THE EXECUTION OF THE ANARCHISTS.

There is much to be said in favor of such slowness of judicial process as has marked the Anarchist cases, but there is one great objection to it, and that is the opportunity it affords to people to forget the severity of the crime, the sufferings and sorrows of its victims, and to lash themselves into sympathy with the doomed criminals. It is now a year and a half since the bomb-throwing in Chicago. During the following six months people's minds were occupied with the horrors of the resulting slaughter and malming of the police, about forty of whom were killed or disabled in the discharge of their duty, and with the devilish malignity of the attack on them. At that time nobody—not even, we think, the firmest opponents of capital punishment—ventured to suggest that there was any place in this world for the bomb-throwers, or that the removal from it of such tigers was not a solemn duty to human society.

Since then, however, a good many people—some of whom are clergymen, some philanthropists, and some simply soft-hearted people who sign all papers presented to them which do not impose pecuniary obligations—have had time to forget all about the police, and all about social security, and all about the Anarchists' teachings and aims, and are trying to get Governor Oglesby to commute the sentences of the men now awaiting execution. We have no fear that he will be weak enough to pay any attention to them. But there is great reason to fear that the agitation in their behalf may do much to weaken the deterring influence of their fate on their surviving brethren, seeing that several men of good standing and repute for common sense and patriotism are lending their countenance to it.

There are some considerations which these people apparently overlook in doing so; and we would therefore earnestly urge upon their attention, and the attention of all concerned, the following points.

(1.) That anybody who has any doubt of the complicity of the whole seven anarchists now awaiting sentence in the awful crime of May 4, 1886, either has not read the judgment of the Supreme Court of Illinois, on the appeal, in which the whole case, both facts and law, is elaborately reviewed; or if he has read it and has not been convinced by it, should so far question his power of weighing the pros and cons of a case of this nature as to feel it his duty to be silent about it, and to abstain from all attempts to influence the conduct of those whom the law obliges to act in it. Nothing but thorough acquaintances with the evidence produced on the trial, and thorough mastery of the reasoning applicable to questions of probability, warrants anybody in asking Gov. Oglesby for a pardon of the prisoners on the plea that they, or any of them, are innocent, that some are less guilty than others. That is to say, that any one who tries to embarrass him or slack his nerves in the performance of such an awful duty as now devolves on him, without feeling well assured that he knows thoroughly what he is talking about, is guilty of a gross violation of social morality.

(2.) That those who ask for a pardon through dislikes of capital punishment, should remember that the opposition to capital punishment in modern times has been everywhere based on the assumption that justice will be committed through private, individual hate, or for purposes of robbery, and that the substitutes suggested for this punishment have not had in view attacks on the whole social organization by sects of con-
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(3.) That should Gov. Oglesby even commute their sentences, the arguments in favor of commutation would, as the memory of the crime grew more faint, be every year used, and with increasing force, to complete the complete pardon; that, in fact, their right to a par-
daughter would become a political issue in the State elections, and that demagogues would soon begin about their liberation, until probably, in five or six years from this time, we should witness the shocking spectacle of the joyous, unperturbed freedom and activity of a band of convicted assassins preaching with renewed vigor the gospel of arson and murder in the very streets which they had redeemed with the blood of the cifi-
cars of the law. No civilized community can afford to offer such a sight as this.

(4.) That although, as Judge McAllister of Chicago says, the hanging of these men may make "them martyrs in the opinion of thou-

sands of people," this is the less of two evils. Society can have a more complete and lasting effect if they are given as martyrs by a great many thousands of people; but it cannot stand their finding ready imitators even among a few hundreds. Nobody is hurt by anybody's considering Spies or Lingg a "martyr," but it would hurt a great many to have even a dozen men conclude that there was no risk in following his example.

(5.) That it must not be forgotten that our criminals are all but one foreigners and new arrivals, who have left behind them in Europe thousands infected with their ideas and as active from the full routine of regular industry, who are watching the case of their forerunners in this country with intense interest, to see if armed attacks on the social organization can be made with more safety here than in Europe. To allow the murder-
eries of the Chicago police to get off with what would certainly prove a short term of imprisonment, would confirm them in their belief that the absence here of the great display of police and soldiery with which they see the law made terrible in the Old World means weakness of the public force, and inability of society to de-
send itself against anybody who chooses to disregard its obligations or dispute its authority. It would, in fact, operate as an invitation to all the ferocious malcontents of France, Germany, and Russia to come here and work out their theories whenever they could raise their passage money, or found the pursuit of the hangman in Europe too hot for them.

There are signs that the discovery of bombs in the cell of one of the Anarchists, in the Chicago Jail is doing something to bring the friends of "elemency," in that region, at least, to their senses, and the petitioning for pardon or commutation has visibly de-

clined. The probabilities are that Lingg meant to blow up himself and as many others as possible. However he failed to an end and the inevitable hour had come. In other words, his tigerish nature was not in the smallest degree softened by the long period of suffering and anxiety through which he had passed.

A great deal of the effort made to save the Anarchists from the gallows is due to the impression that they are being punished for their opinions, and that even if it be just, it is bad policy to punish men for their opinions, because, if these opinions are widespread, the persecution or martyrdom of the authors only helps to spread the poison. It has to be borne in mind that the State of Illinois has acted on this theory for several years. For fully ten years the city of Chi-

cago has been a hotbed of Anarchy, in which the slaughter of well-do people and the destruction of their property was freely and openly advocated, without any interference from the authorities. The result was that the mild and honest Anarchists every day gained strength, and the dreamy, persuasive Anarchists were every day pushed more and more into the background.

The lesson of all this is, that the only op-

pines which a civilized community can treat with either respect or indifference are opin-

ions which, even if embodied in action, would not menace its existence. But the Anglo-Saxon respect for free speech is based on the assumption that public speech is always intended in free countries to persuade people into agreement with the speaker for purposes of legislation, and that the agreement aimed at is therefore a lawful one. The notion that speech is to be tolerated or censored which is to induce people to break up the social or-

ganization and abolish property by force, is historically and politically absurd. The notion that we must not do whatever is necessary to prevent men's publicly encouraging murder and arson, because they are sincere in think-

ing murder and arson good means to noble ends, is worse than absurd—It is, as we see, full of danger for everything we most value on earth.

It is a great pity that we cannot shut up the mouths of the Anarchists by force. But as we cannot shut them up by force, we must do it by fear, that is, by inflicting on them the penalties which they most dread: and the one most appropriate to their case when they kill people, is death. The frightful examples they are making just now to escape the gallows, and the joy with which they would welcome a "life sentence," shows clearly that the gallows is the punishment the case calls for. For violent incitements to murder and pilage, imprisonment will
doubtless suffice; but for actual murder and pillage there is nothing like to prove an effective and deterrent to death. Those who oppose this view can only do so successfully by maintaining their own existence, and that murder and arson are evils only when the murderer's motives are low and selfish; that if he can show that he means well, and has at heart the elevation of the poor, he should be treated with the respect due to philanthropists and apostles. If the propagators of these grotesque fancies only knew the encouragement they were giving to the contempt for law which makes both the rich bribers and semi-barbarous lynchers the curers of American politics at present, we feel sure they would pause in their efforts to save the community the loss of the vagabonds and riff-raff who are now awaiting execution at Chicago.

**TRUSTS, TARIFFS, AND WAGES.**

The Paper-Bag Trust is the latest combination formed for the purpose of creating or maintaining a monopoly in trade. Herebefore the paper-bag people have been so well abetted by patents that they have not needed any other protection. But the patents will come to an end by and by, and it has been deemed prudent to get the business into bomb-proof condition before that eventuality takes place. The number of such Trusts is increasing at a rapid rate. We have been expected to see some defence of them from some able lawyer or skilled dialectician like the Hon. Warner Miller or the Hon. William Walker Phelps, but, to none such has been made, we feel constrained to undertake the task ourselves.

It is constantly affirmed, and generally admitted without proof, that the object of a protective tariff is to enable manufacturers to pay high wages, and that without such protection to the level, everybody knows what. Formerly the English level was taken as the standard, but since English wages have advanced very near to our own level, there has been a general tendency among protectionists to substitute French, German, Italian, and East Indian wages as a standard of misery to be avoided by putting the American producer in funds, and thus enabling him to pay high wages and deal liberally with his men. Willingness to pay high wages is of no practical value unless one has the money to pay with. A steel mill manufacturer, for example, might be persuaded with a desire to raise the wages of his operatives, but his good intentions would be frustrated if he could not sell his goods at a sufficiently high price to reimburse him for the advance. We have never heard of the combination of employers called to consider how they might increase the pay of their employees, although we have been witness to many that have been held for the contrary purpose. Theoretically nothing could be a stronger committee of all the protected interests than a combination in any way to mean to put up wages and keep them up, since every high tariff speech, book, pamphlet, trade, circular, and newspaper article declares that this is the great end and aim of duties on imports. But somehow we never hear of any efforts of this sort. On the contrary, we are always hearing of disputes between the workmen and their employers on this question, in which the latter are striving by every means to neutralize and frustrate the beneficial ends of the tariff by keeping wages down to the lowest possible point. For a quarter of a century Congress has been saying to the protected classes, "Take as much money as you please from the public and give satisfactory wages to your laborers. We will not ask you to show your balances sheet or furnish any statement of receipts and disbursements. We will pass laws giving you the monopoly of the American market, and we shall expect you to make a fair division with your employees. We will take care of the rich and the rich will take care of the poor." Well, at the end of the twenty-five years since the Morrill tariff went into effect it finds the strife between employers and employees as bitter as ever. We have not advanced an inch towards the desired and much promised adjustment of equitable and peaceful relations between the two parties. It may be said that it is unreasonable to look for such a settlement, because, however high wages may be, the laboring men will always ask for more, and that if wages were doubled by a magnat's wand to-day, the trade-unions would begin to plot for more to-morrow. The corollary of this proposition is that, however much money Congress may put into the pockets of the protected classes at any time, it will be best for them to keep it all and never pay a cent more in wages than they are compelled to. This is exactly what happens, what has always happened, and always will happen. The employers have wisely governed themselves in the matter of wages by the law of supply and demand. They have looked forward to a time when domestic competition would reduce their prices, and have acted upon the business principle of making low while the sun shines, putting everything in their pockets that the law allowed them to take.

Now that domestic competition has become an unpleasant matter, we find a new kind of monopoly arising up in every direction under the name of Trusts. The object of a Trust is to secure to the present producers of a given article, such as lead, sugar, India rubber, cattle, straw-board, paper bags, saddlery hardware, cotton-seed oil, petroleum, and what not, absolute control of the market, so that they may keep out all new comers and charge what they like for their goods. A Trust is a supplementary protective tariff in its effects, although not in its origin. It depends on the tariff for its efficiency in so far as foreign competition is stopped, but is offered for sale and might be brought in competition with those produced by the Trust. The article of deal, for example, which has recently "been trusted," is protected by a duty of two cents per pound. The result would be that the trust would break up the Trust and put the lead producers on a plane with the American people in general—

that of making a living by fair competition with their fellows. And so of sugar, India rubber, and many other things protected by these newly devised Trusts. There is a growing uneasiness in the public mind regarding these Trusts. It is not a pleasant thing to contemplate the chaining of the whole people to a series of monopolies controlling the necessities of life, in the same way and upon the identical plan adopted by the Standard Oil Trust. Nobody has opened his mouth to defend them, and this is all the more wonderful since the very same argument that defends the protective tariff, and without which the latter would long ago have crumbled in ruins, is equally available to defend the Trusts. If an artificial monopoly created by Congress through duties on imports serves to increase wages, must not a monopoly created by other means have the same effect? Can anybody give a reason why a Trust should be protected, because it is a profit? Monopoly enable the employers to pay high wages, and if the profits insure that result, does it make any difference whether the good profits come from a tariff or from a trust? Obviously not. If Congress enacts that lead miners shall yield two cents a pound more than its natural price in order to help the workmen, must not any other agency which yields the same result have the same effect—yields supposing that Congress takes no steps to see that the workmen get the share? We throw out this hint to Mr. Warner Miller, Mr. Win. Walker Phelps, and all the workmen's friends, hoping to see this venerable argument put in more attractive shape than we have been able to present it.

**THE PANAMA CANAL.**

Mr. De Lesseps has adjourned for still another year the opening of the Panama Canal, but has now fixed the precise date for the event, namely February 3, 1900. This exactitude is presumptuous of a sort for the funds. The last supplies were secured on terms so extremely onerous as to suggest that there is a limit even to French middle-class credulity. The money on hand will not carry the company through the calendar year 1888. If the shareholders see a deficiency in prospect for continuing the work through the succeeding year, there will be an alarm and the stock will decline. But a decline of the stock would prevent the negotiation of new loans. Mr. De Lesseps must, therefore, keep a full treasury. He must not only anticipate his wants, but he must prevent other people from anticipating a shortage at any time before the period set for the opening of the canal. The belief is generally held in this country that Mr. De Lesseps will never finish the Panama Canal, that no private company will ever finish it, that the present company will become utterly bankrupt, and that when it goes down, the greatest financial disaster of modern times will have superseded it.

The belief is generally held in this country that Mr. De Lesseps will never finish the Panama Canal, that no private company will ever finish it, that the present company will become utterly bankrupt, and that when it goes down, the greatest financial disaster of modern times will have superseded it. It would be difficult to imagine, to collect together any body of capitalists and contractors outside of France who would agree to take