

Chicago is somewhat excited over the question of supplying school children with school books free. That question was settled in New York more than a generation ago, and settled sensibly. It was there assumed that free school books and free schools go together. Under circumstances that make it right to maintain a free public school system, it must be right to furnish free school books. It is quite conceivable that in a free state of society, where every man's income was in proportion to his earnings, free schools would be abandoned. But under existing conditions we not only need free schools but we have them. In these circumstances the question of free books raises no minor issue. It raises the issue of the free school system itself. Granted that free schools should be maintained by general taxation, and free school books follow as a matter of course. They are a logical if not essential part of the system.

Mr. Bryan has been thoughtlessly criticised for saying in a labor day speech that "each decade in our history shows greater production of wealth, and the men who produce it have less to show for it." The criticisms are based upon statistics of increasing wages and diminishing cost of living. But Mr. Bryan is right. Statistics of wages are utterly misleading. The wages referred to are usually day wages or week wages. When computed into yearly wages, they are vitiated by inability, or at any rate neglect, to get at an average which fairly includes the unemployed. If, therefore, slack employment has increased, wages in general might be less though these defective statistics of wages showed a gain. But it is evident, without reference to statistics, that the condition of the working class has declined; and this, after all, is the essence of Mr. Bryan's indictment of economic conditions.

In the first place, the lowest grades of laborers are worse off than they used to be except as charity has come

in to help them. In the next place, the cost of living now is not comparable with the cost of living formerly, merely upon the basis of the prices of staples, which is the basis upon which statistics of the cost of living rest. When clothing and other necessaries were made at home, costing nothing in money except for the materials and next to nothing for them, a low rate of wages yielded a better living than higher wages would yield now, when nearly all necessaries must be bought. In the third place, there has been a great extension in the catalogue of necessaries. In the past, men could live self-respecting lives with a range of supplies which in these days would mark them as almost paupers. The single item of street car fare, caused by the necessity of living at a distance from working place and supply stores, adds not less than \$25, and probably \$50 a year to the living expenses of working class families. Living expenses, therefore, have been increased by the necessity for buying some things formerly made by the family and other things that formerly were unknown; but the statistics of living expenses take no account of these important changes. Could they be statistically measured, the relation of wages to living expenses would not look as pretty in the government reports as they do.

But the chief consideration is yet to mention. Suppose we admit, as we are far from doing, except for the argument, that Mr. Bryan was wrong if he meant that workingmen get a poorer living absolutely than they used to get. Even then he was not wrong if he meant that they get a poorer living relatively—a smaller proportion of what they produce. In half a century productive power has increased enormously. In many vocations one man can accomplish more now than 100 could then. It would be a conservative estimate to say of the aggregate of labor that it is five times as productive as it was in the middle of the last century. Yet who would dare venture the assertion

that workingmen, as such, are five times, or four times, or three times, or even twice as well off as they were 50 years ago. The point of Mr. Bryan's remark is that those who do the work of the world are plundered; and that point is proved when it appears, as to every observant man it must appear, that wages do not advance in proportion to advances in labor power.

### ANARCHISM.

The assault upon President McKinley by an assassin who avows himself an anarchist, and proclaims that his murderous act was a duty, once more directs attention to the subject of anarchism.

Of anarchists there are various schools or parties. They differ all the way from conspirators and revolutionists to men of Quaker-like principles and practices. To suspect all anarchists, therefore, of complicity in assassination because one has committed the crime, is like suspecting every Christian of believing in transubstantiation because Catholics do, or in immersive baptism because Baptists do, or in predestination because Presbyterians do, or in the non-existence of disease because Christian Scientists do.

One school of anarchists is simply what the name implies—extreme individualists. They believe that government is bad, because it interferes with equal freedom. But to abolish government by assassinating rulers is as far from their thoughts as the abolition of war by assassinating generals would be to a Quaker. They depend upon education in their philosophy, and upon the development of thought, for the triumph of their theories. The distinguishing characteristic of this school is its absolute reliance upon the efficiency, for the maintenance of order and the equitable adjustment of social relations, of the natural law of competition.

Another school is that of the communist-anarchist. All the schools except that mentioned above, might be classed as sub-groups of this one, the classification depending less upon di-

versity as to principle than upon disagreement as to practical methods. Communist-anarchists resemble socialists in rejecting or proposing to abolish the law of competition, but they are repelled from socialism by its governmentalism. They would have government, but not coercive government. Their system is, as its name implies, individualism modified by communism. Prince Krapotkin, whose views we considered last spring (p. 36), is a famous apostle of communist-anarchism.

That there are adherents of this school who advocate physical force, including assassination, is doubtless true. But that policy is no more a characteristic of the school than it is of the Republican party, some of whose members in Kentucky murdered Goebel, and whose governor of Indiana made an asylum for one of the indicted persons.

It is a policy, however, which subjects anarchists of the peaceable sort to serious misconception and grave danger. Not only are they liable to be prosecuted as accomplices of revolutionary anarchists, with whom they are in agreement upon philosophical principles but whose practical methods they reject; they are in even greater danger of being victimized by detectives masquerading as anarchists. It is an old detective trick to join suspected conspirators and urge violence with a view to disclosing their lawless character and fixing guilt upon individual members. With shrewd men, or men of clear convictions and strong individuality who oppose violence, the trick fails. But weak or enthusiastic men, though they have no sympathy with violence, are easily led into good-naturedly assenting to almost any abstract proposition made by a "comrade," even if he be a man they wish in future to avoid. Very much of the police information about anarchists has, we suspect, been obtained in this way.

We believe the truth to be that there are very few anarchists in this country who expect to resort to violence against American public servants, or who either directly or indirectly advocate such violence. There may be more who believe that a violent revo-

lution will come in time, even here; but this is not a programme with them, it is a prophecy. There are many who talk loosely, but their speeches would attract no more attention than the speeches of any other stump speaker, if their ideas were not already labeled "dangerous." But with that label the Lord's prayer or the declaration of independence, repeated by them, has a sanguinary sound to the ignorant.

There are also some weak-minded characters in the anarchist movement who think that these speeches inspire them to commit murder. Mr. McKinley's assailant appears to be one of that kind. He traces his murderous impulse to a speech by Emma Goldman. But the speech he refers to appears, as now published, to furnish no reason for suspecting Miss Goldman of being his instigator. So far from advocating violence in this speech, she expressly declared against it. She did refuse to condemn those who resort to violence, and she expressed sympathy with several who had done so; but our criminal law would have to be badly twisted to make her responsible, on the basis of those utterances, for the attack, four months later, upon President McKinley. According to a special dispatch from Cleveland to the Chicago Tribune, published on the 8th, Miss Goldman could not have said much to incite to assassination; for, as that dispatch read, "during Miss Goldman's address a strong detail of police was in the hall to keep her from uttering sentiments which were regarded as too radical." This intrusion of arbitrary power in police uniform at a lecture might very much more easily have incited a man like Czolgosz to commit his crime, than anything Miss Goldman is reported to have said.

The reckless speeches of anarchist orators are, as we believe, best left alone. We believe this because there are worse things than speeches advocating violence, and one of them is a public policy which turns policemen into censors of public speaking. We believe it also because speeches urging violence react, if left alone, upon those who make them, and if they fairly

represent a cause, upon the cause itself. We believe it also because we do not believe that assassins are ever really instigated by violent speeches, unless they are insane; and that if insane they are just as liable to be instigated by a temperance speech or a chapter from the old testament. No public speaker would be safe if any murderer might implicate him in the crime by asserting that he received the murderous impulse from a speech of his.

It is needless for us to say that we have no sympathy with the physical force idea in this country. There are countries where public opinion is kept in ignorance and subjection, and where, consequently, physical force and terrorism of officials are excusable though exceedingly ineffective methods of agitation. But in this country press and platform are as a whole entirely free, so that the people can be educated along any lines that interest them. The right of anarchists to use these means for spreading a knowledge of their theories of civilization without government has been and must be maintained. This right can be safely taken from nobody who seeks the public ear. And if anarchists succeed in converting a majority of the people to their views, the ballot offers an adequate, even if crude, method of putting them into practice. Crude as it is, it is a better method than terrorism, better than assassination or violence of any kind, better even than passive non-conformity. With facilities like these there is no warrant for violence, no need for conspiracies, no excuse for speeches suggesting or applauding violence, no reason whatever for that playing at revolutionist in which some anarchists find a species of satisfaction. Not only is there no excuse, but such conduct is calculated to excite a popular frenzy, which, when some one shoots down a prominent man, may engulf not only the slayer, but those also who have played at conspiracy, and even better men who have not.

It behooves the peaceable anarchists of this country, if they insist upon using a name that is associated in the public mind with the idea of cowardly assassination, to break off all organic

relations with physical force anarchists, and not only to disclaim but to denounce assassination as a method of advancing their cause. On the other hand, it behooves people who are not anarchists to learn the difference between men who murder and teach murder and men who by peaceable methods propagate the political doctrine of individualism.

## NEWS

A vast concourse of people at the Buffalo exposition on the 6th were frenzied by an attempt upon the life of President McKinley. As the shocking news ran over the wires, the whole country shared for the moment in this feeling. But bulletins from the president's bedside soon encouraged hopes of his recovery; and as hope ripened into confidence, the fury that at first threatened to possess the people gave way to the sober second thought. Many newspapers and some policemen, seconded by politicians of a certain type, have endeavored to keep up the unwholesome excitement; but upon the whole the public mind is singularly calm.

The deplorable event occurred in the Temple of Music at the exposition. President McKinley was holding a reception. In this music temple were 3,000 persons, while 10,000 were pressing at the entrance for admission. A passage had been formed by two parallel lines of soldiers, through which the public passed, shaking the president's hand as they went by him. In this line was an obscure man, Leon Czolgosz (Tshawl-gosts), who is now notorious the world over. His right hand was covered with a handkerchief as if it had been wounded. In fact it concealed a derringer pistol. Czolgosz came into the president's vicinity at about four o'clock in the afternoon. As he reached out with his left hand, apparently for the purpose of shaking the president's outstretched right, he fired upon the president twice, through the handkerchief that concealed his weapon. One bullet struck the president on the upper portion of the breast bone. It did not penetrate, but glanced off. The other penetrated the abdomen, five inches below the left nipple and an inch and a half to the left of the median line. It passed through the

stomach, and found lodgment in the muscles of the back, where it still remains and probably always will, the surgeons having decided to make no effort to extract it.

The president sank into the arms of friends and was speedily carried to the emergency hospital, where distinguished surgeons operated upon him. They opened the body through the line of the bullet wound, closed the perforation of the front wall of the stomach with silk stitches, bound and closed the perforation of the back wall in the same way, and searched without success for the further course of the bullet. No injury to the intestines or any other abdominal organ was discovered. Such is the substance of the public statement made during the evening of the 6th by Mr. Cortelyou, the secretary to the president. Since then Mr. McKinley's condition has steadily improved, and he is now considered out of danger.

As the shots reverberated through the great music hall, a secret service officer, who stood directly opposite the president, struck Czolgosz, hurling him to the floor, while another seized the assassin's hand and took away his pistol. As Czolgosz fell, a large Negro, the next person in line, threw himself upon him and would have mangled him to death had he not been rescued by some of the soldiers. When finally arrested the assassin gave the name of Nieman (German for no man), and explaining his crime said he was an anarchist and had done his duty. During the arrangements to remove him, lynching cries were raised in the crowd, and the carriage in which he rode was violently attacked by mobs. But some of the Buffalo police and the detachment of soldiers, to whom alike special credit is due for their intelligent efforts at the critical moment to perform their duty in a lawful manner, succeeded in carrying him safely to police headquarters, where he is still confined. Czolgosz has proved to be of American birth and a resident of Cleveland. He is about 27 years of age.

Immediately after the commission of Czolgosz's crime, the police of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and other cities became active and sensational, as well as somewhat lawless, in what they describe as "rounding up anarchists." They were especially vigorous in Chicago, where serious

charges of corruption overhang them. Capt. Colleran, with a squad of five officers, went on the evening of the crime to the house of Abraham Isaak, the publisher of a communist-anarchist paper, and a friend and disciple of Prince Krapotkin. The paper is called Free Society. It has come to our office as an exchange for several months, and has seemed to be a perfectly legitimate publication, advocating individualistic and communistic principles of society and government in a reasonable manner, and in no way encouraging lawless methods. As no lawless quotations from its columns have yet been given out by the police, it may be fairly inferred that the paper is not a lawless publication. Arriving at Mr. Isaak's house on the evening in question, the police broke in, and, without a warrant, arrested eight persons besides himself, including his wife and young daughter. Also without a warrant, they searched his house and seized his papers. The prisoners were locked up at the police station and subjected to what is known as the "sweat box" examination. Warrants for the prisoners' detention were obtained on the 7th, and a hearing has been set for the 19th. The women prisoners have since been unconditionally released; but the others are still held without the privilege of giving bail, and upon that ground writs of habeas corpus have been issued in their behalf, returnable on the 13th.

At the "sweat box" examination Isaak told in substance the following story, as reported by the daily press:

It is possible that I may have met Czolgosz. There was a man I met July 12, the night Emma Goldman left Chicago. I had never seen him or spoken to him before, but he came to me and said his name was Czlosz. I suppose he spelled it that way, though it might have been Schloss, for all I know of the spelling. I went to the Rock Island station to see Miss Goldman depart, and she said to me: "There is a man there who wants to talk with you." The man had spoken to her after her last lecture just before she left our home, and had come down to the city with her. He took me aside and asked about our secret meetings. He did not go away with Miss Goldman, but rode home with me on the elevated train, riding inside while I stood on the platform. When we got home he came into my house, remaining about ten minutes. He repeated his questions about our secret meetings, and wanted to know how to join. He said he was tired of theory, and was anxious