

The Beacon.

DEVOTED TO THE SOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

VOL. II.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY 7, 1891.

NO. 2

THE RUSSIAN MASSACRE.

BY AN EYE-WITNESS.

(Continued from No. 1.)

RE The curtain may drop. The last act, a "horrible" murder of the noblest, bravest, most self-sacrificing patriots of the world, has been committed by a government, of by and for the Czar, for the purpose of perpetuating a despotism which, a long time ago, has become a stench in the nostrils of every free nation in the world. The reader doubtless admits it; he strains the powers of his memory to find a parallel in past ages where a monstrosity of a crime, like the one revealed by this translation has been committed. He fails in his efforts, because there is no analogous crime in the whole world's history. The reader may remember that this slaughter did not take place somewhere on the "dark continent"—say in Timbuctoo, Dahomey, or in Afghanistan, Beloochistan, Rurmah, Anam, Siam or China. No, it took place in Christian, civilized Russia, on the eve of the twentieth century. The reader will remember that the massacre was prepared and premeditated before there was any crime committed. On the evening before that horrible outrage, the soldiers get their Sharpe cartridges and are told that tomorrow "there will be some shooting of politicians." All this in the face of the fact that on that very day they received official instructions from that very Governor to await his decision in the same place where the exiles were murdered; a few hours later that same dastardly, cowardly brute gives orders to a most ignorant, cruel, brutalized military mob to prepare themselves for murder. Furthermore, the sending, on the 22nd of March, of a mere police sergeant to the exiles with no written warrant, in direct contradiction of previous personal orders of the chief himself, is ample evidence that this trick was to be an excuse for the premeditated slaughter. There must be some excuse for military inter-

ference; it was found, viz: "Disobedience to official orders," amounting to mutiny in the eyes of the autocrat. He knew well enough that the exiles could not and would not obey the oral order of the inferior officer, contradicting to such a degree the order of the chief himself. And he made no miscalculation; the stupid, or fanatical, or so-instructed sergeant turns on his heel, without paying any attention to the explanations of the exiles, and simply reports at headquarters, "The politicals flatly refuse to come."

There has never been a clearer case of conspiracy to murder. That disgusting pack of lies called the "Act of Prosecution" tries to establish the crime of mutiny by the act of a joint petition. This is most shameful, unfounded trickery. There is no law in all the Russian States forbidding to petition the authorities. Even with committed criminals, who, by the very fact of their being committed for a crime, lose every civil right, retain the right of petition.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

ANARCHISTIC ECONOMY.

BY ROSS WINN.

Our governmental system is founded upon the principle of majority rule. The theory is that two persons, by combining together, acquire a right to rule the third, a right which neither possessed as individuals. Anarchists fail to see why two persons have more right to rule one, than one has to rule two. If one person has not the right to control the conduct and regulate the actions of two persons, then, by what process of reasoning, do we arrive at the conclusion that two persons have, because they are two to one, the right to rule the one person? It must easily be seen that the only basis for it is the principle of brute force, as two persons are physically stronger than one, and may thus compel the third to obey.

The philosophy of Anarchism is an emphatic denial of the principle of brute force in the organization of society. Anarchy is, in fact, a dualism, (if it may so be termed,) composed of individualism on the one hand, and socialism on the other. As individualists, Anarchists oppose majority rule as a denial of individual sovereignty, which sovereignty belongs to the individual as an individual.

As socialists they oppose majority rule and brute force, because it is as destructive to the welfare of society as it is to the individuals composing society.

What do Anarchists advocate? They advocate the reorganization of society upon the principle of free association and voluntary co-operation, as opposed to the present despotic system of governmental restriction and majority rule. They advocate a new and a better system, wherein the rights of all shall be inviolable, where each man and woman shall be a sovereign, with their personality for an empire; wherein the bountiful gifts of nature shall be free to all; where none shall partake of the fruits of another's toil; where those that create wealth shall enjoy it, and those who do not create anything shall enjoy nothing.

Anarchy is a look forward to that time when those that work shall have, and having, shall enjoy; where those who do not work shall have not, and having not, shall not enjoy. Anarchy demands for every man, woman and child on the planet a fair chance, a full measure, fair play and no favor. It is opposed alike to privilege and restriction. It demands that those who create wealth shall enjoy all the blessings which its possession confers.

Wealth is produced by labor, and by labor only. To the producer belongs the product. Therefore, to the wealth-producer belongs the wealth he has created.

Anarchism means the destruction of all classes but the working class. It says to the drone, "Go to work; hereafter you will have a fair show; the world needs more muscle and brains to direct it. You have a fair opportunity, and the rule is, work or starve."

Anarchism should not be confounded with Communism. The latter says, "To each, according to his needs, from each, according to his ability." The Anarchist formula is, "To each, according to his deeds." One is equality, the other is equity.

THE BEACON.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

AT 319 FIFTH STREET.

SIGISMUND DANIELEWICZ,
Editor and Proprietor.

PRICE OF SUBSCRIPTION, ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR.

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

San Francisco, February 7, 1891.

The Tools for the Toiler; the Produce for the
Producer.—"Chicago Alarm."**"LABOR" POLITICIAN JAMES H.
BARRY.**

The Weekly Star, of November 22, 1890, contained the following malicious article:

"We note at times the wanderings of dynamiter W. C. Owens, at the risk of rescuing him from obscurity. In cahoot with Haskell and other choice spirits of the Herr Most stripe, he got into and rode the Bellamy movement until it was strangled by their presence. He went to Los Angeles last winter (being able to work best where least known), where a few people were for a short time duped into following his lead. Having lost the editorship of the *California Nationalist*, he got a thousand dollars put up there to start a co-operative paper, under promises of great results. The money is gone. Los Angeles has found him out, and he has decamped to his stamping ground in this city, with the limp remnant of his paper, which resembles a dish-rag. He has run his organ for personal spleen, and to slander those of whose abilities he was jealous, and will now, on the strength of a couple of hundred dollars, try to continue it as the organ of the Anarchists, whom he has re-associated himself with here, upon the principle of trying to pull down those who do anything to raise up humanity. We do not see how the Anarchists are to support two papers here. Danielewicz, the barber, who runs THE BEACON, brought it away from Southern California so as not to compete with Owen there. Now Owen is unkind enough to bring his paper here to compete with THE BEACON, though both are run by men of a similar school of economy. We notice in a copy of THE BEACON, that persons desiring land are recommended to fill their pockets with dynamite bombs, which will cost only ten cents each, and take possession of vacant land, and if anyone interferes, to give him the dynamite; and if tools and implements are wanted, THE BEACON tells them to

march up to the factory where they are stored and help themselves, and if anyone interferes, to give him the dynamite. From this, one might judge that Owen and Haskell were on the staff of THE BEACON. As these people profess that those engaged in the same work ought not to compete with each other, it would seem that either Owen's paper or THE BEACON ought to suspend, and all the talent be united upon one Anarchist organ."

To show the intent of the above article as far as the reference to THE BEACON is concerned, I beg to quote the exact language used by me in No. 13 of THE BEACON. It is this:

"Let these unemployed start a company, and issue NOTES for the value of such a quantity of implements, provisions and stock as they require, REDEEMABLE WITH THE YIELD OF PRODUCE OFF THEIR LAND. Let them quietly march up to the respective warehouses and offer TO PURCHASE their necessities FOR THOSE NOTES. If refused, let them appropriate the wares, LEAVE THEIR NOTES BEHIND, and go about their business on the land, REDEEMING THE NOTES in proper time. Should they be disturbed in that transaction by the impostor-god, (Government), let them explain that they had helped to produce these articles, and had been defrauded out of them by the trickery of profits, interests, rents and taxes; that they were in justice entitled to the result of their labor, even without rendering an extra equivalent for it, and that therefore they were generous enough in offering their notes. If the semi god should then choose to molest them any further, and invade their rights to the result of their labor, let them use the dynamite."

Any fair-minded person will see that my advocacy of the use of dynamite was CONDITIONAL, and depended upon the readiness or REFUSAL of the owners of tools and implements to accept in payment the NOTES which were to be REDEEMABLE WITH THE YIELD OF PRODUCE OFF THEIR LAND. That nails lie number one. Lie number two is proved by the fact that "Danielewicz the barber" did not "bring THE BEACON away from Southern California so as not to compete with Owen (or his *Nationalist*) there." Barber Danielewicz's BEACON was suspended in SAN DIEGO about half a year before the publication of the *California Nationalist* in LOS ANGELES was ever thought of. So much for lies.

Now for ignorance. Barry claims that "these people" (speaking of the Anarchists) "profess that those engaged in the same work ought not to compete with each other," while on the contrary Anarchists contend for competition, with this distinction, that they demand the abolition of the monopoly of vacant land, the means of exchange and the means of labor, and last but not least, of government, which is the worst and most dangerous of all monopolies in that it sanctions and fosters all other monopolies, and by the very nature of its power, threatens the liberties and the very LIVES of the people.

As for Owen and Haskell "being on the staff of THE BEACON," Barry knows well enough that they are not. Were he not so lamentably ignorant upon politico-economic principles, he would certainly know that Nationalism (or State Socialism) and Anarchism, which he persistently mixes into one pot, are diametrically opposed to each other, the one (Nationalism) contending for centralization, or authority, (government), and the other (Anarchism), for decentralization of political power—for liberty. In justice to Brother Owen, I would say in this connection that, although he formerly used to be an advocate of physical resistance, he has in later years changed his opinion, and on various occasions, even in public, rejected the idea of physical resistance. In this respect he stands upon equal ground with Barry, who at one time sought and applied for admission into an organization based upon physical resistance (*Revolutionists*). The difference is simply this, that Brother Owen left the ranks, in which he had served as an honest, faithful worker, on account of an honest change of conviction, and remains a perfect gentleman, with whom I should at any time, but for the difference of political convictions, be happy and proud to associate and co-operate, while Barry was refused admission into the ranks because he was then suspected of being what is now verified by his conduct, a political trickster, maligner, liar and villain, whose very name is sufficient to cause honest peoples' repulsion.

Those brother editors who have continued sending their exchanges during the long recesses of THE BEACON will please be assured of my appreciation of their exceptional kindness.

PULL YOUR OWN NOSE.

On the last page of this issue will be found an extract from the *Morning Call*, censuring the practice of judges in catching little thieves and letting the big thieves escape. The *Call's* indignation is just, and deserves sympathy. Yet it is generally expected that people who advocate reform are to some extent reformers in practice as well as in theory, and that they, as much as possible at least, are mindful of the old adage that "reform should begin at home." Now, what is the *Call*? It is one of the largest San Francisco daily papers, whose proprietors have risen from poverty to opulence and wealth during a comparatively few years. How? By the labor of the scores of their employees, the largest portion of the results of whose labor they have appropriated during all these years by the nefarious practice of "profits on labor." Not only that, but the *Call* is the very paper that but a few years ago, when its compositors demanded a raise of a paltry five cents on a thousand ems, persistently refused this trifling raise for about a half-year, until it finally, by reason of the strong current of public opinion and financial losses, was obliged to yield.

What, then, is the real difference between John C. Hall, who stole \$200,000, and the proprietors of the *Call*, who filched much more from their employees under the cover of "profits on labor?" It is this: The law condemns John C. Hall's manipulations, while it upholds, sanctions and encourages those of the proprietors of the *Call*, simply because they work upon different systems. But both systems are alike in principle, both appropriate the workers' earnings without rendering genuine equivalents, both practice the modern crime of robbing labor.

NOT A "PHILOSOPHIC."

AURORA, Texas, Oct. 2, 1890.

Comrade Danielewicz:—Your kind favor came to hand, and I was very glad to hear that THE BEACON was still on deck. I like THE BEACON. I like its spirit. I recognize in it a rallying point for radical Anarchists. What we want

TRUE BLUE.

LOGANSPOUT, In L., Dec. 5, 1890.

Dear Comrade:—Enclosed please find fifty cents for THE BEACON. I am trying to get subscribers for you, but the minds of most people here are poisoned by the lies of the capitalistic papers.

There are no half-way measures to free the wage-workers from the murdering clutch of the robbers and tyrants called Church and State. A relentless revolution is the only means. This cannot come until a larger number of human beings are thoroughly acquainted with existing wrongs, and can understand the principles of Anarchy, viz: "Equal opportunities for every being," natural law being the only power of control. Let your thoughts go forth freely.

Fraternally, LEWIS YORK.

A "PHILOSOPHIC" NATIONALIST.

In one of the last issues of THE BEACON I asserted that many of the ranters against physical resistance are legalized robbers. Below is a proof of my assertion as furnished by Herman Goepper, (Nationalist) of Santa Ana, Orange Co., Calif., who, in course of two long epistles in which he seeks to "enlighten" me upon Nationalism and ferociously deprecates physical force as a means of resistance, says:

"As to interest, rent and taxes which you deprecate, as do also some Nationalists, I will state my own case. As long as I was able I was a hard worker, but have just accumulated enough so that, by living economically, I and my wife can live decently off the interest of what I call mine. Now, if I had no interest coming to me, I would have to consume the principal, and in a few years it would be exhausted, and we would have to live on charity. There are innumerable cases exactly like mine."

Yes indeed, unfortunately, there are innumerable cases of some people's living upon profits, interest, rents and taxes—that is upon the results of other people's labor, instead of earning it by their own labor, and that is exactly what is the trouble.

is a united phalanx. The so-called "Philosophers," with their bickerings, can accomplish but little real good in the way of advancing the cause of human freedom.

I am not a "Philosophic" Anarchist. I am not a "straight" nor other sectarian Anarchist. I am simply an Anarchist. I have no use for qualifying adjectives. As Lum has so often truly said: "To qualify liberty is to destroy it." ANARCHISM HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH METHODS. NEITHER HAVE METHODS ANY RELATION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANARCHISM.

I am vehemently opposed to passive resistance. In the first place it is slavish, and in the second place there is no reason in quietly submitting to wrongs. It is the right of all to use whatever means are available for self-defense. The State is at present an aggressor. It aggresses upon the liberty of the people, and it is not only their right, but their duty to resist. To teach the people to tamely submit, is only schooling them in slavery. It is our duty to teach men to be men, to assert their rights, and, having asserted them, to be prepared to maintain them at all hazards.

Anarchists do not wish to establish Anarchy for those who do not want it; they only demand that they be allowed to arrange their own social and political relations to suit themselves. This they have a perfect right to do. Therefore, we have the right to resist the State by fair means or foul.

Friend Danielewicz, I am aware that you agree with me in all this, and that you agree that nothing short of a forcible revolution will destroy the present system of organized murder and theft. THE BEACON stands for these principles, and all true friends of the cause will rally to your aid. I read the attack made on you by Fair Play, and wrote a reply and a protest, but finally concluded it was unworthy of reply.

I hope to soon have the pleasure of reading the good things in THE BEACON again. I send enclosed \$1, which will be followed by a larger sum in a short time.

With kindest regards for you and best wishes for THE BEACON, I am fraternally,
ROSS WINN.

BELLAMY'S IDEAL.

BY DAGMAR MARIAGER.

Edward Bellamy has weakened my hope in his sex, and ruined a highly interesting, if not a logical book, by placing in it his ideal woman—a woman who can talk like a parrot, and weep sympathetic tears like Jack Frost's fringe along the eaves of a Minnesota cottage after the spring thaw, but dares nothing more startling than an apology to him for her unmaidenly presumption in returning his love, after he has badgered her fearfully a whole week for it; a woman not a whit less weak, flimsy and characterless than is our average, and a woman far from being the peer of thousands of women of the present day.

I cannot hail with joy the coming 2000th year as Bellamy pictures it, seeing much room for reform in it, and no room for the reformer. He leaped into Chronology's advance, taking with him some things cumbersome and otherwise evil. Among these he had the big god who is the real author of the barbarous state of our present social, industrial and governmental affairs, and would have made matters far worse with us, from the time man invented him, had there not been men and women more humane and just than he. Among Bellamy's baggage, too, was much of the vanity, false modesty and bigotry of to-day, and, though he says nothing of the Sabbath, he hints at "Sabbath rest." Then also, after dining, he has the hardihood to smoke the malodorous cigar that makes the streets, postoffices and so-called public places of to-day largely for men only, and the men unfit for association with women, and much less to become their husbands, and the fathers of their children. And in the New Jerusalem his pet, it seems, is exempted both from school and the labor army, that she may pose beautifully before him, intoxicate him with ecstasy by her elegancies of movement and facial expression while she smiles on him, and that she may twee-dee around him, and among the rosebuds being arranged for the dinner table, while her soft and rosy fingers twinkle gracefully amid her busy idleness.

Bellamy is too good to women to be trusted with their interests. The man who would favor a woman would also rob and degrade her. Although the fi-

nancial provisions for men and women in his book are equal, women are yet set aside—they may, after all, only live and move by sufferance, as prescribed by their nabob lords to the insane and idiotic.

There rests a fatal error in making men or women too great for continued individual growth, or in putting one at the mercy of all his fellows. That may be co-operation, in which there is usually more power than conscience, but it is neither wisdom nor justice. Bellamy puts women into this sphere with the same man—made authority smiling arrogance and brutal licence practiced by men against women to-day, under the claim that women are unfit as co-laborers with, and associates for men. He repudiates women's birthright to self-trust and sovereignty, and rejects, with a contemptuous sneer, their just claim to aspire as his equal, and be recognized as the natural and competent companions of himself and brothers intellectually. He makes women 110 years hence just what they are to-day—mere caterers to his grosser nature, his vices, passions and imbecility, and an ever ready battalion of insensible dependents for himself and his brethren to waste their witless flatteries upon.

Let us hope that the women of a century hence will have more rights than that to be irrevocably chained. Such a stereotyped, while yet morally evil social and governmental system, I hope never to have been born to live in. I should be the most pitiable of all known outcasts, as I should be not alone penniless, but in hopeless despair, all things belonging to the nation, and nothing to me; no, not a foot of ground to stand upon, not a crust to stay my hunger, nor water to slake my thirst, nor even breath to breathe, as I should be there, as here, an uncompromising rebel, and relentless in my ambition to spread the fact that a myriad of fatal evils revolve about men's long-tied deference to women, with its natural associate, contempt for womanhood, and the doctrine, too, that it is no one's business what is my sex, nor mine what is the sex of any other human being.

We have a faint surmise that Bellamy grows eloquently pathetic toward the last, and regret that we may not witness and imbibe his spirit, since he has fortified himself and it behind his picture of his ideal woman.

DISPENSING JUSTICE.

The San Francisco Call (capitalistic,) says:

"The Call has heretofore noticed the difference in the administration of justice sometimes in our San Francisco courts. It has stated that a vagabond who purloined a few dollars was sent to State's Prison for years, but the man who has stolen his tens of thousands goes unwhipped by justice. Indeed, we have often thought that some of our courts go upon the principle that the person who steals a large sum of money commits a virtuous act, inasmuch as he takes money away from a man who has a surplus and scatters it among the people. Again, the man who is robbed of a large sum occupies the position of a culprit, or is made to appear as such. According to this reasoning the person who has the ten, twenty or fifty thousand dollars of which he is robbed is often treated in court as if he were worse than the culprit."

A newspaper contemporary proves the correctness of this statement, as follows: "On Saturday a man who stole 90 cents worth of property was sentenced to two years' hard labor in Folsom Prison. John C. Hall, who stole over \$200,000, is still at large. Justice is mighty, and has a habit of prevailing in story-books, but it does not seem to be startlingly successful in real life."

CO-OPERATION WANTED BY GABRIEL Z. WACHT.

I want a true and intelligent woman to assist me in establishing a Free Intelligence Office and an Equitable Produce and Labor Exchange and in managing business in the same institutions in accordance with methods enunciated in my "Catechism on the Science of a Universal Religion." Please, apply in this Office or send application in care of the Editor of this paper.

Friends and comrades who have offered and shown a disposition to assist in the work of THE BEACON in the shape of subscriptions and contributions, are informed that their assistance will now be welcome.

Don't fail to go to the Lyceum next Sunday afternoon.