted and paid their tribute as the easiest way, and the strongest ruled. But all this had nothing to do with men's rights, or justice; it was simply war for plunder, and eventually was known as the power of taxation.

It is contended that we must have a government; that there would be nothing but chaos and turmoil without it. I should be willing that it should exist, on condition that it be based upon the consent of the governed and its power did not extend beyond defense against aggression from without. That would simply be a voluntary association of men for common defense.

How many are there here among you, my Freethinker friends, this evening, who, like myself, could not at one time see beyond hell? Hell was a necessity, we then thought. Men without fear of hell must commit all sorts of crimes, we imagined. They would do them secretly, we thought, and be beyond detection. A heavenly detective was therefore put on everyone's track from the day of his birth to the day of his death, so he could never escape the punishment for his crime. Well, friends, you have got out of the hell of the Priest, but you are still in the hell of the King, his twin fraud.

Government is claimed to be necessary for the restraint of criminals. Who is the greatest criminal, the greatest thief and murderer in the world to-day? It is the State. Think of twelve million of men under arms in Europe. For what purpose? To keep "order," to preserve "peace," it is claimed. Is there one solitary Frenchman who has any animosity against an individual German? Not at all. But put either one of them behind a band of music, a gorgeous raiment on his back, and he will march up to a city in which no one had ever harmed a hair of his head, and will, with his cannon, murder innocent men, women and children and return, boasting of his exploits and all of that in the name of the State. He has committed no crime, he thinks; the responsibility lies with that intangible thing called State. The fact, however, is, my friends, that this man is nothing but a hired and uniformed assassin. As Shelley says:

"The child,
Ere he can lisp his mother's sacred name,
Swells with the unnatural pride of crime, and lifts
His baby-sword even in hero's mood.
This infant arm becomes the bloodiest scourge
Of devastated earth; whilst specious names
Learnt in soft childhood's unsuspecting hour,
Serve as the sophisms with which manhood dims
Bright reason's ray, and sanctifies the sword
Upraised to shed a brother's innocent blood."

Let priest-led slaves cease to proclaim that man inherits vice and misery, when Force
And falsehood hang even o'er the cradled babe,
Stifling with rudest grasp all natural good."

Every man living is and ought to be responsible for his own action.

Who robs men of their natural rights and denies them the right to their equal share of land, while giving control of millions of acres of it to a band of schemers, destitute of the first principles of honesty? The State. Who denies to man the right to exchange the products of his labor with his fellow man, and puts its minions by the thousand to cripple and plunder commerce and make a natural right a crime? The State.

Thomas Paine, in the very first sentence of his pamphlet to the people of the United States entitled "Common Sense," says: "Men have most always confounded Society with Government, while in fact they are very different and have very different origins. One is begotten of necessities, the other of our wickedness. One is a positive good, but the other has continually to apologize for its existence as a necessary evil, and when, instead of restraining evil-doers it was itself the means and cause of injustice, it ought to be abolished."

Now, my friends, I may be charged with pulling down without giving a remedy for existing evils. I am no firebrand of sedition.

"When men rise and institute a bloody revolution," says Herbert Spencer, "it is only an evidence that the evils they suffer from, are unbearable and they have become restive under them; it is no evidence that they know either the cause or the remedy, but they will often eagerly adopt some quick remedy that promises a safe and easy cure for all their ills."

The remedy for our social ills lies in a clear knowledge of all our social laws. But the trouble seems to be that the people have no clear conception of the meaning of the term law. The old economists defined law as the will of the sovereign. "All the edicts of Louis XIV," says Proudhon, "ran thus: 'It is our sovereign will and pleasure.'" When the republic deposed the King, it simply followed in the footsteps of the monarch, and called law the sovereign will of the "people," which only means the will of the majority of the people. In both cases it was simply the declaration of a will or wills, whereas it ought to be the declaration of a fact, as in the case of Newton when he enunciated the law of gravity.

The savant discovers those laws and simply announces his discovery.

Let me illustrate the law of Liberty and Equality in a given society of say a thousand men. If they are in a primitive state, merely producing what they consume, each doing his own work, and living on his own labor, producing about fifteen bushels of grain each per year and consuming it himself, there would be no wealth and no commerce. But if a hundred of them devoted themselves to some other industrial pursuit, making an article of common use, the balance of

the nine hundred would be obliged to raise one-tenth more grain to exchange with the one hundred for their productions. Here commerce and wealth would begin. In course of time nine hundred would be engaged in industrial pursuits, and the remaining one hundred would have to produce ten times more grain, and would of course be ten times more wealthy now through the division of labor.

The producer consumes but a small fraction of his productions. The bulk is created for society, from whom he draws in exchange what constitutes his wealth.

Now, the best interests, from a purely selfish standpoint, of a man living in a society acknowledging the laws of Liberty and Equality would demand that everybody should have the very best means of labor and possess all the advantages; so that he could produce the greatest possible amount of comforts to exchange for an equally great amount of other productions.

Not only would this be in harmony with his selfishness, but also with his highest moral nature. Anyone endeavoring, in his greed, to accumulate more wealth without considering his neighbor's welfare, by producing the double amount would be no richer, for as others would not double their productions, he would be unable to receive anything in exchange for his own productions, and his labor would be wasted. This social law, called the proportionality of productions, must be observed, or misery and wasted labor would result.

I could point out other social laws, for the violation of which we to-day suffer untold evils, but the great principles of Liberty and Equality are the first and most important; for if they are not observed, all others are of little value.

I am led to these remarks by my observations of present reform movements. Movements of men and women of kind and benevolent natures, which however, must eventually fail, like many others before them, if the laws I have pointed out are not observed. Simple co-operative ameliorations will not avail; nothing can compensate man for the loss of liberty. You may, in your kindhearted enthusiasm imagine, that there will be no divergence of opinion, and that all will eagerly adopt whatever plans you may have, but you are mistaken. Nature has so constituted things that there is an infinite variety through all the universe. This variety in mankind is as great in their mental as in their physical formation. It is like the variety of notes, which if adjusted by the law of harmony, is productive of the most pleasing music. The law of harmony in society is Liberty and Equality.

Suppose that in the advocacy of any new reform a portion of your fellow men entitled to the same natural rights as yourself did not agree with your plans. Supposing you were in the majority; they do not aggress on you or interfere with your rights. If you accord to them the same rights, you claim for yourself, peace and harmony will ensue; but if, in your self-sufficiency you claimed the right to coerce them, and deprived them of their equal rights to decide for themselves, then you must forever have policemen, judges, jails, hangmen, Gatling guns, bayonets, cannons, soldiers, and all the paraphernalia of blood and carnage that has cursed this war-polluted world for ages.

There is no reform. It is either Liberty or Despotism. It is either Peace or war.

The man of beatific soul commands not, nor obeys, however, like a desolating pestilence, poisoning wherever it touches, and obedience, base of all genius, virtue, freedom, truth, makes slaves of men, and of the human frame a mechanical automaton.

Rabbi Freuder's Progressive Lyceum Sunday afternoon meetings, 909 1/2 Market St., ought to be patronized. It is one of the few places where radicals have an opportunity for free discussion.

Cut It Short.

Force of circumstances caused the publication, in this issue, of two extraordinarily long articles, which fact crowds out a lot of other equally important matter. This is an exceptional case, however, and correspondents should not be guided thereby. While I desire and earnestly solicit expression of opinion from all different schools of radical thought, the space of the paper is limited, and correspondents will therefore kindly make their communications brief and to the point.

Read It Again.

In No. 2, the last San Diego issue of THE BEACON, I published "A Dream of the Past and Present," by Lizzie M. Holmes. The print, however, was so badly blurred and so many errors occurred therein that I concluded to republish it in this issue. It is now in good readable shape, and its stirring thoughts and beautiful sentiments will, I am sure, amply repay those who take the pains to read it again in its perfected shape.

The Pot is Boiling.

The Emperor of Germany and the Pope to Rome dabbling in Socialism, a revolution impending in Austria; a formidable strike in progress in America—what does it all mean?

How about the social revolution?

Keep Me Informed.

I intend to send three successive issues of THE BEACON to any person of progressive inclinations whose address I can obtain. Persons who are in sympathy with the paper but unable to subscribe will receive it regularly by informing me of the fact. Others will be dropped from the list, unless they send in the "root of all evil."

The early worms of the next political State campaign are already crawling out of their holes.—J. P. Thomas' Produce Report.

[And the "labor" politicians are not lagging behind.—ED. BEACON.]

That young German emperor is trying to work the same game on the Socialists that the old Roman emperor did on the Christians. In theory it's all right, but not in practice; for the material he has to operate on is so different to what it was in the Roman times. The Proletariat are better posted now.—J. P. Thomas' Produce Report.

For The Beacon.

THE HURRICANE.

BY VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

"We are the birds of the coming storm."
AUGUST SPIES.

The tide is out! the wind blows off the shore!
Bare burn the white sands in the scorching sun!
The sea complains, but its great voice is low.

Bitter are thy woes, O People,
And the burden
Hardly to be borne!
Wearily grows, O People,
All the aching
Of thy wounded heart, bruised and torn.
But yet thy time is not
And low thy moaning,
Desert thy sands!
Not yet is thy breath hot,
Vengefully blowing!
It wafts o'er lifted hands.

The tide has turned; the vane veers slowly round
Slow clouds are sweeping o'er the blinding light.
White crests curl on the sea; its voice grows deep.

Angry thy heart, O People,
And its bleeding
Fire-tipped with rising hate!
Thy clasped hands part, O People,
For thy praying
Warmed not the desolate;
God did not hear thy moan.
Now it is swelling
To a great human cry:
A dark wind-cloud, a groan,
Now backward veering
From that dead sky.

The tide flows in! the wind roars from the
depths!
The whirled-white sand heaps with the foam-
white waves!
Thundering, the sea rolls o'er its shell-crunched
wall.

Strong is thy rage, O People,
In its fury
Hurling thy tyrants down!
Thou metest rage, O People,
Very swiftly.
Now that thy hate is grown;
Thy time, at last, is come!
Thou heapest anguish
Where thou, thyself, wert bare!
No longer to thy dumb
God, clasped and kneeling,—
Thou answerest thine own prayer!

Bakounin says that man distinguishes
himself from the lower animal by his
faculties of thought and revolution. If
he therefore ignores either of them, he
degenerates into the brute species to that
extent.

In the same degree in which human
beings are capable of making sacrifices
of worldly possessions for a noble ideal,
they prove their fitness for the approach-
ing new civilization.

WANTED—A good advertisement solic-
itor. Apply at the office of THE BEACON.

Driftwood.

Another system which has been tried
for years and years is Cooperation. This
has, undoubtedly, more elements of suc-
cess than either Profit Sharing or a sys-
tem of Paternal Government, and yet,
only in a few instances has it proved a
success. It must be admitted that it has
signally failed to do what it has pro-
mised and what its ardent advocates sin-
cerely believed it would do, although
Mons. Charles Robert, in his eloquent
speech at the close of the Paris Exhi-
bition, could not find words laudatory
enough to sing the praises of Coopera-
tion as practically illustrated by the suc-
cess of the Maison Leclaire in Paris. The
only reason why Cooperation has suc-
ceeded in exceptional cases (just as Com-
munism has succeeded in a few isolated
cases here in America) is because it gave
individuality a chance for developement,
and in every instance the success can be
directly traced to one or two members of
that Co-operative or Communistic Socie-
ty, who possessed so marked an indivi-
duality that their fellow workers willing-
ly followed their lead, knowing that they
could rely on it and gain by doing so.
The Co-operative stores and Penny Sav-
ings Banks for work people, started by
Schultze-Delitsch all over Germany in
1862-63 in opposition to Lasalle's agita-
tion for State Socialism, soon closed
their doors, although they had the moral
support of all the well-to-do people and
the government as well. They lacked
the first necessity of success—individual-
ism, management. What was every-
body's business, was nobody's business.
It is admitted that the Co-operative plan
cannot be universally introduced. If it
could, Bellamy's State Socialism would
be a possibility. What a tremendous
gulf there is between the German system
of Paternal Government and Bellamy's
system of State Socialism!

*Extract of an address of Alfred Dolge,
delivered at the 21st Annual Reunion of
his Employees at Lodi, N. Y., Jan.
25th, 1890.*

The Parnell Commission is a thing of
the past, and the judges have handed in
their verdict. The Times claims a vin-
dication of the substantial truth of its
statements, the Parnellites claim a com-
plete vindication of Parnellism. A corre-
spondent writes in a feverish anxiety
to know what I think about it. So far as

the decision may help the Home Rule
movement I am heartily glad of it.
Home Rule is the goal to which Demo-
cracy is steadily steering: it means the
management of one's own affairs, the
abolition of the bayonet in the hands of
privilege, the final overthrow of force.
*The tyranny of the majority will doubtless
make itself felt for some time to come; but
as the interests of all the people will be
practically identical, government will
evolve into mutual agreement.—California
Nationalist.*

CHEERING VOICES.

GRINNELL, IOWA, October 24th, 1889.
EDITOR OF THE BEACON:

Comrade:—About two months since I
received from your office a copy of THE
BEACON. I enclose 65 cts. for six months'
subscription. I was a regular contribut-
or to *The Alarm* publication fund and I
think I recognize in THE BEACON many
features of that able and fearless expon-
ent of revolutionary doctrines. The ar-
ticle "Evolution vs. Revolution" in the
August 31st BEACON is not very convinc-
ing to me of the value of *laissez faire*.
Rather wide reading of history has failed
to show me Liberty obtained without
force—breaking of chains—and defiance
of masters—anywhere. As to taking
"higher ground than revolution affords"
I think it impossible to rise above the
noble army of martyrs who have died in
revolutions for France, Italy, Hungary
and America. Fraternally,

DR. MARY HERMA ATKIN.

FINDLAY, OHIO, January 10th, 1890.
EDITOR BEACON:—

I write to know why I do
not receive THE BEACON. I have waited
long and anxiously to read the good
things in THE BEACON. I am glad of the
existence of such a paper and wish it may
find a place in every home in the land.
I wish the masses were ripe, were grown
strong enough to protest against the
soulless plotters against human rights.
I like the thoughts you express. Now I
wish you would let me know the reason
why I have not received the paper.

Yours, etc.

MRS. BELL C. SHULL.

Comrades and friends will confer a
favor by sending me the names of radi-
cals to whom I may mail sample copies
of THE BEACON.

Small but Solid.

I have been obliged to reduce the size
of the present issue of THE BEACON to
conform it to the size of the press, but
the type used at present being smaller,
the paper actually contains more reading
matter, than the San Diego publication
did.