IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS,

NORTHERN GRAND DIVISION.

MARCH TERM, A. D. 1887.

AUGUST SPIES ET AL.,
PLAINTIFFS,
vs.
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,
DEFENDANT.

Error to the Criminal Court of Cook County.

ABSTRACT OF RECORD.

W. P. BLACK and
SALOMON & ZEISLER,
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS IN ERROR.

LEONARD SWETT,
OF COUNSEL.

Vol. I.

CONTAINING ABSTRACT OF VOLS. 1, O, A TO H, INCL., AND VOL. OF EXHIBITS.

CHICAGO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

CHICAGO:
BARNARD & GUNTHORP, LAW PRINTERS, 44 & 46 LASALLE STREET.
1887.

DEACCESSIONED BY
CHICAGO HISTORICAL SOCIETY
PRINTED COLLECTIONS

L5191

CHICAGO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

ABSTRACT OF RECORD.

VOL. 1.

1 Impaneling of grand jury on May 17, 1886, after excuses being
2 heard from those summoned and there being only seventeen persons left
3 upon the panel, by special venire six more persons were summoned and
all sworn.

4 June 4th: Presentment by grand jury of indictment.

5–20 The indictment, containing sixty-nine counts, charges the eight defendants now before the court, together with Rudolph Schnaubelt and William Seliger, with jointly killing Matthias J. Degan on May 4, 1886, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, first with a bomb, second with a revolver, third with an unknown weapon; then with having been present and aiding, and then, without being present, having aided and advised an unknown person in the killing of Degan, first with a bomb, second with a revolver, third with an unknown instrument; then *seriatim* each of the defendants is charged in a series of counts with killing Degan, first with a revolver, second with a bomb, third with an unknown weapon, the other nine defendants being present, aiding, etc., and in another series with not being present, but having aided, advised, etc., the commission of the crime.

14 The thirty-eighth count charges that one Rudolph Schnaubelt, on May 4, 1886, in Cook county, State of Illinois, unlawfully, wilfully, feloniously, and of his malice aforethought, made an assault upon the body of Matthias J. Degan with a certain deadly and destructive instrument, charged with divers dangerous and explosive substances, wilfully, etc., ignited and cast the same upon the ground near to the said Matthias J. Degan, then and there causing the said instrument to explode, and fragments thereof to strike, lacerate, penetrate and wound the body and limbs of said M. J. Degan, giving him divers mortal wounds, etc., of which he languished, and on said May 4th died in Cook county, State of Illinois, and that the nine other defendants, feloniously, unlawfully, etc., did stand by and aid, abet and assist said Rudolph Schnaubelt in the perpetration of the crime aforesaid.

16 The forty-eighth count charges Rudolph Schnaubelt identically as in the thirty-eighth count, alleging that the other nine defendants feloniously, etc., not being present, aiding, abetting and assisting, had advised,

encouraged, aided and abetted the said Rudolph Schnaubelt in the perpetration of the crime aforesaid.

21, 22 Endorsement of indictment.

23, 24 June 5th: Arraignment of August Spies, Michael Schwab, Samuel Fielden, Adolph Fischer, George Engel, Louis Lingg and Oscar W. Neebe and plea of not guilty entered as to each and every one of them.

25–27 June 10th: Defendants take change of venue from Judge John G. Rogers.

28, 29 June 10th: Cause set for trial by Judge Joseph E. Gary for June 21, 1886.

30, 31 June 21st: Defendants move for leave to withdraw plea of not guilty, which is overruled by the court. Motion by August Spies, Michael Schwab, Samuel Fielden and Oscar W. Neebe for separate trial from

31 other defendants; overruled.

32 Defendant Albert R. Parsons arraigned, pleads not guilty.

33–40 Orders for special venires and continuances from day to day.

41 June 25th: J. H. Cole, S. G. Randall, T. E. Denker and C. B. Todd sworn to try the cause.

42–47 Orders for special venires and adjournments from day to day.

48 June 29th: Henry L. Ryce appointed a special bailiff to serve special venires.

49–63 Continuances.

64 July 8th: Frank S. Osborne, Charles H. Ludwig, A. Hamilton and J. H. Brayton sworn to try the cause.

65–74 Continuances.

75 John B. Greiner, G. W. Adams, A. H. Reed and H. T. Sanford sworn to try the cause.

76 Jury ordered to be kept together in charge of an officer.

77–130 Continuances.

131 August 19th: After all the evidence and arguments and instructions of the court are heard by the jury, the latter retire to consider their verdict.

132, 133 August 20th: Verdict returned as follows: We, the jury, find the defendants, August Spies, Michael Schwab, Samuel Fielden, Albert R. Parsons, Adolph Fischer, George Engel and Louis Lingg guilty of murder in manner and form as charged in the indictment and fix the penalty at death. We find the defendant Oscar W. Neebe guilty of murder in manner and form as charged in the indictment, and fix the penalty at imprisonment in the penitentiary for fifteen years.

VOL. 1.

134 Motion for new trial by defendants continued until next term of court.

137–141 October 1st to October 7th: Arguments of counsel on motion for new trial.

142 October 7th: Motion for new trial overruled and exception. Motion in arrest of judgment by defendants, overruled and exception.

143–145 October 7th to October 9th: Defendants say why sentence should not be pronounced against them on verdict.

146 October 9th: Judgment against defendant August Spies, that he be confined in the Cook county jail until December 3, 1886, and on that day between 10 A. M. and 2 P. M., be hanged by the neck until he is dead.

147 Same judgment against Michael Schwab.

148 Same judgment against Samuel Fielden.

149 Same judgment against Albert R. Parsons.

150 Same judgment against Adolph Fischer.

151 Same judgment against George Engel.

153 Same judgment against Louis Lingg.

154–155 Judgment against Oscar W. Neebe, that he be taken by the sheriff to the penitentiary of this state, at Joliet, and delivered to its keeper, and that he be confined there for fifteen years at hard labor.

156 October 28th. On motion of defendants, thirty-five days are granted within which to file bill of exceptions.

157 November 13th. Bill of exceptions filed.

159 Grounds of defendants' motion for leave to withdraw their plea of not guilty, and motion to quash the indictment:

First. There is a misjoinder of counts in indictment.

Second. There is a multiplicity of counts in indictment.

Third. The indictment is uncertain and insufficient.

Fourth. During the consideration of this case by the grand jury, Julius Grinnell, state's attorney, and Edward Furthman, pretending to be in the employ of the state's attorney, were present in the grand jury room and put questions to, and examined witnesses then under examination by said grand jury.

Fifth. Grand jury were improperly drawn and impaneled, in that certain of said jurors, to wit: John N. Hills, John N. Clark, Edward S. Dreyer, John C. Neemes, W. J. Quan and F. W. Hall were not drawn from the body of the county nor were they bystanders, but the sheriff caused said persons to be improperly selected, and particularly

160 one E. S. Dreyer, who was at the time a personal enemy of August

Spies, and in that at the time of the impaneling of said grand jury in the court room, none of these defendants were present in the court room and were prevented from being present by reason of their being confined in the county jail, except Oscar Neebe, who at the time, however, was not held to answer for any crime.

Sixth. The Hon. John G. Rogers improperly and erroneously charged the grand jury.

Signed and sworn to by August Spies, Michael Schwab, Samuel Fielden, Adolph Fischer, Louis Lingg, George Engel and Oscar Neebe.

161 Affidavit of Ernst Legner shows that affiant, whose name is endorsed on the back of indictment in this case, testified before grand jury on or about May 20, 1886, that while so in the grand jury room states's attorney Julius S. Grinnell and one Furthman, an assistant of his, were present, but not as witnesses and not testifying then and there, but both said Grinnell and Furthman put questions to affiant and principally conducted his examination; that when affiant answered that he was not a socialist, said Grinnell said in substance: "If you ain't a socialist, you are not far from it." When affiant left grand jury room, said Grinnell and Furthman remained there.

162 (Said motions were overruled; defendants severally and respectively excepted.)

163 Motion by defendants, August Spies, Samuel Fielden, Michael Schwab and Oscar W. Neebe, to be jointly granted a separate trial from all other defendants with them indicted, upon following grounds:

1. Testimony against them will be materially different from that against the other defendants with them jointly indicted.

2. Testimony which may be competent as against other defendants will not be competent as against them, and will prejudice them.

3. Certain evidence of an alleged conspiracy will be introduced on the trial with which these defendants are in no way connected, and which will prejudice them.

4. Their defense will be greatly imperiled by reason of such evidence, incompetent as to them, in the course of a lengthy and tedious trial.

5. They are advised that illegitimate evidence will be submitted to the jury, especially in regard to an alleged conspiracy, which they will be powerless to exclude, because it may be competent as against other defendants with them jointly indicted.

164 6. These defendants cannot have a fair, legal and impartial trial, if tried jointly with the other defendants.

Affidavit of August Spies, Samuel Fielden, Michael Schwab, and Oscar W. Neebe, shows upon information and belief, that upon the trial of this cause, the prosecution intends to introduce evidence tending to show that some of the defendants participated in a meeting held on May 2d and in a meeting held on May 3d, in which it was agreed that violence might or would be used thereafter, and pursuant to which alleged conspiracy the death of M. J. Degan on May 4th last will be claimed to have been caused; that affiants had neither knowledge of or consented
165 to or counseled the holding of said meetings, nor did any of them ever subsequently thereto acquiesce in or adopt any action or policy alleged to have been adopted, proposed or discussed at any of said meetings.

Affiants are advised that such evidence will or may be competent as against certain other defendants.

Affiants show that more than sixty names of witnesses are endorsed on back of indictment, and a list of about an equal number of additional witnesses was furnished to their counsel by the state's attorney; that the trial will be very lengthy; that if evidence, incompetent as to them, but competent as to the other defendants, will be introduced, it will be impossible for the jury to clearly apply such evidence; that the greatest possible prejudice and damage will result therefrom to these affiants, and that the instructions of the court will not be able to overcome and guard against it in a trial of the magnitude of this; and that the only possible means of their obtaining a fair, legal and impartial trial is by the court ordering a separate trial for these affiants from the remaining defendants jointly indicted with them.

166 Affidavit of Moses Salomon, Sigmund Zeisler, W. P. Black and W. A. Foster shows that they have, since their respective engagements as counsel of defendants, devoted all their time to ascertaining the proof which will be probably offered by the people on the trial of this cause; that the statements relative to the evidence to be introduced, contained in the foregoing affidavit of defendants, are true, and that they verily believe that the only means of obtaining a fair and impartial trial for the defendants, August Spies, Samuel Fielden, Michael Schwab and Oscar W. Neebe, is by permitting them to sever in their trial from the other defendants jointly with them indicted.

167 Said motion was overruled, and said last named defendants excepted.

Albert R. Parsons surrendered himself to the jurisdiction of the court on June 21, 1886, and being called upon to plead, etc., to said indictment moved the court to quash the indictment upon the same grounds as em-

bodied in the motion of the other defendants, and for a separate trial from the defendants Louis Lingg, George Engel, and Adolph Fischer, the last motion being based upon the same grounds as the motion in behalf of August Spies, Michael Schwab, Samuel Fielden and Oscar W. Neebe, said motions were severally overruled, and said defendant, Albert R. Parsons, excepted.

VOL. O.

1 The following instructions were given on behalf of the people:

1.

2 The court instructs the jury in the language of the statute that murder is the unlawful killing of a human being in the peace of the people, with malice aforethought, either expressed or implied. An unlawful killing may be perpetrated by poisoning, striking, starving, drowning, stabbing, shooting, or by any other of the various forms or means by which human nature may be overcome. and death thereby occasioned.

Express malice is that deliberate intention unlawfully to take away the life of a fellow creature which is manifested by external circumstances capable of proof. Malice shall be implied when no considerable provocation appears, or when all the circumstances of the killing show an abandoned and malignant heart.

2.

The court instructs the jury that whoever is guilty of murder shall suffer the penalty of death or imprisonment in the penitentiary for his natural life, or for a term not less than fourteen years. If the accused or any of them are found guilty by the jury, the jury shall fix the punishment by their verdict.

3.

The court instructs the jury that while it is provided by the constitution of the State of Illinois, that every person may freely speak, write and publish on all subjects, he is, by the constitution, held responsible under the laws for the abuse of the liberty so given. Freedom of speech is limited by the laws of the land, to the extent, among other limitations, that no man is allowed to advise the committing of any crime against the person or property of another; and the statute provides: "An accessory is he who stands by and aids, abets and assists, or who, not being present, aiding, abetting or assisting, hath advised, encouraged, aided or abetted the perpetration of the crime. He who thus

VOL. O.

aids, abets, assists, advises or encourages, shall be considered as principal, and punished accordingly.

Every such accessory, when the crime is committed within or without this state by his aid or procurement in this state, may be indicted and convicted at the same time as the principal, or before or after his conviction, whether the principal is convicted or amenable to justice or not, and punished as principal.

4.

3 The court further instructs the jury, as a matter of law, that if they believe from the evidence in this case, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendants, or any of them, conspired and agreed together, or with others to overthrow the law by force, or to unlawfully resist the officers of the law, and if they further believe from the evidence, beyond a reasonable doubt, that in pursuance of such conspiracy and in furtherance of the common object, a bomb was thrown by a member of such conspiracy at the time, and that Matthias J. Degan was killed, then, such of the defendants that the jury believe from the evidence, beyond a reasonable doubt, to have been parties to such conspiracy, are guilty of murder, whether present at the killing or not, and whether the identity of the person throwing the bomb be established or not.

5.

If the jury believe from the evidence, beyond a reasonable doubt, that there was in existence in this county and state a conspiracy to overthrow the existing order of society, and to bring about social revolution by force, or to destroy the legal authorities of this city, county or state by force, and that the defendants, or any of them, were parties to such conspiracy, and that Degan was killed in the manner described in the indictment, that he was killed by a bomb, and that the bomb was thrown by a party to the conspiracy, and in furtherance of the objects of the conspiracy, then any of the defendants who were members of such conspiracy at that time are in this case guilty of murder, and that too, although the jury may further believe from the evidence that the time and place for the bringing about of such revolution, or the destruc- one of such authorities had not been definitely agreed upon by the conspirators, but was left to them and the exigencies of time, or to the judgment of any of the co-conspirators.

VOL. O.

5½.

4 If these defendants, or any two or more of them, conspired together with or not with any other person or persons to excite the people or classes of the people of this city to sedition, tumult and riot, to use deadly weapons against and take the lives of other persons, as a means to carry their designs and purposes into effect, and in pursuance of such conspiracy, and in furtherance of its objects, any of the persons so conspiring publicly by print or speech advised or encouraged the commission of murder without designating time, place or occasion at which it should be done, and in pursuance of, and induced by such advice or encouragement, murder was committed, then all of such conspirators are guilty of such murder, whether the person who perpetrated such murder can be identified or not, if such murder was committed in pursuance of such advice or encouragement, and was induced thereby, it does not matter what change if any, in the order or condition of society, or what, if any, advantage to themselves or others, the conspirators proposed as the result of their conspiracy, nor does it matter whether such advice and encouragement had been frequent and long-continued or not, except in determining whether the perpetrator was or was not acting in pursuance of such advice or encouragement, and was or was not induced thereby to commit the murder. If there was such conspiracy as in this instruction is recited, such advice or encouragement was given, and murder committed in pursuance of and induced thereby, then all such conspirators are guilty of murder. Nor does it matter, if there was such a conspiracy, how impracticable or impossible of success its end and aims were, nor how foolish nor ill-arranged were the plans for its execution, except as bearing upon the question whether there was or was not such conspiracy.

6.

The court instructs the jury that a conspiracy may be established by circumstantial evidence the same as any other fact, and that such evidence is legal and competent for that purpose. So as to whether an act which was committed was done by a member of the conspiracy may be established by circumstantial evidence, whether the identity of the individual who committed the act be established or not; and also whether an act done was in pursuance of the common design may be ascertained by the
5 same class of evidence, and if the jury believe from the evidence in this case beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants or any of them conspired and agreed together, or with others to overthrow the law by

force, or destroy the legal authorities of this city, county or state by force, and that in furtherance of the common design, and by a member of such conspiracy, Matthias J. Degan was killed, then these defendants, if any, whom the jury believe from the evidence, beyond a reasonable doubt, were parties to such conspiracy, are guilty of the murder of Matthias J. Degan, whether the identity of the individual doing the killing be established or not, or whether such defendants were present at the time of the killing or not.

7.

The jury are instructed as a matter of law, that all who take part in the conspiracy after it is formed, and while it is in execution, and all who with knowledge of the facts concur in the plan originally formed, and aid in executing them, are fellow conspirators. Their concurrence without proof of an agreement to concur, is conclusive against them. They commit the offense when they become parties to the transaction or further the original plan with knowledge of the conspiracy.

8.

The court instructs the jury as a matter of law that circumstantial evidence is just as legal and just as effective as any other evidence, provided the circumstances are of such a character and force as to satisfy the minds of the jury of the defendants' guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

9.

The court instructs the jury that what is meant by circumstantial evidence in criminal cases is the proof of such facts and circumstances connected with or surrounding the commission of the crime charged, as tend to show the guilt or innocence of the party charged. And if those facts
6 and circumstances are sufficient to satisfy the jury of the guilt of the defendants beyond a reasonable doubt, then such evidence is sufficient to authorize the jury in finding the defendants guilty.

The law exacts the conviction, wherever there is sufficient legal evidence to show the defendants' guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and circumstantial evidence is legal evidence.

10.

The court instructs the jury as a matter of law that when the defendants, August Spies, Michael Schwab, Albert R. Parsons and Samuel Fielden testified as witnesses in this case, each became the same as any

VOL. O.

other witness, and the credibility of each is to be attested by and subjected to the same tests as are legally applied to any other witness; and in determining the degree of credibility that shall be accorded to the testimony of any one of said above named defendants, the jury have a right to take into consideration the fact that he is interested in the result of this prosecution, as well as his demeanor and conduct upon the witness stand during the trial, and the jury are also to take into consideration the fact, if such is the fact, that he has been contradicted by other witnesses. And the court further instructs the jury that if, after considering all the evidence in this case, they find that any one of said defendants, August Spies, Michael Schwab, Albert R. Parsons and Samuel Fielden, has wilfully and corruptly testified falsely to any fact material to the issue in this case, they have the right to entirely disregard his testimony, except in so far as his testimony is corroborated by other credible evidence.

11.

The rule of law which clothes every person accused of crime with the presumption of innocence and imposes upon the state the burden of establishing his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, is not intended to aid any one who is in fact guilty of crime to escape, but is a human provision of law, intended, so far as human agencies can, to guard against the danger of any innocent person being unjustly punished.

12.

7 The court instructs the jury as a matter of law that in considering the case the jury are not to go beyond the evidence to hunt up doubts, nor must they entertain such doubts as are merely chimerical or conjectural. A doubt to justify an acquittal must be reasonable, and it must arise from a candid and impartial investigation of all the evidence in the case, and unless it is such that were the same kind of doubt interposed in the graver transactions of life, it would cause a reasonable and prudent man to hesitate and pause, it is insufficient to authorize a verdict of not guilty. If, after considering all the evidence, you can say you have an abiding conviction of the truth of the charge, you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt.

13.

The court further instructs the jury, as a matter of law, that the doubt which the juror is allowed to retain on his own mind, and under the influ-

VOL. O.

ence of which he should frame a verdict of not guilty, must always be a reasonable one. A doubt produced by undue sensibility in the mind of any juror in view of the consequences of his verdict, is not a reasonable doubt, and a juror is not allowed to create sources or materials of doubt by resorting to trivial and fanciful suppositions and remote conjectures as to possible states of fact differing from that established by the evidence. You are not at liberty to disbelieve as jurors, if from the evidence you believe as men; your oath imposes on you no obligation to doubt where no doubt would exist if no oath had been administered.

13½.

The court instructs the jury that they are the judges of the law as well as the facts in this case, and if they can say, upon their oaths, that they know the law better than the court itself, they have the right to do so; but before assuming so solemn a responsibility, they should be assured that they are not acting from caprice or prejudice, that they are not controlled by their will or their wishes, but from a deep and confident
8 conviction that the court is wrong and that they are right. Before saying this, upon their oaths, it is their duty to reflect whether from their study and experience they are better qualified to judge of the law than the court. If, under all the circumstances, they are prepared to say that the court is wrong in its exposition of the law, the statute has given them that right.

14.

In this case the jury may, as in their judgment the evidence warrants, find any or all of the defendants guilty or not, or all of them not guilty; and if, in their judgment, the evidence warrants, they may, in case they find the defendants or any of them guilty, fix the same penalty for all the defendants found guilty, or different penalties for the different defendants found guilty.

In case they find the defendants or any of them guilty of murder, they should fix the penalty either at death or at imprisonment in the penitentiary for life, or at imprisonment in the penitentiary for a term of any number of years, not less than fourteen.

9 To the giving of which instructions and every one of them, respectively, the defendants then and there severally excepted.

The following instructions asked by the defendants were refused by the court:

VOL. O.

10 1. No person can be legally convicted under the laws of Illinois on account of any opinion or principles entertained by him. It cannot be material in this case that defendants, or some of them are or may be socialists, communists or anarchists, and no prejudice ought to be borne against them on account thereof by the jury, although the jury may believe their doctrines are false and pernicious.

2. If you believe from the evidence that it was only manslaughter in the person inflicting the injury which caused the death of Mathias J. Degan, then it was only manslaughter in the accessory.

If, therefore, the jury believe from the evidence that on the night of the 4th of May, the defendants, or some of them, were present at a meeting held for the purpose of discussing the situation of laboring men, and advising them to insist upon their demands by the use of force, and the deceased, Mathias J. Degan, was one among a number of police officers who attempted unlawfully to disperse the meeting; and thereupon some person, while resisting the act of the police, upon a sudden heat and passion, and without premeditation or malice, threw the missile while resisting such unlawful arrest, then the perpetrator of the act is only guilty of manslaughter.

11 3. The court instructs the jury that, in order to convict these defendants, they must not only find that they entered into an illegal conspiracy, and that the Haymarket meeting was an unlawful assembly in aid of said conspiracy, but that in addition thereto that the bomb by which Officer Degan lost his life was cast by a member of said conspiracy in aid of the common design, or by a person outside of said conspiracy, aided and advised by all or some one of these defendants; but in any event, should you find such a conspiracy from the evidence to have been in existence, any one or more of these defendants not found beyond a reasonable doubt to have been a member thereof, and who is or are not proved beyond a reasonable doubt to have been present at the Haymarket meeting, or who, if present, did not knowingly counsel, aid or abet the throwing of the bomb by which officer Degan lost his life, such defendant or defendants you are bound to acquit.

4. The court instructs the jury that the prosecution is bound to prove the guilt of the defendants beyond a reasonable doubt before they are called upon to offer any evidence of their innocence, and if the guilt of any of these defendants, on the testimony of the state, should be established beyond reasonable doubt in your minds, and such defendant by the testimony introduced by him awakens an apprehension in your minds that

VOL. O.

he is not guilty beyond reasonable doubt on the whole of the evidence taken together of the crime as laid in the indictment, you are bound to acquit such defendants.

5. The court instructs the jury, that the policy of our law deems it better that many guilty persons should escape rather than that one innocent person should be convicted and punished; so that, unless the jury, after a careful and thorough consideration of all the evidence in the case, can say and feel that every material allegation in the indictment is proved beyond a reasonable doubt, the jury should find the defendants not guilty.

12 6. The court instructs the jury, if you believe from the evidence that on the night of the 4th of May the defendants or some of them were holding a meeting on the Haymarket for the purposes of discussing the grievances of the workingmen, and of advising them to forcibly insist upon their demands from their employers, and the police, although aware of the object of the meeting, and the lawful authorities invested with the power of dispersing said meeting, and being present, sanctioned and conceded its lawfulness, yet a police officer, having the charge, direction and control of a large number of police officers, of his own volition, go upon the scene of the meeting for the pretended purpose of dispersing it, but in fact for the purpose of destroying the lives of all the persons there assembled, and some person in the meeting having a reason to apprehend that such was the real purpose of the police force, in order to avoid being killed, hurl a deadly missile at such officers, whereby the life of the deceased, Matthias J. Degan, who was one of said officers, was destroyed, then, in the eye of the law, such act of the person throwing the missile is justifiable, and neither he nor the persons with whom he is associated, can be held responsible for the act.

7. While any act done by a member of an unlawful conspiracy in furtherance of the common design is the act of all; yet collateral acts carry responsibility only to the individual or individuals perpetrating them; the court instructs you, gentlemen, that should you find that the defendants illegally conspiring to overthrow the government, but that they declared to their fellow conspirators that nothing should be done in furtherance of the common design, beyond the making of speeches, should these be found by you to be in furtherance thereof, at the Haymarket meeting, but that, notwithstanding that declaration, a member of the conspiracy so found to be in existence, of his own volition, out of the depravity of his own heart, impelled by a vicious, depraved mind, contrary

VOL. O.

to the advice, intention and design of these defendants, threw the bomb by which officer Degan lost his life, such throwing was a collateral act for which these defendants are not liable, and so finding, you must acquit them.

13 8. If the jury believe from the evidence that the defendants or any one of them entered into a conspiracy to bring about a change of government for the amelioration of the condition of the working classes by peaceable means, if possible, but if necessary to resort to force for that purpose, and that in addition thereto in pursuance of that object the Haymarket meeting was assembled by such conspirator or conspirators to discuss the best means to right the grievances of the working classes, without any intention of doing any unlawful act on that occasion, and while so assembled the bomb by which officer Degan lost his life was thrown by a person outside of said conspiracy, and without the knowledge and approval of the defendant or defendants, so found to have entered into said conspiracy, then and in that case the court instructs the jury that they are bound to acquit the defendants.

9. The court instructs the jury that it is not enough to find that the defendants unlawfully conspired to overthrow the present form of government, and that the Haymarket meeting was an unlawful assembly called by these defendants in furtherance of that conspiracy, but you must find, in addition thereto, that the bomb by which officer Degan lost his life was thrown by a member of said conspiracy, in aid of the common design; or if you should find that it was thrown by a person not proved beyond a reasonable doubt to have been a member of said conspiracy, then you must find that these defendants knowingly aided and abetted or advised such bomb thrower to do the act, otherwise you are bound to acquit them.

IV.

14 10. The mere confession of Lingg that he was at the meeting of the night of the 3d of May is insufficient to establish the fact that he was there, and if you believe that it is shown by other satisfactory evidence that Lingg was not at that meeting and knowingly did no act in furtherance of the plan of the meetings, and was not present at the meeting held on the night of the 4th of May, then he is entitled to an acquittal at your hands.

11. The court further instructs the jury, that unless you find from the

evidence, beyond all reasonable doubt, that there was a conspiracy existing to which the defendants or some of them were parties, and that the act resulting in the death of Mathias J. Degan was done by somebody who was a party to said conspiracy, and in pursuance of the common design of said conspiracy. you must find the defendants not guilty, unless the evidence convinces you, beyond all reasonable doubt, that the defendants or any of them personally committed the act resulting in the death of Mathias J. Degan, as charged in the indictment, or that the defendants or any of them stood by and aided, abetted or assisted, or not being present, had advised, aided, encouraged or abetted the perpetration of the crime charged in the indictment, and then you should find guilty only those defendants as to whom the evidence satisfies you, beyond all reasonable doubt, that they thus committed or aided in the commission of the crime charged in the indictment.

12. The court instructs the jury, as a matter of law, that the guilt of any person, charged as accessory before the fact to any crime, is dependent upon the guilt of the principal. And before you can find any of the defendants guilty as accessory before the fact to the crime charged in the indictment, it is incumbent upon the state to show who did the act resulting in the death of Mathias J. Degan, as charged in the indictment, and the evidence must convince you, beyond all reasonable doubt, of the guilt of that person thus shown beyond all reasonable doubt to have done the act, and unless you are satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt of the principal, it is your duty to acquit the person sought to be held as accessory.

15 13. The court further instructs the jury, that under the constitution of this state it is the right of the people to assemble in a peaceable manner to consult for what they believe to be the common good, and that so long as such meeting is peaceably conducted, orderly, and not tending to riot or a breach of the peace, no official or authority has or can have any legal right to attempt the dispersal thereof in a forcible manner. Such attempt, if made, would be unwarranted and illegal, and might legally be resisted with such necessary and reasonable degree of force as to prevent the consummation of such dispersal.

If the jury believe from the evidence in this cause that the meeting of May 4, 1886, was called for a legal purpose, and at the time it was ordered to disperse by the police was being conducted in an orderly and peaceable manner and was about peaceably to disperse; and that the

VOL. O.

defendants, or those participating in said meeting, had, in connection therewith, no illegal or felonious purpose or design, then the order for the dispersal thereof was unauthorized, illegal, and in violation of the rights of said assembly and of the people who were then gathered.

And if the jury further believe from the evidence that the meeting was a quiet and orderly meeting, lawfully convened, and that the order for its dispersal was unauthorized and illegal under the provisions of the constitution of this state referred to, and that upon such order being given, some person in said gathering, without the knowledge, aid, counsel, procurement, encouragement or abetting of the defendants, or any of them, then or theretofore given, and solely because of his own passion, fear, hatred, malice or ill-will, or in pursuance of his view of the right of self-defense, threw a bomb among the police, wherefrom resulted the murder or homicide charged in the indictment, then the defendants would not be liable for the results of such bomb, and your verdict should be not guilty.

14. The court further instructs the jury that the mere manufacture and disposition of deadly weapons does not of itself make the party so manufacturing or disposing thereof responsible thereof for murder committed therewith by third parties. Before such manufacturer or distributor can be held liable for a murder committed by a third party, it must be made to appear by credible evidence, beyond all reasonable doubt, that such manufacturer or distributor countenanced, advised, aided, encouraged or abetted the particular act of such third party, which resulted in the homicide, and was thus himself in contemplation of law accessory to the particular act charged as a crime.

16 15. If the jury are satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt that a conspiracy was formed, participated in by defendants, or some of them, to commit a breach of the peace and to use violence in the event of a collision between the police and the striking workmen, or others and further find a crime was committed at the Haymarket by the killing of Degan, still, if from any reasonable hypothesis, the jury believe that some one else than any of defendants unaided, unassisted and unadvised by defendants or any one of them may have committed said crime, it is the duty of the jury to acquit all of said defendants.

16. The court instructs the jury that, although you may find from the evidence, beyond all reasonable doubt that the defendants or some of them were engaged in a conspiracy, this alone is not sufficient to warrant a verdict of guilty as to those defendants thus believed to have been en-

gaged in said conspiracy; but before you can find those defendants guilty, the evidence must also establish, beyond all reasonable doubt, that the party who committed the act resulting in the death of Mathias J. Degan was a party to said conspiracy, and that said act was done in furtherance of the common design entertained by said conspiracy.

17. If the jury are satisfied that a conspiracy was formed, participated in by defendants or some of them, to commit a breach of the peace and to use violence in the event of a collision between the police and the striking workmen or others, and further find that a crime was committed at the Haymarket by the killing of Degan, still, unless you believe from the evidence that the death of Degan was caused by some one of the supposed conspirators, in pursuance of the common design, and further that a person who was a co-conspirator committed the act which caused the death of Degan, the defendants are entitled to an acquittal.

17 18. Although certain of the defendants may have advised the use of force in opposition to the legally constituted authorities, or the overthrow of the laws of the land, yet unless the jury can find, beyond all reasonable doubt, that they specifically threw the bomb which killed Degan, or aided, advised, counseled, assisted or encouraged said act, or the doing of some illegal act or the accomplishment of some act by illegal means in the furtherance of which said bomb was thrown, you should return said defendants not guilty.

19. If the person who threw the bomb which killed Degan, did so in heat of passion from the sudden appearance of the police and the order to disperse given, or for any other reason, or from any other cause, but without deliberation, premeditation or malice, he would then be guilty of manslaughter only, and not murder.

20. If the principal is guilty of the crime of manslaughter only, the accessories before the fact to his crime can be guilty of no greater crime; that is, the parties that plan a crime are guilty in no greater degree than the one who executes the plan and commits the act.

21. The jury may find from the whole evidence that the person who threw the bomb which killed Degan, acted upon his own responsibility, and that defendants, nor any of them, were in any way connected with said act. If the jury so find, the defendants must be acquitted.

This proposition being true, it is also true, that before defendants or any of them can be convicted, the people must prove that they either threw the bomb, or that the same was thrown by and through their procurement or agency, and with their knowledge, consent, procurement and advice.

18 22. The fact, if such is the fact, that the defendant Neebe circulated or distributed or handled a few copies of the so-called Revenge circular, and while doing so said substantially: "Six workmen have been killed at McCormick's last night by the police; perhaps the time will come when it may go the other way," is not of itself sufficient to connect him with the killing of Degan, nor is the fact that he had in his house a red flag, a gun, a revolver and a sword sufficient, even when taken together with the other statement contained in this construction, to connect said Neebe with the act which resulted in the death of Degan, as charged in this indictment.

23. There has not been introduced any evidence in this case to either show that the defendant Neebe, by any declaration, either spoken or written, has advised or encouraged the use of violence or the doing of any act in any way connected with the offense at the Haymarket, at which Degan was killed; nor is there any evidence that he was engaged at any time in any conspiracy to do any unlawful act, or the doing of any act in an unlawful manner, in the furtherance of which said Degan was killed, and therefore the state has not established any case as against the defendant Neebe, and you are therefore instructed to render a verdict of not guilty as to him.

24. The jury are instructed to return a verdict of not guilty as to the defendant Neebe.

25. The defendants in this case cannot be convicted upon the mere proof of advice that the use of force and dynamite should be resorted to generally, but such proof must specially refer to some circumstance, time, place or event, so that such advice is directly traceable to the crime, and the crime clearly leads back to such counsel. If this proposition is not established beyond reasonable doubt, the connection between defendants (if they did not themselves throw the bomb) and the person who did throw said bomb is not established, and the defendants must be acquitted.

19 To the refusal of the court to give above instructions, and each and every one of them, the defendants severally excepted.

Instructions given on behalf of defendants:

20 The jury in a criminal case are the judges of the law and the evidence, and have to act according to their best judgment of such law and the facts.

The jury have a right to disregard the instructions of the court, provided they can say upon their oaths that they believe they know the law better than the court.

VOL. O.

The law presumes the defendants innocent of the charge in the indictment until the jury are satisfied by the evidence, beyond all reasonable doubt, of the guilt of the defendants.

If a reasonable doubt of any facts, necessary to convict the accused, is raised in the minds of the jury by the evidence itself, or by the ingenuity of counsel upon any hypothesis reasonably consistent with the evidence, that doubt is decisive in favor of the prisoners' acquittal. A verdict of not guilty simply means that the guilt of the accused has not been demonstrated in the precise, specific and narrow forms prescribed by law.

21 No jury should convict anybody of crime upon mere suspicion, however strong, or because there is a preponderance of all the evidence against him, but the jury must be convinced of the defendants' guilt, beyond all reasonable doubt, before they can lawfully convict.

The law does not require the defendants to prove themselves innocent, but the burden of proof that they are guilty beyond all reasonable doubt is upon the prosecution.

The indictment is of itself a mere accusation and no proof of the guilt of the defendants.

The presumption of the innocence of the defendants is not a mere form, but an essential substantial part of the law of the land, and it is the duty of the jury to give the defendants the full benefit of this presumption in this case.

It is incumbent upon the prosecution to prove beyond all reasonable doubt every material allegation in the indictment, and unless that has been done, the jury should find the defendants not guilty.

22 The burden is upon the prosecution to prove by credible evidence beyond all reasonable doubt that the defendants are guilty as charged in the indictment of the murder of Mathias J. Degan; it is the duty of the jury to acquit any of the defendants as to whom there is a failure of such proof. The jury are not at liberty to adopt any unreasonable theories or suppositions in considering the evidence in order to justify a verdict of conviction.

A reasonable doubt is that state of mind, in which the jury, after considering all the evidence, cannot say they feel an abiding faith amounting to a moral certainty, from the evidence in the case, that the defendants are guilty as charged in the indictment.

The rules of evidence as to the amount of evidence in this case are different from those in a civil case; a mere preponderance of evidence would not warrant a verdict of guilty.

mony to mistake or misrecollection rather than to a wilful intention to swear falsely, if you can reasonably do so under the evidence.

26 The jury should fairly and impartially consider the testimony of the defendants, together with all the other evidence.

If the verbal admission of a defendant is offered in evidence, the whole of the admission must be taken together, and those parts which are in favor of the defendant are entitled to as much consideration as any other parts, unless disproved, or apparently improbable or untrue, when considered with all the other evidence.

It would be improper for the jury to regard any statements of the prosecuting attorneys not based upon the evidence, as entitled to any weight.

If all the facts and circumstances relied on by the people to secure a conviction can be reasonably acounted for, upon any theory consistent with the innocence of the defendants, or any of them, then you should acquit such of them as to whom the facts proven can thus be accounted for.

27 It is not enough to warrant the conviction of a person charged with crime that he contemplated the commission of such crime. If any reasonable hypothesis exists that such crime may have been committed by another in no way connected with the defendants, the accused should be acquitted.

If the evidence leaves a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendants, as charged in the indictment, the jury should acquit, although the evidence may show conduct of no less turpitude than the crime charged.

The allusions and references of the prosecuting attorneys to the supposed dangerous character of any views entertained or principles contended for by the accused, should in no way influence you in determining this case.

Individuals and communities have the legal right to arm themselves for the defense and protection of their persons and property, and a proposition by any person, publicly proclaimed, to arm for such protection and defense, is not an offense against the laws of this state.

If the defendants, or some of them, agreed together, or with others, in the event of the workingmen or strikers, that they (defendants) would assist the strikers to resist such an attack, this would not constitute conspiracy if the anticipated attack was unjustified and illegal, and such contemplated resistance simply the opposing of force wrongfully and illegally exercised, by force sufficient to repel said assault.

VOL. O.

28 The burden is not cast upon the defendants of proving that the person who threw the bomb was not acting under their advice, teaching or procurement. Unless the evidence proves beyond all reasonable doubt, that either some of the defendants threw said bomb, or that the person who threw it acted under the advice and procurement of defendants or some of them, the defendants should be acquitted. Such advice may not neeessarily be special as to the bomb, but general, so as to include it.

It is not proper for the jury to guess that the person who threw the bomb was instigated to do the act by the procurement of defendants or any of them. There must be a direct connection established by credible evidence between the advice and the consummation of the crime, beyond all reasonable doubt.

29 The bomb might have been thrown by some one unfamiliar with, and unprompted by, the teachings of the defendants or any of them. Before defendants can be held liable therefor, the evidence must satisfy you beyond all reasonable doubt that the person throwing said bomb was acting as the result of the teaching or encouragement of defendants or some of them.

Before a person charged as accessory to a crime can be convicted, the evidence must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime was committed by some person acting under the advice, aid, encouragement, abetting or procurement of the defendant whose conviction as accessory is sought. Though you may believe from the evidence that a party in fact advised the commission in certain contingencies of acts amounting to crime, yet if the act complained of was in fact committed by some third party of his own mere volition, hatred, malice or ill-will and not materially influenced, either directly or indirectly, by such advice of the party charged, or any party, for whose advice the defendants are responsible, the party charged would not in such case be responsible.

If you find that at a meeting held on the evening of May 3d at 54 W. Lake street, at which some of the defendants were present, it was agreed that in the event of a collision between the police, militia or firemen and the striking laborers, certain armed organizations, of which some of the defendants were members, should meet at certain places in Chicago, that a committee should attend public places and meetings where an attack by the police and others might be expected, and in the event of such attack report the same to said organizations to the end that such attack might be resisted and the police stations of the city destroyed, still, if

30 the evidence does not prove beyond all reasonable doubt, that the throw-

ing of the bomb which killed Mathias J. Degan was the result of any act in furtherance of the common design herein stated, and if it may have been the unauthorized and individual act of some person acting upon his own responsibility and volition, then none of the defendants can be held responsible therefor on account of said W. Lake street meeting.

31 The following instruction on behalf of the defendant, Louis Lingg, was refused by the court:

32 It is not enough to warrant the conviction of the defendant Lingg that he may have manufactured the bomb, the explosion of which killed Mathias J. Degan. He must have aided, abetted or advised the exploding of the bomb or the doing of some illegal act, or the doing of a legal act in an unlawful manner, in the furtherance of which and as incident thereto the same was exploded and said Degan killed. If, as to the defendant Linng, the jury should find beyond all reasonable doubt that he did in fact manufacture said bomb, but are not satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt that he aided, advised, counseled or abetted the throwing of said missile or the doing of any unlawful act which resulted in the explosion of said bomb, your verdict should acquit him, so far as the establishment of his guilt is attempted by the manufacture of said missile or bomb.

33 Which instructions the court marked as given, and proceeded to read the same to the jury until he had read the same about half through, when the court stopped, and remarked in the presence of the jury, in effect, that an instruction often impressed one differently when read aloud, and thereupon suspended the further reading of said instruction, and marked it "Refused," and refused to give said instruction to the jury in the presence of the jury.

(To which action of the court, and each and every part thereof, said defendant, Louis Lingg, then and there excepted.)

34 Upon the conclusion of the reading of the instructions in behalf of the defendants, which were read after the instruction on behalf of the people, the court of its own motion gave to the jury the following instruction:

35 The statute requires that instructions by the court to the jury shall be in writing, and only relate to the law of the case.

The practice under the statute is that the counsel prepare on each side a set of instructions and present them to the court, and if approved to be read by the court as the law of the case. It may happen, by reason of the great number presented and the hurry and confusion of passing

on them in the midst of the trial, with a large audience to keep in order, that there may be some apparent inconsistency in them, but if they are carefully scrutinized such inconsistencies will probably disappear. In any event, however, the gist and pith of all is that if advice and encouragement to murder was given, if murder was done in pursuance of and materially induced by such advice and encouragement, then those who gave such advice and encouragement are guilty of the murder. Unless the evidence, either direct or circumstantial, or both, proves the guilt of one or more of the defendants upon this principle so fully that there is no reasonable doubt of it, your duty to them requires you to acquit them. If it does so prove, then your duty to the state requires you to convict whoever is so proved guilty. The case of each defendant should be considered with the same care and scrutiny as if he alone were on trial. If a conspiracy, having violence and murder as its object, is fully proved, then the acts and declarations of each conspirator in furtherance of the conspiracy are the acts and declarations of each one of the conspirators. But the declarations of any conspirator before or after the 4th of May which are merely narrative as to what had been or would be done, and not made to aid in carrying into effect the object of the conspiracy, are only evidence against the one who made them.

What are the facts and what is the truth the jury must determine from the evidence and from that alone. If there are any unguarded expressions in any of the instructions which seem to assume the existence of any facts, or to be any intimations as to what is proved, all such expressions must be disregarded, and the evidence only looked to to determine the facts.

36 (To the giving of which instruction the defendants excepted.)

The following was the instruction given as to the form of the verdict:

37 If all of the defendants are found guilty the form of the verdict will be:

We the jury find the defendants guilty of murder in manner and form as charged in the indictment, and fix the penalty

If all are found not guilty the form of the verdict will be:

We the jury find the defendants not guilty.

If part of the defendants are found guilty and part not guilty the form of the verdict will be:

We the jury find the defendant or defendants (naming him or them) not guilty; we find the defendant or defendants (naming him or them) guilty of murder in manner and form as charged in the indictment, and fix the penalty

38 (To the giving of which instructions the defendants excepted.)

The defendants moved the court to give an instruction with reference to the right of the jury to find a verdict of manslaughter under the indictment. The court stated that if the defendants desired such an instruction given, they could prepare the same and submit it to the court. The jury was then directed to retire.

And afterwards the court sent for the jury and gave the following instructions, submitted by counsel for defendants:

39 Manslaughter is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice or deliberation. Punishment. Under an indictment for murder, the accused may be found guilty of manslaughter.

43 On October 1, 1886, the arguments on the motion for new trial began. The grounds of defendants' motion for new trial were read, showing that the verdict is contrary to the law and the evidence in the case; that the court erred in giving the several instructions on behalf of the people, and in refusing and modifying certain instructions asked to be given by defendants; in admitting incompetent testimony for the people and excluding testimony for the defendants; that the jury was not impartial; misconduct of the officers summoning the jurors under special venires; there is newly

44 discovered evidence; the closing argument of the state's attorney was improper; the court erred in its ruling in regard to the competency of jurors, in overruling the motion of defendants Spies, Schwab, Fielden and Neebe for a separate trial.

47 The defendants then moved the court for leave to examine Otis S. Favor in open court touching certain matters referred to in affidavit of defendants and of E. A. Stevens, which were read.

49 The affidavit of defendants shows upon information and belief the following: the special bailiff, Henry L. Ryce, with the avowed intention of making sure of the conviction of affiants, selected the parties summoned by him for jury service in this case from men having prejudices in the case and fixed beliefs as to the guilt of affiants; that consequently affiants were compelled to accept such men as jurors to try the case; the above facts can be shown by the testimony of Otis S. Favor, to whom Ryce made statements to the effect that he was managing the case against affiants and knew what he was about, that they would hang as certain as death; that he was summoning as jurors men whom affiants would be compelled to challenge, whereby their challenges would be exhausted, and they would be compelled to accept as jurors such men as were satisfactory to the prosecution. Affiants received information of premises

VOL. O.

long after the verdict and only within a few days past; said Favor refuses to make any affidavit substantiating above on account of the popular prejudice against defendants, but would testify to the matters set forth, if
50 required as a witness to do so; the above remarks of Ryce were made almost immediately upon the appearance, in one of the leading papers in the city, of an editorial, advising, substantially, such a course in the selection of jurors. Affiants therefore ask that Otis S. Favor be required to testify herein touching above matters, and that such testimony when given, may be considered in support of the motion for new trial.

51 Affidavit of E. A. Stevens shows: he is well acquainted with Otis S. Favor, a citizen of this state, and merchant of standing and repute in Chicago; said Favor is intimately acquainted with Henry L. Ryce, who acted as special bailiff in summoning jurors in this case; affiant has heard Favor state that Ryce said to Favor and others in his presence, that he (Ryce) was managing this case and knew what he was about; that the defendants are going to be hanged as certain as death; he was calling such men as the defense would have to peremptorily challenge and waste their time and challenges; then they would have to take such men as the prosecution wants. Affiant requested Favor to make an affidavit regarding above statements of Ryce, but Favor refused to do so, stating that he would take no action in favor of the defendants, but if called as a witness and compelled to testify, might state the fact as to what was said by Ryce substantially as above stated.

53 In addition, Mr. Black states, that in a personal conversation with said Favor the same did not deny the alleged statements by him, but declared he would not speak of the matter, unless required to do so under some order of court; that Mr. Favor's place of business is close by, and
54–60 further moves the court to issue a subpœna for Mr. Favor's attendance, who was in town and whose place of business was within a quarter of a mile, so that the proceedings would not be delayed. After argument the court overrules the motion, giving as reasons that the arguments on the motion for new trial had been peremptorily set for this day, and that even if Favor was here, it would be of no consequence, as it was well known to everybody present at the trial that the last fifty of defendants' peremptory challenges were exhausted simply for the purpose of exhaust-
61 ing them. The defendants excepted to the ruling of the court.

64, 65 Affidavit of defendants showing that since the trial of this case there has come to their knowledge certain newly-discovered evidence of material matters which could be proved on a new trial and are contained in the

VOL. O.

affidavits filed; also that certain expressions of opinion, feeling or purpose of certain jurors set up in affidavits, showing said jurors to have been disqualified, have come to their knowledge since they had been respectively accepted.

66 Affidavit of Thomas J. Morgan shows that he is a citizen of Illinois and of the United States, lives at Woodlawn Park, and well knows T. E. Denker, of the same place, who was one of the jurors who tried this case; that on May 6, 1886, when affiant stated in a conversation with his son in reference to a picture of Spies in a Chicago paper, that said picture did not look more like Spies than it did like affiant, said Denker stated, with much feeling and emphasis, in effect as follows: It don't make any difference whether it is like him or not—he and the whole damned crowd ought to be hung—referring to some of the defendants then under arrest for alleged responsibility for the so-called Haymarket
66, 67 massacre. Affiant states that he is not and never has been an anarchist.

Affidavit of Thomas S. Morgan shows that affiant is a son of Thomas J. Morgan, corroborates the above affidavit of the latter in every material point, and states that affiant is not an anarchist, nor a member of any socialistic, communistic or anarchistic group or society.

68 Affidavit of Michael Cull shows that he has resided at Evanston, Cook county, for twenty-four years; is a married man and lives with his family; he is well acquainted since fifteen years with G. W. Adams, of Evanston, who was one of the jurors in this case; that shortly after the Haymarket affair said Adams, affiant and a number of others had a conversation about that affair in the vicinity of Adams' paint shop; that in that conversation affiant stated that the police had no right to interfere with the Haymarket meeting; if the police had let them alone they would have gone home in a little while, to which said Adams replied that the police ought to have shot them all down; that they (meaning defendants) had no right in this country, and if he (Adams) were on the jury he would hang all "the damned buggers."

Sworn to, on September 30, 1886, before M. Salomon, notary public, and resworn to on October 1, 1886, before John Stephens, clerk of the Criminal court of Cook county.

71 The affidavit of Albert P. Love shows that he is a resident of La Grange, Cook county, owns his home there, is a painter and has known Harry L. Gilmer since ten years; that on May 4, 1886, shortly after 8 P. M., he and Orrin S. Blossom, a painter, met said Gilmer on Halsted street, somewhere between Madison and Van Buren streets; the three

went to a saloon on the north-east corner of Halsted and Van Buren streets, where they and another painter, Phil Hunt, drank and remained in conversation until a little after 9 P. M., when affiant left to take the 9:20 P. M. train for home, while Gilmer, Blossom and Hunt remained there; the next morning affiant saw an account of the bomb-throwing on the Haymarket. Affiant has been a resident of Cook county for about twenty years past, having come to Chicago immediately after being mustered out of the United States service, where he was a private
72 soldier in the 29th Regt. Indiana Volunteers. Affiant never communicated the above facts to anybody until after the verdict in this case; is ready to testify to them, if a new trial should be granted; is not a socialist, anarchist, or communist, and has no relation to any of the defendants.

Affidavit of Orrin S. Blossom shows that he has known Albert P. Love since eight or ten years, is a painter and remembers being with said Love, one night early in May, 1886, on the west side, and at some place on Halsted street, between Madison and Van Buren; a tall, spare man, a painter, joined them; the three went into a saloon at the north-east corner of Halsted and Van Buren streets, about 8 P. M., and remained there some considerable time talking. Affiant did not at the time know the name of the tall painter, but said Love told him it was Harry L. Gilmer; the man was considerable over six feet high, light complexioned, spare and raw-boned. In the saloon they were joined by another painter, who was called Hunt by Love. About 9 P. M. Love left the saloon, while affiant, Gilmer and Hunt remained there drinking and talking
73 until about half-past 10. Affiant has lived in Chicago since about ten years; is a boss painter since about four years; is not a socialist, anarchist, or communist; has no relation with any of defendants; has never detailed the above facts until since the verdict in this case; that Love is a man of property and of good standing and repute among his friends, and the above occasion was the only one, when affiant was with said Love at or near that date.

81 Affidavit of John Philip Deluse, dated August 24, 1886, shows that he lives in Indianapolis, Indiana, and keeps a saloon there; that he is no socialist, anarchist or communist, belongs to no labor organization and is not in sympathy with the Chicago anarchists or any other; that on a certain day in May, 1866, a man of medium size, about five feet and two to four inches high, who had a mustache, wore a dark suit and carried a small satchel about one and one-half feet long, entered the saloon, took a drink and asked about the labor movement in Indianapolis. Affiant told

him that everything was quiet there. The stranger then said: "I come from New York and I guess I will go to Chicago, you will hear of some trouble there very soon"; pointing to his satchel, he continued: "I have got something in here that will work, you will hear of it." Leaving the saloon, he turned again under the door and said once more: "You will hear of it soon." A day or two afterwards the news came of the Haymarket bomb-throwing. Affiant immediately thought of that stranger and spoke to several persons about it, among them Mr. Oscar Sputh, a teacher of gymnastics, and they brought the stranger and his satchel in their minds together with the bomb-throwing. The verdict rendered in this case was discussed last Saturday by a number of guests in my saloon, when Mr. Sputh related the story of the stranger with his satchel in the presence of Mr. Jacob L. Bieler and others.

82 Affidavit of Jacob L. Bieler confirms the statement in foregoing affidavit in regard to the Saturday conversation.

Affidavit of Oscar Sputh confirms all the statements relating to him in the above affidavit of Deluse, and states that Deluse told him of the stranger and his peculiar expression on May 5, 1886.

84 Affidavit of Sigmund Zeisler shows that James H. Cole, who was one of the jurors who tried this case, said to affiant, in substance: "We jurors could hardly make a mistake as to what the evidence was. When the taking of evidence commenced, I myself suggested to the other jurors, that this was probably going to be a long and tedious trial and we all ought to take notes of the evidence as it would be introduced. You saw that proposition was carried out; every one of us had a full synopsis of the important points of the evidence. No, we all knew what the evidence was, before the lawyers commenced their arguments." Affiant further says that he observed the jurors during the entire trial and saw that most of them were almost incessantly writing in little note books, while evidence was introduced.

86 From the affidavit of William P. Black, read to the court on motion for the new trial, it appears that the State's Attorney, Julius S. Grinnell, in addressing the jury, made use of the following language: "In this
87 temple of justice, founded upon justice, to compare loathsome murderers to Christ! Has the case for the defense descended so low, so mean, that he, who was for peace, shall be compared to these wretches here! Besides, a comparison with Christ, the man who was for peace, the comparison of these men with Victor Hugo, is another cruel thrust at liberty itself. Victor Hugo, a pure man, who never counseled war of this kind,

and who was in France the exponent of republicanism, who desired to have there what we have here—Victor Hugo, compared with assassins! The gentlemen upon the other side would allow you to believe, although they have no confidence in the words they utter, for it is mere rhetoric and talk for effect, and to save a possible doubt for a lot of wretches, the comparison is made of the defendants with Victor Hugo. His writings are in evidence here, some of them. Think of that for an additional comparison, and for what purpose? To save these men, not from punishment, for all the counsel admit in their arguments that they should be punished—to save them from death. As I said, there is only a step from republicanism to anarchy. Let us never take that step. Gentlemen, the great responsibility that has devolved on you in this case, is greater than any jury in the history of the world ever undertook.
88 This is no slight or mean duty that you are called upon to perform. You are to say whether that step shall be taken."

" One other suggestion I have to make to you in that connection, is this: You have been trying a murder case in which the defendants are charged with the murder of Mathias J. Degan. He was one of the officers killed by the bomb at the Haymarket riot. You have also, as a matter of law, been trying these defendants for the murder of seven officers; because where the act of any individual or any number of individuals causes the murder of one or two, three or four, or seven individuals, the trial of one is the trial of all. In other words, if you should see fit to acquit the defendants of the charge under this indictment, they never could be tried again."

" The responsibility, gentlemen, is still greater with you, for a reason which I will state to you. It has been frequently said to you that you are trying these men for the murder of Mathias J. Degan. That is true, technically; but really and actually you are trying the eight men for the murder of the seven officers, as well as for the injury to these sixty others; and that is why all the proof that you have heard has been introduced. They complain of that proof, too. I will suggest another proposition to you; if you should in this case concede that there was a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of these men and acquit them, that is the end. There is no appeal by the State of Illinois. Or if, in the trial of this case, you should conclude that the defendants are guilty from the proof in this case and under the instructions of the court, you then in rendering your verdict, would do what the gentlemen on the other side from the numerous exceptions they have taken, expect you to do—find the defendants guilty,

VOL. O.

they can appeal. If they don't like your verdict they can ask this court to set it aside, or the Supreme court of the state to review your judgment. The state can never appeal. You remember Mr. Ingham's
89 analysis of the foolish conduct of a criminal—it was admirable and unanswerable. And, in that connection, I would say to you, not only out of compliment to Mr. Ingham, but out of compliment to my profession, Mr. Ingham's argument, gentlemen, stands before you untouched; and as one of the counsel said to me in the hall, his argument was unanswerable, and therefore they would not undertake it."

(Objected to by Captain Black.)

Mr. GRINNELL, (continuing): "I am only giving the compliment to the speech of Mr. Ingham, which it deserves. The fact remains, they have not answered it."

On the subject of prejudice, he said: "Prejudice! Men, organized assassins, can preach murder in our city for years, and you deliberately under your oaths hear the proof and then say that you have no prejudice!"

Objected to by Capt. BLACK, who said. "I wish to take an exception to the language of the state's attorney. I should not have interrupted him, but the frequent repetition makes it a decided offense against propriety, that he should refer to these defendants, whose guilt is the question under consideration, as assassins."

"Save your exception," replied Judge Gary.

Mr. GRINNELL (continuing): "Before I proceed further in the discussion of the case, that may be in some measure personal to the prosecution, not in the way of extenuating—in the way of apology. We stand here, gentlemen, as I told you yesterday, already with our verdict in our favor; I mean in favor of the prosecution as to the conduct of this case."

90 Capt. BLACK: "If the court please, I desire to note an exception to that statement by the state's attorney."

The COURT: "Save the point."

Mr. GRINNELL (continuing): "Let me give you a little plain history. This case has engaged my personal attention, gentlemen, since the morning of May 5th, at 7 o'clock. It has been an engrossing attention, absorbing. It was proper that it should. Great interests were at stake—the law itself was on trial. Government was on trial. A murder had been committed. The question was, 'Who was responsible?' Gilmer told us the story on the 5th or the 6th or the 7th, I will not be sure about

the date, and has told us all the time the same. Remember this fact, gentlemen, that on the first inception of this business, we had no knowledge of the conspiracy."

(Defendants object; the court overrules the objection, and defendants except.)

91 "When we had Spies under arrest, I confess to you then, after it was developed that a conspiracy existed, I confessed this weakness—that I did not suppose that a man living in our community would enter into a conspiracy so hellish and damnable as the proof showed, and our investigations subsequently showed, he had entered into; therefore, notwithstanding Gilmer's statements to us so frequently, he was not shown and not identified. My associates found fault with me in the office immediately afterwards for not clearly defining it."

(Defendants except.)

92 "Don't try, gentlemen, to shirk the issues. Law is on trial, anarchy is on trial; the defendants are on trial for treason and murder."

(Defendants object; the court overrules the objection, and defendants except.)

"Treason, gentlemen, can only be committed by a citizen. You and I can commit treason. None of these defendants, except Parsons and Neebe, according to the statement of Mr. Foster, can commit treason under the laws. Why? Because there are none of them citizens. If they had been citizens, you (looking at counsel for defense) would have proved it; or else there was more design in it than that. Or you failed to prove it, because, thinking that there might be some possible chance or technicality in the upper court, on the proofs produced here, and the law, that they might be indicted for treason; if we prove the fact that they were citizens, because an overt act has been committed. That is why they proved a case half at a time. First prove no conspiracy, and then finding the difficulty to become great, assert before you that they are citizens. I don't know whether Neebe was born in Philadelphia or not; neither does Foster. But, gentlemen, Capt. Black suggested that they are not on trial for treason. That is true. The penalty for treason is death, and it is death in treason whether the individual committing a treason, kills a man or not. A man can commit the overt act of treason and injure no individual, and it is then death. Is the offense any the less because seven men are dead and because sixty others, some of them maimed for life? I thank the gentleman for making the suggestion

93 about treason. But not content, these revolutionists, these traitors, these

VOL. O.

men who have committed treason, I thank again the gentlemen for the word, these men who have committed treason, are not content with confining their power and influence to the small limits of Cook county, but Spies goes to Grand Rapids, and there gives utterance to these same treasonable sentences; and there is no doubt that other proselytes of the humanitarian crowd were at other places in the country doing the same thing. Another thing, they had prepared before the McCormick meeting for this difficulty. How? At Emma street, on Sunday, was a conspiracy meeting of these infamous scoundrels, seeking our lives, seeking the destruction of the law. For God's sake, has the defense descended so low, that men in their graves must be brought up to save the lives of wretches who have attempted to destroy the law? Weekly since the 4th of May have bombs been found scattered in the north and west and south-west part of the city, and they will continue to be found."

(Defendants object; the court overrules the objection, and defendants except.)

"As Wirt Dexter said in his speech about that matter, in praising the act of the police in that transaction: 'How noble was their conduct; in-
94 stead of fleeing and running, they said: 'Fall in, boys,' and the town was saved. I would like to take you all over to the Haymarket that night, and with you, with tears in your eyes, see the dead and mingle with the dying.'

"Another thing: One of the officers swears that he was wounded in the knee. I was not looking at Capt. Black when he motioned to you the place where the wound occurred. For the purpose of correcting myself and making no mistake about it, because the testimony of an officer or any witness who put his finger on the spot, cannot get into the record, and I found that by looking at the record that he pointed his finger here and here. Of course, there was no significance to that. I had the officer come to my office and examined the wound, and I found that the bullet went in there (indicating) and came out above, going around opposite the knee-cap, and was not from behind."

(Defendants object; the court overrules the objection, and the defendants except.)

96 The following reply affidavits were here read by counsel for the people, copies of which had not been furnished beforehand to the defendants:

97 Affidavit of John Carney shows, that affiant is captain of police of Evanston; has known Michael Cull for over twenty years; that said Cull is a worthless and shiftless person; spends for liquor whatever he

VOL. O.

earns, and does very little towards the support of his wife and five children.

99 Affidavit of Geo. W. Adams shows, he was one of the jurors who tried this case, and is the person mentioned in Michael Cull's affidavit; that said Cull is a worthless, shiftless person; spends for liquor whatever he earns; has a bad reputation in Evanston where he resides, for sobriety and truthfulness; affiant never had any conversation with Cull or in his hearing about the throwing of the bomb, the Haymarket affair, or the
100 action of the police there, or the defendants; never heard said Cull express the opinion attributed to him in his affidavit; affiant never expressed the sentiment attributed to him in Cull's affidavit, nor anything in which such sentiment was contained.

Affidavit of Theodore E. Denkler shows, he was one of the jurors who tried this case and is the person referred to in the affidavits of T. J. and T. S. Morgan; affiant has known T. J. Morgan for some time; that one morning soon after the 4th of May, 1886, affiant asked said Morgan if a picture of Spies in the newspapers was a correct likeness of Spies, to which Morgan replied that it looked no more like Spies than Morgan did; that affiant remembers no further remarks about the Haymarket massacre in that connection; affiant believed at the time that Morgan was in sympathy with Spies and expressed no opinion, in order not to injure his feeling unnecessarily, although affiant says that previous to his being accepted as a juror he had an opinion and had expressed it. Affiant is informed and believes that the son of said Morgan mentioned is about thirteen years of age.

101 Affidavit of Albert P. Love shows, that he is the same person who made a statement purporting to be an affidavit in this case in the morning of September 29, 1886, in the office of Salomon & Zeisler; after signing the statement, a man asked him if the signature was affiant's; affiant said yes, and the man said "all right"; no oath was administered to affiant. A number of statements in said pretended affidavit are not true. Affiant never knew Harry L. Gilmer; never saw him, to his knowledge; did not see him on the night of May 4, 1886. Affiant was not in the city of Chicago on that day after 6:20 o'clock P. M., and was not, on that night, in company with Orrin S. Blossom at any saloon in Chicago, or at any other place. Affiant spent one evening with said Blossom visiting different saloons, but that was, as
102 affiant recollects, on May 5th, while Blossom says he thinks it was on May 1st; but affiant has no recollection of having seen Gilmer on that

VOL. O.

night, or any person answering his description. Affiant knows one Hunt, but has not seen him for five years last past. Affiant made said statement because he had been promised he should be paid therefor immediately upon its execution, and believed he could contradict it before it was used in court. After having acknowledged his signature, one Lewis L. Smith, who was present at the time in the office of Salomon & Zeisler and with whom affiant had conversed about the making of such statement prior thereto, was given a check by Mr. Zeisler for ninety-one dollars. Affiant, Smith and Blossom who also made a statement at the time, then had the check cashed and affiant received from Smith thirty dollars, Blossom received the same, and one dollar was used in the purchase of cigars. This affidavit is made voluntarily by affiant and he has told Messrs. Black, Salomon and Zeisler that the former statement signed by him was not true.

105 Affidavit of Orrin S. Blossom shows, he is the person who signed a paper purporting to be an affidavit in this case. Affiant does not know Harry L. Gilmer; never saw him, to his knowledge; was not with him or with Albert P. Love on the west side, or at any place, on the night of May 4, 1886; has no recollection of meeting a tall, spare man, a painter, who answers the description of H. L. Gilmer, on Halsted street between Madison and Van Buren. Affiant was with Love in different saloons on the night of May 1, 1886, until about 9 o'clock, but don't recollect of meeting Gilmer that night, but met many painters whom he knew, and among them some tall men. Affiant made the statement referred to in Salomon & Zeisler's office on September 29, 1886; he was simply asked if the signature was his, but no oath was administered to him. Lewis L. Smith was present. Salomon told affiant Smith would settle with him. Affiant received thirty dollars from Smith after Smith had cashed a check of ninety-one dollars at the International Bank.

126 Motion by defendants to have a reasonable time allowed to prepare and file reply-affidavits as to material matters contained in the counter-affidavits filed on behalf of the people before proceeding further with the argument was overruled by the court, to which the defendants excepted.

Abstract of Jury Examination.

Impaneling of the Jury.

VOL. A.

1 All of the jurors herein were first sworn in regular form, to answer questions as to their competency.

William Veney Smith, excused by consent.

2–7 David H. Mason, peremptorily excused by state.

8–12 Edward H. Campbell, peremptorily excused by state.

H. F. Chandler: I am in the artists' material business for Thayer & Chandler; am a brother of the junior member of that firm. I was born in Chicago;
14 am twenty-four years old. I don't know any of the defendants. I have read and talked about this case; was not present at the occurrence on the night of May 4th. I would try to determine the innocence or guilt of the defendants upon the proof presented to me in court here, regardless of everything that I have ever read or heard about it. I believe I
15 could do it.

58 Cross-Examination.

The first thing I heard of the Haymarket trouble were the reports of the guns that night. I live nearly a mile from the scene of the occurrence. Afterwards I read about it in the paper, and have been reading
59 about it ever since. I have formed no opinion upon the question of any of these defendants' guilt or innocence of the murder of Mr. Degan. I have a prejudice against socialists as a class, but none but what would be removed if I heard the testimony.

71 Mr. Chandler peremptorily challenged by defendants.

16 W. M. Upham: I am a manufacturer of leather; live at 337 Wash-
17 ington boulevard. I read about this case and discussed it some; I quite likely expressed some opinions myself and heard some expressions. I do
18 not know any of the defendants. I think I could determine the guilt or innocence of the defendants upon the proof alone presented here in court, but I don't know as I could distinguish between them. I have a fair
19 business memory.

VOL. A.

61 CROSS-EXAMINATION.

I think I formed an opinion in regard to some of these defendants, upon the question of their guilt or innocence, based upon the belief of what I read and heard. I probably expressed that opinion to others.

63 (Challenged for cause; challenge overruled.)

The COURT: Q. The question is whether you have ever formed or expressed any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of any one of these eight men of the murder of officer Degan?

A. I cannot say what I have expressed in words, but my opinion was that some of them are guilty.

The COURT: That is not any ground of challenge under the law.

64 I believed the statements upon which I formed my opinion to be true at the time; I have the same opinion now which I then formed.

Q. Will it require sworn testimony to overcome the opinion which you now have before you will be unbiased and free to act upon the testimony?

66 (Objected to; objection sustained and exception.)

67 I have a prejudice against the teachings of socialists and anarchists; I believe their influence pernicious; I have no prejudice against the individuals which would in any way influence my verdict in this case. I think I could render a verdict according to the law and the evidence. I have

68 some prejudice against labor organization and against men who teach the right and speak in favor of the organization of laboring men for their own protection. I don't think this prejudice would bias my judgment in

69 this case. I think I might get mixed up a little in remembering as to which of the defendants the different parts of the evidence apply.

(Mr. Upham challenged for cause; challenge overruled; exception by defendants. Mr. Upham challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

21–26 Henry H. Aldrich: I live on South Ashland avenue; am a commission merchant on the board of trade.

41–47 CROSS-EXAMINATION.

I have formed and expressed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants, based upon the belief of what I have read and heard.

(Challenge for cause by defendants overruled.)

I have expressed an opinion upon the truth of the reports which I heard about the transaction.

(Challenge for cause renewed and sustained.)

VOL. A.

27–29 George Norval: I live at 159 So. Greene street, am keeping a boarding house now.

Challenged peremptorily by the state.

30–31 Jerry Albright: Excused for cause by state.

32–36 Joseph H. Peterson: Challenged for cause by state.

37–40 Sidney H. Warner: I live at 582 West Taylor street, employed by the firm of Warner & Wilbur, in the commission business; am a member of the board of trade. I do not know any of the defendants. I have read and heard a good deal about this case and talked about it a little. I think I could determine the innocence or guilt of the defendants upon the proof presented here in court, regardless of everything that I have ever heard about it.

48–50 CROSS-EXAMINATION.

I knew that the murder of those policemen at the Haymarket was wrong. I did not form an opinion upon the question of the guilt of any of these defendants. I don't think the papers always get it right.

52 Q. Suppose that it should appear in evidence that the meeting held at the Haymarket square was a meeting called by socialists and anarchists, and was attended by them and others; suppose that it should further appear that the bomb which is alleged to have produced the death of Mr. Degan was thrown by some one in sympathy with the socialists or anarchists. Now, provided it was not established beyond all reasonable doubt that these defendants actually threw the bomb, or that they aided, participated in or advised the committing of that wrong: Would the fact that they were socialists or communists have any influence upon your mind in determining their innocence?

(Question refused to be answered by the court as calling upon the
53 juror to swear as to operations of his mind in the future. Exception by defendants.)

54 I have a prejudice against the class of socialists and anarchists, from
55 what I have heard of their belief. I don't think the fact of their being socialists would prejudice me.

57 Q. I will ask you whether or not the fact that the defendants affirm rather than swear, would in any way affect your mind as to the credit which you would give to their testimony?

(Objected to; objection sustained, and exception by defendants.)

Q. I will ask you whether it would in any way, in your judgment,

affect their testimony, provided it would appear that they were atheists or were not believers in the existence of a personal God?

(Objected to; objection sustained, and exception by defendants.)

71 Challenge for cause against Warner overruled, and exception. Warner peremptorily challenged by defendants.

The panel of four jurors tendered to the defendants, namely, Waner, Chandler, Upham and Aldrich, being exhausted by challenges exercised by the defendants, the latter require the state to make another tender of

72 four jurors, instead of being required to tender back to the state four jurors. The motion was overruled, and exception.

73–78 Hiram A. Yarnell: Challenged for cause by defendants.

79–82 John F. Vette: Challenged for cause by defendants.

83–85 Albert Traff: Challenged for cause by defendants.

86–90 Arthur M. Elliott: Challenged for cause by defendants.

91–96 Merrill K. Sweet, accepted and tendered to the State by defendants,

246–249 was, upon cross-examination, peremptorily challenged by the state.

97–104–163 Charles L. Wells: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

106–109 Lancaster: I have lived in Chicago eight years; have been engaged in railroading in different capacities all that time. From reading and hearing reports in regard to this case, which I believed to be true, I formed an opinion in the case, but not upon the question of the guilt or innocence

110 of any of these defendants. I have a prejudice against the persons who instigated the throwing of the bomb; I have no prejudice against the class of communists or anarchists or socialists; I do not know their objects.

114 Q. Suppose it should appear in evidence that the meeting held at the Haymarket square was a meeting called by socialists or anarchists, and was attended by them and others; suppose that it should further appear that the bomb which is alleged to have produced the death of Mr. Degan was thrown by some one in sympathy with the socialists or anarchists. Now, provided it was not established beyond all reasonable doubt that these defendants actually threw the bomb, or that they aided, participated in or advised the committing of that wrong; would the fact that they were socialists or communists have any influence upon your mind in determining their innocence?

Mr. GRINNELL: I will not object to that question.

Question refused by the court.

I am not acquainted with any of these defendants; never saw them

133 until yesterday. I do not think I could render an impartial verdict in

VOL. A.

this case. My present state of mind is such that if I was called upon now I could not render a fair and impartial verdict in this case.

The COURT: The question is whether you believe that you could fairly and impartially render a verdict in the case in accordance with the law and the evidence? A. Yes, sir.

134 Mr. FOSTER: I will ask you whether or not you are of the opinion that from the opinion which you now have, if the testimony was equally balanced, you would decide according to your present opinion?

(Question refused by the court; exception by defendants.)

151 Mr. Lancaster was challenged for cause by the defendants; challenge
152 overruled, and exception; then challenged peremptorily by defendants.

117–124 M. T. Karey: Challenged for cause by defendants.

125, 126 Martin Newhouse: Challenged for cause by defendants.

127–132 Fred. Kohl: Challenged for cause by defendants.

135–137 Henry Keller: Challenged for cause by defendants.

138–140 James J. Adams: Challenged for cause by defendants.

141–148 William Crowley: I was born in Lemont; live there now. I am a farmer. I have heard and read something about the Haymarket trouble, but formed no opinion in the case. I have some feeling against the communists, but it is not so strong that I could not render a true verdict in this case under the evidence. I have some prejudice against socialists, communists and anarchists. I would not give the same credit to the testimony of an anarchist or communist on the stand as I would to any other unimpeached testimony.

(Challenge for cause by defendants overruled, and exception.)

Q. If it should be established by competent evidence that a meeting of socialists, anarchists and others was held at the Haymarket square in
149 this city on May 4th, and that a bomb was maliciously thrown by some one in sympathy with such meeting, and in sympathy with the principles advocated by socialists, communists and anarchists, and that by reason thereof Matthias J. Degan was killed, but if the evidence introduced upon the trial fails to show, beyond a reasonable doubt, that such bomb was thrown by these defendants, or any of them, and that they nor any of them either assisted, aided, abetted, advised or counseled the throwing of such bomb, would your prejudice against socialists, communists and anarchists prevent you from rendering an impartial verdict and acquitting the defendants, or are you now so prejudiced against the classes to which I have referred that you

cannot act impartially and fairly as a juror in this case under the facts assumed in the question?

(Question refused by the court; exception by defendants.)

150 Q. If the testimony was equally divided upon the trial of this case, would you find against the defendants or in favor of the defendants, because of their being socialists, communists or anarchists?

(Question refused by the court; exception by defendants.)

Mr. Crowley was excused peremptorily by defendants.

153–155 John W. Scott challenged for cause by defendants.

156–162, 224 Lewellyn Lindsey: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

164–166 John Kyle: Challenged for cause by defendants.

167–169 Benoit Bryard: Challenged for cause by defendants.

170, 171 John Spain: Challenged for cause by defendants.

172 James H. Cole: I live at 987 Lawndale avenue; have lived in Chicago seven years. I have been in the railroad business, and I was book-keeper for the Continental Insurance Company up to April 1st last; since then I have not been engaged in any business. I heard and read about the
173 Haymarket trouble; I did not believe all that I read in the newspapers; I don't think I have ever formed an opinion upon the question of the guilt or innocence of any one of these defendants. I have a prejudice against all secret societies; I have a prejudice against all organizations that violate the law. From what I know now of socialists, communists and anarchists I have a prejudice against them as a class. That prejudice is not so great
174 that I could not render a fair and impartial verdict in this case; my verdict would be rendered the same as against any other men. I think I could lay aside all opinions which I have formed, and be guided exclusively by the law and the evidence.

176 The identical lengthy question which was asked by defendants of William Crowley on page 149, Vol. A, was asked of Mr. Cole, and refused by the court; exception by defendants.

177 I was in the Confederate army from 1861 to '65; I am 50 years old now.

180 Q. Is your bias or prejudice against an anarchist or communist such that it would in any way bias you against the testimony of a witness who was a communist or a socialist?

(Question refused by the court; exception by defendants.)

Q. I will ask you whether your prejudice against socialists, communists or anarchists is such that you would not give the same credence to
181 their testimony—everything else being equal—that you would to another witness, and whether that is your opinion now, at the present time.

(Question refused by the court; exception by defendants.)

VOL. A.

183, 184 Thomas Ablewhite: Challenged for cause by defendants.

185, 187 James B. Thornburgh: Challenged for cause by defendants.

188, 190 Walter H. Krouskup: Challenged for cause by defendants.

191, 193 Frank E. Zahner: Challenged for cause by defendants.

194, 195 Charles F. Hoff: Challenged for cause by defendants.

196, 197 James Finnigan: Challenged for cause by defendants.

198 A. F. Bradley: I am sanitary inspector in the employ of the city since six years. Before that I was a letter carrier for nine years, and previous to that I worked seven or eight years at my trade as a painter. I have read and heard accounts of the Haymarket trouble; have not formed an 200 opinion upon the question of the guilt or innocence of any of the accused. 201 I am not acquainted with any of the defendants. I have a strong prejudice against anarchists, socialists and communists. I have no prejudice against trade-unions. I don't know whether the prejudice which I have against socialists, communists and anarchists would prevent my returning 202 an unprejudiced verdict in this case. I could not tell whether it might or not.

Q. Would you now receive the testimony from a witness belonging to the organization of anarchists, communists, or socialists as freely and readily as any other witness that might be presented?

(Objected to; objection sustained, and exception.)

The fact that the defendants are anarchists, or communists, or socialists, would not bias me in determining the question of their guilt or innocence.

203 Q. You feel that you could lay your prejudice all to one side and be governed exclusively by the testimony as it was introduced and the law governing the case, as given you by the court? A. No, I don't know about that, as I told you before. I don't know whether I could or not. I cannot answer that, because I don't know.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception.)

Q. Would you think that you could disregard the prejudice that you have against socialists, communists and anarchists, and render a verdict in this case under the testimony and instructions of the court, fairly and impartially? A. I don't know but what I could, I am not positive upon that point.

204 The COURT: Do you believe that you can fairly and impartially determine the guilt or innocence of the parties here on trial by the evidence presented here and nothing else, together with the instructions

VOL. A.

of the court? A. I do think I could. I feel the same trying this case as I would any other case that I was trying.

205 (The identical lengthy question asked by defendants of William Crowley, on page 149, Vol. A, was asked of Mr. Bradley, and refused by the court; exception by defendants.)

206 Bradley peremptorily challenged by defendants.

207–216 Richard Fitzgerald: Challenged for cause by defendants.

217–223 R. H. Ashton, accepted and tendered to the state by the defendants,

236–241 was, upon cross-examination, challenged peremptorily by the state.

225–234 Herman Beifuss, accepted and tendered to the state by the defend-

242–245 ants, was, upon cross-examination, peremptorily challenged by the

279 state.

255–260 Patrick Moss: Peremptorily challenged by the state.

261–265 Henry Turk: Peremptorily challenged by the state.

266, 267 F. L. Porter: Challenged for cause by the state.

268, 269 John L. Clancy: Challenged for cause by the state.

270–273 P. J. Raleigh: I am clerk for the Pennsylvania Coal Company. I heard and read abont the Haymarket trouble. I have a pretty well fixed opinion, and it will take very strong evidence to convince me to the contrary; I don't know any of the defendants.

289–295 CROSS-EXAMINATION.

I have formed a very decided opinion in this case; it will take a good deal of evidence to overcome the opinion I have formed to convince me.

(Challenge for cause by defendants overruled, and exception.)

I base the opinion that some of these defendants were instrumental in causing the Haymarket occurrence upon the belief of what I read about it. I gave it as my opinion that what I had read was true.

(Challenge for cause renewed and allowed.)

274, 275 John Murphy: Peremptorily challenged by the state.

276–278 Edward E. Dausenbach, tendered to the defendants, was, upon cross-

305–308 examination, challenged for cause by the defendants.

280–284 Matthias Schaffhausen: Peremptorily challenged by the state.

285–288 Frank Jacobson: I live at 2806 Butterfield street; I am a watch-case maker at 32 State street. I don't know any of the defendants. From what I have read and heard about the Haymarket trouble I have formed some opinion in the case. I think I can determine the innocence or guilt of the defendants upon the proof presented here in court, regardless of what I have read and heard about it.

VOL. A.

309–312 CROSS-EXAMINATION.

I have read pretty generally the newspaper reports of the Haymarket occurrence. From reading and hearing about the case I have formed and expressed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of these defendants, which I still entertain. I never stated that I believed the statements which I heard and read about the case to be correct. I do now believe that the
313 statements which I read in the newspapers and heard on the street, upon which I based my opinion, are correct.

314 (Challenge for cause overruled, the court in its opinion announcing
316 the rule that the opinion about the truth of the newspaper statements or the rumor upon which a person called as a juror has formed an opinion or impression must have been expressed previous to his being called as a juror, in order to disqualify him. De-
317 fendants except to the ruling of the court.)

319 I have a prejudice against socialists, communists and anarchists as a class.

Q. Now, is your prejudice such that it would influence your verdict in this case under the evidence that is introduced upon the trial and the charge of the court, as given by his Honor, the judge?

320 (Question refused by the court; exception by defendants.)

I think I can fairly and impartially try the case upon the evidence.

321 Mr. Jacobson was then peremptorily challenged by the defendants.

296–304 John J. Karstens: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

322–327 Paul W. Brooks: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

328–330 Frank Bilderbeck: Challenged for cause by defendants.

331, 332 Edward Einhorn: Challenged for cause by defendants.

333–336 Moses Marcott: Was accepted by defendants and tendered to the state. Upon cross-examination said Marcott was peremptorily challenged by the state.

337–339 S. H. Little: Challenged for cause by defendants.

340–342 Charles H. Tourjee: Excused by agreement.

343–345 Christian Carlson: Challenged for cause by defendants.

346–351 Patrick H. Powers: Challenged for cause by defendants.

352–355 Joseph Emblem: Challenged for cause by defendants.

356–360 T. J. McCormick: Challenged peremptorily by the defendants.

361, 362 John O'Connell: Challenged for cause by defendants.

363–365 Michael Fleming: Challenged for cause by defendants.

366–369 W. S. Watrus: Challenged for cause by defendants.

371–373 F. W. Fuller: I have formed and expressed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, based upon the belief of the truth of the statements read, which opinion I still entertain.

(Challenged for cause.)

374, 375 CROSS-EXAMINATION.

I can't say that I ever expressed to anybody that the newspaper statements or the accounts which I heard were true. I don't know as anybody ever contradicted them.

376 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION.

I did believe those statements and do believe them now to be true.

(Challenge for cause overruled and exception.)

The COURT: Yes; as was said in the Connor case, forty years ago, every intelligent, right-minded man ought to lay aside what they have read and heard.

(Defendants object to the reading of that case in the presence of the jury.)

377 Mr. FOSTER: Q. I will ask you whether your opinion now is that the opinion which you have formed could only be removed by sworn testimony contradicting it?

(Question refused by the court, and exception.)

378 I do not believe that I could lay aside my present opinion and return an impartial verdict under the law and the evidence.

(Challenge for cause renewed and allowed.)

380–383 Edwin Thomas: Challenged for cause by defendants.

384–386 Thomas Scully: Challenged for cause by defendants.

387–389 E. F. Shedd: I have formed and expressed and still entertain an opinion upon the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants, based upon the belief of the truth of the statements which I read and heard about the case. I have not expressed the opinion that I believe the substance of what I heard or read in regard to it. The doubt of that belief was not questioned. I think I could lay aside all opinions which I have and render an impartial verdict on the law and the evidence.

390 Q. Now, then, I ask you whether you could lay aside, in your judgment, your present opinion and not be biased by it in the consideration of the testimony as it is introduced upon the trial of the case? A. I would have my opinion, my own opinion, until it was set aside by the whole testimony.

Q. Then you mean to say that it would require some testimony to remove the opinion which you now have before it would be removed?

391 A. Yes, sir.

(Challenged for cause.)

391–396 After full argument the challenge for cause was overruled and the defendants excepted.

I have a decided predjudice against the class known as socialists, communists or anarchists. I believe that prejudice would prevent my rendering an impartial verdict in this case, provided it was conceded or

397 proved the defendants belonged to this class.

The COURT: I know, or the court judicially, what are the objects of the communists, socialists and anarchists.

Mr. FOSTER: Beg your pardon. It presumes that the juror knows.

The COURT: You must presume that I know, because it has been decided that for a man to say that he is prejudiced against horse thieves is no ground for imputing to him any misconduct as a juror. Now you must assume that I know either that anarchists, socialists and communists are a worthy, a praise-worthy class of people, having worthy objects, or else I cannot say that a prejudice against them is wrong. I do not know.

398, 399 Argument upon this point.

The COURT: Mr. Shedd, with this prejudice which you have been questioned about, do you believe you can fairly and impartially determine upon the evidence, and upon that alone, the question of the guilt or innocence of these defendants of the crime with which they are charged by this indictment, without any reference to any class to which they may be assumed or supposed to belong? A. Yes, sir; putting it as you did then.

(Challenge for cause overruled and exception.)

400 Mr. FOSTER (resuming): Q. Now, would the prejudice which you have against communists, anarchists and socialists, as a class, be in the way of your listening to the testimony and rendering an absolutely impartial verdict, if it was conceded or proved that the defendants belonged to that class? A. Yes, sir.

(Challenge for cause renewed.)

401 The COURT: Do you mean by that that you would believe you would not render the same verdict upon the same evidence if it was shown that they were of the same class referred to, as you would if it were not so shown? A. I think the mere fact of their being communists would influence my opinion as a juror.

VOL. A.

Mr. BLACK: You would require additional evidence? A. Yes, sir. * * * It would take less evidence from them than from law-abiding citizens, to find a verdict of guilty.

The COURT: Well, that prejudice of yours then, is based upon your understanding that they are not law-abiding citizens, is it? A. That is what it is.

(Last question by the court objected to, and exception.)

The COURT: Suppose it should turn out that that opinion of yours is
402 not correct, that that is a mistake, that in fact they were law-abiding citizens, then would that prejudice have any effect upon your verdict or not, in your judgment?

(Question objected to by defendants, and exception.)

A. No, sir; if it should turn out that they were.

The said E. F. Shedd was thereupon peremptorily challenged by defendants.

403–405 J. K. Misch: I have formed no opinion as to the guilt or innocence of
406 the defendants. I have a prejudice against the class known as socialists, communists or anarchists. I think the opinion which I have formed against this class would influence me in determining this case upon the law and the evidence; I think it would require more testimony before I could find them not guilty, or less before I could find them guilty, than though they did not belong to this class.

(Challenged for cause.)

407 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY THE STATE.

I do not think I could make a fair juror. I think I would be prejudiced; I think it would take more testimony on account of it.

The COURT: Is your prejudice upon this subject based upon the idea that you suppose this class are in favor of overturning society by force?

Mr. BLACK: I desire to except to that question and to ask whether the state objects to our challenge, by its representative.

The COURT: Well, you can except. (The question of the court being read the juror answered): It is.

408 Q. If, in the progress of this case, there should not be anything to indicate that these men had any intention of overturning society by force, you still think that you would have the same prejudice that would influence your verdict in the case?

(Question by the court objected to by defendants, and exception.)

A. My prejudice would still remain. I do not think I could give

VOL. A.

these men a fair and impartial trial regardless of all other circumstances than what may be proved by the evidence in the case.

409 J. K. Misch, challenged peremptorily by defendants.

The COURT: I have not overruled the challenge for cause.

Mr. BLACK: The record will speak for itself.

410–411 Frederick B. Smith: Challenged for cause by defendrnts.

412–414 W. B. Blackman: Challenged for cause by defendants.

415–418 G. Lindholf: Challenged for cause by defendants.

419–426 Isaac Freeman: Accepted and tendered to the state by defendants,

455–459 was, upon cross-examination, peremptorily challenged by the state.

435–440 August Essenacher: Challenged for cause by the state.

441–446 Charles Dyck: Challenged peremptorily by the state.

460–462 M. L. Barrett: Accepted and tendered to defendants by the state.

VOL. B.

17–19 Upon cross-examination, challenged for cause by defendants.

VOL. A.

463–470 M. J. Burke: Challenged for cause by the state.

471–477 Terrance T. Curry: Challenged for cause by the state.

478–484 William Harrison: Challenged for cause by the state.

485–488 Charles J. Robinson: Challenged for cause by the state.

489–493 Edwin E. Hart: Challenged for cause by the state.

494–496 F. H. Medbury: Accepted and tendered to the defendants by the state.

VOL. B.

12–16 Upon cross-examination challenged for cause by defendants.

1–4 Sol. Hamburg: Challenged for cause by the state.

5–7 H. F. Jaeger: Challenged for cause by the state.

8, 9. David L. Streeter: Challenged for cause by the state.

10, 11 George H. Hess: Accepted and tendered to the defendants by the

20–25 state. Upon cross-examination challenged for cause by defendants.

25 S. G. Randall: I live at 42 LaSalle street; am twenty-three years old. I am employed as a seedsman by J. C. Vaughan; have lived in Chicago two and a half years. I came here from Erie county, Pennsylvania, where I was

26 a farmer. I have heard and read some about the Haymarket occurrence. I have formed no opinion as to the guilt or innocence of any of the de-

27 fendants. I am not acquainted with any of the defendants. I don't understand the principles advocated by socialists, communists or anarchists. I know of no prejudice or bias or any reason why I could not return a fair and impartial verdict under the law and the evidence. I went into

29 my present employment last fall. From spring until fall last year I had

a milk route, owned my wagon and bought the milk. Previous to that I was in the City Hotel, 16th and State streets, first as a common laborer,
30 then as a waiter.

Accepted and tendered by the defendants to the state.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

32–35 I think I could determine the innocence or guilt of the defendants upon the proof presented here in court, regardless of everything else. I think I have seen defendant Fielden upon the lake front one Sunday when I was there, either this summer or last.

36, 37 M. P. Carroll: Challenged for cause by defendants.

38–40 F. C. Gibbs: Challenged for cause by defendants.

Owen Murray: I formed and expressed and still entertain quite a strong opinion upon the question of the guilt or innocence of the accused. I believed the statements which I read sufficiently to base my opinion upon them; I don't know that I ever expressed my belief that the newspaper accounts were true or not. I have a prejudice against the class of communists, anarchists and socialists.

43 Q. Have you a prejudice which will influence your judgment, sitting as a juror, if it should appear or be conceded that the defendants belonged to the class of communists, anarchists or socialists, which would prevent you from rendering an impartial verdict?

(Question refused by the court and exception.)

I don't believe that the opinion which I now have would prevent me from rendering a verdict under the testimony; I would not convict the defendants on newspaper reports; I could leave my prejudices entirely out of the case.

Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

45, 46 W. D. Field: Challenged for cause by defendants.

47–49 M. Gayley: Challenged for cause by defendants.

50–52 B. M. Giroux: Challenged for cause by defendants.

53–55 C. D. Sherman: Challenged for cause by defendants.

56–59 John Daley: Challenged for cause by defendants.

60, 61 C. J. Stratton: Challenged for cause by defendants.

62, 63 James P. Dryer: Challenged for cause by defendants.

64–69 Martin Levy: Accepted and tendered to the state by the defendants
71 was challenged peremptorily by the state.

72–74 George A. Hitchcock: Challenged for cause by defendants.

75, 76 John Goldman: Challenged for cause by defendants.

VOL. B.

77, 78 James H. Leonard: Challenged for cause by defendants.

79, 80 Phillip Knusmann: Challenged for cause by defendants.

81, 82 James Foley: Challenged for cause by defendants.

85, 86 John W. Thomas: Challenged for cause by defendants.

87, 88 E. L. Park: Challenged for cause by defendants.

89, 90 R. B. Whitney: Challenged for cause by defendants.

91 Frank H. Krugel: Challenged for cause by defendants.

92–94 J. F. Somes: Challenged for cause by defendants.

95, 96 George J. Smith: Challenged for cause by defendants.

97, 98 C. J. Albertine: Challenged for cause by defendants.

99 T. H. Dowd: I have formed and expressed and still entertain an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of some of these defendants. I did not express an opinion about the correctness of what I heard and said in regard to the matter. I don't think my opinion would prevent me in
102 rendering an impartial verdict. I have a prejudice against the class of anarchists, communists and socialists.

Q. I will ask you whether that prejudice is so strong that it will in any way influence your verdict if you should be selected as a juror in this case?

(Questions refused by the court, and exception.)

Q. Sitting as a juror, listening to the testimony as it may be introduced by witnesses upon the stand and the law as given you by the court, do you now believe that the prejudice which you have against the classes to which I have referred would prevent you from rendering an impartial verdict in the case, provided it should be established or con-
103 ceded that the defendants or some of them belonged to one or the other of the classes to which I have referred?

(Question refused by the court, and exception.)

Q. If it should appear or be conceded that the defendants were communists, anarchists or socialists, would it require less evidence, or more evidence, to acquit or convict than though that fact did not appear?

(Question refused by the court, and exception.)

104 I think I could act entirely upon the law and the evidence and render a verdict in this case regardless of my opinion and without prejudice as to the defendants.

Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

105–106 Henry Hassel: Challenged for cause by defendants.

107–112 Charles Neumeister: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

113–117 B. W. Pierce: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

VOL. B.

118, 119 F. H. Edler: Challenged for cause by defendants.

120–122 Charles J. Dobson: Challenged for cause by defendants.

123 George Pearce: Challenged for cause by defendants.

123½ H. Haker: Challenged for cause by defendants.

125 Theodore Denker: I live at Woodlawn Park, in the town of Hyde Park. I have formed, and expressed, and still entertain an opinion upon the question of the defendants' guilt or innocence upon the charge of murder.

Q. You believe what you read and what you heard? A. I believe it, yes.

Q. Is that opinion such as to prevent you from rendering an impartial verdict in the case, sitting as a juror under the testimony and the law?

126 A. I think it is.

Challenged for cause by defendants.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

If I were taken and sworn as a juror in the case I think I could determine the innocence or guilt of the defendants upon the proof presented to me here in court, regardless of any prejudice or opinion, or of what I have read.

The COURT: Do you believe that you can fairly and impartially try the case, and render an impartial verdict upon the evidence as it may be presented here, and the instructions of the court? A. Yes, I think I could.

(Challenge for cause overruled.)

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION.

127 I have formed my opinion from reading the papers and from conversations, but I don't believe everything I read in the newspapers; I believed enough, however, to form an opinion upon the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants. I never

128 expressed an opinion in regard to whether the newspapers were correct or not. I am shipping clerk for Henry W. King & Co., wholsale clothiers, corner Madison and Franklin, since about two years and three months. I am 27 years old. Previous to my last engagement I worked as conductor on a wagon in the United States Express Company. I

129 have formed my opinion entirely from what I have read in the newspa-

130 pers. I am unmarried, I live with my parents. I don't know anything

131 about socialism, anarchism or communism. I think I am a little preju-

VOL. B.

145–150 John A. Anderson: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

151–154 Robert G. Barrett: Challenged for cause by defendants.

155, 156 John Johnson: I have read the accounts of the Haymarket occurrence and discussed the matter to a certain extent. To a certain extent I believe what I read and heard about it. I have formed and still entertain an opinion as to the defendant's innocence or guilt on account of what I have read and heard, and I believe I have expressed that opinion to others. I think I could return an impartial verdict according to the law and the

157 evidence. I have to a certain extent a prejudice against socialists, anarchists and communists.

Q. Would that prejudice affect your verdict in this case if it were conceded that the defendants belonged to those classes?

(Question refused by the court, and exception).

158 Q. Is this opinion which you have formed a fixed opinion—that is, is it a strong opinion, or a slight impression? A. It is not very strong; it can possibly be removed by evidence contrary to what I have read; I I don't think it would prevent me from rendering an impartial verdict in the case.

Q. Is it one which would require evidence to remove?

(Question refused by the court, and exception).

Q. Do you now say that it would require strong evidence to remove your opinion?

(Question refused by the court, and exception).

159 (Challenge for cause overruled; challenged peremptorily by defendants).

160, 161 W. H. Barry: Challenged for cause by defendants.

162, 163 Max Levinson: Challenged for cause by defendants.

164–166 J. B. Sharp: Challenged for cause by defendants.

167, 168 William Hayden: Challenged for cause by defendants.

169–171 Henry Carsons: Challenged for cause by defendants.

172–174 Charles E. Willetts: Challenged for cause by defendants.

179–183 E. O. Tooker: Challenged for cause by defendants.

184–186 Joseph Fish: Challenged for cause by defendants.

187, 188 Clarence H. Hill: I have formed and still entertain an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, based upon the belief of what I have read about the Haymarket occurrence. I have not expressed that opinion to others. I think I could try the case according to the law and the evidence, notwithstanding my opinion, or what I have read or heard about the case.

VOL. B.

194 Q. Have you now any prejudice against the class known as anarchists, communists or socialists? A. Well I should say I have.

Q. Now, I will ask you whether that prejudice is such that it would prevent you from listening to the sworn testimony in this case and the charge of the court and render an absolutely impartial verdict in the case?

(Question refused by the court, and exception.)

195 Q. Do you believe that notwithstanding your prejudice and opinions you can listen to the testimony of the witnesses sworn in this case and the charge by the court and render an impartial verdict in this case? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have no opinions, biases or prejudices which it would require testimony to overcome? A. Yes, I have.

(Challenged for cause on the last answer; challenge overruled, and exception.)

196 Mr. Hill was then peremptorily challenged by defendants.

197, 198 Cyrus P. Wright: Challenged for cause by defendants.

199–201 Charles A. Baker: Challenged for cause by defendants.

202–204 E. B. Kilham: Challenged for cause by defendants.

205, 206 Henry Sanmeyer: Challenged for cause by defendants.

207–209 Henry C. Gross: Challenged for cause by defendants.

210–219 William W. Barnard: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

220–223 James T. O'Rourke: From reading about the Haymarket occurrence I formed an opinion that the defendants were morally responsible for it; I have that opinion now. I have not expressed it, to my knowledge, it would not prevent me from rendering an impartial verdict in the case according to the law and the evidence.

Challenged peremptorily by the defendants.

225–227 Richard Waters: Challenged for cause by defendants.

228–230 John Bodden: Challenged for cause by defendants.

231, 232 Lewis O'Neil: Challenged for cause by defendants.

233, 234 Rudolph Shavow: Challenged for cause by defendants.

235–237 B. D. Uptigrove: Challenged for cause by defendants.

238, 239 F. J. Hoffman: Challenged for cause by defendants.

240, 241 Henry T. Hart: Challenged for cause by defendants.

242–244 C. McGovern: Challenged for cause by defendants.

245–247 J. L. Worthington: Challenged for cause by defendants.

248–250 E. W. Bradbury: Challenged for cause by defendants.

251, 252 John Soderberg: Challenged for cause by defendants.

VOL. B.

253, 254 Edwin W. Hanley: Challenged for cause by defendants.

255, 256 George Olsen: Challenged for cause by defendants.

257–263 Benjamin F. Nourse: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

264, 265 Felix McHugh: Challenged for cause by defendants.

266–268 Charles Jesse: Challenged for cause by defendants.

269–272 G. M. Pitner: Challenged for cause by defendants.

273–282 E. J. Dutcher: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

283–285 W. H. Stillson: Challenged for cause by defendants.

286, 287 Robert Miller: Challenged for cause by defendants.

288–296 Thomas S. Wild: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

297 C. B. Todd: I live at 1,013 West Polk street; I am a salesman in the Putnam Clothing House. I have read newspaper accounts of the Haymarket occurrence and had conversations in regard to it. I have an
298 opinion as to the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants; it is not a firm opinion. I could listen to the testimony and be governed solely and entirely by the evidence and the charge of the court. I have lived in Chicago four years. I came here from the southern part of Minnesota where I lived sixteen years and carried on a mercantile
299 business for myself. I am a man of family. I have no prejudice against the class of socialists, communists or anarchists. I think of them as advanced thinkers, but have no prejudice.

300 The matter was talked about in the store; opinions were expressed in my hearing; I presume I expressed my opinion. I am not conscious of
301 any reason why I could not determine this case purely, solely and entirely upon the evidence introduced upon the trial and the charge of the
302 court. I have no prejudice against trades unions or labor unions. I served in the war from 1864 until the close. I am forty-seven years old.

303 (Accepted and tendered to the state by the defendants.)

(Upon cross-examination, Mr. Todd is accepted by the state, and with James H. Cole, S. G. Randall and Theodore Denker, sworn to try the issues in this case.)

306–308 James W. Newburn: Accepted and tendered to the defendants by the
365 state, was, upon cross-examination, challenged for cause by the de-
367 fendants.

309–311 E. W. Beck: Challenged for cause by the state.

312–315 S. K. Whittemore: Challenged for cause by the state.

316–318 William Stein: Challenged for cause by the state.

VOL. B.

319–322 E. J. Macheret: Challenged for cause by the state.

323–325 David Dunseath: Challenged for cause by the state.

326, 327 Marshall Fay: Challenged for cause by the state.

328–330 and 350 Nathan Dickinson: Challenged for cause by the state.

331–335 George A. Fellows: Accepted and tendered to the defendants by the
358 state. Was, upon cross-examination, challenged for cause by the de-
360 fendants.

338, 339 Martin B. Lightcap: Challenged for cause by the state.

340–342 D. H. Broadway: Challenged for cause by the state.

343–345 T. J. Doyle: Challenged for cause by the state.

346–348 O. F. Carpenter: Accepted and tendered to the defendants by the
369 state. Was, upon cross-examination, challenged for cause by the de-
364 fendants.

351, 352 John Hogelman: Challenged for cause by the state.

353–355 B. Herzog: Challenged for cause by the state.

356, 357 W. D. Curtis: Accepted and tendered to the defendants by the state.

372–375 Was upon cross-examination challenged for cause by the defendants.

369–371 E. C. Grant: Challenged for cause by defendants.

377 The last panel of four jurors tendered to the defendants by the state having been exhausted by challenges for cause, allowed as to each of them, the defendants move the court to direct the state to tender the defendants another panel of four jurors.

379 (The motion is overruled, and the defendants except.)

380–388 and 511 K. Einstedt: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

389–393 John Scanlon: Challenged for cause by defendants.

394–396 Phillip Gedleman: Challenged for cause by defendants.

397–399 D. D. Thurber: Challenged for cause by defendants.

400, 401 R. L. Guerin: Challenged for cause by defendants.

402, 403 S. E. Nelson: Challenged for cause by defendants.

404–410 A. F. Triester: Challenged for cause by defendants.

411–415 Samuel Armstrong: Challenged for cause by defendants.

416–419 William Leanthal: Challenged for cause by defendants.

420–426 (Vol. C. 90) W. C. Hazeltine: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

427–436 (Vol. C. 158) R. H. Moore: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

437–446 J. B. Jenkins: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

447–450 S. C. Rowly: Challenged for cause by defendants.

451–453 C. E. Anderson: Challenged for cause by defendants.

454–456 Charles Holtz: Challenged for cause by defendants.

VOL. B.

457, 458 Hamilton Crary: Challenged for cause by defendants.
459, 460 A. B. Phillips: Challenged for cause by defendants.
461–464 Charles Noyes: Challenged for cause by defendants.
465, 466 G. B. Fisher: Challenged for cause by defendants.
467, 468 C. O. Winter: Challenged for cause by defendants.
469, 470 Charles Sander: Challenged for cause by defendants.
471–476 Julius Weske: Challenged for cause by defendants.
477–479 E. C. Tracy: Challenged for cause by defendants.
480, 481 J. J. Trimble: Challenged for cause by defendants.
482–493 George D. Eddy: Challenged peremptorily by defendants.
494, 495 C. S. Lammert: Challenged for cause by defendants.
496–498 D. H. Howe: Challenged for cause by defendants.
499–503 A. Van Sicklen: Challenged for cause by defendants.
504 D. B. Harris: Excused by agreement.
505, 506 F. A. Hartman: Challenged for cause by defendants.
507, 508 N. B. Hanson: Challenged for cause by defendants.
509, 510 W. G. Miller: Challenged for cause by defendants.

VOL. C.

1–7 E. Melchior: Examined by defendants, was tendered to state (page 454), and by the state permptorily excused. (Page 455.)
8–12 O. M. Reed: Challenged for cause by defendants.
13–15 C. L. Skinner: Challenged for cause by defendants.
16–19 J. F. Muchmore: Challenged for cause by defendants.
20, 21 W. H. Johnson: Challenged for cause by defendants.
22, 23 Riley Darnell: Challenged for cause by defendants.
24, 25 John P. Dabney: Challenged for cause by defendants.
26–28 William D. Hollis: Challenged for cause by defendants.
29–31 F. Basterfield: Challenged for cause by defendants.
32, 33 R. I. Stearns: Challenged for cause by defendants.
34 William C. Nicholas: Challenged for cause by defendants.
35–39 W. S. Minckler: Challenged for cause by defendants.
40–43 John N. Chapman: Challenged for cause by defendants.
44–49 James A. Parish: Challenged for cause by defendants.

50 William Neil, manufacturer of oil tanks; doing business in Chicago; have heard and read about the Haymarket difficulty, and believed enough thereof to form some opinions as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, which opinion I still have, but it is not so strong that evidence would
51 not change it—strong evidence to the contrary would change my opinion. I have expressed that opinion. It would take pretty strong evidence to

85 I have read of socialists, communists and anarchists, and have formed a decided prejudice against them.

" Q. Would you extend that prejudice to the individuals who profess the doctrines of socialists, communists or anarchists? "

(Question refused by the court, and exception).

" Q. Do you now believe that if it were conceded or proven on the trial of this case, that these defendants, or some of them, were anarchists, socialists or communists, that fact would influence you one way or the other in arriving at a fair and impartial verdict in the case? "

(Question refused by the court, and exception).

86 I have met a person who claimed to have been present at the Haymarket meeting, and who undertook to detail to me the facts as they occurred. What he told me coincided with the facts as I before understood them and supported the opinion which I had formed from reading the 87 newspapers, and I believed what they said in the main. I believed the account given me by the person who claimed to have been present at the Haymarket meeting.

122 (This witness was challenged for cause on all his answers; challenge overruled; thereupon challenged peremptorily by defendants).

91 James W. Oakley: Reside in Hyde Park; have lived in Cook county twenty years; am in the leather business and manufacture. Have a down-town office and a factory in the north-western part of the city. I have heard and read of the Haymarket difficulty, and believed enough of the reports to form an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants, which I have expressed and still entertain.

92 " Q. Is that opinion so strong and firmly fixed in your mind that it would take strong circumstances and evidence to remove it? "

(Question refused by court, and exception by defendants).

93 Think I could determine the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants from the evidence produced in court, but don't think I could do so uninfluenced by the opinion which I now have. I think that the 94 opinion which I now have, and what I have read and heard would influence me in arriving at a verdict.

Challenged for cause.

To the Court: Have no acquaintance with the defendants; don't think I have ever seen them before; have no feeling with regard to what 95 is called the Haymarket matter, and the connection of the defendants,

or supposed connection of the defendants, or some of them with that. Think I could determine the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants upon the evidence alone.

96 Challenge for cause overruled, and exception by defendants.

97 Further examined: I guess I read about the Haymarket trouble in all the papers. I believed what I read, and have said to my family that
98 I thought the reports were true; and the indictment by the grand jury has added to my impression.

Challenge for cause renewed.

To Mr. Grinnell: I believe in the main what I read and heard.

99 To the Court: I don't think I did express any opinion as to the truth of what I had read, but expressed an opinion based on what I had read.

101 To defendants' counsel: I have read of socialists, communists and anarchists, and formed an idea concerning them; think there is no place in this country for them.

"Q. If it should be proven or conceded on the trial of this case that the defendants, or some of them, are anarchists or communists, would
102 this opinion of yours in regard to these classes that you have now expressed, influence you in arriving at a just and impartial verdict?"

(Question refused by the court, and exception. Challenged on the ground of the expression of his opinion, and upon his answers generally. Challenge overruled, and exception by defendants.)

103 Edmund Knauer: Am in the real estate business in Chicago. Have formed and expressed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of one or more of the defendants, which I now have—"a pretty strong opinion; it would take pretty good evidence to change it." Think I could determine the question of guilt or innocence upon the evidence.

104 (Challenged for cause; overruled, and exception.)

108 Am prejudiced against socialists and communists.

"Q. Do you believe that the prejudice against anarchists would control you in a trial in which the defendants were conceded to be anarchists?"

109 (Question overruled by the court, and exception. Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

110–112 George S. Sawyer: Examined by defendants; challenged for cause.

113–119 I. W. R. Peales, examined by defendants; stated that he had heard and read about the Haymarket affair, sufficient to form an opinion which he still entertained and had occasionally expressed; that he be-

lieved what he had read and was prejudiced against socialists and communists.

Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

120, 121 Otto Luhring, examined by defendants; challenged for cause.

123, 124 George W. Todd, examined by defendants; challenged for cause.

125 W. D. Allen: Am in the wholesale rubber business, reside in Chicago; of the firm of E. B. Preston & Co.; have read and heard about the Haymarket difficulty, and from what I have read and heard have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants, which I now entertain and have frequently expressed; a strong opinion.

126 It is a decided conviction. My mind is made up as to whether the defendants are guilty or innocent. It would be difficult to change that conviction; perhaps impossible. " It would be hard to change my conviction."

(Challenged for cause.)

To Mr. Grinnell: I could determine the innocence or guilt of the defendants upon the evidence in court regardless of my opinion.

To the Court: I have no personal acquaintance with the defendants;

127 never saw them before to my knowledge; have no feeling against them " except such as grows out of what I have read or heard in connection with the matter which is referred to as the Haymarket difficulty." Would endeavor to get at the truth as a juror, and believe that I could fairly and impartially try it by the evidence in court and the instructions. Am familiar with the rule of law that a juror should be governed by the

128 evidence. Believe that I will fairly and impartially apply that rule to the present case.

128–130 Argument in support of challenge for cause.

(Challenge overruled and exception.)

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

131 A. L. Ketchum: Am in the drug business with Peter Van Schaack & Sons, 138 Lake street; am twenty-two years old; have read and heard about the Haymarket difficulty sufficiently to form an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of one or more of the defendants. Have expressed

132 that opinion and still entertain it. It is a strong opinion, but I think I could render a fair and impartial verdict.

" Q. Would it require testimony to overcome that opinion, or circumstances? "

(Question refused by the court, and exception.)

VOL. C.

133 Believe I will be uninfluenced in hearing the evidence by my present
134 opinion. I have conversed about this case. I was pointed out by my
135 employer to the deputy to be served for a juror in this case—was called
136 down by my employer and pointed out to the sheriff, who then served
179 me. I repeat that I have a decided opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, which I have expressed to others and still entertain.

(Challenge for cause.)

180 To Mr. Grinnell: I think I can determine the innocence or guilt of the defendants on the proofs in court, regardless of my opinion and everything outside.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception by defendants. Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

137, 138 R. D. Woodruff, examined by defendants; challenged for cause.

139, 140 G. W. Roberts, examined by defendants; challenged for cause.

141–148 William Williamson, examined by defendants; challenged for cause.

149 H. F. Chandler; am in the stationery business with Skeen, Stuart & Co. Have heard and read of the Haymarket trouble, and from what I have heard and read, have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants, which I still entertain and have expressed be-
150 fore coming into court. I believed what I heard and read, but I have never expressed my opinion as to the truth of the accounts received. The opinion I have is a decided opinion, and my mind is pretty well made up. "It will take evidence to satisfy me." My opinion was based
151 on the newspaper reports. It might be hard to change my opinion. Believe I could determine the question of the guilt or innocence of these
152 defendants solely upon the evidence presented in court, uninfluenced by my present opinion. Have a pretty strong prejudice against socialists, anarchists and communists.

"Q. If it should be proven or conceded on this trial that the defendants or some of them are socialists, anarchists or communists, do you think your prejudice would in any way influence your verdict?"

(Question refused by the court and exception by defendants.)

157 I was pointed out to the deputy sheriff by my employer to be sub-
pœnaed as a juror. I repeat that I have formed an opinion as to the
209 guilt or innocence of some of the defendants, which I have quite frequently expressed.

(Challenge for cause.)

210 To the court: Don't know defendants. Think I have some feeling

against the defendants, not only based upon what I have read about the Haymarket trouble, but on matters which I heard before that. The
211 only opinion I have is based upon what I have heard and read, and I believe that I can fairly try the case solely upon the evidence. I have now
212 an opinion upon the question as to whether the defendants did the act which resulted in the death of Mathias Degan.

212 The COURT: It don't seem to me it makes any difference in the competency of a juror, whether he has simply formed an opinion or expressed an opinion which he has formed. I don't see how it makes a particle of difference in his state of mind. Every man is in favor of jus-
213 tice and fair-dealing as between other people where his own interests are not affected; and, as I have said before, I think it is in the nature of any man when he wants to find out the truth of any transaction, that he will, when the original sources are presented to him, follow them and not any hearsay that he has ever heard.

(Challenge for cause overruled. Exception by defendants and challenged by defendants peremptorily.)

158 Further examination of Mr. Moore: I stated on my examination on Saturday, that I had formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants. I was pointed out to the deputy to be summoned.

Excused peremptorily by defendants.

159–161 A. J. Atwater, challenged for cause by defendants.

162, 163 Charles H. Coffin, challenged for cause by defendants.

164–166 Edward Scott, challenged for cause by defendants.

167–170 Frank T. Ford, challenged for cause by defendants.

171–178 and 396 I. Springer, challenged peremptorily by defendants.

181–185 P. W. Nelson, challenged for cause by defendants.

186, 187 M. S. Davis, challenged for cause by defendants.

188–190 M. Anderson, challenged for cause by defendants.

191, 192 M. B. Frost, challenged for cause by defendants.

193, 194 Charles W. Melcher, challenged for cause by defendants.

195 D. F. Swan; reside in Chicago; do business at 109 Dearborn street. Have heard and read about the Haymarket trouble, and formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants, which I still entertain, and have occasionally expressed heretofore. That opinion is at present firmly fixed in my mind. I believe I could be governed as a
196 juror by the evidence alone. Have a strong prejudice against social-

VOL. C.

197 ists, communists and anarchists and their views; don't believe in labor or-
198 ganizations, and am opposed to many of such organizations.

199 (The same questions as to possible influence upon the verdict of the prejudice against socialists and anarchists, as in other cases, asked this witness, and refused by the court; defendants except.)

200 I have had a conversation with a policeman who was present at the Haymarket, in regard to this case, and he made a statement of the facts as they occurred there, to me, which in great measure I believe to be true. I
201 should say that the names of some of the defendants were mentioned by the officer, who was one of the force on the ground at the time of the trouble, namely, Lieut. Baird. I have freely expressed the opinion as to
202 the guilt or innocence of the defendants which I have formed, which opinion I still have.

(Challenge for cause.)

To the Court: I have no personal acquaintance with the defendants
203 nor any feeling against them, except "such as grows out of what I have heard about their connection with the Haymarket." I guess I could sit here and listen to the evidence, and from the evidence make up my mind as to the truth of this matter without reference to what I have heard or read.

(Challenge for cause overruled; defendants except, and challenge peremptorily.)

204 Defendants moved the court for the appointment of a special bailiff to serve the special venires, pursuant to the statute.

205 Defendants requested the court to instruct the bailiff as to his duties—that the bailiff should summon the jurors from the body of the county, and not go into the wholesale district or wholesale houses and ask for names.

206 Mr. Grinnell suggested Mr. Ryce as special bailiff, and he was accepted and appointed.

207 Mr. Ryce inquired if he should select jurors from all walks in life and vocations. The court replied: "You must exercise your own judgment in getting the best class of men; that is all I know about it. They
208 may be selected anywhere in the county that the bailiff pleases, and he must exercise his own judgment to get the best kind of men he can."

214–216 R. A. Hitchcock, challenged for cause by defendants.

217, 218 Richard Braddell, challenged for cause by defendants.

219, 220 John Childs, challenged for cause by defendants.

221 James P. Hayde, challenged for cause by defendants.

VOL. C.

222 W. Morgan, challenged for cause by defendants.

223, 224 W. T. Burke, challenged for cause by defendants.

225, 226 F. W. Thurston, challenged for cause by defendants.

227, 228 A. C. Land, challenged for cause by defendants.

229, 230 Matthew Smith, challenged for cause by defendants.

231 E. M. Endicott, challenged for cause by defendants.

232, 233 Watson Griffith, challenged for cause by defendants.

234, 235 Charles Rogers, challenged for cause by defendants.

236 R. D. Fannon, examined by defendants; challenge for cause sustained.

237, 238 L. M. Tonnoyer, challenged for cause by defendants.

239, 240 W. H. V. Thornton, challenged for cause by defendants.

241, 242 William Chick, challenged for cause by defendants.

243 C. H. Gentry, challenged for cause by defendants.

244–246 Ed. J. Grady, challenged for cause by defendants.

247–249 A. Carlson, challenged for cause by defendants.

250, 251 Geo. Butters, challenged for cause by defendants.

252, 253 J. C. Oran, examined by defendants; challenge for cause sustained.

254, 255 James Durham, challenged for cause by defendants.

256 A. W. Bonner: Reside at 794 Rawson avenue. In business in floor
and ornamental tiles, for myself. Have read and heard considerable
257 about the Haymarket trouble, but did not form any opinion as to the
258 guilt or innocence of the defendants. Have expressed an opinion concerning the truth of the story which I have read and heard. I am
260 prejudiced against socialists, anarchists and communists.

263 Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

264–271 Charles N. Post, fully examined; challenge for cause sustained.

272, 273 E. S. Downer, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

274, 275 Thomas H. Martin, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

276 M. Tichnor, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

277, 278 James S. Bassett, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

279, 280 Walter M. Beecher, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

281, 282 F. C. Storey, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

283 T. S. Ingham, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

284 F. I. Wilson, examined by defendants; I am a manufacturer of wholesale galvanized iron, copper and zinc material at 81 East Jackson street, Chicago. I have heard and read about the Haymarket trouble, and have formed an opinion in reference thereto. To a certain extent, I be-
285 lieved the newspaper account, and have an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants, which I have expressed and still

entertain. I think that opinion might prejudice me so so as to influence my verdict—my best judgment is that it would influence me in rendering a verdict.

286 Challenge for cause.

286 To Mr. Grinnell: I think I might, if taken as a juror, determine the guilt or innocence of the defendants, upon the proof presented in court, regardless of my opinion or prejudice.

To the Court: I have no personal acquaintance with the defendants.
287 I think, possibly, I have some desire that there shall be evidence produced upon the trial which shall prove some of these men to be guilty. I have no feeling toward them other than what grows out of what I have read about them. It might be that if I were to sit as a juror the effect of the evidence for or against the defendants would be increased or di-
288 minished by what I have heard and read. I desire that the evidence should establish the guilt of some one, but not necessarily these defend-
289 ants, and don't know that I am conscious of a desire that they should be found guilty. I don't think I have any other desire than that the truth may be discovered.

(Challenge for cause was thereupon overruled by the court, to which defendants excepted and challenged peremptorily.)

290 Charles F. Walker, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

291 Frank S. Osborne, one of the accepted jurors, stated: I am an employe in the firm of Marshall Field & Co. I have heard and read about the Haymarket trouble, but have not formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants. In the reports I read their names were
292 mentioned. I saw the action of the coroner's jury, and think I read the verdict, but am not positive; think I must have done so—read the papers
295 every day. I have no opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants.

298, 299 J. M. Bennington, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

300–305 Sebastian Bauer, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

306, 307 C. F. Orr, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

309 H. C. Griffith, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

310, 311 L. J. Mason, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

312–319 Fred. Shank, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

320, 321 A. A. W. Burkhardt, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

322–324 S. S. Bliss, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

325–329 George A. Reardon, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

VOL. C.

330–333 H. Larned, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

334, 335 H. R. Campbell, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

336, 337 George A. Leiter, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

338 Jno. Connoly, clerk at Cranston & Stow's, book publishers, Chicago: Heard and read about the haymarket meeting, and formed an opinion.

339 Have made up my mind as to whether the defendants are in fact guilty of the offense there committed, which opinion is firmly fixed in my mind, and is in reference to the guilt or innocence of some of these defendants. Think I am open to conversion, and that evidence to the contrary of my

340 opinion might change my views, but until such evidence is produced I would stick to my present opinion. I would try hard to be governed by the evidence—I like to be fair-minded and haven't any revengeful opinion.

341 I have expressed my opinion frequently. In weighing the testimony pre-

342 sented in court I might, to some extent, be influenced by the opinion I

343 now have—in determining whether the proof presented is sufficient to establish beyond reasonable doubt the guilt of the defendants. I think I would be influenced in that matter.

(Challenged for cause by defendants.)

To the Court: I think I would be influenced in the case supposed to some extent by my present opinion, and don't think I can fairly and impartially try the case on the evidence alone—no, I think I could try the case upon the evidence alone, "at least I would try hard to." Don't

344 know either of the defendants and have no feeling against them "except such as grows out of what I have heard or read about them."

(Challenge for cause overruled. Exception by defendants, and Connoly challenged peremptorily.)

347–353 William B. Bogg; employe of John V. Farwell & Co., examined; challenge for cause sustained.

354–356 F. A. Rehkopf, carriage manufacturer, in business for himself, residing 745 West Lake street, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

357–360 S. F. English, examined; am a horse-shoer, in business for myself, at 817 West Lake street. Challenge for cause sustained.

361–364 Otis S. Favor, wholesale commission merchant, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

365–366 Charles Haubald, cigar manufacturer, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

367–371 C. Maguire, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

372–381 W. T. Glenn, examined; in the grocery and market business for himself; challenge for cause sustained.

VOL. C.

382, 383 Edward E. Edgerton, locksmith, doing business for himself; challenge for cause sustained.

384–388 J. E. Smith, bookkeeper, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

389–395 E. O. Hubbard, examined; stated that he was a shoe salesman for William Goodyear, whose store was about a block from the Desplaines street station—that he had read and heard about the Haymarket meeting and had formed an opinion that the defendants were guilty, believing what he had read and heard, which opinion he still entertained, but stated that he believed he could try the case upon the evidence without reference to his opinion.

444, 445 Have no doubt whatever that I have expressed my opinion to others. (Challenge for cause; challenge overruled; exception by defendants, and said Hubbard challenged peremptorily).

397–399 Joseph E. Jones, examined; stated that he was in the painting business for himself at 690 West Lake street; challenge for cause sustained.

400–403 John Kurtz, a butcher at 219 Mohawk street, was challenged peremptorily by defendants.

404–406 Charles Heinemann, a harness-maker at 620 Wells street; challenge for cause sustained.

407–411 Nicholas Nelson, shoe salesman, examined by defendants, was upon peremptory challenge excused.

412–416 George H. Parker, manufacturer of picture frames, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

417–421 David McLachlin, grocer, etc., examined; challenge for cause sustained.

422, 423 J. M. Ranney, dry goods merchant, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

424–427 E. C. Daniels, baker and confectioner, examined; challenged for cause.

428, 429 I. D. Kramer, paint, oil and wall paper dealer; challenged for cause.

430, 431 Edward Walker, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

432, 434 E. H. Lowis, merchandise broker; challenged for cause.

434–437 H. J. Whitcombe, grocer, in business for himself, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

438–443 Thomas Sargent, examined by defendants.

446, 447 Henry Schweigerman, coal dealer at 709 West Lake street, examined; challenge for cause sustained.

448–452 Charles Michaelis, examined by defendants.

454 The jurors Osborne, Michaelis, Melchior and Sargent, accepted by defendants and tendered to the state.

VOL. C.

455 E. Melchior, challenged peremptorily by the state.

457–459 and 476 Thomas Sargent, examined by the state, and peremptorily challenged.

460–463 and 469 Charles Michaelis, examined by the state and challenged peremptorily.

464, 468, 470 and 503 L. S. Steadman, examined by the state and challenged peremptorily.

471–475 Frank Mansfield, examined by state and challenged peremptorily.

477–480, 502 and 507 H. L. Anderson, grocer and market man, examined by the state.

481–483 E. E. Brown, hardware merchant, examined by the state; challenge for cause sustained.

484–489 N. W. Tryon, picture frame dealer, and merchant examined by the state; challenge for cause sustained.

490–492 J. Brietspraak, examined by state; challenge for cause sustained.

493–497 G. N. Decker, evangelist, examined by the state, challenged peremptorily.

498–501 M. P. Warner, examined by the state.

504–506 J. Meade, examined by the state.

507 State tender to defense Osborne, Meade, Warner and Anderson.

507–517 H. L. Anderson, cross-examined by defendants. Am a member of the butchers' union—not a butcher by trade. The butchers' union is a benevolent society. Read about the Haymarket affair, and formed an
509 opinion as to the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants. Have very frequently talked the matter over with other people and expressed my opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, which I still
510 retain, and it is based not only upon what I read, but on what I heard. I believe enough of what I read and heard to form an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants. Am sure I could lay aside my
511 opinion, and try the case upon the evidence alone. Am well acquainted
512 with some of the police force, some of whom are friends of mine, who were present at the Haymarket, and they have given me their views of the matter since that meeting, and told me what happened there in connection with the effort to disperse the crowd. They were on duty that
513 night, and some of them were injured by the explosion of the bomb. I have not conversed with those who were present at the time and injured, but with those who were present and not injured. I knew one of the men that were killed by the bomb—knew him well. I

formed an unqualified opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defend-
514 ants, which I regard as deep-seated, a firm conviction that these defend-
ants, or some of them, are guilty. I think I could lay that all to one side,
however, and try the case without bias. As a result of the conversations
that I had with the policemen present at the meeting, I reached an opin-
ion as to the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants.

516 Anderson challenged for cause upon his answers.

518 (Challenge for cause overruled; exception by defendants and chal-
lenged peremptorily.)

519–525 M. P. Warner, cross-examined by defendants and challenged per-
emptorily.

526–528 J. Meade, cross-examined by defendants, and challenged peremptorily.

529, 530 John F. Newell, photographer, examined by defendants, and challenge
for cause sustained.

531, 532 E. Hobbs, florist, challenged for cause by defendants.

533, 534 W. Tobias, notion business, examined by defendants, and challenge for
cause sustained.

535–539 Olof Jackson, coal merchant, examined by defendants, and challenged
peremptorily.

540–543 Joseph Imlay, merchant, examined, challenge for cause sustained.

544, 545 A. W. Lauderbeck, auction business, examined by defendants, chal-
lenged for cause.

546–548 Charles M. Barron, formerly in the West Town tax office, regular
business meat market, examined by defendants and challenged per-
emptorily.

549–554 August Berg, barber, examined by defendants.

555, 556 William F. Bosse, cigar manufacturer, examined by defendants; chal-
lenge for cause sustained.

557, 558 Herman Horn, manufacturer of gold and silver leaf, examined by
defendants; challenge for cause sustained.

558½, 559 Jacob Henrich, hardware merchant, examined; challenge for cause
sustained.

560 E. C. Morey, crockery and glass-ware merchant; heard and read
about the Haymarket difficulty. Have conversed with some members of
the police force; know a number of them.

565 Knew Mathias J. Degan. He had a beat near my store and was very
566 frequently in it. My acquaintance with him led me to inquire particu-
larly into the circumstances of his death, and at the time of such inquiry

VOL. C.

I formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants or some of them, which opinion I now have and have expressed to others, but I think I could render a fair verdict uninfluenced thereby.

576 Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

568–575 and 582 A. D. Nye, dry-goods merchant, examined by defendants; challenge for cause sustained.

577–581 C. B. Wilson, druggist, challenged for cause by defendants.

VOL. D.

1–5 W. H. Wilder, dealer in meats and vegetables: Examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

6–10 John Mayer, druggist: Challenged for cause by defendants.

11–13 Thomas H. Carruthers, boot and shoe dealer: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

14 T. A. Harney, clothing dealer: Have read and heard of the Haymarket meeting, and formed an opinion upon the question of the defendants' guilt or innocence which I still have. I think it is a strong opinion; think it would prevent me from rendering an impartial verdict in this case. Challenged for cause.

15 To Mr. Grinnell: I would not undertake to convict a man or acquit him on a newspaper account, and know that his guilt should be proved in court. Know nothing in this case, except what I got from the newspapers, and my opinion is based on that; think I could determine the guilt or innocence of the defendants upon the proof presented in court, regardless of my opinion.

16 To counsel for defendants: I have now a firm opinion which I would take with me into the jury, and I think that opinion would influence my verdict after the testimony was introduced and the charge given. I believe I would be prejudiced, and that my opinion would prevent me from rendering an unbiased and unprejudiced verdict; that is my present judgment.

(Challenge for cause renewed.)

17 To the Court: Never saw any of the defendants, and whatever opinion I have is based on what I heard and read, which I took for granted

18 to be true; did not know Degan; think I have now an opinion as to whether some of these defendants caused the wound from which Degan died. Know that a man should not be punished unless his guilt is made certain—believe I could listen to the evidence, and fairly and impartially make up my mind as to whether their guilt was established beyond reasonable doubt; don't believe that conclusion would be affected by my pres-

ent opinion; think I could consider the evidence alone, and be governed by that.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception. Also, objection and exception to the line of inquiry adopted by the court.)

Further examined by defendants: I believed enough of what I heard and read to form an opinion; did not express my opinion to others; talked with policemen who were at the Haymarket; knew one of them by sight, who told me what occurred there, and my opinion as to the guilt of these men was largely based on what he said; he was one of the officers engaged in dispersing the crowd; don't think that my opinion would prevent my rendering an impartial verdict; think I could lay it aside; have lived in Chicago three months; came here the first of last April from LaSalle county; am in business for myself; a single man, and my parents have resided here a year; rented my present store about the 15th of March, and occupied it about the first of April; can't tell exactly; came here to stay probably about the first of April; don't remember the name of the policeman I talked with.

(Further challenged on the ground that it did not appear that the juror had been a resident of the county ninety days before being examined.)

To the Court: I reside with my parents who have lived here for a year; came up from La Salle and took my store in March to engage in business, and have since moved up.

(Challenge for cause overruled and exception; challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

John T. McShane, salesman with J. W. Tuohy & Co., dry-goods, examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

J. J. Shively, traveling salesman, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

H. D. Cook, grocer; challenged for cause by defendants.

Thomas K. Elvey, coal dealer, examined by defendants; stated that he had a firm opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants from what he had heard and read, but that he did not believe it would influence his verdict.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

T. E. Keefe, grocery salesman, wholesale and retail. Have heard of the Haymarket affair, and from what I have heard and read have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the murder of Degan, which opinion I still have, and which is a firm opinion. I think

such opinion would not influence my verdict. I knew officer Degan for
45 several months before he was killed; knowing him, what I heard and read caused me to form a very strong opinion upon the question of the guilt or innocence of these defendants, or some of them, which I still have and have expressed to others. I believed what I heard and read, and based my opinion on that belief; I have stated that what I heard
46 and read I believed, and I did in fact believe the accounts as published and have so stated repeatedly, and at the same time told others my opinion.

(Challenged for cause.)

To Mr. Grinnell: I got an opinion from what I read, which I
47 expressed; I did not say to anybody that I believed what I read; I did believe it but I didn't say so; the opinion that I had was as to who was responsible.

48 To the Court: I have never had any discussion as to the truth of the reports, but I expressed my opinion as to the transaction and the parties.

48 To Defendant's Counsel: I didn't understand your questions; I have
49 expressed my opinion, which was based on what I heard and read, which I believed, more what I heard than what I read, and I told others what I had heard; knew officer Degan; I stated to others that I believed what I had heard, but did not state that I believed what I read; I stated to others that I believed what I had heard, and gave them my opinion; there is no mistake about this; I said to others that I believed what I heard.

(Challenge for cause renewed.)

To the Court: I have heard the Haymarket transaction talked of,
51 but I never told anybody that I believed the newspapers had got the story straight, nor that I believed that I had got the story straight from any one who talked with me.

53 To defendant's counsel: My opinion was largely formed from what I heard; in communicating that opinion to others I said that I believed what I had heard; there is no mistake about this; I told them also my opinion which was based on what I heard and read.

(Challenge for cause renewed.)

54 To Mr. Grinnell: I told others in discussing the matter with them
55 what I had heard, and expressed my opinion, but I did not say that I believed every word or any particular word that had been told me.

To the Court: Don't remember who first told me about the transaction—I may have talked with a dozen or two; I have never said anything as to whether I thought they got the story straight.

VOL. D.

56 To defendants' counsel: I heard the story from several parties, but
57 cannot give the names, and discussed the matter with a good many; I
58 formed my opinion from what I believed of what I heard, and repeated
59 to others what had been told me or part of it, but did not tell them that
60 I believed what I had heard; I did believe it, but did not say so; I told others in talking with them I believed what I heard, but did not narrate the story fully; I am sure that I did tell them that I believed what I had heard in my conversation with different ones.

61 (Challenge for cause overruled, and exception by defendants; challenged peremptorily.)

62–65 A. H. Newman, printer, publisher and dealer in merchandise; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

66, 67 Kenneth Chisholm, dry-goods salesman; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

68–72 J. F. Dietrich, manufacturer of shirts; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

73, 74 John Ashbury, druggist; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

75, 76 David Allard, hat and fur business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

77, 78 C. J. Easterly, gents' furnishing goods; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

79 George F. Baker, in the employ of Carter, Hall & Co., tea importers; have heard and read about the Haymarket meeting, and have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the murder of Degan, which I think I have expressed to others, and which I still entertain; it would be a very firm opinion "unless contradicted by very strong
80 evidence"; it would take very strong evidence to overcome my opinion, and I would start off with a verdict in my mind for the reason that my opinion is so strong.

(Challenged for cause.)

To Mr. Grinnell: I have an opinion now which I should be very apt to carry with me.

81 To defendants counsel: My opinion would stay with me until evidence was introduced to carry it away; it would remain with me until overcome by the evidence; but I don't think it would bias my judgment; I
82 think I have expressed this opinion to others; it would remain unchanged until overcome by evidence.

(Challenge for cause overruled; exception by defendants; challenged peremptorily.)

VOL. D.

83 Magnus A. Hess, printer: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

84–89 J. R. Adams, importing commission merchant: Examined by defendants; challenged for cause, the juror stating that he believed his opinion or prejudice would prevent him rendering an impartial verdict.

In the examination of this juror the following occurred: "The COURT: Q. Do you believe that, after you have heard all the evidence that can be presented, or that shall be presented on each side—examination and cross-examination—that your conclusions then as to what is the truth will be at all affected by what people have said or written about it before you heard any testimony? Do you believe that your conclusions as to what that evidence proved or failed to prove will be at all affected by what anybody has ever said or written about that matter before? A. I believe it would.

"The COURT: It is incomprehensible to me."

(To which remark of the court objection and exception was taken. Challenge for cause allowed.)

90, 91 H. A. Butcher, clothing merchant: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

92–94 F. J. Poole, dry-goods merchant: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

95 H. Grass, knit-goods salesman: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

96, 97 Edward Bayless, general house furnishing goods: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

98, 99 H. M. Caswell, manufacturer of mirrors: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

99½–101 G. W. Carpenter, butcher: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

102, 103 Henry Allers, grocer: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

104–8 and 127–8 Frank Pike, boot and shoe dealer: Examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

109, 110 W. G. Phillips, retail furniture dealer: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

111, 112 G. W. Snow, flour and feed dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

113–117 Thomas McCoy, hardware clerk; examined by defendants; challenged premptorily.

VOL. D.

118, 119 J. H. Jones, boot and shoe dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

120–6, 134 148–9, 213 Frank Hoffman, cigar and confectionery store; excused by agreement.

129–30 E. D. Morse, livery-stable keeper; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

131–3 Thomas F. Smith, in the paper and decorating business; examined by defendants; challenged premptorily.

135–6 Joseph Buchanon, hardware and furnace dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

137–9 R. B. Marsh, market keeper; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

140–41 John Kellar, in the crockery business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

142–3 William Hutchins, employed by the St. Nicholas Toy Company; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

144–7 Henry Higgins, furniture salesman; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

150–1 Gustav Haubold, cigar store and factory; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

152–9 John D. Osgood, employed by Carson, Pirie, Scott & Company, drygoods; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

160–1 Edward Riley, keeper of a fruit store; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

162–5 Jacob B. Breese, dealer in investment securities; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

166–174 William Biggs, boot and shoe dealer; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

175–6 A. S. Montgomery, painter and paper-hanger; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

177–9 Charles A. Gaines, shipping-clerk for H. W. Wetherell; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

180–2 A. B. Vandervoort, a lawyer by profession, but not in practice; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

183–4 William E. Taylor, real estate dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

185–190 Robert C. Griswold, hay and seed dealer; examined by defendants; formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants from what he had heard and read, which opinion he still entertained and had

expressed to others. "Don't think that opinion would affect my verdict, chosen as a juror; I could try to form my opinion according to the evidence."

189 "Q. Do you believe that you could lay the opinion that you have aside, and act upon the sworn testimony and the charge of the court?"

(Question refused by the court and exception by defendants.)

190 Challenged peremptorily by defendants.

191 George M. Porter, grocer: Read of the Haymarket meeting every day since it occurred; have formed an opinion on the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or some of them, of the murder of 193 Mr. Degan from what I have heard and read; have expressed that opinion; talked the matter over in the store a great many times; it is as strong as could be from reading the papers; think it would take more evidence if I were sitting as a juror than if I had never read about it; my present opinion would bias my judgment, I think. I would try to go by the evidence, but I think what I have read would have a great deal to do with it—that it would require more evidence or less, according to my present opinion, to establish a given fact, so that my 193 mind is, to begin with, biased; it certainly is biased now, "and it would take a good deal of evidence to change it; would try to go by the evidence."

Challenged for cause.

To Mr. Grinnell: Know the rule of law as to the question of guilt being determined by the evidence and not upon newspaper reports or conversation; I know nothing of this case except what I have read, and would try to be governed by the evidence if taken as a juror, regardless of my present opinion; still, I am pretty strongly prejudiced 194 now, though I would try to give every man the benefit of a doubt; would try to determine the question on the evidence alone—rather think I could do so, regardless of my present opinion.

195 To the Court: As to determining the question on the evidence alone, "I think what I have read and heard before I came into court would have some influence with me;" don't know as it would influence my conclusion; understand that it would be my duty to render a verdict according to the evidence, but I am afraid that what I have heard and read and my present opinion would affect the verdict I would render; still I think I could fairly and impartially try the case, taking the evi- 196 dence as my guide—I certainly would try to. Have no personal acquaintance with the defendants, nor any feeling against them, "except what grows out of what I have heard and read about it."

VOL. D.

198 (Challenge for cause overruled, to which defendants except.)

To defendant's counsel: Don't know any policemen who were at the Haymarket, and have not conversed with any who were there; have a prejudice against socialists, anarchists and communists, though I have never investigated and don't really know what they are; don't know that this prejudice would influence my verdict, but I am prejudiced against any
200 thing of that kind, and have so expressed myself a great many times; I would try to go by the evidence "but I think in this case it would be awful hard work for me to do it." I would try very hard to and believe I could—that I could lay aside my present views and be governed by the
201 testimony. I have frequently expressed my opinion based on my belief in what I read and heard; don't know that I ever expressed my belief of the narrative, but I do "believe what I read in the papers—believe that the parties are guilty." In substance, I did, in discussing this matter, state
202 that I believed what I had read and my opinion was governed by this belief.

(Challenge for cause renewed.)

To the Court: As to whether, in my discussions of this matter, any question was made as to the truth of the narrative, "that is a pretty hard question to answer; I don't know; I have expressed myself as believing
203 it—believing what I read in the papers—believing alike the story and the opinion—believing it just as I read it in the papers." Don't know that any question as to the truth of the narrative was ever raised, or that I ever expressed an opinion as to whether the newspapers got bodily or the substance of the story right; don't know that I ever did express an opinion as to the truth of the story told.

204 To defendant's counsel: I will not swear that I did not state my belief in the truth of what I had read—I don't remember how that was.

(Challenge for cause overruled; exception by defendants; challenged peremptorily.)

205–6 M. A. Crocker, hardware merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

207–8 W. G. Watkins, butcher business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

209–212 Mathew Anderson, plumber; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

214–217 George F. Kimball, plate glass business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. D.

218–224 A. N. Warner, dry goods; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

225–6 William H. Robinson, flour and feed merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

227 Charles Davidson, meat market; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

228–35 James W. Nye, wholesale hardware; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

236–41 Joseph Roder, iron business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

242 F. D. Slegel, wire goods; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

243–9 C. H. Walters, grocer; examined by defendants; challenged peremp-
264 torily by defendants.

250–1 George E. Copper, coal, lumber and wood business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

252–3 William H. Brackett, hotel keeper; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

254–5 H. C. Smith, boot and shoe business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

256–8 O. W. Folsom, clerk; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

259 Andrew Hamilton, hardware business; have heard and read of the Haymarket meeting, and have an opinion against somebody as to the
260 murder of Degan, but don't know whether these parties are guilty; read
261 the account in the News and Tribune, and have casually followed it up; have no acquaintance with the police force; think I could try the case impartially and render an impartial verdict; don't think that my feeling that somebody ought to suffer would influence my verdict unless it was
263 proved that these were the men. Usually attend the Baptist church,
359–61 but am not a member thereof; presume I have said that some one ought to be made an example of—whoever was responsible for the Haymarket trouble; don't remember distinctly using such an expression, and don't know these defendants "except once in a while seeing their names in the papers; if these are the men I should say yes—if it is proven to me that these are the men." I have no doubt of my ability to try this case fairly.

365 To Mr. Grinnell: Think I could try this case upon the proofs pre-

VOL. D.

sented, without reference to any opinion I now have; do not know any
366 of the defendants or either counsel.

265–8 L. D. Tuttle, hardware business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

269–70 George M. Balling, furniture business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

271 Peter Simon, printer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

272–3 Richard E. Lyman, vegetable dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

274–8 Arthur Wallen, dry goods; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

279–80 W. H. White, residence 3623 Prairie avenue, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

281–2 J. E. Rider, chiropodist, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

283–6 L. M. Smith, real estate and renting business, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

287–8 E. R. Williams, watchmaker and jeweler, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

289–90 George Walter, butcher, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

291–2 Theodore A. Gehrmann, grocer, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

293–7 M. C. Bryant, clerk, examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

298–9 Robert Renshaw, painter, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

300–2 Edward D. Murray, hardware merchant, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

303 S. H. Brown, grocer, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

304 E. H. Martin, book-keeper in the insurance business: Have read and heard of the Haymarket meeting, and have formed and expressed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants upon the charge of
305 the murder of Degan; do not think that would influence my verdict;
306 read of the occurrence in the Daily News and the Tribune at the time; formed an opinion concerning the guilt or innocence of the defendants;

307 I believed what I read to be true, and have stated my opinion to others; I suppose that I stated also my belief that what I had read in the papers was true—no, what I mean is that I formed my opinion from what I
308 read and believed to be true, and stated my opinion based on what I read in the papers, and I said that I based it on what I had read; and I still believe to be true what I so read.

(Challenged for cause; challenge overruled, and exception; challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

309 J. Daniels, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

310 W. G. Hullhorst, bookkeeper; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

311 H. M. Smith, hardware merchant; have formed and expressed an opinion upon the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the murder of Mr. Degan, but don't think that would prevent my rendering an impartial verdict; I read the newspapers at the time and had quite a number of conversations in reference to the matter and formed quite a decided opinion, which I still have. I don't know whether I
312 would listen to the testimony impartially—am afraid I would listen to what supported my opinion a little more intently than to what attacked it—"I would be willing to have my opinion strengthened, and would hate very much to have it dissolved." I do not believe I could render a fair and impartial verdict—"I think I would be prejudiced, because my feeling is very bitter." I would render my verdict according to the testimony, if possible, but I suppose my mind is prejudiced and I think my
313 prejudice would influence me in arriving at a verdict; "think it would take less testimony as a juryman to come to the conclusion which I now have than to come to an opposite conclusion; that is my best judgment now."

(Challenged for cause.)

To Mr. Grinnell: I think I could determine the guilt or innocence of the defendants upon the proof alone, regardless of what I have heard or
314 read—they are to be judged by the evidence; understand it is the duty of a juror to listen to the testimony and be governed by that alone, and I think I can do that.

To the Court: Have no personal acquaintance with the defendants. "I have a personal feeling; some of the officers were personal friends of mine;" but I have no feeling towards any of the defendants other than what is based on what I have heard or read; have talked with per-

sons who were at the Haymarket, but not as to these special defendants.

315 (Challenge for cause overruled; exception by defendants. Challenged peremptorily.)

316–18 W. R. Elwell, clerk; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

319–20 Willis Powers, clerk; examined by defendants; challenged for cause allowed.

321–2 Leo Austrian, mirror business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

323–5 Peter R. Wright, furniture business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

326 Samuel Carson, dry-goods business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

327–33 David Graham, dry-goods business; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

334–8 Edward C. Huling, out of business at present; was in gents' furnishing goods business; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

339 Isaac W. Pinkham, coffee business; have heard and read of the Haymarket meeting, and have an opinion on the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants, which I have expressed to others, and still entertain. Don't know that that opinion would influence my verdict, "if
340 the evidence showed that I was in error." Of course I have an opinion now. Read all the Chicago papers; think I could listen to the testimony
341 and render an impartial verdict; "think I could change my opinion if I saw any necessity for it," but it would be necessary to change that opinion, for I have an opinion now, and the evidence would have to show
342 that I was in error. As to acting on the testimony alone, "I presume my present opinion would have to show cause why to change it—my present opinion would naturally prejudice me slightly;" don't think that would prejudice me so that the evidence would not be weighed; my
343 opinion is made up principally from what I read. Should try not to be biased—believe I could weigh the evidence—can't say more than that—can't tell till the time comes. "If the evidence should show that I was in error," I would lay aside my present opinion, but the evidence would have to show that I was in error before I would change my mind—it would take testimony to overcome my present opinion.

(Challenged for cause.)

344 To Mr. Grinnell: Believe I can determine the innocence or guilt of

the defendants upon the proof presented in court alone, regardless of my present opinion, or of what I have heard and read.

(Challenge for cause overruled; exception by defendants.)

(Challenged peremptorily.)

345–7 Henry B. Edwards, carriage business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

348–9 K. J. Decatur, wholesale salesman; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

350–1 F. A. Smith, carriage business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

352 Charles A. Ludwig, wood mantel business; have heard and read of Haymarket meeting, but neither formed nor expressed an opinion; have
353 a prejudice against communists, socialists and anarchists from what I have read, but don't know that that would influence my verdict; am
357 book-keeper for Charles L. Page.

Thereupon defendants tendered to the state Osborne, Berg, Hamilton and Ludwig.

363–4 August Berg; examined by Mr. Grinnell: Have talked about this case to others but never expressed an opinion upon it. Was born twelve miles north of Berlin. Am a naturalized citizen.

367–391 (August Berg challenged peremptorily by the state; objected to as follows: "August Spies, the accused, objects to any further peremptory challenge by the attorney prosecuting on behalf of the people, because the said attorney has already been admitted to and has exercised against this accused twenty peremptory challenges, being the full number of peremptory challenges allowed to this accused under the statute, and in the exercise of such challenges, has excluded from the jury divers jurors who were acceptable to and accepted by this accused, to wit: R. H. Ashton, Sweet, Freeman, Martin, Levy, E. L. Melchior, Charles Michaelis and Thomas Sargent.")

(The same objection was interposed on behalf of each of the defendants.)

(The objection was fully argued and authorities cited, but was overruled and the state's peremptory challenge of August Berg allowed; to which defendants respectively excepted.)

392–3 Charles H. Ludwig to Mr. Grinnell: Know of nothing to prevent me acting impartially; have no sympathy with any class of individuals who

VOL. D.

have for their purpose the overthrow of the law by force; am not a socialist, and have no friends who are.

394–7 Charles H. Curtis, piano business; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

398–400 Morris Cooney, lithographer; challenged for cause by state.

401–2 Henry Magnus, laundry; challenged for cause by state.

403 Foster Watling, commercial traveler. Examined by state. Have read
404 about this case and formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of these defendants, or some of them, of the crime of murder, which was
405 formed from what I have read. If taken as a juror "I think I should be very much prejudiced." I believed a great part of what I read and based my opinion upon it, but have not talked with any one who was
406 present, and only knew of the matter from my reading. As to whether I am prepared to hear the story from the mouths of witnesses and determine the innocence or guilt of the defendants, I don't know. "I have a pretty strong opinion on the subject—it would take very strong evidence to change it." I don't think I would convict a man on a newspaper report, and know the defendants are entitled to a fair trial, the question of their guilt or innocence to be determined by evidence. I think,
407 perhaps, I could determine the question of the guilt or innocence of these defendants from the evidence alone. I presume I could.

Thereupon counsel for the state tendered to defendants, Osborn, Hamilton, Ludwig and Watling.

408 Mr. Watling, examined by defendants' counsel: My opinion, based on what I have heard and read, "would have great weight in the verdict" I would render—would have great weight in weighing the testimony; don't think I could lay my opinion entirely aside.

409 (Challenged for cause by defendants.)

To counsel for state: I think the defendants are responsible for the offense committed at the Haymarket and believe that opinion would influence my verdict.

(Challenge for cause allowed.)

(Thereupon defendants asked the court that in this and every instance, the state's representatives should, in the first instance, be required to fill the panel of four and tender them to defendants, which motion was overruled, and defendants excepted.)

411 M. D. Flavin; engaged in the marble business; interior decorations of marbles etc.; have read and heard about the Haymarket affair, and formed

an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the murder
412 of Degan, which stands pretty strong yet, which I still entertain and which I believe I have expressed to others; one of the officers killed was
413 a relative of mine—Officer Flavin, though the relationship was distant, and for this reason my feeling was perhaps different than from what it
414 otherwise would have been, and occasion a very strong opinion in my mind as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or some of them. I stated in discussing this matter with others that I believed what I had
415 heard and read, not so much what I had read as what I had heard; I believe I expressed the opinion that what I heard was a true narrative.

(Challenged for cause.)

To Mr. Grinnell: I read the accounts of the Haymarket, and from what I heard and read formed an opinion, but don't suppose that I ever told anybody in substance that I believed the story that I had heard and
416 read was a true story; did not express any opinion as to the truth of the details.

To defendants' counsel: What I heard had more to do with my
417 opinion than what I read. And now, I don't think that I said to anybody that I did believe what I heard. Mr. Grinnell is a neighbor of mine; I have known him quite a while, four or five years, and know Mr.
418 Ingham by sight. I have no doubt I could give a fair and impartial verdict.

419 (Challenge for cause overruled; exception by defendants.

Challenged peremptorily.

420–9 M. J. Moth, manufacturer of vacuum pumps; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

430–4 Oscar F. Henning, sail-maker; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

435–40 Cyrus H. Underwood, salesman for American Desk and Stool Co.; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

441–2 Charles J. Reed, stockholder in American Desk and Stool Co. examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

443–45 E. E. Page, retail cigar dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

446–8 Charles Seberry, dry-goods salesman with Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co. Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

449–50 W. J. Ellston, book agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. D.

451–6 Rudolph Deimel, parlor furniture dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

457–8 R. H. Given, Jr., book-keeper for J. S. Ford, Johnson & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

459–60 Horace E. Bent, grocers' clerk; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

461–2 P. A. Bonfeig, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

463–8 Harry H. Johnson, sign-writer; examined by defendants and tendered to the state with Osborne, Ludwig and Hamilton.

469–72 Johnston excused by the state and challenged peremptorily.

(Objection by defendants as before; overruled by the court; peremptory challenge allowed, and defendants except.)

473–6 G. W. Price, confectioner and fancy goods dealer, examined by state. Challenge for cause allowed.

477–8 R. R. Griffith, in the plumbing business; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

479–31 H. H. Tobias, board of trade operator; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

482–7 R. W. Sweet, wholesale dealer in cigars; examined by the state; challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception as before in behalf of each defendannt.)

488–9 Andrew Scherer, druggist, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

490–3 George Beeber, shoe business, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

494–6 Gustav Burkhardt, cornice manufacturer, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

497–9 Ed Heffenon, wholesale hat business, with Edson, Keith & Co., examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

500–3 Edward J. Madden, in charge of telegraph department for Armour & Co., examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

504–5 J. M. McCullough, board of trade speculator, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

506–9 David J. Whittaker, book-keeper, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

510–11 R. Berryman, boot and shoe manufacturer, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. D.

512–15 Hugh Williams, grocer, challenged for cause by the state.

516–18 Smith Crookes, shoemaker, challenged for cause by the state.

519–520 Charles Poorschman, engaged with Clybourne & Smith, retail meat dealers, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

521–4 R. S. T. Barrett, manufacturer of car springs, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

525–7 Thos. W. Shaughnessy, hardware dealer, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

528–31 Fred Heide, livery business, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

531½–33 M. Kaeper, brush manufacturer, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

534–5 August Afton, clerk for E. R. Steck, hardware; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

536–7 William P. O'Cock, grocer and meat market keeper; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

538–40 Otto Redlich, manufacturer for Redlich Manufacturing Company; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

541–2 Thomas C. Peimington, treasurer Chicago City Railway Company; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

543–8 William H. Miller, lumber broker; examined by the state; challenged peremptorily; challenge allowed, and same objection, and exception by defendants, respectively, as before.

549–52 James T. Vickery, grocer; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

553–5 John W. Carter, carriage manufacturer, with C. R. Kimball & Co.; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

556–7 David Fisch, furniture dealer; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

558–60 M. J. Brown, Thos. H. Brown & Son, Novelty Carriage Works; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

561–2 Maxwell M. Jones, corresponding clerk with Libby, McNeil & Libby; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

563–4 William Wendland, of Wendland Bros. & Doose, truck manufacturers; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

565–8 William Meade, shipping clerk for Boyington Folding Bed Company; examined by the state; challenged peremptorily; challenge allowed.

(Same objection and exception in behalf of each defendant as before.)

569–71 Peter Malzen, grocer; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. E.

1–4 Daniel J. Burke, meat market business; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

5–8 George W. Winslow, clerk in stationery, tobacco and cigar store; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

9, 10 John W. Heal, manufacturer of furniture; examined by state,; challenge for cause allowed.

12–14 John W. Kneale, soap manufacturer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

15–18 J. H. Kennedy, carpenter, doing business for himself; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

19, 20 George Baker, clerk in coal office of Baker Brothers; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

21, 22 Isidore Lotenstein, grocer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

23 J. T. Ruth, grocer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

24, 25 C. H. Blackman, commission merchant on board of trade; examined by state; accepted and tendered to defendants.

26–32 Mr. Blackman, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed. (Defendants moved that the state be required to tender four jurors, the panel of four having been broken; motion overruled, and exception.)

33–37 A. A. McKay, board of trade speculator; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

38, 39 T. D. Endesly, deputy probate clerk; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

40–42 D. H. Dickinson, wholesale marble dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

44–47 D. S. Wheeler, member Chicago Board of Trade; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

48 William F. Peirronet, board of trade commission; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

49–53 Daniel B. Gardner, real estate owner and dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

54–56 Daniel Reily, board of trade grain dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

57 V. Serveny, hardware business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

58 Fred Gillman, music teacher; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. E.

59–65 George E. Felton, hosiery business, and former clerk of the Chicago House of Correction; examined by defendants; admitted that he had formed and expressed an opinion in the case; challenged peremptorily by defendants.

66, 67 A. W. Walroth, clerk; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

68 J. W. Barker, contracting car-builder; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

69 Charles H. Dahl; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

70 D. A. Lang, dry-goods business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

71 G. W. Zeiger, in the butchering business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

72, 73 N. C. Gram, a butcher since he was fourteen years old; not naturalized; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

74 Gustav Jaeger; unable to speak English. Excused.

75 J. C. Wendt; in the butchering business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

76 Charles Stilling, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

77, 78 Anton Deiden, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

79–82 Charles Carlson, restaurant keeper; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

83–87 Olaf Dahling, house trimming and cabinet-making business; member of cabinet makers' union; examined by defendants; accepted and tendered to the state.

88 Mr. Dahling excused peremptorily by the state without examination. (Objected to on behalf of each defendant; objection overruled and exception.)

89–91 John Collins, a *laborer*; examined by state; excused peremptorily. (Objection by each defendant; objection overruled, and exception.)

92, 93 Henry Wieland, clothier; examined by state; accepted and tendered to defendants.

94–97 Said Wieland examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed. (Motion by defendants' counsel that state be required to tender four jurors; motion overruled, and exception.)

VOL. E.

98, 99 Jacob Helmke, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

100 F. T. Chiniquy, boot and shoe merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

101, 102 Martin Costigan, coachman for J. C. McMullen, vice-president Chicago and Alton railroad; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

103–4 Henry Hecht, grocer: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

105–13 A. C. Wehrle, assistant teacher National Institute of Pharmacy: Examined by defendants; accepted and tendered to the state.

114–16 Mr. Wehrle examined by the state; challenged peremptorily.

(Objection by defendants respectively, same as before; objection overruled, and exception.)

117–21 Fred. F. Sherman, clerk in west town assessor's office: Examined by state; challenged peremptorily.

(Objection and exception by each of the defendants as before.)

122–24 Matthias Kaiser, grocer: Examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

125–7 Conrad G. Warnecke, employed in the post-office: Examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

123–33 Thomas Dyche, freight inspector south-western freight pool: Examined by state; accepted and tendered to defendants.

134 Mr. Dyche peremptorily challenged by defendants.

135–6 A. C. Slayton, retail grocer: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

134–43 C. W. Zimmerman, traveling dry-goods salesman: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

144–6 Carl John Mortinson, manufacturer of carriages: Examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

147–51 C. B. Kinley, manufacturer of baby carriages: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

152–4 George Fraser: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

155–61 W. H. Stewart, ex-deputy west town assessor: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

162–7 John Klein, saloon and restaurant keeper: Examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

VOL. E.

168, 9 H. M. Moody, retail boots and shoes: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

170–1 Claus Nillson, car builder for Chicago and North-Western Railroad Company: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

172–5 Benedict Messlein, in the real estate business: Examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

176–80 Henry W. Porter, grocer and tea merchant: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

181–8 Andrew Stark, dry-goods merchant: Examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

189–94 Robert Ellis, shipping clerk for Whitman & Barnes Manufacturing Company; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

195–6 James McGinn, boot and shoe dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

197–202 James E. Kells, machinist and engineer; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

203–5 D. O. Wilkie, city building inspector; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

206–7 W. R. Dowb, tobacconist; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

208–9 D. C. Loveland, bookkeeper for M. C. Frederickson & Co., land dealers; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

210–11 M. G. Self, book-binder for J. L. Regan & Co., examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

212 S. L. Self, brother of last panelman and store-keeper of Commercial Hotel; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

213–21 M. D. Rapp, bookkeeper for County clerk and in the Circuit court, but at present out of employment; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

222–3 William J. Barth, clerk for Ellinger & Co., cloak manufacturers; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

224–9 George D. Cornell, employed with Crane Bros. Manufacturing Co., examined; challenge for cause allowed.

230–1 Winfield N. Sattley, examined; challenge for cause allowed.

232–4 William C. Dunwell, stationery; examined; challenge for cause allowed.

235–7 N. Bruun, druggist; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. E.

238–45 John N. Phillips, in the employ of Marshall Field & Co., wholesale hosiery department; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

246–9 J. P. Huggins, traveling agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

250–3 Henry Tillottson, hardware business; examined; challenged by defendants for cause; challenge allowed.

254–6 David Crawford, floorwalker, with Charles Gossage & Co., examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

257–60 H. G. Brown, bookkeeper and general clerk with Mears & Co., lumber dealers; examined; challenged by defendants for cause; challenge allowed.

261–2 Fred Burkhardt, grocer's clerk; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

263–7 Alexander W. Pond, assistant manager in Dunlap & Co.'s grain warehouse, examined; challenged by defendants for cause; challenge allowed.

268 (A new venire being about to be called, defendants challenged the array on the ground that the venire was not properly drawn from the jury box; challenge to array overruled and exception by defendants.)

268–70 John Heide, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

271–2 Henry Hackbaum, in the rent collecting business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

273–82 Edwin A. Potter, wholesale crockery and glassware; examined by defendants; claimed exemption from jury service on the ground that he was captain and assistant quartermaster general of the state militia; claim allowed and Mr. Potter excused.

283–4 Henry L. Turner, real estate dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

285 H. C. Voute, merchant tailor; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

286–91 E. Neville, formerly salesman with Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co., and later, sleeping car conductor for the New York Central Sleeping Car Company; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

292–3 Charles R. Ruggles, buyer for Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

294–5 William F. Stewart, assistant secretary People's Gaslight and Coke Company; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. E.

296–300 F. Par Woodruff, dry goods salesman Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co.; examined; challenge for cause allowed.

301–7 James E. Field, buyer for Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co.; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

308 I. P. Freeman, merchandise brokerage and real estate brokerage; examined by defendants.

309, 310 (A new venire being about to be issued, defendants moved that the special bailiff be instructed to select the panelmen from the jury list. The court refused to give any instructions; to which defendants excepted.)

311–15 Upon further examination of Mr. Freeman, he was challenged for cause by defendants, and the challenge allowed.

316–26 Samuel Baker, corresponding clerk for Spalding & Merrick, tobacco factory; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

327–9 W. T. Dwight, real estate agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

330–1 H. C. Ridgeway, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

332–4 A. L. Butler, Chicago agent for the Crescent Steel Works of Pittsburgh; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

335–7 Thomas Davies, calciminer and house painter; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

338–9 Edward Biggs, agent for Hoey Bros., baking powder, extracts and supplies; excused by the court, not being a citizen of Illinois.

340–1 Madison B. Whitford, jeweler; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

343–4 H. L. Thompson, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

345–8 O. M. Brady, fire insurance agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

349–51 J. B. Birchard, hardware merchant; examined; challenged by defendants for cause; challenge allowed.

352–4 E. S. Runyan, shoe merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

355–6 Frederick Katz, shoe merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

356½ H. C. Wallace, clerk Phœnix Fire Insurance Company; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. E.

357 C. A. Betyke, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

358–60 T. W. Zerberg, real estate agent; examined; challenged by defendants for cause; challenge allowed.

361–2 J. P. Hoffman, cashier Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company's office; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

363–4 James Caldwell, shipping clerk Franklin MacVeagh & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

365 A. F. Johnson, commission merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

366 H. M. Dermody, painter and paper hanger; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

367 Francis Waikman, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

368 E. A. Holroyd, druggist; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

369 J. Husted, dealer in ladies' and gents' furnishing goods, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

370–1 Charles A. Morrell, wholesale shoe merchant, examined; challenged by defendants for cause; challenge allowed.

372 F. G. Beehher, coal dealer, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

373 William Porter, merchant tailor, "614 West Lake street, opposite the police station," examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

374–5 John Kleinman, hardwood lumber salesman, examined; challenged by defendants for cause; challenge allowed.

376–7 L. Samuel, crockery and glassware merchant, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

378 Luke Cassady, retail furniture dealer, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

379–88 and 380a–382a A. W. Beecher, printer, examined by defendants, accepted and tendered to the state; excused peremptorily by the state; exception by defendants.

383a–384a Charles Nicolai, hardware, examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

385a–389aa–390–1 C. O. Pratt, furniture business, examined by state; challenged peremptorily; exception on behalf of each defendant.

392–6 William J. Bowman, plumber and gasfitter, examined by state; challenged peremptorily; subject to the same objection by defendants.

VOL. E.

397–9 Richard A. Brown, cigar and tobacco merchant, examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

400–4 B. L. Ames, hats and caps, examined by state; am prejudiced against socialists, communists and anarchists—it might be a question whether I could determine the matter of the guilt or innocence of the defendants here upon the proof alone, regardless of what I have read and heard; think I might determine their guilt upon the evidence.

Tendered to defendants.

Challenged for cause by defendants on the answers given.

To the Court: Don't think I can fairly and impartially hear the evidence in this case, and from that evidence, with the instructions of the court, determine the guilt or innocence of the defendants.

To Mr. Grinnell: Think I may be prejudiced from what I have read.

405 To Defendants' Counsel: Don't know that I could listen to the testimony and return a verdict on that alone, uninfluenced by my present
406 opinion; think my opinions would influence me, and that I, perhaps, could not act in the case without bias or prejudice.

407 To the Court: Don't believe, everything considered, that I could sit as a juror, listen to the evidence, and from that alone make up my mind as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants; don't know defendants,
408 but have frequently been with the police; don't think I could listen to the evidence presented and make up my mind from that alone as to whether it proves the defendants' guilt beyond reasonable doubt.

The COURT: Q. "Why not? What is to prevent your listening to the evidence and acting only upon that? Why can't you listen to the evidence and make up your mind on that?"

(Exception by defendants to said question.)

A. I can, I suppose, make up my mind, but I might be prejudiced just the same.

Q. Can you make up your mind whether that evidence proves beyond reasonable doubt whether they are guilty, or does not prove it? A. Yes, sir, I could come to a conclusion.

Q. Can't you do that impartially? The question in this case for a juror is, not what he may think will be the effect upon his mind, as to his private impressions, suspicions or notions, but what effect the state of his mind will have on his verdict? Will your verdict be influenced by anything other than the evidence in the case and the instructions of the court?

A. I am afraid it would be for certain reasons.

Q. You do not believe that you could fairly and impartially try the

case and render a verdict on the law and the evidence? A. I don't think I could.

409 (Challenge for cause allowed.)

By Defense: The state has tendered a juror held by the court to be incompetent and we claim that they should now be required to tender us another juror.

(Motion overruled, and exception.)

410 George Alles, plumber; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

411–14 E. Greenewald, hardware merchant; examined by defendants; tendered to the state.

415–18 Mr. Greenewald, examined by the state and excused peremptorily; exception by each defendant.

417–19 Frank Lawson, bar-tender, examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

421–23 Wallace L. Gilson, grocer, examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

424–26 Henry T. Miller, grocer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed

427–30 Henry C. Lantis, dry goods business; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

431–3 Herbert L. Wilton, dry goods; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

434 H. W. Cole, general tradesman; real estate and other property; exam-
435 ined by state; have formed some opinion as to guilt or innocence of the
436 defendants; if taken as a juror in this case, I might be a little prejudiced, but should probably try to overcome that—would want to be sure a man was guilty before I hung him; don't know any of the defendants; if taken
438 as a juror, I should try to overcome any prejudice, but at the same time I might be a little prejudiced.

440 Would try to determine the case upon the proofs alone regardless of what I have read or heard; don't know whether I could do so, but think I can.

441 Tendered by the state.

Examined by defendants: Am not in good health, and the condition of my health is such that I should think it might interfere with a six weeks' or two months' jury service.

442 Have talked with quite a good number of policemen about this case;
443 have conversed with policemen a little who were at the Haymarket meeting, and undertook to narrate what occurred there. Mr. Kramer

VOL. E.

444 was one. "I talked with Mr. Wilson after he got out." My talk with Wilson was recent. I saw him on the street with his hand done up, and asked him how he was getting along, etc. My talk with Kramer was
445 within a day or two after the trouble, "and he told me about the stampede and all those things." From the papers and from all sources I got the impression that these defendants were the instigators or the guilty parties connected with the throwing of the bomb. If taken as a juror, I should try not to be biased, but "I have been a little prejudiced." I
446 rather think I could give defendants a fair trial under the testimony,
448 "but I don't know as I could." I should try not to allow my sympathy for the injured policemen to influence me, and don't really think it would.
450 "I have been a little prejudiced." Have known Capt. Schaack a good many years; knew him in the past quite intimately. I have expressed my opinion as well as formed it, which was based on my belief in the truth of what I read and heard. I did believe what I heard and what I
451 read, at least sufficiently to form an opinion. I had a very decided and firm opinion, which I still entertain and which I expressed to others; can't say whether I ever said to others that I believed what I had read or heard.

Challenged for cause by defendants; challenge overruled, and exception.

Challenged peremptorily.

452–3 Norman Robinson, florist, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

454–5 Fred Eberhardt, salesman, with Charles Eneu Johnson Co., printers' inks; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

456–8 Frank Deiss, dry goods merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

459–65 Frank Cardiff, locksmith; examined by defendants, and accepted.

466–8 Tendered to the state, and examined by Mr. Grinnell.

Excused peremptorily by state; exception by each of defendants.

469–73 H. W. Duncanson, jeweler; examined by state; challenged peremptorily; exception by each of defendants.

474–6 Leonard Gould, wood and willow-ware dealer; examined by state, and tendered to defendants.

477 Mr. Gould examined by defendants:

Am a wholesale dealer; have discussed the Haymarket meeting, and think I formed a pretty decided opinion as to the guilt or innocence of these men. Nothing has since occurred to change that opinion, and I still entertain it.

478 " Q. Do you think that the opinion would have any influence upon your mind, if you should be selected as a juror? A. Oh, I think I could be persuaded. I think I could listen to the evidence, whatever evidence was offered."

Have a strong opinion against socialism; think I could listen to the
479 evidence; I don't believe I could be governed by the evidence alone, irrespective of present prejudices, opinions and conclusions.

Challenged for cause by defendants.

To Mr. Grinnell: I think I could weigh the evidence impartially, but
480 " I really don't know that I could do the case justice; " think my verdict, if I should sit, would be governed by the testimony alone.

481 To Defendants' Counsel: I admit that I have some bias and prejudice in this matter. If I were to sit as a juror, I should calculate to be governed by the testimony, but it is a hard question to say whether I could do so, uninfluenced by my present prejudice and opinion.

482 " The COURT: The question is not whether he believes he can act without reference to his prejudice. The question under the statute is, does he believe that he can fairly and impartially render a verdict in accordance with the law and the evidence? Not what may be the struggle or preliminary efforts to get rid of all bias, but whether he believes that, in coming to a verdict, he can render a verdict fairly and impartially in accordance with the law and the evidence."

483 A. Think I could render a verdict in accordance with the law and the evidence.

By the DEFENDANTS: " Q. Do you believe that you can return a verdict under the evidence and proofs and the charge of the court, and that alone, uninfluenced by any opinion, prejudice or feeling that you now have?

The COURT: " You are asking whether he himself would be influenced; now, the influence may be by his struggling against previous positions. The real question is whether he believes he can render a verdict in accordance with the law and the evidence.

" Q. Do you believe than you can return a verdict under the evidence and the proof and the charge of the court and that alone, uninfluenced
484 by any opinion, prejudice or feeling that you now have?

The COURT: " Whether you mean the verdict uninfluenced or himself uninfluenced is ambiguous; if you mean himself uninfluenced, that is quite a different thing from the verdict uninfluenced. * * * Unless you will say which you mean, the verdict or the juror uninfluenced,

I will hold that the question is not proper, because it is an ambiguous
485 question. I rule that question is improper on the ground of the ambiguity of it."

(Exception by defendants.)

I have expressed my opinion to others; the opinion was based upon
486 a belief of what I had read and heard; I believed the truth had been stated substantially; I did not state to others that I believed what I had read, because I took it for granted.

"Q. I want to ask you whether you believe you can listen to the testimony and other proofs that may be introduced here in court, and the charge of the judge, and render an absolutely impartial verdict in this case, notwithstanding your present opinion, bias or any prejudices that you may have? A. Well, that is the same question over again. * * I answered it as far as I could answer it.

"The COURT: You can tell whether you can answer it by yes or no? A. I don't know whether I can answer it by yes or no.

"Q. You say that you do not know that you can answer that either yes or no? A. No, I don't know that I can."

Challenged for cause.

487 To the Court: In a general way I think I could listen to the law and the evidence, and form my verdict from that.

"The COURT: I would have no doubt that you would earnestly wish to render such a verdict as the evidence proves is a proper verdict to render? A. My disposition is to do that.

"Q. Now, do you believe that you can? After you have sufficiently reflected upon it, so as to examine your own state of mind, then say yes or no? A. It is a difficult question for me to answer.

"Q. Well, make up your mind as to whether you believe that you can fairly and impartially render a verdict in accordance with the law and the evidence. Most men in business possibly have not gone through
488 metaphysical investigations of this sort so as to be prepared to answer offhand without some reflection? A. Judge, I don't believe I can answer that question.

"Q. Can't you answer whether you believe you know? A. I could try; if I had to do it, I should do the best I could.

"Q. The question is whether you believe you can or not. I suppose, Mr. Gould, that you know that the law is, that no man is to be convicted of any offense with which he is charged, unless the evidence proves that he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt? A. That is true.

"Q. The evidence heard in this case in court? A. Yes.

"Q. Do you believe that you can render a verdict in accordance with that law? A. Well, I don't know that I could.

"Q. Do you believe that you can? If you do not know of any reason why you cannot, do you believe you can? A. I couldn't answer that question.

"Q. You can't answer whether you believe that you can or believe that you can't? Can't you say either that you believe that you can or thatyou can't? A. Well, I said it was a pretty hard question for me to answer.

"Q. Have you a belief one way or the other as to whether you can or cannot? A. If I were to sit on the case I should get just as near to
489 it as possible, but when it come to laying aside all bias and prejudice and making it up in that way, it is a pretty fine point—it is a pretty fine point to make.

"Q. Not whether you are going to do it, but what do you believe you can; that is the only thing. You are not required to state what is going to happen next week or the week after, but what do you believe about yourself—whether you can or cannot? A. I am just about where I was when I started.

"Q. Think of it for a little while and see whether you cannot make up your mind as to what you believe about yourself now. It is not that you are to state what you will do, but what you believe you can do—you believe about yourself—what you think you can do? A. Well, I believe I have got just as far as I can in reply to that question.

"Q. I haven't heard you make any reply to that question—whether you believe that you can or that you cannot impartialiy and fairly render a verdict in accordance with the law and the evidence? A. I have replied to it a good while ago.

"The COURT: Q. This question, naked and simple, of itself, is: Do you believe that you can fairly and impartially render a verdict in the case in accordance with the law and the evidence? A. I believe I could."

To Defendants' Counsel: "Do you believe that you can do that uninfluenced by any impression, prejudice or opinion which you now have? A. You bring in that point that I object to, and I don't feel quite competent to answer."

(Challenge for cause on all answers renewed; challenge overruled, and exception. Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

VOL. E.

491–3 Charles V. Marsh, agent for a sugar refinery, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

494–6 A. N. Fuller, wholesale grocer, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

497 P. C. Hanford, wholesale paints and oils: Have formed an opinion from what I read upon the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or some of them, of the crime of murder of the policemen, which I have expressed to others; don't think it would influence my
501 verdict. The opinion which I have formed, expressed and still entertain is quite firmly fixed in my mind.

(Challenged for cause; challenge overruled, and exception. Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

502 S. A. Maxwell, bookseller: Have heard and read of the Haymarket meeting and have formed an opinion touching the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the alleged murder, which opinion I have expressed to others.

"Q. In your opinion now, do you believe that opinion or conclusion would prevent your rendering an impartial verdict in the case if you should be selected as a juror? A. I don't think it would, provided their innocence could be established—provided I could be satisfied that they were not guilty."

503 Think I could act on the evidence uninfluenced by my present opinion. Have a prejudice against socialists, communists and anarchists.

"Q. Now, taking all prejudices in your mind, do you believe that you could determine this case absolutely, entirely and only upon the proofs produced in court and that alone? A. Well, I think my prejudice would have some influence with me."

504 Think I could act upon the proof introduced into court and under the charge, uninfluenced by my present opinion. I have now "a very firm opinion" as to the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants, based upon what I read and heard. I believe what I read and heard.
505 In a general way, in talking over the matter, I have stated my belief in what I read on the subject, but I have not stated that I did believe what I read. I think my present opinion would have weight in the consideration of the testimony and that "it would take less testimony to establish the guilt or innocence of the defendants in accordance with my
506 present opinion than upon the other side." Think my opinion would have a great deal to do with my verdict.

(Challenged for cause.)

VOL. E.

To Mr. Grinnell: I would try to determine the question of the defendants' guilt or innocence from the testimony, to the best of my ability. "I think my opinion would have something to do with the matter."

To the Court: I think I could fairly and impartially render a verdict in accordance with the law and the evidenee.

(Challenged for cause; overruled, and exception.)

508 (Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

509–511 S. A. Tollman, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. F.

1–4 Isaac S. Collins, wholesale grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

5–7 Charles E. Deane, wholesale grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

8–10 J. E. Taylor, of Thompson & Taylor, coffee and spices; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

11 H. D. Bogardus, flour and fruit merchant; examined by defendants: Have heard and read of the Haymarket meeting, and from what I have read and heard, have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the crime now charged, which opinion I have expressed to others, and still entertain; it certainly would influence my verdict if
12 selected as a juror; I could not act independent of the opinion; it would "require very strong proof to overcome my opinion. It would be influenced by it, of course," and I would not render my verdict upon the testimony alone, fairly and impartially.

(Challenged for cause.)

To Mr. Grinnell: I have talked with some policemen about the Haymarket affair, but whether they were there or not, I do not know.
13 I have heard no testimony upon the matter. I would be influenced as a juror by my prejudices and opinions against the defendants; "it would require very strong proof to overcome it." I don't believe I could give them a fair trial upon the proof, for it would require very strong proof to overcome my prejudices; "I hardly think that you could bring proof
14 enough to change my opinion." If accepted on the jury, I would try to do my duty according to the evidence, and might do so; think I could do my duty, "but it would require pretty strong evidence to overcome
15 my prejudice." Would not convict without some evidence. If taken as a juror in this case, I think I could "determine the guilt or innocence of the defendants upon the proof produced alone, * * * but being

prejudiced, it would take very strong evidence to overcome my prejudice."

To the Court: I know the law as to defendants not being convicted except upon evidence on the trial, and I think I might fairly and impar-
16 tially determine whether the evidence proved that they are guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, "but it would require pretty strong proof." I can fairly and impartially render a verdict in this case in accordance with the law and the evidence, I think.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception, but ruling withdrawn for further examination.)

To Defendants' Counsel; "I say it would require pretty strong testi-
17 mony to overcome my opinion at the present time." Still I think I could act independent of my opinion. I would start with an opinion, however, and "I think that the preponderance of proof would have to be against my opinion strong." I think the defendants are responsible for what occurred at the Haymarket meeting. The preponderance of evidence would have to be in favor of the defendants' innocence with me.

(Challenge for cause renewed.)

"The COURT: In the naked question of whether the verdict will be controlled only by the evidence, why, Mr. Bogardus' first answers are all right. Now, as to the effect of his opinions, prejudices and bias, etc., that has nothing to do with it. For example, Mr. Foster, you won't suspect me of either irony or flattery when I say that I believe if you were impaneled as a juror at Richmond to determine whether Jefferson Davis had made war against the United States, you could sit there and find out from the evidence only, and all that you know about it now would not affect the verdict to be given upon the evidence.

"Mr. FOSTER: No, I think I would have been challenged for cause, and if that had not been sustained, peremptorily, perhaps.

"The COURT: The question is, what will the verdict be? The statute says that if a man says that he believes that he can fairly and impartially render a verdict in accordance with the law and evidence, that then the formation of opinions from rumor or newspaper statement is not a ground of challenge; of course, leaving it to the judgment of the tryer, whether that belief of his is well founded or not. But I have expressed my opinion upon that part of the case here, so that it is not necessary to repeat it. Every fairly intelligent and honest man, when he comes to investigate the question originally for himself upon authen-

tic sources of information, will, in fact, make his opinion from the authentic sources instead of the hearsays that he had before."

(Exception to the ruling of the court)

20–6 Upon further examination of this talesman, he finally stated to the court directly, that he would find the defendants guilty unless the evidence was very strong and clear, and that, if evenly balanced, his prejudice would condemn them (page 26); and thereupon the juror was finally discharged from the panel and the challenge for cause allowed.

27–9 Frank W. Oliver, wall paper, paints and oils; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

29–31 F. S. Sherman, wholesale teas, coffees and spices; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

32–4 P. J. Toole, wholesale teas, coffees and spices; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

35 James H. Walker, dry-goods merchant, of James H. Walker & Co.; examined by defendants. Have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the murder of Mr. Degan, which I still entertain and have expressed to others; don't think I would be influ-
36 enced, if taken as a juror, by my present opinion "more than any intelligent man." "I am willing to admit that my opinion would handicap my judgment, possibly." At the outset my judgment would be handi-
37 capped or influenced by my present opinion. Still, I should expect to be governed by the testimony. I don't say that I think I can determine this case upon the testimony alone, uninfluenced or unbiased by my present opinion. "I would be handicapped." I believe, however, that I could render a fair verdict by the present opinion. "Certain impressions would have to be removed, but I assume that the testimony you
38 know would decide whether they should be removed or not."

39 I am prejudiced against socialists, communists and anarchists. Upon the trial of the present case, "if the testimony were equally balanced, I should hold my present opinion," and I suppose that that opinion would justify me in convicting them if the testimony were equally balanced. I believe it would do so.

(Challenged for cause by defendants.)

To Mr. GRINNELL: Think I could pass upon this case upon the testimony presented in court, and that I would be governed by the law, regardless of the opinion which I now have.

To the COURT: Understand that no man is to be tried on private im-
41 pressions, but upon evidence; would try to fairly and impartially render

a verdict in accordance with the law and the evidence in the case, if taken as a juror, and think I could, " but I should feel that I was a little handicapped in my judgment."

" The COURT: Well, that is a sufficient qualification for a juror in the case. Of course, the more a man feels he is handicapped, the more he will be guarded against it.

" Mr. BLACK: We except to that remark of the court. We do not
42 think it is in accordance with observation and judgment and experience. We think it is an improper remark to make in the presence of the jurors, and would like to have the record show that the seats are full and talesmen present at the time the remark is made."

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception by defendants.)

W. T, Chandler, wholesale grocer; examined by defendants: Have
43 formed an opinion upon the question of the guilt or innocence of the accused, which I have expressed to others and still entertain; don't think it
44 would influence my verdict as a juror. I am prejudiced against socialists, communists and anarchists, but think I would not be influenced by
45 my prejudices. Have been in a slight degree affected by strikes; our
47 teamsters struck in May last. I had a slight conversation with one policeman who was present at the Haymarket, and my opinion is based both upon what I have read and what I heard, but more particularly, I should say, upon what I have read. From what this policeman told me, who was present at the meeting, from what I have heard from others, and from what I have read, I have formed a decided opinion as to the guilt or ininnocence of the aecused, or some of them, which I have expressed to others and still entertain.

(Challenged for cause by defendants; challenge overruled, and exception.)

Further examined: I have expressed to others my belief that what I
49 had heard was true, and that what I had read was true. I don't mean that I expressed my conclusions alone, but that I expressed the belief that what I had read and what I had heard was true. I passed upon the correctness of what I read and heard.

(Challenge for cause renewed.)

To the Court: I don't mean that I said anything about whether the story was rightly told; " what I mean is that I remarked that I believed thut the statements were true." I never said anything about the accuracy of the report, as to whether the newspapers had got the thing in the manner in which it occurred. I expressed my opinion, based upon my

VOL. F.

belief in the truth of what I had heard and read, but I did not tell anybody that I believed the narrative was true.

(Said challenge for cause not being allowed, the said W. T. Chandler was, upon peremptory challenge by the defense, excused.)

Jacob Hirsch, wholesale clothing dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

Rush Patterson, in the silk department of Edson, Keith & Co.: Been working for Mr. Keith eleven years; had read and heard of the Haymarket meeting and have formed an opinion touching the guilt or innocence of the accused, or some of them, of the murder of Mr. Degan, which opinion I have expressed to others, and there has been nothing since to change it. It would have considerable weight with me if selected as a juror. "It is pretty deeply rooted, the opinion is, and it would take a large preponderance of evidence to remove it." Think I could listen to the testimony and render a verdict upon that alone, uninfluenced by my present opinion. Am prejudiced against socialists, communists and anarchists. I still think it would take a preponderance of evidence to remove my present opinion. I should naturally take the law from the court and the evidence from the witnesses. I should give the defendants the benefit of a reasonable doubt if the evidence were equally balanced, but to some extent I should be governed by my present opinion. My opinion is based more upon what I have read than what I have heard. "It would require the preponderance of evidence to remove the opinion I now possess." "I feel like every other good citizen does feel, a feeling that these men are guilty; we don't know which. We have formed this opinion by general reports and the newspapers. Now, with that feeling, it would take some pretty positive evidence to make me think these men were not guilty, if I should acquit them; that is what I mean." I could act entirely upon the testimony; "I would do so as near as the main evidence would permit me to do." Probably I should take the testimony alone.

"Q. But you say it would take positive evidence of their innocence before you could consent to return them not guilty?

"A. Yes, sir; I should want some strong evidence.

"Q. Well, if that strong evidence of their innocence was not introduced, then you would want to convict them, of course?

"A. Certainly."

Don't know whether, if the testimony was evenly balanced, my opin-

VOL. F.

ion would turn the scale, but I think it would; I think if the testimouy was evenly balanced, my present opinion would convict them.

64 (Challenged for cause by defendants.)

To Mr. GRINNELL: If I did not believe beyond a reasonable doubt these defendants or some of them were guilty, I would be willing to acquit them upon the proof presented in court. I would give the defendants the benefit of a doubt.

65a If the testimony were equally balanced, I think my present opinion would convict the defendants. I said so, and I still think so.

To the Court: I understand that a defendant must be proved guilty by the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, or he is entitled to be acquit-

65 ted. I should give the benefit of the doubt to the prisoners, "unless they were proved to be guilty by the evidence."

(Challenge for cause overruled; exception by defendants; challenged peremptorily by the defendants.)

66–9 N. C. Tillinghast, wholesale hide and leather dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

70–1 A. L. Simons, wholesale clothing dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

72–6 J. H. Bell, wholesale grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

77–8 C. H. Marshal, wholesale dry goods, C. H. Marshal & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

79, 80 H. Goodman, wholesale clothing dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

81–4 Marshall M. Kirkman, comptroller for the Chicago and North-Western Railroad Company.; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

85–7 W. L. Sherwood, wholesale woolens, Sherwood & Campbell; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

88–90 Edmund A. Cummings, real estate agent; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

91–6 Townsend Smith, real estate agent; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

97–100 Samuel H. Sweet, wholesale hats and caps; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

101–2 Austyn Clement, wholesale clothing; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

103–7 E. W. Prescott, cashier and book-keeper of E. Strahorn & Co.,

Union Stock Yards; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

108–9 Augustone Hall, crockery and glassware, of the firm of Hall, Birsback & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

110–111 John Barnes, retail druggist; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

112 Charles O. F. Sedgwick, not a naturalized citizen; excused without examination.

113–116 B. F. Reitz, saddlery hardware, but at present retired from business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

117, 118 T. P. Murray, hardware business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

119 (New panel presented; defendants challenge the array and object to the swearing of them, on the ground that they are not drawn as provided by law.

Challenge to the array overruled, and objection overruled, and exception.)

120–1 N. C. Nevin, grocer at the Union Stock Yards; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

122–4 E. A. Atwater, hog buyer for Armour & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

125–9 C. M. Hutchins, carpenter and joiner; examined by defendants; accepted and tendered to the state.

130–1 Mr. Hutchins peremptorily challenged by the state, to which defendants respectively except.

132–41 J. H. Brayton, teacher in the public schools; admitted that he had formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, based upon what he had read, and that he was prejudiced against socialists, communists and anarchists, but stated that he believed he could try the case upon the evidence alone without reference to his opinion; was accepted and tendered by the state to the defendants. And upon examination by the defendants, further stated that he believed he could try defendants fairly and impartially upon the evidence alone, without reference to his previous opinion, and was thereupon accepted by the defendants.

Second panel of four then sworn to try the case.

142–4 James Johnson, real estate dealer; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. F.

145–7, 190 G. C. Jackson, real estate, renting and collections; examined by the state.

148–51, 189 D. E. Terriere, cashier of the Englewood bank; examined by the state.

152–4, 191 George N. Chase, in the livery business; examined by the state.

155–6 H. O. Wilson, in the hotel business in Chicago; examined by the state; challenged peremptorily; exception by each of the defendants on the same ground as before.

157–8 William F. Curtin, former clerk in the water department in the town of Lake, Cook county; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

159–62 John Scholtz, merchant tailor; examined by the state; challenged peremptorily; same objection and exception on the part of each of the defendants as to peremptory challenge.

163–5 L. C. Hogan, druggist; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

166–8 George Sherwood, formerly locomotive engineer, but at present looking after his own property; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

169–70 Edward P. Glennin, formerly in the bottled beer business; excused by consent.

171–3 E. D. White, in the baker business; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

174–6 Frederick Malkow, formerly saloon-keeper and restaurauter; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

177–8 George Bowhardt, live stock commission; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

180–2 W. H. Mallory, cattle buyer for Nels. Morris; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

183–4 F. J. Rappal, live stock commission; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

185–8 Frank Deforrestk, live stock dealer, Union Stock Yards; examined by the state.

191 State tendered to defendants Frank DeForrest, D. E. Terrierre, D. C. Jackson and George M. Chase.

192–201 G. C. Jackson, examined by defendants and excused for cause, being over sixty years of age.

202–4 D. E. Terrierre, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

213–16 George N. Chase, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. F.

217–21, 266, 351 Frank Deforest, examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

205–12 C. W. Partridge, dry-goods merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

222–6 E. C. Wilson, of Wilson Bros., wholesale and retail men's furnishing goods; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

227–8 Henry R. Symonds, cashier First National Bank; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

229–33, 268 James K. Demming, insurance agent; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

234–6 Levi Doud, pork packer, of the firm of Doud & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

237–9 H. N. Stevens, assistant cashier Commercial National Bank; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

240–2 J. L. Rowe, jeweler, of Rowe Brothers; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

243–8, 252 C. Aldis, book-keeper, Seamens Lungren Gas Illuminating Co.; examined by defendants.

249–51 A. S. Haskell, manufacturers' agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

254–5 John R. Walsh, president Chicago National Bank; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

256–7 Gardner S. Chapin, of the firm of Chapin & Gore, wholesale whiskies, etc.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

258–68 Charles M. Wellington, general agent for proprietary medicines; examined by defendants.

269–79 Henry F. Hersey, canned goods and foreign fruit commission business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

280–81 John J. McGrath, manufacture and sale of wall paper; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

282–5 John A. King, wholesale druggist; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

286–7 Robert Morrisson, wholesale druggist; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

288–90 J. T. Magner, real estate agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

291–4 Henry J. Christoph, banker; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

VOL. F.

295–7 F. A. Winslow, wholesale leather business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

298–307 W. J. Johnson, wholesale bagging; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

308–9 Charles H. Patton, member of the firm of S. I. Pope & Co., steam heating; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

310–14 Erskine M. Phelps, wholesale boots and shoes; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

315–17 E. L. Canfield, real estate brokerage; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

328–19 E. B. Clark, molding and picture frame business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

320–22 Byron A. Baldwin, real estate agent; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

323–5 A. S. Gage, wholesale and retail merchandise; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

327 J. C. Neely, cashier Merchants' National Bank; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

328 E. D. Kinney, fire insurance business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

329–32 T. B. Elliott, real estate agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

333–5 P. A. Barnes, real estate agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

336–40 G. S. Wheeler, real estate business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

341–3 W. B. Wetherwax, real estate business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

344–5 Charles B. Ross, furniture dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

346–7 W. E. Frost, manufacturer of sash, doors and blinds; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

348–50, 369–70 Arthur Lederer, manager of banking house of C. B. Richardson & Co.; examined by defendants.

352–3 C. H. Leach, real estate owner and dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

354–6 Matthew J. Hackett, clerk in the loan department of the North-Western Mutual Life Insurance Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. F.

357–8 J. W. O'Dell, grain elevator proprietor; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

359–60 Amos Pettibone, retail and jobbing stationery and blank books; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

361 J. A. Bartlet, real estate and loan; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

362 L. Hasbrouck, fire insurance business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

363–4 H. J. Ullman, fire insurance business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

365 C. M. Rogers, fire insurance business; challenge for cause allowed.

366–7 W. W. Baird, real estate business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

371–2 N. A. Mayer, banker, of Leopold Mayer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

373–4 Frank M. Elliott, real estate agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

375–6 Albert Durham, financial broker; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

377–80 Charles Hepper, retail grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

381–2 W. E. Paulsen, insurance business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

383–5 Charles C. Phillips, insurance agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

386–90 Otto Wasmansdorf, banker, of the firm of Wasmansdorf & Heineman; examined by defendants.

(Defendants accepted and tendered to the state Otto Wasmansdorf, Arthur Lederer, C. M. Wellington and H. C. Aldis.)

395, 428–9 H. C. Aldis, examined by the state and challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception on behalf of each defendant as before.)

396–402, 407–8 Arthur Lederer, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

403–6 Charles M. Wellington, examined by the state; challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception on behalf of each defendant as before.)

409–11 Otto Wasmansdorf, examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. F.

412–13 J. B. Stevens, in the butcher business; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

413–17 C. B. Meserve, livery stable proprietor; examined by state.

418–20 F. B. Krugg, hardware merchant; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

421–3 Joseph H. Shields, coal and wood business; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

424–7 Phillip Brask, grocer; examined by state; challenged peremptorily. Same objection and exception by each defendant as before.

430–2 Edward Schumacher, book-keeper for Cabin & Eckman, plumbers; examined by state.

433–7 J. C. Magill, real estate and loans, examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

438–40 H. A. Pierson, banker and broker; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

441–4, 449 James Foster, painter in business for himself; examined by state.

445–8 G. H. Bauer, hardware merchant; examined by state.

449 The state accepted and tendered Edward Schumacher, James Foster, G. H. Bauer and C. B. Meserve.

450–5 Edward Schumacher, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

456–61, 479 C. B. Meserve, examined by defendants, and challenged peremptorily.

464–7n James Foster, examined by defendants, and challenged peremptorily.

468–73 G. H. Bauer, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

474–8 G. B. Milne, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

480–1 E. D. Petrie, book-keeper for Etna Insurance Company; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

482–4 W. R. Scott, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

485-6 George W. Scott, attorney in fact for non-residents, collecting agent, etc.; examined by defendants.

488–92, 520 John W. Becker, real estate agent; examined by defendants.

493–5 W. H. Richards, livery and boarding stable; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

496–502 C. T. Paine, retail furniture dealer; examined by defendants.

503-4 B. J. Ridgeway, coal dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. F.

505 Charles Anderes, fire insurance agent, etc.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

506 (New panel of talesmen presented; same challenge to the array; overruled, and exception.)

507–9 George B. Coombs, real estate; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

510–11 August Hussy, cashier and book-keeper for Sutter Bros.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

512–13 John H. Brown, wholesale and retail rubber goods business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

514–15 D. C. Peck, salesman for Electrical Supply Company; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

516–17 E. E. Ellsworth, wholesale and retail barbed wire manufacturer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

518–19 P. P. Gibbs, examined by defendants.

521 (Defendants accepted and tendered to the state George W. Scott, John W. Becker, C. T. Paine and P. P. Gibbs.)

521–4, 556 John W. Becker, examined by state and challenged peremptorily. (Same objection, and exception on behalf of each of the defendants.)

525 George W. Scott, examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

526–9 C. T. Paine, examined by the state. (This juror was subsequently challenged peremptorily by the state, and the same objection and exception in behalf of each defendant as in the other cases. See Vol. G, page 17.)

530–2, 565–9 P. P. Gibbs, examined by the state and excused for cause.

533–5 D. H. Patterson, metal manufacturer and agent of the Scoville Manufacturing Company; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

536–7 David Walters, dry-goods salesman; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

533–40 John Reynolds, merchant tailor's salesman; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

541–3 J. P. Deidel, dry-goods and notion merchant; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

544–5 Fred Cook, salesman with James Wilde, Jr., & Co., clothier; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

546–7 David Vanderwolff, baker and confectioner; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. F.

548–50 James Armstrong, dry-goods merchant; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

551–5 Charles J. True, examined by state.

557–8 Seifert Bus, grocer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

559–61 A. Witt, hardware merchant; examined by state; challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception in behalf of each defendant as before.)

562–4 John M. Dickinson, hardware salesman; examined by state; challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception by each of the defendants.)

570–3 H. C. Storey, furniture and household goods; examined by the state.

574, 578–9 Charles J. True, examined by defendants.

575–7 W. P. Johnson, grocer; examined by the state; challenge for cause allowed.

586–4 H. C. Storey, examined by defendants.

584 Mr. Storey challenged peremptorily by the state.

(Same objection and exception on behalf of each of the defendants.)

VOL. G.

1–5, 3–6 Otto G. Hettinger, druggist; examined by state.

6–9 Christian B. Strange, clerk in First National Bank; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

10–14 F. M. Williams, druggist; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

15, 16 and 35 Hamilton B. Bogue, real estate agent; examined by state.

18–21 Stephen A. Farrar, mechanical engineer, Lincoln Park; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

22–40 W. W. Sherman, division superintendent Union Stock Yard Company; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

25–27 J. P. Kennedy, retail grocer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

28, 29 William Zeitz, grocer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

30, 31 A. L. Russell, druggist; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

32–4 H. R. Lee, wholesale pictures and moldings; examined by state.

37 The state accepted and tendered to defendants Charles F. True, Otto G. Hottinger, Hamilton B. Bogne and H. R. Lee.

37–49, 176–7 Mr. Hottinger, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

50–3 Mr. Bogue, examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

54–60, 80–1 Mr. Lee, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

61 Mr. True, examined by defendants: My opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants is quite firm; it is just as strong now as it was before; as far as I know, I have a pretty decided prejudice against socialists, anarchists and communists. I don't know how it would be about my being influenced by the prejudice or bias that I have by reason of my opinion; the best that I could do would be to try to overcome it; I could only guess at it. I cannot say absolutely that I can act upon the proofs alone, and not be influenced by my prejudice and opin-

62 ion; cannot say whether I would be influenced or would not be influenced; I would try not to be, but cannot say; I cannot say I would not be. (Challenged for cause; challenge overruled, and exception. Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

63–4 L. D. Kent, buyer at the stock yards for C. H. North & Co., of Boston; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

65 William F. Bodley, commission merchant, stock yards; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

74–9 T. M. Hobbs, clerk for Armour & Co.; examined by defendants; excused on account of physical debility.

82–4 C. N. Perry, buyer for packing-house of Geo. D. Baldwin & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

85–93 F. H. Horine, live stock commission business; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

94–6 Arthur K. Brown, retail boot and shoe dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

97–8 Thompson Tipton, live stock commission business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

99–102 J. W. Perry, assistant salesman for Rosenbaum Brothers, stock yards; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

103–8 W. J. Quinn, employed by Armour & Co., town of Lake; examined by defendants.

109–112 B. Conlick, live stock commission business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

113–15 A. D. Osborne, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

116–19 T. B. Seavey, retail hardware; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. G.

120–2 H. Webster, mechanical engineer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

123, 124 W. T. O'Herne, hardware merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

125–6 D. E. Hennessey, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

117 Arthur Hugunin, clerk in the railroad business; am not actively with any company at present; last with the North-Western railroad. Have heard and read about the Haymarket meeting; I formed a pretty strong opinion about the matter at the time; I have a rather decided opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants; it would not influence my verdict; I would give them as fair a trial as I know how—I know I
129 could do that. I am not particularly in love with anarchism. Would try to give the defendants as fair a trial as I know how. If I have any
130 prejudice "there might be evidence enough to overthrow my prejudice." If the evidence was evenly balanced, my prejudice might determine the case; I suppose I would accept more kindly the testimony in favor of my present opinion than what was opposed to it; the evidence being evenly balanced, I would decide in accordance with my present views.

(Challenged for cause by defendants.)

To Mr. Grinnell: I know the defendants are entitled to a fair trial, and if, after hearing the proof, I could not tell where the weight of evidence
131 was, that would raise a reasonable doubt and I would give the defendants the benefit. Think I could try the case and render a verdict on the evidence, without reference to my present opinion.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception by defendants.)

To the Court: I recognize the rule that no man should be convicted unless the evidence proves his guilt, and I believe I can fairly and impartially determine whether or not the evidence to be presented in this case does or does not prove these defendants guilty of the crime charged, and unless the evidence establishes their guilt, I would acquit.

133–5 Further examined by defendants:

136 Am acquainted with members of the Chicago police force who were at the Haymarket meeting, and have talked with them about the affair.

137 I refer to Officer Haas—detective Louis Haas. I have known him probably three or four years. He did not mention the names of any of the defendants.

139 (Peremptorily challenged by defendants.)

VOL. G.

140–4 Joseph O'Brien, grocery and market business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

145–6 J. G. Cook, grocery and meat-market; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

147–50 H. W. Durant, grocery business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

151–2 John T. Martin, live stock business at stock yards; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

153–7 M. J. Berry, deliverer for the Union Stock Yards Transit Company; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

158–62 F. D. Buckley, wall paper, paint and oil business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

163–4 J. McGillicuddy, clerk for Armour & Co. at stock yards; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

165 Leroy Hannah, live stock commission merchant; examined by defendants: Have been in business for myself eight years, most of the time
166 live stock. Have heard and read of the Haymarket meeting, but have formed no opinion touching the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or
167 any of them. I have a prejudice against socialists, communists and anarchists. I think were I a juror in this case, my verdict might be prejudiced by my present bias and opinion, and I believe that I cannot act upon the proof presented here in court, alone, uninfluenced thereby.

(Challenged for cause by defendants.)

To the State: I have formed an opinion that a crime was perpetrated, but not as to the parties responsible. If taken as a juror, I should try, at
168 least, to determine the question of the guilt or innocence of these defendants, without reference to what I have heard or read, or my own opinion, and I believe I could do so, probably.

To the Court: Have never seen any of the defendants; have no personal acquaintance with them, and the only opinion that I have about this cause is f rom what I have read and heard. I talked with a policeman, who was present at the Haymarket, but the names of the defendants
169 were not mentioned, and my conversation had no influence on my opinion as to any of these defendants; think I could listen to the evidence in this case, and decide upon that alone; think I could fairly and impartially render a verdict upon the evidence and in accordance with the law, if I should be selected as a juror.

(Challenge overruled.)

To Defendants' Counsel: I talked with a policeman who was present

VOL. G.

at the Haymarket meeting, and, in a general way, he told me about what happened there, the marching up of the police, and the throwing of the bomb through the crowd; did not mention any of the defendants, or what particular persons made speeches; but I have heard the names of Spies, Parsons and Fielden, and whatever opinion I have upon the matter has reference to the parties who bear those names; and the prejudice which I have is against these parties bearing those names and the principles they advocate; it applies to Mr. Spies, Mr. Parsons and Mr. Fielden.

171 It is so strong that it would probably influence me in considering the testimony. I am prejudiced against the principles that they advocate and against them. The way I feel is, that my prejudice might influence my verdict; don't know that it would. "I don't know but we deceive ourselves sometimes, when we say we can do so and so." My prejudice might bias my verdict.

172–5 (Challenge for cause renewed; argument upon said challenge; challenge overruled; exception by defendants, and said Hannah

193 challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

178–9 F. H. Hebard, expressman, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

180–1 L. G. Lambert, buyer for Edson Keith & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

182–3 Henry McKenzie, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

184–5 Andrew Murray, live-stock dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

186–92 Henry Nehring, clerk for Edson Keith & Co.; examined by defendants.

194–6 T. E. Paxton, book-keeper in wholesale shoe house; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

197–201 B. T. Green, clerk in furniture store; examined by defendants.

202 (Defendants accepted and tendered to the state Henry Nehring, B. T. Green, W. J. Quinn and T. M. Hobbs.)

203 W. J. Quinn, challenged for cause by the state; challenge allowed.

204–212 B. T. Green, examined by state; challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception in behalf of each defendant.)

213 Henry Nehring, examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

214–18 T. M. Hobbs, examined by state and excused upon his statement that he did not believe that he was physically able to sit.

VOL. G.

219–21 C. F. Rice, dealer in picture frames, etc.; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

223–5 Charles Higgins, book publisher; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

226–7 George Louderback, employed by H. Blackall, tea and coffee dealer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

228–30 H. Stilson, furniture dealer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

231–2 M. M. Grable, salesman for Davis, Morse & Co.; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

233–4 Henry J. Kirk, salesman for Edson Keith & Co.; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

235–6 J. M. Dimery, gas-fixtures salesman for Wilmarth & Co.; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

237–8 H. C. Colby, furniture dealer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

239–42 J. D. Burris, live stock commission; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

243–6 Patrick A. Valentine, with Armour & Co., as confidential clerk; examined by state.

247–50 A. E. Schraudenbach, general merchandise; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

251–2 F. T. Bishop, clerk with Montgomery Ward & Co.; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

253–66, 311 Alanson H. Reed, piano manufacturer and dealer; examined by state.

267–9 W. G. Woodruff, shipping clerk for Healey & Millet, stained glass manufacturers; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

270–2 W. A. Campbell, wall paper business; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

273–4 Joseph Spiegel, furniture manufacturer and dealer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

275–8 Benjamin Coffman, live stock business at stock yards; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

279–82 F. A. Upham, salesman, in furnishing goods business; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

283–8 John Gauler, butcher, not in business at present; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

289–91 D. W. Burchard, wholesale dealer in novelties; examined by state.

VOL. G.

292–4 George W. Singles, salesman for Edson Keith & Co.; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

295–6 Albert A. Reiley, mantels and grates; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

297–8 J. B. Steager, dealer in pianos; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

299 George W. Hill, hardware merchant; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

300–3 J. E. Lewis, sewing machine supplies; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

304–5 Lewis Peterson, grocery clerk; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

306–8 William Hayden, furniture dealer; examined by state.

312 State accepted and tendered Patrick A. Valentine, Alanson H. Reed, D. W. Burehard and William Hayden.

312–18 Patrick A. Valentyne, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

318 (Motion by defendants renewed, that state be required to fill the panel of four men; overruled, and exception.)

319–21 William Hayden, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

329–35 D. W. Burchard, examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

322–3 C. W. Dingman, clerk with Armour & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

324–8, 342 John Fitzgerald, clerk for Armour & Co.; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

336–7 W. Bradley, druggist; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

338–41 James C. Connor, contractor and builder; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

343–7 C. R. Kelley, book-keeper with Armour & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

348–50 S. D. Lamphier, grocer; challenge for cause allowed.

351–4 Charles F. Hellmuth, florist; examined by defendants.

355 J. B. Greiner, examined by defendants: Employe in the general freight office of the Chicago and North-Western Railway Company, in charge of the pool maps; examined by defendants. Have heard and read of the Haymarket meeting, and have formed an opinion based upon

356 these reports as to the crime committed at the Haymarket. "It is evident that the defendants are connected with it, from their being here." At least, I would expect that it connected them, or they would not be here; so that the opinion which I now have is an opinion touching the guilt or innocence of the defendants. I certainly think that opinion would affect my verdict to some extent; "I do not see how it could be
357 otherwise." I suppose if I were on the jury, it would be my duty to disregard everything except the evidence, and I think I could act upon
359 the testimony alone, and render an impartial verdict.

359–62 Mr. Greiner examined by the state by consent.

363–4 Andrew Simpson, keeper of a meat market; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

365–8 J. R. Snyder, jeweler; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

369–70 N. P. Williams, druggist; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

371–3 Lou Lenhardt, coal, wood, flour, feed, lime and cement merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

374–9 E. H. McGuire, clerk, Union National Bank; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

380–1 M. H. Walker, caterer and restaurant keeper; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

382–93 Alexander Drummond, retail hardware dealer; examined; challenge for cause by defendants allowed.

394–5 Moses D. Witkowsky. bank clerk, Union National Bank; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

386–401 W. C. Garwood, druggist; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

402–3 W. G. Hedden, grocer's clerk; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

404–10 John H. Purdy, map canvasser; examined by defendants.

410 (Defendants accepted Alanson H. Reed, and tendered with him to the state Charles F. Hellmuth, John B. Greiner and John H. Purdy.)

411 Charles F. Hellmuth, challenged for cause by state; challenge allowed.

413–16 C. J. Gilbert, real estate dealer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

VOL. G.

417–21 Robert J. Hobbs, painter; examined by state.

(Said Hobbs was challenged peremptorily by the state, to which defendants excepted upon the same ground as in other cases. See Vol. H, page 1.)

422–6 John H. Purdy, examined by the state; challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception on behalf of each of the defendants as before.)

427–30 D. J. Moss, grocer; examined by state and challenged upon his answers for cause by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

431–2 George Taylor, grocer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

433–6 Nicola P. Mersch, grocer; examined by state; challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception on behalf of each of the defendants as before.)

437 George H. Quinlan, hotel clerk; examined by the state. Was formerly a bank clerk in First National Bank; have read about the Haymarket
438 affair and have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, which I still entertain; think I could determine the question of their guilt or innocence regardless of my opinion and of what I have
439 read. Don't know any of the defendants nor their counsel. Have no sympathy with any individual or class of individuals who have for their purpose the overthrow of law by force. I am a little afraid as to my ability to fairly and impartially determine from the proof alone whether the defendants are or are not guilty, for "I have a pretty strong opinion about the thing." Honestly, I do not believe I could do it; I am afraid
440 I should be biased from the opinion which I have already formed. I know they are entitled to a fair trial, but I do not believe I could be entirely impartial. I know they are entitled to have the question of their guilt or innocence determined upon the proofs, and I know nothing as to the facts myself; I have an opinion based on what I have read; have not talked with anybody who professed to know about the matter or who saw
441 the transaction. I do not see why I should not determine, if chosen as a juror, whether the defendants are guilty from the proof introduced and that alone, though, of course, I have talked about this thing and have a very strong opinion.

To Defendants' Counsel: Do not believe I could return a verdict in this case on the evidence uninfluenced by my present opinion.

(Challenged for cause by defendants.)

VOL. G.

To the State: I have stated that I believed I could determine the guilt or innocence of the defendants upon the proof presented here in court, and I still believe so, but my opinion would be biased. "I am
442 positive that that opinion which I have formed would override my judgment."

VOL. H.

2, 3 Eugene McKay, retail shoe dealer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

4, 5 W. T. Lord, dry goods merchant; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

6–8 W. G. Hoag, insurance and banking; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

9, 10 Daniel S. Smith, painter; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

11 Samuel Kaufman, dry-goods merchant; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

12–16 A. Montgomery, grocer; examined by state; challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception by each defendant as before.)

17–20 John Culver, real estate and insurance; examined by state; challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception on behalf of each defendant as before.)

21–3 John Anderson, furniture dealer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

24–5 Robert Finley, grocer; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

26–9 L. Turner, livery-stable keeper, examined by state; challenged peremptorily.

(Same objection and exception by each defendant as before.)

30 George W. Adams, examined by state; am a painter by trade, but
31 am at present salesman for George W. Pitkin, wholesale mixed paints;
32 do not belong to any labor organization and never did; am unmarried; saw in the papers the account of the Haymarket occurrence and heard of it as well. Formed an opinion as to the commission of a crime, but not as to the guilt of the defendants, and I have no opinion upon that point. Believe I could determine their guilt or inno-
34 cence upon the proof presented in court, regardless of anything else. Know of no reason why I cannot fairly and impartially try this case

upon the proofs presented in court and determine the question of the defendants' guilt upon that alone.

(The state thereupon accepted and tendered to the defense, with Mr. Reed, John B. Greiner, George W. Adams and George H. Quinlan.)

George H. Quinlan, examined by defendants: Do not believe that I could try this case and render a verdict upon the proofs presented in court alone; my opinions and prejudices are so strong that I do not think I could render a fair and impartial verdict if selected as a juror.

(Challenge for cause allowed.)

Charles G. Klein, flour, feed and groceries; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

George H. Adams, examined by defendants: Am twenty-seven years of age: my territory as traveling salesman for Pitkin was in Michigan. Read of the Haymarket occurrence both in the Chicago papers and in the Michigan papers, and, after my return, about the middle of May, frequently conversed with my friends as to what was supposed to have occurred there. I formed an opinion as to the offense there committed, and I thought some of these defendants were interested in it, and still think so; nothing has occurred to change that opinion. I remember the names of some of the parties now on trial being mentioned in reports read by me, and that caused me to form an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants; do not think that opinion is strong. Have carried on the business as a painter for myself, employing others. This was when I was in Kansas City; have no feeling against the organization of working people, and have no prejudice, so far as I know, against socialists, communists or anarchists. Notwithstanding the opinion which I now have touching the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants, my mind is in such a condition that I can try this case upon the testimony only which may be introduced in court, and I suppose it to be the duty of the jury to decide and return a verdict formed entirely upon legal evidence in court. Never sat on a criminal jury before. I understand also that a conviction must be based solely upon the evidence, without reference to outside report, and that in order to justify a conviction, the guilt of the defendant must be established beyond all reasonable doubt. I believe I can render a verdict in this case unbiased by any opinion I now have. My father is a contractor and I have worked at times for him.

47, 48 R. W. Hamill, grain commission business; examined by defendants; Have heard and read of the Haymarket meeting and its results, and have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or some of them, but not very decided, nor such as to prevent my rendering an impartial verdict, I think.

49 (Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

50 A. W. Dunlap, employed in the general freight house of the North-Western railroad; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

51–2 Brainard Parker, livery and real estate business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

53 James M. Stimpson, cashier Dalziel National Printing Company; examined by defendants: Have formed an opinion from what I have heard and read of the Haymarket affair as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the murder of Degan or some of them; it is a decided opinion, which I still entertain, and have expressed to others.

(Challenged for cause; challenge overruled and exception. Challenged peremptorily.)

54–5 Frank Cassidy, traveling auditor for the Northwest Traffic Association; examined by defendants.

(Adams accepted by defendants and with Cassidy, Greiner and Reed tendered to the state.)

56 Cassidy examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

57–8 R. F. Harriett, traveling agent for the Lackawanna Fast Freight Line; examined by state; challenge for cause allowed.

59–62 B. H. Patterson, examined by state and tendered to defendants, with Adams, Greiner and Reed.

63 (Excused peremptorily by defendants.)

64–5 J. G. Thorn, west bound agent for the Lackawanna line; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

66–7 Oscar Dunklee, livery stable business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

68 A. R. Porter, dry goods merchant; examined by defendants: Have read and heard of the Haymarket meeting and of the killing of Mr. Degan, and have formed an opinion upon the matter, which I still entertain and have expressed to others. It is an opinion touching the guilt or innocence of the defendants.

(Challenged for cause.)

Examined by state. The opinion is based on what I have read and

49 heard. It is an opinion as to the crime committed and not as to the guilt of defendants.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception. Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

70–1 John D. Zoller, painter, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

72–3 William Moore, salesman with Edson Keith & Co; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

74–5 Alexander Stevens, carpenter; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

76–7 W. L. Robbinson, coal dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

78–9 Wirt J. Allen, agent for the Nickel Plate Fast Freight Line; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

80–1 F. W. Irwin, railroad business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

82–3 Frank Ray, clerk First National Bank; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

84 James A. Rowe, in the employ of the Union National Bank; examined by defendants: Have heard of the Haymarket meeting and the killing of Mr. Degan. I have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of that offense, based on what I have read in the papers, which opinion I have expressed to others and which I still entertain.

(Challenged for cause.)

85 Examined by State: I can't say that I have an opinion that any one of these eight men was guilty of the offense, not knowing of my own knowledge.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception by defendants.)

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

86–7 J. R. McAdam, residing in Hyde Park; examined; challenged by defendants for cause; challenge allowed.

88n Daniel F. Wynn, clerk; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

89 F. L. Dillion, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

90 Charles Roberts, grocer; examined by defendants: Have heard and read of the Haymarket meeting and have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the killing of Mr. Degan, which opinion I still entertain and have communicated to others.

(Challenged for cause.)

Examined by State: The opinion is based generally upon newspaper reports read by me, but also upon conversations at different times, but with no one who was present at the Haymarket meeting that I know
91 of. I have decidedly an opinion as to whether or not these defendants or any of them were guilty or not of that crime. I think I could fairly and impartially try this case and render a verdict upon the evidence. Have told others that I believed what I read in the paper. Have communicated my opinion to different parties at different times.

"Q. The question is not whether you ever told anybody your opinion, but whether you have told anybody that you believed the facts which you read in the newspapers to be true—that is, after you read the newspaper and then said to some one man, 'I believe that statement to be true?' A. I think I have made that statement."

"The COURT: There is a distinction between expressing an opinion about the fact of a crime having been committed or about the guilt or innocence of any of the defendants, and expressing an opinion as to whether the story as told in the paper was rightly told by the paper. Now, have you ever expressed any opinion about the newspaper, whether the newspaper had a right version of the story or not? A. I read the report in the different newspapers."

"Q. Have you ever said anything about whether the version in the newspaper, or any of them, was a correct version of the transaction or not? A. I do not know that I have."

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception.)

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

94–5 George Key, engaged in the plumbing business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

96 H. Meyers, book-keeper with J. M. W. Jones company; examined by defendants: Have heard of the killing of Mr. Degan and read about it, and have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants or some of them of that offense. Have no opinion now.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

97 Thomas Carr, examined by defendants: Have read the newspaper accounts of the Haymarket affair, and in those accounts saw the names of Fielden, Spies and Parsons. If the defendants, Fielden, Spies and Parsons, are the same persons named in the report, I have an opinion as to their guilt or innocence, which I have expressed to others and still entertain.

(Challenged for cause.)

To the State: My opinion was based upon the account simply. Think I could try the case fairly and impartially upon the evidence if taken as a juror. Have never expressed an opinion as to the truth of the statement in the newpaper.

98 To the Court: Don't know the defendants, and whatever feeling I have in reference to them grows out of the report which I have heard and read. Have not talked with anybody present at the Haymarket.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception by defendants; challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

99–101 William B. Webb, reside in Hyde Park; examined.

(Challenge for cause allowed.)

102–3 E. W. Beedle, engaged with the South-Western Railway Association; examined by defendants: Have a prejudice against the organization of laboring men and the establishment of trades unions—a decided prejudice, and also against those engaged in organizing these unions. "I think they are a hurt to the country."

(Challenged for cause; challenge overruled, and exception by defendants; challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

104 F. C. Nicholas, in the railroad business; examined by defendants: Have a decided and firm prejudice against socialists, communists and anarchists.

(Challenged for cause; challenge overruled, and exception; challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

105–6 John H. Fitch, hardware dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

107–8 J. R. Bour, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

109 Frank L. Koontz, railroad clerk; examined by defendants; have heard of the Haymarket meeting; have formed and expressed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, which I still entertain and which I have expressed to others.

(Challenged for cause.)

Examination by the State: The opinion is based partially upon the newspaper reports and partly on conversations, but not with any who

110 were present at the Haymarket. Believe that I can fairly and impartially render a verdict upon the law and the evidence. Don't know that I ever made the statement that I believed the statement of facts which I had read in the newspapers to be true.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception; challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

VOL. H.

111 Joseph P. Ravanaugh, construction agent for the Chicago and North-Western road; examined by defendants; have heard of the Haymarket meeting and the killing of Officer Degan. From all that I have read and heard, I have formed an opinion upon the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or some of them, which I expressed to others.

112 (Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

113 Harold F. Walcott, in the storage business; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

114 A. Nelson, clerk in a stationery house; examined by defendants: Have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the murder of Mr. Degan, which I still entertain and have expressed to others. It is a good, firm conclusion that I have come to.

(Challenged for cause.)

Examined by the State: My opinion is based solely upon what I have read in the newspapers. I have an opinion as to whether one or more
115 of the defendants in this case is guilty of the offense charged, but that opinion is based on newspaper report. Think I could fairly and impartially try this case upon the law and the evidence. Never told anybody that I believed what I had read.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception; challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

116–17 G. Q. Dow, dry-goods merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

118–19 E. W. Smith, undertaker; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

120–1 Werner Pappe, railroad clerk in the Michigan Central office; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

122 C. P. Moynahan, mantels and grates; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

123–4 M. J. Wheeler, railroad engineer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

125–6 G. S. Calkins, real estate agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

127 E. W. Hale, manufacturer of safes; examined by defendants: Am decidedly prejudiced against the organization of laboring men and the organizations of trades unions, etc. Don't believe laboring men have any right to meet as an organized society, to discuss what they believe for

their general interests, and am prejudiced against them if they do that, even if they keep within the law.

(Challenged for cause; challenge overruled, and exception by defendants; challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

128 J. W. Ellsworth, miner and shipper of coal; examined by defendants: Am affected by labor strikes nearly all the time, and have a prejudice against coal miners. Am decidedly opposed to unions; have always suffered from them and feel a prejudice against all such organizations.

(Challenged for cause.)

129 To the Court: The organization of laboring men without any breaches of peace, have you any objection to? A. Well, as I have stated, I have always suffered from their organization. I could not say that I would have any prejudice against a supposed organization which did not contemplate nor permit any breach of the peace.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception.)

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

130–1 James W. Wolls, dealer in and manufacturer of furnaces, ranges and stoves; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

132–3 Walter C. Nelson, in real estate business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

134 Edward Brown, examined by defendants: My home is Chicago, but at present I am residing out of the city. Am doing business in Wisconsin, traveling, and my family reside in Wisconsin. My wife lives there and I live with her. We have a home in Chicago, but my wife is now living in Wisconsin. I presume that I live in Wisconsin and simply own a house here which I have rented to somebody else.

(Challenged for cause.)

135 To the Court: First came to Chicago in 1876. Left Chicago about the first of last March. We had been keeping house in Chicago until about March, 1885; went to Kansas to go into business, but returned to Chicago. Am in the lumber business in Kansas, with an office in Chicago Ship lumber from Wisconsin and Chicago. Voted last spring, but not last
136 fall. Never had intended to make my permanent home elsewhere than in Chicago. My residence now in Wisconsin is simply for the accommodation of my business.

137 To Defendants' Counsel: I went into Wisconsin about the first of March and my family moved there about the first of May. It is uncertain as to when we shall return, possibly not in five years.

heretofore submitted, and on the further ground that the jurors were summoned from a particular class or classes of people, to wit: clerks, merchants and salesmen, and not generally from the body of the county. Challenge and motion sworn to and a demand by defendants that the state be required to plead, answer or demur to the motion and challenge.

162 After argument, the court refused to make any order, and refused to require the state to answer either in law or in fact. Defendants except.)

164–70 L. R. Stone, salesman for D. B. Fisk & Co.; examined; challenge for cause allowed.

171–2 Joseph N. Robinson, wholesale and retail tobacco dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

173–4 Fred W. Gardiner, manager Michigan Stove Company; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

175–6 M. A. Ford, salesman wholesale boots and shoes; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

177–8 J. E. Aldrich, board of trade commission merchant; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

179 W. F. Conklin, residing at 167 Dearborn avenue; examined by defendants: Have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the murder charged; a decided opinion which I still entertain and which I have communicated to others.

(Challenged for cause.)

To the State: My opinion is based on what I read in the newspapers; think I could fairly and impartially try this case and return a verdict from the evidence. Have never told any one that I believed the newspaper account.

180 To the Court: The only feeling that I have against the defendants grows out of what I have read and heard.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception; challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

181–3 H. C. Metcalfe, engaged in the stationery and book business; examined; challenged peremptorily by defendants.

184–5 A. S. Phelps, manager Chicago branch Detroit stove works; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

186 J. S. Atwater, publisher, examined by defendants: Have read the newspaper accounts of the Haymarket affair, and with reference to the

187 defendants have concluded that the law has probably got the right men. Have formed an idea that the defendants might be connected with the murder charged. In order to try this case upon the evidence introduced and the proofs alone, "I would have to set aside a good deal of my personal feeling." I understand that the defendants can be legally convicted only in the event of the evidence establishing beyond all reasonable
188 doubt their conviction, but I also understand that it is sometimes very difficult to get the evidence before the jury." "Then whatever they do not get they do not consider? A. Yes, but they may have conclusive opinions of their own in regard to the matter."

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

189–90 William McElwaine, cashier for Hiram G. Thompson, manufacturer of molding and picture frames; examined by defendants: Have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused or some of them.

Q. Is your condition of mind such that you can listen to the testi-
190 mony here in court and return a fair and impartial verdict, do you believe? A. Well, I am prejudiced now. Don't know whether I could lay aside that prejudice and try the case upon the testimony. Have a strong prejudice against socialists, communists and anarchists.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

191 Henry Hoadley, blank-book and stationery business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

192 James S. McKenzie, salesman with D. B. Fisk & Co.; examined by defendants; challenged peremptorily.

193–5 O. B. Tennis, wholesale millinery; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

196 Theodore Kane, manufacturer of school furniture and slates, examined by defendants. Have heard of this case, and have an opinion as to
197 the guilt or innocence of the defendants—from the newspaper accounts and what I have heard. Would try to be impartial if chosen as a juror in all cases, but as to whether my mind is in a condition that I can say I believe I can fairly and impartially try them, I guess you are ahead of me. Have given the best answer I can. Don't know whether any man can tell whether he can lay aside his prejudices.

198 (Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

199 Edward Wright, livery business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

200–5 F. E. Moore, merchant and dealer in clocks and diamonds; examined by defendants, and excused by court on the ground of physical incapacity.

VOL. H.

206–8 I. P. Rumsey, board of trade commission merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

209–11 George Robinson, foreman Sawyer's livery stable, examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

212, 13 A. F. Seymour, salesman in the flour business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

214 Marks Levy, butcher, examined by defendants: Have heard of the Haymarket meeting and the killing of Mr. Degan. Have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants—a pretty strong opinion. Read the papers every day. Still have that opinion, and have communicated it to others many times. Don't think it would influence my verdict.

215 (Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

216 Charles Roberts, book-keeper for Robert Knight; examined by defendants: Have an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants in this case—a strong one. Have expressed it to others, and still entertain it. Think it would influence my verdict in this case.

Challenged for cause.

To the State: If taken as a juror, I could probably try the case upon
217 the evidence without bias from my present opinion. Think I could try it fairly. Know nothing about the case except from report. Never talked with any one who was present at the Haymarket, or that professed to know anything of their own knowledge about the guilt or innocence of the defendants. Never told anybody that I believe what the newspaper said was true.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception.)

Further examined by defense: Know nothing about socialism, communism or anarchism. Never heard anything about socialism to amount to anything—not enough to form an opinion. My opinion is such that I now believe it would influence my verdict, from what I have read since the occurrence.

(Challenge for cause renewed.)

To the Court: Don't know and never saw either of these eight men. This is the first time to my knowledge that I ever saw any of them. The feeling that I have grows out of what I have heard and read about this occurrence. Think I could fairly and impartially attend to the evidence, and render a verdict in accordance with the law and evidence.

(Challenge for cause overruled, and exception. Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

VOL. H.

222 D. F. Enwright, butter and cheese commission business; examined by defendants: Heard of the killing of Mr. Degan by the bomb at the Haymarket on the 4th of May. I have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants from what I have read in the papers. 221 I consider it a firm opinion which I still entertain, and have, I believe, expressed to others. Don't think it would influence my verdict. Think 222 I have a prejudice against communists. I think it is a strong prejudice.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

223–4 H. Parker, grain commission merchant; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

225 W. F. Hartney, railroad clerk; not employed by any company at present; examined by defendants: Have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, what I still entertain and have expressed to 226 others; don't think it would influence my verdict; I believe I could listen to the testimony and determine it without reference to my opinion; have a prejudice against communists, I think.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

227 Philo J. Beveredge, merchandise broker; examined by defendants: Have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, which is moderately firm; don't think it would influence my verdict; am 228 opposed to socialists, communists and anarchists; decidedly opposed, have a strong opinion against them.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

229–30 M. Hayden, clerk in coal office; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

231–2 J. A. Samuelson, furniture dealer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

233–6 Samuel Falkner, Chicago manager of Proctor & Gamble, of Cincinnati, soap and candle business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

237 Daniel Hugenon, fire insurance business; examined by defendants: Have an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or some of them, of the murder of Mr. Degan—a firm opinion—which I have 238 expressed to others and still entertain; don't think it would influence my verdict; have a strong prejudice against the views entertained by socialists, communists and anarchists.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

239–40 A. E. Dickerman, furniture business; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

241 John Monahan, clerk for J. T. Lester & Co.; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

242–3 T. C. Baldwin, manufacturer of perfume; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

244–7 John Bradford, manufacturer of Tuttle's retaining valves; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

248–9 Samuel E. Dunham, commission man on board of trade; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

250 Adolph W. Kueker, hardware business; examined by defendants: Formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or some of them, which I still entertain, and have expressed to others; think I could, notwithstanding my opinion, listen to the testimony and render an impartial verdict in the case under the evidence produced here in
251 court; believe the opinion I now have would not prevent my doing that; am opposed to socialists, communists and anarchists.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

W. H. Madden, in the pig-iron rail business; examined by defend-
252a ants: Have an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or some of them, which I still entertain and have expressed to others. Think I could listen to the testimony that is introduced in court and render an
252 impartial verdict in the case. I am opposed to the views of socialism, communism and anarchism—decidedly opposed to all of them.

(Challenged peremptorily.)

253 G. M. Weinberger, druggist; examined by defendants: Have an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, a pretty decided opinion, which I have expressed to others and still entertain. Believe I could listen to the testimony in court, the charge of judge, and render a
254 fair and impartial verdict in the case. Have a feeling against socialists, communists, and anarchists—a decided feeling—a very determined and decided opinion.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

255 F. A. Ruck, meat market business; examined by defendants: Have an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants. I could listen to the testimony introduced in court and the charge of the judge, and
256 render a fair and impartial verdict, uninfluenced by my present opinion. I have a decided opinion against socialism, communism and anarchism,
257 very much prejudiced against them; very firm and decided opinion.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

VOL. H.

258 R. B. Hooker, boot and shoe dealer; examined by defendants: Have a kind of opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, which I have not expressed to others, but which I still entertain. Believe I could listen to the testimony and decide the case upon the evidence alone, and render an impartial verdict.

260 (Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

261–2 Michael W. McDonald, clerk with Franklin MacVeagh & Co., wholesale grocers; examined by defendants; challenge for caused allowed.

263 S. A. West, livery and boarding stable; examined by defendants: Have had an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the
264 alleged murder of Mr. Degan, but I dont think I have an opinion on the question now. Have a prejudice against socialists, communists and anarchists.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

266 Owen Fay, clerk in the Grand Pacific livery office; examined by de-
266 fendants: Have read of the Haymarket affair. Am somewhat opposed to socialism, and to the principles of socialists, communists and anarchists, and am opposed to those entertaining such views.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

267 P. J. Sullivan, grocer and saloon keeper; examined by defendants: Have formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the alleged murder of Degan. Have a very strong opinion upon the
268n question. Am decidedly opposed to the views of socialists, communists and anarchists. Think I could decide the case, if taken as a juror, without reference to my opinion or prejudice.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

269 J. H. Trumbull, real estate agent; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

270 H. Bowman, tailor, examined by defendants: Have no opinion upon the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants. Have heard of the Haymarket matter, and did form an opinion in reference to it. Don't like socialists, communists and anarchists.

378 (Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

273–4 William H. Rich, grocer; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

275 John L. Bennett, wholesale druggist; examined by defendants: Have an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants of the crime
276 alleged, based on what I read in the papers. Think I could disregard that opinion in reaching a verdict. Am strongly prejudiced against

socialists, communists and anarchists. Have never read any works on the subject.

(Challenged peremptorily by the defendants.)

277–9 A. W. Ramlin, boots and shoes; working for Doggett, Bassett & Hills; examined by defendants. Challenge for cause allowed.

280 M. L. Beers, architect; examined by defendants: Have a firm opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants. Don't know anything as to the facts, and think I could listen to the testimony and render
281 an impartial verdict on the proofs in court. I have a very decided and enthusiastic opposition to socialists, communists and anarchists—very decided. Have never read any work upon these subjects.

(Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

282–3 F. B. Wilson, banker; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

284–7 E. V. Lathrop, banker; examined by defendants; challenge for cause allowed.

288 W. E. Wait, examined by defendants: Formerly chief deputy sheriff of Cook county; not in business now. Have read and heard about the
289 Haymarket matter and the killing of Officer Degan. Don't know anything about whether the defendants are legally liable for the throwing of the bomb. Believe I can listen to the testimony and render a fair verdict. Since leaving the sheriff's office, have been in the employ of the West Park board of the Board of Education, as superintendent for some
290 of their work. I suppose, as the result of my reading, the anarchists undertake to break the law. Never read any authorities upon socialism, communism and anarchism, but anarchy implies an absence of all law, or the breaking of all law.

292 (Challenged peremptorily by defendants.)

293 H. T. Sanford, examined by defendants: Am a clerk in the North-Western railroad office, in the freight auditor's office, and have been
294 there about fifteen months. I am twenty-four years old. Was formerly a petroleum broker in New York for a time. I have an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or some of them, of the murder
295 of Degan. Based upon what I have read, my opinion is as to the guilt or innocence of some of the defendants of the throwing of the bomb. Understand that a defendant is entitled to be tried upon the evidence
296 produced in court alone, and believe in this case that I could fairly and impartially try and determine this case upon the evidence—listen to the

testimony, and render an impartial verdict. Have a decided prejudice against socialists, communists and anarchists. I know so little about the case, however, that it is hard to answer whether that prejudice would
297 influence my verdict. I would attempt to try the case upon the evidence
298 introduced here. Believe that I would be able to determine the question from the witnesses produced and their testimony, regardless of the im-
299 pression that I now have. Have no acquaintance with any of the attorneys representing the prosecution, nor with any of the detectives of tne city to my knowledge.

(Challenged for cause by defendants.)

300 Examined by State: My opinion is based upon what I read in the newspapers. Never talked with any one who was present at the Haymarket or professed to know personally about it. Don't recall whether or not I have ever said to any one that I believed the statements of facts in the newspapers to be true, "but still I have no reason to think they were false."

301 (Challenge for cause overruled, and exception by defendants.)

It was stated by the clerk of the court that the defendants had exhausted their 160 peremptory challenges, the defendants, upon the challenge for cause to Sanford being overruled, stopped.

302–6 Mr. Sanford, further examined by state, was accepted by the state, and thereupon, together with Greiner, Mr. Reed and Mr. Adams, was sworn to try the cause, completing the panel of twelve.

VOLUME OF EXHIBITS.

Exhibit 1. Photograph of plat of Haymarket square and vicinity.

Exhibit 2. Photograph of plat of Neff's Hall on Clybourne avenue, two-story frame building.

People's Exhibit 3. Photograph of plat showing basement and first floor of Greiff's Hall, 54 West Lake street.

People's Exhibit 4. Photograph of plat of Zepf's Hall.

People's Exhibit 5. Handbill printed in German and English calling the Haymarket meeting, and containing the line in English: "Workingmen, arm yourselves and appear in full force," and in the German part the German equivalent.

People's Exhibit 6. The revenge circular, so called, printed in German and English. The English part of the circular is as follows:

"REVENGE.

"Workingmen! To arms!

"Your masters sent out their blood-hounds—the police—they killed six of your brothers at McCormick's, this afternoon. They killed the poor wretches, because they, like you, had the courage to disobey the supreme will of your bosses. They killed them because they dared ask for the shortening of the hours of toil. They killed them to show you 'Free American Citizens' that you must be satisfied and contented with whatever your bosses condescend to allow you, or you will get killed!

"You have for years endured the most abject humiliations; you have for years suffered immeasurable iniquities; you have worked yourselves to death; you have endured the pangs of want and hunger; your children you have sacrificed to the factory lords—in short, you have been miserable and obedient slaves all these years. Why? To satisfy the insatiable greed, to fill the coffers of your lazy, thieving master? When you ask them now to lessen your burden, he sends his blood-hounds out to shoot you, kill you!

"If you are men, if you are the sons of your grandsires, who have shed their blood to free you, then you will rise in your might, Hercules, and destroy the hideous monster that seeks to destroy you.

"To arms, we call you, to arms!

"YOUR BROTHERS."

People's Exhibit 7. Copy of the Arbeiter Zeitung of the issue of May 3, 1886, printed in German, containing certain articles, translations of which were read and appear later as exhibits.

People's Exhibit 8. Copy of Arbeiter Zeitung of issue of May 4, 1886, printed in German, with various marked articles, translations of some or all of which were offered later as exhibits. On the first column on the fourth page of this issue, after two paragraphs, appears the following: "Briefkasten Ruhe!" the words being printed in a black-faced type slightly heavier than the main body of the paper, but apparently the same as that in which the first paragraph in the column is printed.

People's Exhibit 9. Photograph of Rudolph Schnaubelt.

People's Exhibit 10. The two words, in manuscript, "Briefkasten Ruhe!"

People's Exhibit 10a. Copy of the English portion of the "Revenge circular," so called.

People's Exhibit 10b. "Letter-box Y; Come Monday night." (Translation of notice in the Fackel of Sunday, May 2d.)

People's Exhibit 12. Photograph of front view and floor plan of 442 Sedgwick street (testified of as the house occupied by Seliger, and in which Lingg roomed).

People's Exhibit 13. Copy of map in Chicago Daily News January 14, 1886.

People's Exhibit 14. Photograph of diagram showing plan of the four floors of the Arbeiter Zeitung building, 107 5th avenue.

People's Exhibit 15. "Science of Revolutionary War. Manual for instruction in the use and preparation of nitro-glycerine, dynamite, gun-cotton, fulminating mercury, bombs, fuses, poisons, etc., etc., by Johann Most, New York. Printed and published by the Internationale Zeitung Verein (International News Co.), 167 Williams street."

The substance of this treatise is as follows:

About the importance of modern explosives for the social revolution, present and future, nothing need be said. They will form a decisive element in the next epoch of the world's history. It is, therefore, natural that the revolutionists of all countries should be anxious to obtain these explosives and learn to apply them practically. Too much time has been wasted, books are expensive, etc. Even explanations of learned treatises are unavailing. Persons attempting to experiment according to the instructions met with results not encouraging. The matter was expensive, dangerous, etc.

Some under experiment have produced tolerable gun-cotton, and small quantities of nitro-glycerine converted into dynamite. But this was of small value, as with small quantities of dynamite little can be done, and it is expensive. For manufacture of dynamite on a large scale, an expensive outfit is required and separate quarters. A private dwelling cannot be used. Such a laboratory must be kept in a secluded spot, because of the stench which would lead to discovery and ejection. We have not, however, abandoned experiments, but concluded that dynamite cannot be successfully supplied by private manufacture, but must be obtained from professional manufacturers. Not an ounce of dynamite heretofore used has been manufactured by revolutionists, but obtained by them. Watchmen cannot prevent the securing of a supply. Beside, it is now an article of commerce for many purposes, so that its obtainment cannot be pre-
5 vented. The purchase is easier and cheaper than private manufacture, and for this money is required. Dynamite factories may be confiscated. The purpose of this treatise is to publish the simplest methods for the manufacture of explosives, and to explain their use and effect. In this direction many mistakes have been made, attributable to ignorance. Dynamite may be exploded by a spark of fire, but it is not so usually, for when brought in contact with the flame, it usually burns without causing further effects. It is exploded by shock and therefore must be handled
6 carefully. Explodes easier when frozen than not, and freezes a few degrees above zero, Reaumer. It will stand a high degree of heat without exploding. Moisture has no effect upon it, as the principal ingredient, nitro-glycerine, is greasy. The simplest and surest way to explode dynamite is in the application of blasting cartridges, obtainable in all large houses dealing in blasting or shooting utensils (description of the cartridge given). In important undertakings, procure best quality of fuse,
7 which looks like common twine, which should be guarded against moisture by being soaked in tallow or tar, or incased in rubber. When explosion is desired from a distance, a wire and electric battery is preferable, but if only a few minutes are desired to get away, six or eight inches of fuse will answer, attached to a piece of touchwood. For a bomb only so much fuse required as can burn in the interval of throwing—six or eight inches is enough, determinable by experiment. To explode dynamite by fuse and percussion cartridge, the bomb or other vessel should be enclosed on all sides with an opening through which the blasting cart-
8 ridge may be introduced. The cartridge should reach into the explosive material two-thirds of its length, but not let the fuse touch, for the

fuse might set fire to the dynamite, and it might escape in flame through the orifice. When the fuse burns to the cartridge it explodes the latter, and that the dynamite. The fulminating cap should be tightly squeezed into the petard, to avoid dislocation. Before introducing the fuse into the cap,
9 cut it off to make a fresh end. In important undertakings, the greatest care is advisable. The fulminating mercury rests loosely and may fall out of the cartridge, which should therefore be examined before being used. The same rules obtain as to nitro-glycerine, but the latter is a more powerful explosive than dynamite, the latter consisting of seventy-five to eighty per cent. of nitro-glycerine and twenty to twenty-five per cent. of charcoal, sawdust or other proper material. On account of its rapidity, the greatest force of a dynamite explosion is in the direction where it meets greatest resistance. No very heavy or very strong cylinder should be used to demolish a wall, but a simple tin can is preferable.
10 But where dynamite is proposed to be exploded among a number of persons, the stronger the shell, "the more splendid are the results."

The best shape for a bomb is globular, as furnishing equal resistance and producing the same explosive effect in all directions. Iron shells are the best; obtainable in a foundry. Zinc globes are not to be despised, and can be privately manufactured; but the latter requires obtaining a brass mold from a trustworthy expert. With such a mold, fifty semi-globes of moderate size, can be manufactured in a day, and these can be soldered together. Every bomb must have an opening, about three-quarters of an inch through which to fill, provided with a screw top to be put in after the filling is done, with a hole bored through the top,
11 large enough to pass a detonating cap which is connected with the fuse. After the bomb is filled with dynamite, it is screwed together, and then the fuse can be lighted and the bomb thrown. "A trial of such a bomb has had a most excellent result."

A zinc globe four inches in diameter, filled with dynamite, was experimented with. The explosion was like a cannon shot, bursting a large flagstone into twenty pieces, scattering them ten to fifteen feet, making a hole two foot in the ground, and at thirty to forty feet distance pieces of the shell were found about the size of a revolver ball and very ragged. If this bomb had been placed under the table of a gluttonous dinner party, or if it had been thrown through a window onto the table, what a beautiful effect it would have had.

Another method—a piece of gas or water pipe a few inches long; cut
12 a screw on each end and cover with a screw cap, and for explosion, pro-

ceed as with the other bomb. Such missiles are easily manufactured, cheap, and against a crowd must produce brilliant effects. No certainty of one bomb being successful--may result only in broken windows, etc. Any ordinary house will resist such explosions, and in operating against houses, a different method must be pursued. Percussion primer bombs, can be provided by making pyramid or other shaped shells with a percussion cap on each side, so that when thrown, whichever side strikes will explode the cap; but these, if falling in soft ground, are ineffective.

13 The cap must be secured tightly so as not to fall off, and the detonating chamber closed at its bottom with fulminating mercury and the space being filled with fine gunpowder, a second explosive cap being placed at the bottom of the vent in the dynamite which is to be used preferably.

14 A bomb filled with fulminating mercury would have to have a very strong shell to be effective, and filling a bomb with fulminating mercury is dangerous, and the fulminate is more expensive than dynamite. Besides all which the primer bombs described are more expensive and difficult of construction than a globular bomb. We are of opinion that

15 the fuse construction (with detonating chamber) is more practical and reliable. The best construction for a bomb, that will explode by concussion, is one in which is inserted a small glass tube, slightly bent, closed at each end by melting, and then inserted in a shell so that the ends of the tube meet the opposite sides of the chamber; around this inner tube is placed another tube full of a mixture of chlorate of potash and sugar; and around this combined tube the chamber is filed with dynamite and the shell closed. When this bomb is thrown, the concussion breaks the glass tube, the sulphuric acid ignites the potash mixture, and

16 the result is an explosion of the dynamite. In practical use, the power of dynamite is illustrated in mining blasts, etc., small quantities producing wonderful results, which are dependent upon the confinement of the dynamite. In attacking buildings, unless the dynamite can be introduced into chimneys or other orifices, considerable quantity must be used to shake the building or bring it down. For ordinary buildings, nothing less than ten pounds will do, and for massive buildings, barracks, churches, etc., forty or fifty pounds may be required, and even then, will

17 not be effective unless skillfully placed. The explosives should be placed under or within a foundation or close to the main wall, just above the ground, but not packed in a shell—simply in tin cylinders, the length of the cylinder being proportionate to the breadth of the breach desired. Care must be taken not to break the fuse.

18 Waterproof fuse may be had ready made. Following are results of experiments by the war department of Austria. Four pounds of dynamite in a tin box made a hole two feet by eighteen inches in a one-foot brick wall; seven pounds made a hole thirteen by fifteen inches in a two-foot brick wall; twenty-seven pounds made a hole fifteen feet square in a three-foot brick wall; forty-three pounds knocked down a brick wall three and a half feet thick. Good results were obtained by loading down the dynamite with sandbags of earth. Two pounds at the bottom of a wall sunk in the earth and covered with a foot and a half of ground, shaking down seven feet of a wall eighteen inches thick; fourteen pounds of dynamite in two tin cylinders, each two feet long and three inches in diameter, made a breach in a wall six and one-half feet wide and seven
19 feet high. In a foundation of a four-foot brick wall three holes were dug, eight feet apart and seven and one-half feet deep, and six pounds of dynamite in a tin box placed in each hole and exploded simultaneously by electricity. The result was the demolition of the wall for a distance of twenty-five feet. As compared with dynamite, sixty pounds of gunpowder in tin boxes, exploded against a stone wall, produced no other effect than to blacken it, the damage to the wall being eight to ten times
20 less, even when confined, than in the case of dynamite. In case of war the destruction of bridges, etc., is important, and here dynamite has been especially effective. As examples: Two pounds of dynamite in a tin box, exploded on a wrought-iron plate, two inches thick, tore a hole through the plate. Twenty-six pounds of dynamite in eight tin boxes, laid one on another, destroyed an iron single track railroad bridge, pipe construction, securely built. Seven pounds of dynamite exploded near a railroad track threw off one rail and splintered the second, destroying the nearest tie. A train following immediately, perhaps imperial special, might have "gone to the devil." Other experiments also mentioned.

21 To thaw dynamite, which freezes very easily, the best plan is to put the dynamite in a waterproof vessel into a larger one containing water. Frozen dynamite is dangerous when ignited, and may fail to explode if special pains are not taken. Failures should be avoided in revolutionary movements. It is cheapest to buy explosives or confiscate them, but instruction given for manufacture, avoiding technical terms. Advises
22 processes which we have tried successfully, the principles of operation resting on the method discovered by Ditmar, the New York dynamite manufacturer, but simpler.

To manufacture dynamite, there are mixed, first, two parts sulphuric

acid with one of nitric acid; second, there is added one-eighth of the whole quantity of glycerine. Scientists have overstated the dangers of this manufacture, with the result that, on the part of revolutionists, less
23 nitro-glycerine has been manufactured than would otherwise have been. Sulphuric acid of at least forty-five degrees can be had of any wholesale druggist in nine-pound bottles; nitric acid of at least sixty-six degrees in seven-pound bottles. To eighteen pounds of sulphuric acid you need nine pounds of nitric acid and three and one-half pounds of glycerine. Mixing can be done in an iron pot, enameled, or in any porcelain or glazed vessel. In an outer vessel pour water till it reaches three-fourths of the height of the inner vessel, kept cold by the use of ice. Put the sulphuric acid into the inner vessel; add half the quantity of nitric acid, stirring with a glass rod and pouring in slowly. To get rid of the offensive and unhealthy fumes, cover the mouth and the nose by a handkerchief; keep the windows open and mix near or under an open flue. When the mixture is completed, cover with a piece of glass and leave for fifteen to twenty minutes to cool off, the
24 mixture causing a high degree of heat; then add the glycerine, stirring briskly with the glass rod while pouring. If yellowish red fumes arise, indicating conflagation, stop pouring the glycerine and stir more briskly, and afterwards resume the addition of the glycerine. After completing the mixture, stir for ten minutes or so; then lift out the inner vessel containing the mixture, and pour it into the water in the outer vessel slowly. A yellowish oil will settle to the bottom, which is nitro-glycerine. After some time pour off the water. Then pour the nitro-glycerine for further purification into a bowl filled with good soda lye, stirring briskly, so as to cause all of the nitro-glycerine to come in contact with the lye; let settle and pour off the lye, when the nitro-glycerine can be bottled. Nitro-glycerine in a natural state being dangerous from concussion, it is desir-
25 able to manufacture the dynamite at once. To do this, take sawdust or pulverized charcoal, or a mixture equal parts powder, sugar, dust of saltpetre and wood pulp; put this material into a vessel and pour on the nitro-glycerine, kneading it with a wooden ladle to the consistency of a thick dough; pack in oil paper or tin boxes. Long continued handling of dynamite with the bare hands produces severe headache.

Gun-cotton is also an explosive, not much inferior to dynamite. To prepare it, take unglued cotton wadding, boil in soda lye, dry carefully,
26 either in the air or upon hot iron plates or bricks. The cotton is then dipped in the mixture of acids (sulphuric and nitric), and after being left

until thoroughly saturated, is taken out, squeezed dry, but not with the hands, and is then put in a vessel with soda lye; after fifteen minutes again taken and squeezed out, which may be done with the hand, and which is repeated two or three times, but each time in new warm water. Then the wadding must be dried by atmosphere, not by hot material. It is not extensively used, because it ignites in warm sunshine. Use immediately after manufacture, or keep in water until required, and then dry and use. Unconfined gun-cotton burns without explosion, but is explosive when placed in cylindrical bombs and rammed in securely. It
27 can be exploded by fire without concussion. It is not to be despised, because it is more easily manufactured than dynamite and has an innocent appearance.

Gun-cotton saturated with nitro-glycerine results in nitro-gelatine, incredibly explosive and far superior to dynamite, but its keeping on hand is dangerous, and the mixture should therefore immediately precede its contemplated use.

Near Washington the following experiment was recently made: By a dynamite gun bombs were thrown containing eleven pounds nitro-gelatine two thousand feet against solid rock. One bomb tore a hole six feet deep and twenty-five feet in diameter in the rock, and ten tons of rock were cut loose and thrown in all directions, while stones from ten to twelve pounds were carried about half a mile. The spectators, nearly
28 all military men from foreign countries, concurred that an ordinary vessel would be destroyed by the explosion of a single such bomb, while an iron-clad receiving it in the side would thereby be disabled. Revolutionists cannot manufacture dynamite cannon (which are about forty feet long), but they can make bombs and use ordinary slings. "That which reduces what had been solid rocks into splinters may not have a bad effect in a court or monopolists' ball room."

Fulminate of mercury is a powerful explosive, consisting of mercury, sulphuric acid and alcohol, equal weights, which must be mixed in a clean glazed vessel, in cold water or ice, the mercury being first put into the vessel and the rest stirred in slowly, the acid being added first, and enough of it to secure the entire solution of the mercury; pour in the
29 alcohol after cooling. The product, a gray substance, is then spread on tissue paper to dry, and a little potash is added to reduce the danger of explosion. It explodes at a temperature of 150 degrees. Silver may be substituted for mercury, giving a better product, but more expensive. Experimenting should be done with very small quantities to begin with.

Fulminate of mercury explodes under a spark, as, for instance, a gun-cap and bombs charged with this explosive explode by concussion simply. In filling a bomb great care must be taken, as no ramming or concussion is allowed, and the filling is therefore better done while the mixture is moist, and when it will settle into shape; but in this event the
30 shell must be left open until completely dry. In closing the shell care must be taken not to cause any spark or ignition, which would be followed by an explosion. In modern wars they do not confine themselves to explosives and weapons of any particular description, but are aimed to weaken the enemy by all means possible.

A particularly effective weapon is fire. For example, in Moscow, against Napoleon, and by the Prussians in France in 1870–71. Therefore, in a list of revolutionary war utensils, the article serviceable for incendiary purposes must not be omitted. A very effective mixture is of phosphorous and bi-sulphide of carbon. Buy yellow phosphor, which is always kept under water, and must never be touched with the
31 bare hands, but taken from the containing bottle with a fork or stick—put in a porcelain bowl full of water and cut into portions about the size of a bean under water. The phospor must be kept in a bottle with a glass stopper, fitting air-tight. Fill a bottle with bi-sulphide of carbon, drop in the phospor quickly and close; then shake slowly until dissolved. The fluid is then ready for use, and if poured on rags will result in spontaneous combustion, after a time. Petroleum added retards the combustible action, and may be used when one desires to make good his escape. Experiments with this mixture were made in France by detectives.

32 Another incendiary article is thus constructed: Take a tin fruit jar, remove the cover; cut a hole in the center of the cover, into which insert a medicine glass; then resolder the cover; pour in benzine; fill the medicine glass with gunpowder, and close with a stopper, passing a fuse through the stopper; light the fuse; the result is, after a time, the explosion of the powder, bursting the can and scattering the benzine blazing in every direction. A hundred men equipped with such implements, scattered through a city, could achieve more than twenty batteries of artillery, and the thing is easily made, and cheap.

There may be cases in which the revolutionist must abandon shelter and sacrifice his own life in the warfare against the property-owning
33 beast of society; but no revolutionist should unnecessarily endanger his own life. An unknown danger is the more terrible. Therefore, revolutionists should act singly or in as small numbers as possible.

Owing to the failure of various attacks, the idea has been suggested to poison weapons used for assault. But this idea has never been carried out, owing to the expense and difficulty of procuring suitable
34 poisons. The best substance for poisoning arms is curari, used by the South American Indians on their arrows. It is absolutely fatal, but is high priced. A dagger red-hot and hardened in a decoction of rose laurel is fatal. Pulverize phosphor mixed with gum arabic and applied to the weapon is also fatal. So with verdigris. So as to cadaver poison and prussic acid, but poisons must always be prepared immediately before use, as they dissolve in the atmosphere and become innocuous.

35 The successful arming of the people cannot be achieved by one definite procedure, but by utilizing all different circumstances. The best thing would be for organized workingmen throughout the civilized world to provide themselves with muskets and ammunition and to thoroughly drill, but this is almost impossible, as the authorities would interfere with them, and throughout Europe even the purchase of weapons by the common people is made difficulty, while secret purchase
36 subjects to the charge of "constructive treason." In America every one has the constitutional right to arm, but the carrying of concealed weapons is prohibited, while, if carried openly, that also would soon be prohibited. That is not all. Hardly had a military organization been effected in Illinois, when the legislature passed a law allowing to march and drill only the state organizations. A litigation has resulted which is as yet undetermined. There is evidenced also among legislators, a disposition to prohibit dynamite except for industrial purposes and national
37 defense. The workingmen of America cannot arm themselves unless they do it soon. If they arm themselves at once, well; if not, it will soon be difficult or impossible, and "you will find yourselves defenseless and powerless in the face of a mob of murderers in uniform, armed to the teeth." The price of a watch would buy a fine breech-loader. We do not take much stock in the arming of organizations, for several reasons, among others, that it will cause a great pressure upon those who are unwilling to join, which is in violation of the anarchistic principle and dangerous to the existence of the organization. Besides which, it would involve great financial sacrifice to those who prefer to do nothing for the cause. Labor organizations
38 should therefore content themselves with allowing arming by those who desire to do so. They may buy arms at wholesale, and retail to those who wish to purchase, on the installment plan, if necessary, at cost, thus

saving expense without trenching upon the assets of the society. Muskets are not the only desirable weapons; good revolvers, daggers, poisons and firebrands are destined to be of immense service during a revolution. The modern explosives deserve attention first of all. Quantities of nitro-glycerine and dynamite, numerous hand grenades and blasting cartridges should be at the disposal of the revolutionists, these things acting as the proletariats' substitute for artillery. These are particularly
39 recommended to European revolutionists, as they cannot buy rifles. "Taken all in all, our motto is: Proletarians of all countries, arm yourselves; arm yourselves, no matter what may happen, the hour of battle draws near."

Certain precautions should be adopted by the revolutionist if he wishes to address an associate in writing. He should use a fictitious address, which should be frequently changed, and its contents ought to be shaped with a view to the possibility of its falling into the wrong hand. He should never mention the true name of his confederates. Initials or nicknames are preferable. There should never be a communication even to a comrade of a fact which it is not necessary for him to know. Your
40 right name should never be signed. The use of a cipher is not desirable, because it is a suspicious method and is very liable to detection. If used at all, the key to the cipher should be communicated only to one confederate. "All letters received, which bear secrets, should always be burned immediately after reading." Revolutionists should never retain things which would lead to detection, and should always be on guard against detectives and police. Neither through friendship, love or family ties should you talk unnecessarily. These rules apply particularly "to all enterprises that are directed against the prevailing disorder and its laws." If a revolutionary deed is proposed, it should not be talked about, but silently pursued. If assistance is indispensable, it may be chosen, but a misstep in this is fatal. The society of suspected persons
41 should be carefully avoided, thus spies would be rendered harmless. Self-composure in arrest is essential. Only when the arrest can be successfully resisted should there be resort to it, or when it becomes a question of life and death. But if you are sure that the arrest is on suspicion, you protest energetically and submit quietly. To examinations by a judge, the revolutionist should submit only so far as he can prove an alibi; admit nothing except what is proven. If all means of deliverance are exhausted, then the prisoner should defend his deed from the standpoint of the revolutionist and anarchist, and convert the defendant's seat

into a speaker's stand. Shield your person as long as possible, but when you are irredeemably lost, use your respite for the propogation of your principles. We thus speak because we observe that even expert revolutionists violate its plainest rules.

42 *Appendix.*

We have received from a layman an essay presenting another means of preparing fulminate of mercury, which essay reads as follows: Use an ordinary retort; to precipitate the fumes, put the neck of the retort in water, put in five grains of mercury and fifty grains of nitric acid; after this has cooled, add sixty grains of best alcohol in small quantities, shaking the retort well while mixing; upon the neck of the retort put an india rubber tube, thirty or forty centimeters long, passing through a vessel filled with water; light an alcohol flame under the retort until the mixture begins to boil; the fulminate of mercury crystallizes; pour
43 off the liquid residue; refine the fulminate in cold water several times, and then boil the water; spread on tissue paper to dry, in a high temperature; then close carefully to prevent absorbing moisture. Thus writes our correspondent.

As a substitute for a blasting cartridge, where the latter cannot be conveniently obtained, cut a piece off the closed end of a metal penholder, say an inch and a half long, and fill this with the caps ordinarily used for toy pistols, stuffing them in, then add a fuse and the cartridge is ready for use.

44 Pulverized seeds of stramonium, baked in almond or other cake, furnish an effective poison to be used against a spy, informer, minion of the law, or other scoundrel.

Invisible ink is recommended for revolutionary correspondence. To mislead spies, write an ordinary letter, and then write with the invisible ink between the lines, or on the reverse pages, or send an old book and write on the blank pages, or write on the inside of paper wrappers. There are invisible inks which are developed by heat, but these are not recommended, as heat is always applied to suspicious correspondence by the detectives. The chemical is preferable. If you write with nitrate of cobalt (invisible), it becomes bluish if you spread oxalate of potash over it. Nitrate of copper made legible by spreading cyanide of potas-
45 sium on. And so if written with hydro-chlorate. There are still other methods, but enough has been suggested.

We speak now of Sprengel's acid and neutral explosives. Sprengel

has found that hydro-carbons, mixed with vehicles, can be exploded by a cap like dynamite. For instance, equal parts of carbolic acid dissolved in nitric acid gives an explosive. By the solution of carbolic in nitric acid, picric acid is produced; in the mixture heating takes place which should be cooled off. Mix the picric acid with nitric acid and an explosive as strong as nitro-glycerine is produced, the proportions being 58.3 of picric acid to 41.7 of nitric acid. If instead of carbolic acid, benzine is used, the result is nitro-benzole. Add nitric acid in the proportion of 71.92 nitric acid to 28.08 nitric-benzole, and you have an explosive. These various liquids can be utilized by absorbing them into chlorate of potash, moulded into suitable shapes, which can be exploded ordinarily by a percussion cap; but these preparations are not as handy as dynamite, and can be used only in glass, stone or iron shells, other shells being affected by the acid, but they are easier to produce than nitro-glycerine.

Prussic acid may be prepared as follows: Take thirty grains yellow prussiate of potash, twenty grains sulphuric acid and forty grains of water; heat the mixture in a retort and catch the fumes in a well-cooled receiver. It is desirable that the receiver should be bent and furnished with water in its lower portion, through which the fumes must pass, thus aiding condensation. There must be a hollow globe to receive the accumulating prussic acid. It is very volatile, and upon drying up no poisonous substance remains. Avoid the escaping fumes. Proceed under a well-ventilated flue. Prussic acid is not useful for poisoning arms, but is for liquors—looks like water and smells and tastes like bitter almonds. May be preserved in the dark for a long time.

For combustion, we add the following suggestion: Take blotting paper, saturate it with the phosphor dissolved in carbon, as published recently in the Freiheit, and put it in an unclosed envelope, with pulverized chlorate of potash. Close the letter, and in about a quarter of an hour, upon opening it, an explosion and intense blaze will ensue. These letters can be carried around and dropped, and be carried safely in an air-tight tin box. For large buildings, such as courts, etc., put the phosphor in a small box that can be carried in the overcoat pocket, filling the lower part with tar and the upper part with shavings, saturate with prepared phosphor, and add potash, nail on a lid carefully, bore a few holes to let in the air, and in the course of three or four hours an explosion will follow, and a fire.

Phosphor may be used as a fuse for dynamite, keeping it from the air

until the box of dynamite is placed in the proper position, then raise the lid, letting the air to the fuse, and in due time an explosion will follow.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 16.

Platform International Association of Workingmen, published in the Arbeiter Zeitung during February, March and April, 1886.

The Declaration of Independence declares when a long train of abuses and usurpation, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them (the people) under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security. Are we not too much governed, and is it not the time to practice this thought of Jefferson? Is our government anything but a conspiracy of the privileged classes against the people? Fellow-laborers, read the following declaration, which we issue in your interest, for humanity and progress. The present order of society is based upon the spoliation of the non-property by the property owners, the capitalists buy the labor of the poor for wages, at the mere cost of living, taking all the surplus of labor. By machinery constantly reducing the volume of human labor, produces constantly increasing quantities of goods, whereby the competition of labor is increasing and its price being reduced. Thus, while the poor are increasingly deprived the opportunities of advancement, the rich grow richer through increasing robbery. Only by rare and accidental opportunities can the poor become rich; avarice increases with wealth, and capitalists compete for the spoliation of the masses. In this struggle the moderately wealthy succumb, while monopolists flourish, concentrating in their hands entire branches of industry, trade and commerce. Industrial and commercial crises follow, which force the wretchedness of the non-property owners to the highest point. Statistics of the United States show that after deducting raw material, interest on capital, etc., property owners claim five-eighths, and allow to the laborers but three-eighths of the residue. The result of the present system is recurring over-production, while the increasing elimination of labor from the process of production brings the impoverishment of an increasing percentage on non-property owners, " who are driven into crime, vagabondage, prostitution, suicide, starvation and manifold ruin. This system is unjust, insane and murderous." Therefore those who suffer under it, and do not wish to be responsible for its continuance, ought to strive for its destruction by all means and with their utmost energy. " In its place is to be put the true order of society. This can be

brought about only when all instruments of property—all capital produced by labor—has been transformed into common property, for thus only is the possibility of spoliation cut off. Only by the impossibility of accumulating private capital can every one be compelled to work who claims the right to live. Neither lordship nor servitude will thereafter exist. This system would result further that no one would need to work more than a few hours a day, and yet every reasonable want of society would be satisfied." In this way, time and opportunity are also given for opening to all the people the possibility of the highest imaginable culture."

Opposed to such a system are the political organizations of the capitalists, whether monarchies or republics. States are in the hands of property owners with no other apparent end than to maintain the disorder of the present day. The laws turn their sharp points against the laboring people, and so far as they seem otherwise, are evaded by the ruling class. The school exists for the offspring of the rich, while the children of the poor receive scarcely an elementary education, and this directed to promote conceit, prejudice, servility, anything but intelligence. By reference to a fictitious heaven, the church seeks to make the masses forget the loss of paradise on earth, while the press takes care to confuse the public mind. These institutions aim to prevent the people from reaching intelligence, being under the sway of the capitalist class. The laborers can look for aid from no outside source in their fight against the existing system, but must achieve deliverance through their own exertions. Hitherto, no privileged class have relinquished tyranny, nor will the capitalists of to-day forego their privilege and authority without compulsion. This is evidenced by the brutal resistance always manifested by the middle classes against all efforts by the laboring classes for their advancement. It is therefore evident that the fight must be of a revolutionary character; that wage conflicts cannot lead to the goal. Every reform in favor of the laboring classes involves a curtailment of the privileges of the rich to which we cannot expect their assent. "The ruling classes will not voluntarily relinquish their prerogatives, and will make no concession to us. Under all these circumstances, there is only one remedy left—force." Our ancestors of 1776 have taught us that resistance to tyrants is justifiable, and have left us an immortal example. By force, they freed themselves from foreign oppressors, "and through force their descendants must free themselves from domestic oppression." Therefore, it is your right and duty to arm, says Jefferson. Agitation to or-

ganize, organizations for the purpose of rebellion, this is the course if the workingmen would rid themselves of their chains. And, since all governments combine in their policy of oppression, it is evident that the victory of the laboring population can be confidently expected only when the wage-workers along the whole line of capitalistic society inaugurate the decisive combats simultaneously. Hence the necessity for international affiliation and the organization of the International Association of Workingmen.

Our platform is simple and clear:

1. Destruction of existing class domination, through inexonorable revolution and international activity.

2. The building of a free society on communistic organizations or production.

3. Free exchange of equivalent products through the productive organization without jobbing and profit making.

4. Organization of the educational system upon non-religious and scientific and equal basis for both sexes.

5. Equal rights for all, without distinction of sex or race.

6. The regulation of public affairs through agreements between the independent communes and confederacies.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 18. From the Alarm of October 4, 1884.

" A word to tramps." A word to the thirty thousand now tramping the streets in enforced idleness without enough to purchase food. A word with you and the hundreds of thousands situated like you. You have worked hard, toiled long in producing wealth, and through your years of drudgery have produced much which you have no part in. While laboring with machinery during your hours of service, you received of the results produced only enough for your bare subsistence. For rest you had to wait till Sunday; while with all economy you are able to accumulate scarcely anything; and at the caprice of your employer, you have at times been turned upon the highway by a lockout, hungry and in rags. No one cared for your tears or heartaches as you turned from your family and tramped the road in search of employment, and to be denounced as a vagrant. "Can you not see that it is the industrial system, and not the boss, which must be changed?" When following a summer and autumn without employment and without savings, the winter comes upon you, do not listen to the hypocrite who says it is ordained of God, that the poor ye have always; or to the robber who will say, you drank

your wages, and who will drive you from them, and shoot you if you are persistent in your petition. But listen, when next winter you suffer with cold, with insufficient clothing, with hunger and all wretchedness centered upon you—and life a burden and a mockery and you face suicide and are ready to seek the embrace of the lake, rather than suffer, halt! Can you do nothing to insure those whom you are about to orphan against a like fate? The waves will mock your act; but stroll down the avenues, look in the voluptuous homes and discover there the robbers who have despoiled you. Here let your tragedy be enacted and send forth your petition that will never be heeded except when read in the glare of conflagration, or when handed to your oppressors upon the point of the sword. You need no organization—that would be a detriment, but avail yourselves of the methods of warfare which science has placed in the hands of the poor. Learn the use of explosives. " Dedicated to the tramps by Lucy E. Parsons."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 19. The Alarm, November 1, 1884.

This exhibit is the international workingmen's proclamation and declaration of principles, substantially the same as the translation thereof published in the Arbeiter Zeitung and before extracted, but closes as follows:

Whoever agrees with this idea, let him grasp our outstretched brother hands.

Proletarians of all countries, unite.

Fellow workmen, all we need for the achievement of this great end is organization and unity.

There exists now no great obstacle to that unity. The work of peaceful education and revolutionary conspiracy will, can and ought to run in parallel lines.

The day has come for solidarity. Join our ranks! Let the drum beat defiantly the roll of battle; workingmen of all lands, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to win. Tremble, oppressors of the world! Not far beyond your purblind slight there dawns the scarlet and sable lights of the judgment day!

Issued by the Pittsburgh Congress of International Workingpeople's Association on October 16, 1883.

Published by the bureau of information.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 20. Alarm, October 11, 1884.

"Take care." At a meeting of the international, No. 54 West Lake street, last week, J. P. Ducey said the unemployed should attack the lives and property of those who have robbed them and then turned them adrift to starve. The Daily News, grown rich on working people's pennies, says of Mr. Ducey he should be nipped in the bud of his mischief making. If he don't like the way this country is run, the authorities should transport him to some land "where such creatures are given their deserts at the end of a rope." The Daily News man fears an attack upon the principle that "the thief doth take each bush to be an officer." Some fine day every wage-worker will become a communist and the Daily News representative of capitalistic robbers will dangle instead of Ducey. Have patience and your curses will come home to roost.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 21. The Alarm of October 18, 1884.

"The Anarchist." The Daily Inter Ocean closes a lengthy article thus: There are anarchists in America, Germany, France and England whose rabies are like those of the Russian nihilist; in India it is thugism. There is nothing republican or socialistic in it—socialism proposing to make the powers of the state all comprehensive. It is announced that the parliamentary buildings at Quebec have been blown up by dynamite. This is anarchic nihilism. The Cleveland fires perhaps the same. Anarchists will discover that an American militia is more prompt and merciless than an imperial army, and the American people will be more condign and vengeful against anarchism. If the public become certain that anarchism means malicious and deadly force, anarchists will find Russian despotism less effective for their suppression than American law.

The Inter-Ocean man has overlooked the fact that one man with a dynamite bomb is equal to a regiment of militia. The method of warfare has been revolutionized by the discoveries of modern science, and will use explosives in the coming conflict.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 22. The Alarm, October 25, 1884.

Miners in Ohio are organizing companies of sharpshooters, proposing to try force. "The necessity which has heretofore compelled them to submit to the employers' terms they now intend to get rid of by removing those who created that necessity."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 23. The Alarm, October 25, 1884.

"The Socialists." Socialists are falsely accused of being blood-thirsty. Once competition ground down so slowly as to be unnoticed, but now, with free schools, free press, etc., its course is observed, and when anything is moving against the rights of the majority, it will be stopped. Whether bloodshed will be required depends upon how old the principle is, and how interested its supporters are in keeping it up; and second, upon the determination of the opposition. An opposition known to be sufficiently strong for certain victory will command and obtain a bloodless surrender. This is why the anarchist urges scientific study and the construction of explosives, to make themselves too strong to be opposed with deadly weapons, which alone can insure against bloodshed. Bloodshed being useless and injustice defenceless, people can be forced to deal justly and generously with each other. The ridiculous situation that requires men to freeze because there is too much coal, starve because there is too much bread, go naked because there is too much clothing, and lie out-doors because there are too many houses, cannot continue, especially when that evil is known to be increasing. The only remedy is make common property and let all partake of the earnings; allow none to hoard or carry off.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 24. The Alarm, November 1, 1885.

"The Useless Classes." Who does no good to humanity is useless. There is a vast amount of useless work going on, by reason of which the workers have lost sight of the pleasure of work. The selfish, infernal scheme, called "the right of property," has created useless work and useless workers—the capitalists and their allies, including jailers and police, bankers, brokers, judges, peddlers, etc., and the end of the right of property is to constitute a class of paupers, thieves, vagabonds, hypocrites, etc. Destroy the right of property and you set these useless workers at useful work, thereby reducing the hours of labor of the present laborers, and doing away with poverty and filth.

This can be done by making ourselves masters of the use of dynamite, then declaring against private ownership and punishing its assertion. Let us not strike when our numbers are too small, and to avoid unnecessary bloodshed, etc., we must strike together and know our purpose and be prepared. "Our war is not against men, but against systems." We can expect few converts among the rich, and it will be better for our cause if they strike first.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 25. The Alarm, November 1, 1884.

Socialists are accused of advocating the destruction of property. Their plan is to make property common, to supply all needs, but prevent destruction or waste, only destroying to prevent recapture.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 26. The Alarm, November 1, 1884.

"Anarchism." "The anarchist believes in peace, but not at the expense of liberty. He believes that political laws are enacted to force men to do those things they would not naturally or if left untrammeled. Therefore he considers all political laws as violations of the laws of nature and the rights of man. He believes if each man held all laws within himself, he would be held to a just execution of them by every other man. Therefore, that he can only hope for justice and liberty through the abolition of statutes and governments. He has no faith in the laws of man; but all faith in the laws of nature.

"He believes that, under any government, the more a man is governed the less he is free. Therefore, as the least government the better, none at all is best—that all governments become despotisms; that evil in man results from the violation of natural right, and that most laws are intended to advantage one class at the expense of another. He therefore demands the abolition of all political laws and the restoration of the rights of man as nature has provided."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 27. The Alarm, November 15, 1885.

"The Butchers of Men." What Gen. Phil. Sheridan says in his annual report upon the subject of capital and labor.

November 10th last, Gen. Phil Sheridan in his annual report says that latterly much attention has been given to rifle practice, developing great skill in long-distance shooting. Approves the state militia, and thinks Congress ought to determine the number of troops in each state and provide arms, equipage, etc. Urges sea coast fortification, and then says: There are other signs of trouble. Destructive explosives are easily made, and that large buildings can be easily demolished and commerce destroyed by an infuriated people, with means carried safely in their pocket. Militarism is capitalism embodied in force, and the instruments of tyrants—its only occupation "to protect the sacred rights of property." The right of property enslaves, plunders and destroys the propertyless class. "Dynamite is the emancipator. In the hands of the enslaved it cries aloud, justice or annihilation." The workingmen will use it until "property

rights are destroyed and a free society and justice becomes the rule of government among men."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 28. The Alarm, November 22, 1884.

"This paper." This paper is owned by the International Workingpeople's Association; published by the working people for the public good. We ask a little from those interested to increase its circulation and its size.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 29. The Alarm, November 28, 1884.

"The Black Flag." The emblem of hunger unfolded by the porletarians of Chicago. The red flag, borne aloft by thousands of workingmen on Thanksgiving day. The poverty of the poor is created by the robbery of the rich. Speeches, resolutions and a grand demonstration of the unemployed, the tramps and miserables of the city. Significant incidents. Shortly before Thanksgiving day some of the working people, after consultation, issued the following circular to wage-workers and tramps: The governor has ordained next Thursday for Thanksgiving. You are to give thanks because your masters refuse you employment; because you are hungry and without home or shelter, and your masters have taken away what you have created and arranged to shoot you by the police or militia if you refuse to die in your hovel, in due observation of "Law and Order." You must give thanks that you face the blizzards without an overcoat; without fit shoes and clothes, while abundant clothing made by you spoils in the storehouses; that you suffer hunger while millions of bushels of grain rot in the elevators; for this purpose a thanksgiving meeting will be held on Market square at 2:30 o'clock, to be followed by a demonstration to express our thanks to our "Christian brothers on Michigan avenue." Every one that feels the mockery of this Thanksgiving order should be present. Signed, the Committee of the Grateful Workingpeople's International Association.

Thursday opened with sleet and rain, cold and miserable. At 2:30 over three thousand people assembled on Market street, under the unpitying rain and sleet. A stranger said, "What you want is guns; you don't want to be heard talking." He was stopped for the regular arrangements. The meeting being called to order, A. R. Parsons said: "We assemble as representatives of the disinherited, to speak in the name of forty thousand unemployed workingmen of Chicago, two millions in the United States and fifteen millions in the civilized world." He compared

the Thanksgiving feast to that of Belshazzar, and said the champagne wrung from the blood of the poor ought to strangle the rich. He then read as follows: "St. James, chapter 5, says, 'Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries which are to come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasures together for the last days. Behold the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which ye have kept back by fraud, crieth: Woe to them that bring about iniquity by law.' The prophet Habakkuk says: 'Woe to him that buildeth a town by blood, and establisheth a city by iniquity.' The prophet Amos says: 'Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor to fail from the land, that I may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes.' The prophet Isaiah says: 'Woe unto them that chain house to house, and lay field to field, till there is no place, that they may be alone in the midst of the earth.' Solomon says: 'There is a generation that are pure in their own eves, and yet is not washed of their filthiness; a generation, Oh, how lifted are their eyes, and how their eyelids are lifted up: A generation whose teeth are as swords, and their jaw teeth as knives, to devour the poor from off the earth, and the needy from among men.'"

And concluding, he said: We did not intend to wait for a future existence, but to do something for ourselves in this.

He introduced S. S. Griffin, who said this was an international assembly in the interests of humanity, having no quarrel with each other and objecting to being set at work by governmental scheme. Don't believe that any government or system should be allowed to pit man against man, for any cause; and to get at the root of these evils, we must go to the foundation of property rights and the wage system. The old system could not meet the demands of our present civilization. The present cry is against over-production, because it operates against humanity. Over-production, glutting the market, causes a lockout, depriving the wage class of the means of purchasing. Vacant houses stop the building industry, and results in throwing builders out of employment; ragged because of a surplus of clothing; homeless because of too many houses; hungry because there is too much bread; freezing because too much coal is produced. The system must be changed. Man can wear but one suit of clothes at a time and can consume only about so much. The genius of our age is inventing and increasing the productive

power. A system that in effect tells the working classes that the more they produce the less they will have to enjoy is a check on human progress and cannot continue. Everything must be made free. No man should control what he has no personal use for.

Upon Mr. Parsons' call the resolutions were read as follows:

WHEREAS, We have outlived wage and property system; and whereas, the right of property requires more effort to adjust it between man and man than to produce and distribute it,

Resolved, That property rights should no longer be maintained or respected, and that all useless workers should be deprived of useless employment and required to engage in productive industry; and as this is impossible under the payment system,

Resolved, That no man shall pay for anything, or receive pay for anything, or deprive himself of what he may desire, that he finds out of use or vacant.

Resolved, That whoever refuses to devote a reasonable amount of energy to the production or distribution of necessaries is the enemy of mankind and ought to be so treated; and so of the willful waster.

As this system cannot be introduced as against existing ignorance and selfishness without force, *Resolved* that when, introduced, the good of mankind and the saving of blood requires that forcible opposition shall be dealt with summarily; but that no one should be harmed for holding opposite opinions.

Resolved that our policy is wise, humane and practical and ought to be enforced at the earliest possible moment.

As an expression of thankfulness, *Resolved* that we are thankful we have learned the true cause of poverty and the remedies, and can only be more thankful when the remedy is applied.

The next speaker was Samuel Fielden. He denounced the hypocrisy of calling upon people to thank God for prosperity, while providing no changes for the better, when so many were in actual want in the midst of abundance. That when he was a boy, his mother taught him to say, "Our Father who art in Heaven;" but so far as he knew God had remained there and would not come here until things were better arranged. Our motto is, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, embracing all men. Our international movement is to unite all countries and to do away with the robber class.

August Spies spoke. Pointing to the black flag, he said it was the first time the emblem of hunger and starvation had been unfurled on

American soil. He said we had got to strike down these robbers who were robbing the working people.

In answer to a call from the Germans, Mr. Schwab spoke in German a few minutes. A stranger said, "Get your guns out and go for them. That is all I have got to say." Three cheers were given for the social revolution. The audience then formed a procession three thousand strong and marched headed by the band playing the Marsellaise, carrying two large flags, one black and the other red, and about midway of the procession two more. Various transparencies were borne along. Among them: "Workmen, organize. Liberty without equality is a lie." "Private capital is the reward of robbery." "All workmen have identical interests." "Privilege is injustice." "No greater crime in our day than poverty." "Down with wage slavery," etc. When the procession reached the Arbeiter Zeitung building, Mr. Parsons spoke from the window, congratulating the crowd upon the success of the demonstration, introduced Fielden, who made a brief and eloquent speech and said they had given fair warning. He urged them to organize and prepare for the inevitable conflict which the capitalistic class would force upon them. He said that "All nationalities and creeds were swallowed up in the international, which made of all mankind a band of brothers, and by securing justice to each, would bring, peace, prosperity and happiness to all."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 30. The Alarm, November 29, 1884.

"The Property Power." So long as property is protected by law, each person will use his accumulations as a weapon against the unfortunate. The property power is a lever that meanness alone can acquire, inhumanity alone will use. "If we would but stop to think of the real depravity of the crime of withholding from the hardworking needy, and especially from their little ones, we would thoroughly damn ourselves for allowing it to continue." The deprivation of the poor is for the aggrandizement of the rich. If there was a shadow of truth in the statement that the freely giving of food, shelter and clothing to all would, in the least, take away the present comforts of robbers of the so-called upper class, then people could more patiently tolerate the present wickedness.

When the people wake up to the enormity of the crime of property holding and property manipulating, then dynamite will not be too powerful or too quick to express their hatred for those who uphold it. There 's no just reason why three-fourths of the world's energy should be

wasted in stealing, guarding and manipulating the comforts and necessaries of life. It is no credit to a men that he spends his energies—he does it because he has to, is so created and cannot help it; and not to do so would be pain; therefore, no man should be paid for what he produces, and, in justice to humanity, he who will not produce should be killed. Down with this infernal nonsense that we must surely live by money! We have no just use for money, or banks, brokers or insurers, jailers, or any other hoodlum class who are wickedly wasting the energy of their lives. No rascality or stupidity is sacred because it is old.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 31. The Alarm, December 6, 1884.

"Dynamite, the protection of the poor against the armies of the rich."

The article again quotes from Gen. Sheridan's report of November 10, 1884, as to the ease of constructing and carrying explosives, and further says, a hint to the wise is sufficient. One dynamite bomb properly placed will destroy a regiment of soldiers. Their First regiment may as well disband, for if it should ever level its guns upon the workmen of Chicago, it can be annihilated.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 32. Translation of "Anarchist."

Motto: All government we hate. Organ of the autonomous group of the I. A. A. Volume 1. Chicago, January 1, 1886. No. 1. Complaints should be sent to G. Engel, 286 Milwaukee avenue. Call. Workingmen and fellows: We recognize it our duty to contend against existing rule, but he who would war successfully must equip himself with all implements adapted to destroy his opponents and secure victory. In consideration thereof we have resolved to publish the Anarchist, as a line in the fight for the disinherited. It is necessary to disseminate anarchistic doctrine. As we strive for freedom from government we advocate the principle of autonomy, in this sense: We strive towards the overthrow of the existing order, that an end may be put to the "abhorrent work of destruction on the part of mankind, and fratricide may be done away." The equality of all, without distinction of race, color or nationality, is our fundamental principle, thus ending rule and servitude. We reject reformatory endeavors as useless play, adding to the miserable derision and oppression of the workingmen. Against the never-to-be-satisfied ferocity of the capital we recommend the radical means of the present age. All endeavors of the working classes not aiming at the overthrow of existing conditions of ownership and at complete self-gov-

ernment are to us reactionary. The idea of the absence of authority warrants that we will always carry on a fight of principles only.

Motto, second page: " For liberty we strive."

Third page. Conclusion of German prospectus, " Liberty, equality and brotherhood can only be established by anarchy." Signed " F'g," showing who the writer is.

On the third page, " For equality we fight. New Year's Greeting." The poem is one of eight verses, of eight lines each, presenting the inequalities between poverty and wealth, and calling upon the workingmen to gird them for the rebuilding of the world.

On the third page of the same paper is the following: " The right to live." No one can deny that man brings with him into the world the right to live. But this is denied him by the property beast. He who has the whip of power will brandish it over the poor. What does the world offer to the poor who are compelled to carry on a mere struggle for existence? Patented machinery, combined with capital and other means of preservation, denies work to the workmen on account of the excessive offer of working powers. Workingmen should therefore enter the ranks of those who propose to set aside the present system of inequality and build up a system of equality and freedom. Let every one join the International Workingmen's Association, and arm himself with the best weapons of modern tfmes.

Page 3 of the same paper: " Beginnings of a reaction in America." The authorities in America have hitherto refused to prosecute anarchists as the European powers do, not because of hatred to despotism, but from fear that the American people might be driven into anarchism. As anarchists increase, however, it is intended to do away with them by slow degrees. To this end a bill was introduced in Congress refusing to and revoking citizenship of such. Yet the anarchist declines citizenship because he regards himself as cosmopolitan. We hope for more foolish things to open the eyes of American workingmen.

From page 4 of the same paper: " Reflections of an anarchist at the grave of Leiske." After the workingman becomes a journeyman he feels free, casts a glance into the world—it is glorious, beautiful. He thinks there is happiness for him somewhere. He proposes to go abroad, but a terrible cry falls upon his ears, the outcry of a tormented people. He inquires, have the pariahs of to-day a right to live? and answers yes. Why otherwise born if suffered to die with hunger? And hunger and poverty are the results of the stealings of the rich. Having thus con-

cluded, he swears to help in the work of liberation, "In the great struggle of mankind for a better condition"; to take vengeance upon those responsible for this misery. In his investigations he learns the utter vileness of the police power, and a policeman is killed. Whereupon the workman is arrested, charged with the murder of Rumpf and killed after nearly a year of most devilish torture. With what contempt Leiske met his executioners and with what heroism he went unto his death is known to our fellows, and he shall be avenged. Signed, Sch – – – k.

Motto on fourth page: "Thus we conquer or die." Meetings advertised: The south-west side group at 611 Throop street, every Saturday evening; the north-west side group every Thursday evening at 636 Milwaukee avenue; the Lehr und Wehr Verein, third company in Workingmen's Hall, West 12th street, every Thursday evening, and the school of discussion of the anarchists at 713 West 20th street, every Monday evening.

Below that, anarchistic periodicals advertised:

Freiheit, John Mueller, 167 William street, New York; the Alarm, 107 5th avenue; Parole, 112½ South 7th street, St. Louis; Budoonost, 396 West 18th street; Anarchist, 585 Center avenue, Chicago; Arbeiter Zeitung, Flackel, Verbote, 107 5th avenue; Proleter, 550 16th street, New York.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 33. The Alarm, December 13, 1884.

"The seat of war." The industrial war between the rich and poor is daily broadening and intensifying. During the past week government has resorted to military force on four occasions: At Des Moines, to suppress the workingmen on a strike; at Norwalk, Conn., Straitsville, Ohio, and Port Huron, Ontario, same. The property class always fall back on force. To arms, fellowmen!

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 34. The Alarm, January 13, 1885:

"Force the only defense against injustice and oppression." Because the socialists advocate resistance, they are accused of brutality and want of wisdom. All men agree that themselves should not be trampled upon by others. If you can compel a man to agree to allow others to exercise control over him, you will find that the soldier will soon claim all you have acquired for yourselves. This only teaches that it is dangerous for the wicked to teach war; not so with justice. Justice can never create opposition to itself. Therefore "justice is always safe in accumulating force, while injustice

can only accumulate force at its peril." We are told force is cruel, but this is only true when the opposition is less cruel. If the opposition is relentless power, starving, freezing, etc., and the application of force will require less suffering, then force is humane. Therefore we say that dynamite is both humane and economical. It will, at the expense of less suffering, prevent more. It is not humane to compel ten persons to starve to death, when the execution of five persons would prevent it. " A system that is starving and freezing tens of thousands of little children, in the midst of a world of plenty, cannot be defended against dynamiters on the ground of humanity." " If every child that starved to death in the United States was retaliated for by the execution of a rich man in his own parlor, the brutal system of wage property would not last six weeks." " It is a wonder that a father, after his vain search for bread, see his little ones starve or freeze, without striking that vengeful, just and bloody blow at the cause that would prevent other little ones suffering a similar fate. It is not probable that men will always endure this cruel, relentless process of monopoly and competition."

" The privileged class use force to perpetuate their power, and the despoiled workers must use force to prevent it." Signed C. S. G.

People's Exhibit 35. The Alarm, January 24, 1885.

" Wage workers." Michael Schwab spoke in German, that the gap between the rich and the poor was growing wider, therefore socialism had arisen. The poor had to labor too long to properly educate himself. He spoke of Reinsdorff as a martyr to the cause, whose death was avenged by the killing of Rumpf.

" It was no wonder that socialism should prosper, when people learned how cruel capital was." That murder was forced on many through misery and want, produced by the tyranny of capital. That freedom in this country was unknown, both political parties being corrupt, and that what was needed was a bloody revolution which would right their wrongs.

August Spies spoke in German and advised immediate revolt. Wage slavery could only be abolished through powder and ball. No reform could be secured through the medium of the ballot, which was a mere game of cards, in which a cold deck was wrung in on the innocent voter by the capitalistic class. The ballot was a humbug and a fraud so far as accomplishing reform for the workingman was concerned. He alluded to the tyranny of capital as shown in the Hocking Valley and at South

Bend, where they charged that men were robbed and compelled to starve *en masse*, and when they demurred, were shot down like dogs. They should bring about the reform by force. They should inform themselves and bring about emancipation of the wage slaves.

Spies offered a resolution, which was adopted, applauding the slaying of Rumpf as a spy.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 36. The Alarm, February 7, 1885.

"Notice." Hereafter articles in the Alarm will be signed by the initials of the author.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 37. The Alarm, February 7, 1885.

"The war cry." A poem of five verses, signed Gorsuch. Describes briefly the contest between wage-workers and capital and speaks of dynamite as a delivering power.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 38. The Alarm, February 21, 1885.

"The dynamite terror." There is first quoted a passage from Swinton's paper, claiming that the ballot furnishes the remedy for all political evils in this country; then expresses surprise at the idea, and proceeds: "America is not a free country. A wage slave is a slave everywhere. How can the industrially enslaved be politically free? Only the hand which holds the bread can wield the ballot. Political changes do not bring deliverance to the wage slaves nor changes in the personnel of the office-holders. The poor have no votes; wealth alone can vote. The poor are deprived of the means of existence, opportunity to acquire knowledge and culture and refinement; and for the perpetuation of these evils they have to thank the government, the ballot-box and the politicians, and these are the results of the wage-slavery system." "The deep-rooted, malignant evil which compels the wealth-producers to become the defendant hirelings of a few capitalistic czars, cannot be reached by means of the ballot." Slaves can only revolt. Here, as elsewhere, the worker is held in economic bondage by force, and force only can emancipate it. P.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 39. The Alarm, February 21, 1881.

"Dynamite." Dynamite is the good stuff; in giving it to the downtrodden millions, science has done its best work. It can be carried about in the pocket without danger, while it is a formidable weapon against

force, which would stifle the cry for justice which comes forth from the plundered slaves—not ornamental, but useful. It is a boon for the disinherited, while it brings terror to the robbers, but it brings terror only to the guilty. You cannot prohibit its manufacture successfully. A pound of this good stuff beats a bushel of bullets. "It takes more justice and right than is contained in laws to quiet the sprit of unrest." The sledge to shatter every link is dynamite.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND. T. LIZIUS.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 40. From the Alarm, March 7, 1885.

"Our Agitators." The agitation trips of Comrades Gorsuch, Fielden and Griffin during the past two weeks, was prolific of good results. Twelve American groups were organized in different cities, and those united with the international are working "to bring into the ranks of the revolutionary army the proletariats of the contiguous districts. The Workingpeople's International Association now embraces eighty groups, scattered all over the United States, mainly in centers of industry, from which the propagandism radiates everywhere, the membership being many thousands. In Chicago, with thousands of members, five newspapers, with increasing circulations, are published. The good work goes bravely on, and exertions should be redoubled.

"Agitation for the purpose of organization; organization for the purpose of rebellion against wage slavery, is the duty of the hour." Signed "P."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 41. From the Alarm, March 21, 1885.

"How to make dynamite." The next issue of the Alarm will begin the publication of a series of articles on the manufacture and use of dynamite, of bombs, etc.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 42, from the Alarm of April 18, 1885.

"Assassination." "Assassination is stigmatized as barbarous and cowardly, which is sometimes true, but there are instances in which it is brave, humane and wise. Governments cannot be abolished by accepted methods, because it requires an organized government for the contest. The abolition of government suggests the picture of diverse petty governments resulting and contending with one another. This fact suggests the destruction of government in such manner as to prevent the organization of other governments. This can only be done by assassi-

nating the heads of governments, and thus preventing such organization. Such is the policy of the nihilist of Russia. Governments least offensive should be destroyed last. All governments exist by the abridgment of human liberty. Domineering powers should be treated as enemies. Assassination will remove the evil. Man will always need officers, teachers, leaders, but not bosses, jailers or drivers. Man's leader is his friend, his driver, his enemy. Assassination, properly applied, is wise, humane and brave. For freedom all things are just." Signed "G."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT, 43. From the Alarm of April 18, 1885.

"Explosives." "The power of dynamite, as illustrated by blasting exercises. (Translated from Freiheit by A. A.)"

The translation is substantially the same as a portion of the contents of Most's book, presenting the results of the experiments by the Austrian government, etc., etc.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 44. From the Alarm of May 2, 1885.

"Bombs." The manufacture and use of the deadly dynamite bomb made easy. The weapon of the social revolutionists falls within the reach of all. The terror of tyrants. (Translation from Freiheit by A. A.)"

This exhibit, we believe, is substantially the same as that portion of Most's book treating upon the manufacture of different styles of dynamite bombs.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 45. From the Alarm of June 27, 1885.

"Dynamitė." Instructions regarding its use and operations.

"Though every one speaks of dynamite, few know its character. To those who will sooner or later be forced to employ its destructive qualities for their rights, as men and for their preservation, a few hints may not be of out place." With proper care dynamite may be safely handled. It is known in the market as giant powder, and is a mixture of nitroglycerine with clay or sawdust. The mixture requires a chemist, being dangerous. Revolutionists should buy dynamite ready made. It is cheap and can be purchased from any large powder concern. It explodes at a temperature of 180 degrees Fahrenheit, and from violent concussion. It ought not to be exposed to the rays of the sun or placed near a stove. The best storage is, wrap in oil paper, place in a box of sawdust and bury where it cannot be touched. Do not thaw frozen dynamite, and be

careful not to get any of the dynamite upon your lips or skin, as it will give a headache. In filling bombs use a rubber mitten and tie a handkerchief over the mouth to prevent inhaling dangerous gases. Never be careless. Keep pure and avoid sand. The revolutionst should practice throwing bombs. For further information, address A. S., Alarm, 107 5th avenue, Chicago.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 46. From the Alarm of May 30, 1885.

"War with all means." (Translation from Freiheit.) Substantially the same as that portion of Most's book in reference to the use of combustibles, found on pages 30 to 32 of People's Exhibit 15.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 47. From the Alarm, June 13, 1885.

"Explosives." "Recent experiments have greatly increased the explosive power of gun-cotton. The following from Johnson Turner's work of chemistry will prove valuable. After washing the gun-cotton in light soda lye and rinsing in clean water, soak in a solution of chlorate of potash before drying. This will make its explosive power equal to dynamite. Signed A. A."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 48. From the Alarm, July 25, 1885.

"Street fighting." How to meet the enemy. Some valuable hints for the revolutionary soldiers. What an officer of the United States army has to say. The following letter, published in the San Francisco Truth some time ago, will be read with interest. The letter is quoted as follows, in substance: "I am an officer in the army of the United States, and know whereof I write. John Upton said to me, with great earnestness, that the day of armies is passing away. I believe this. This introduces my subject. I desire to place the details of the science of butchery before the people; to point out its weak points, so that in future uprisings the people may stand some chance of winning. They have for the past twenty years been overcome only because of their own ignorance. They have been slaughtered and subdued because of a lack of coolness, want of knowledge, and adherence to what is called 'humanity,' 'honorable warfare,' etc. I assume that my readers agree with me that against tyrants all means are legitimate, and that in war that course is best, though bloodiest, which soonest ends the contest. My purpose is to persuade the people to add a little common sense in future to their gallant heroism, and thus insure success.

United States and state regiments are organized on the unit of fours, which permits the most rapid and effective change of front that can be devised. The art of war consists in making soldiers fight. The line of retreat must be kept open to avoid capture. In future revolts the people shall assume the aggressive. Army officers have wasted years of study over the problem of street fighting, unavailingly. The plan below shows a method now adopted as best. The troops are formed on the street in two bodies in column of four, headed by a gatling gun. On the sidewalk a line of skirmishers and sharpshooters, whose duty it is to fire into the houses, the whole advancing cautiously. When a cross street is reached, a company is left to hold it, in order to keep open the avenue of retreat. Military knowledge has become popularized since 1877, and now, in almost any contest, it would be easy to find some fair leaders of the people who would devise some means of meeting such an advance, as indicated by the following diagram. The diagram represents a street corner. The plan is, at the street crossing to have bodies of revolutionists with movable barracks placed obliquely on the cross street, and who from there will fire vigorously upon the advancing column. They have supporters also in the building, also at the corner, whose duty it is to throw dynamite upon the troops. If the position is carried, the party defending escape through the cross street. The rear of the column can also be attacked from the cross streets. "If the men in the barricades are armed with the new international dynamite rifle (which I am told exists in the hands of the revolutionists), I give it as a careful technical opinion, that, pursuing these tactics under brave and able leaders, fifty men can hold at bay and finally destroy in any of your cities an attacking force of five thousand troops." Signed "R. S. S." Alcatraz Island, December 8.

People's Exhibit 49. From the Alarm of August 22, 1885.

"Wage slavery." "The private property system has doomed millions to enforced idleness and slow starvation in the United States. These unemployed wage slaves, more wretched than the chattel slave, can find no master willing to give them work or bread.

People's Exhibit No. 50. The Alarm, September 5th, 1885.

"Eight Hours." Our Reply. Will the rich help to bring it about, or oppose it with starvation, prisons and cold steel? Will increasing machinery increase the number of unemployed? Shortening the hours

of labor is no real remedy. It still leaves wage slavery, and there cannot be any peace under that master and servant system. The power to accumulate is not equally bestowed, and as no man has made himself, no one is to blame for a want of this power; nor is it a virtue in him who possesses it. "A man gets rich by meanness and remains poor because he is generous." How long can we endure a system that rewards meanness and starves generosity? Can you shorten the hours? Will they help to bring about a condition where there are no unemployed men, to be called upon by them in their effort to force down wages by the process of competition? Private property makes competition necessary, and monopoly results. We must strike at the root of the evil, and all short of this is useless patchwork. It is foolish to quarrel about the odds and ends of a bad system, but we must have patience with the humble minded.

The Alarm does not antagonize the eight-hour movement. It simply says that it will be inefficient. In England the shortening of the hours of labor was immediately followed by a general increase of machines and a subsequent discharge of a proportionate number of employes, whereby the exploitation of those at work was intensified, they now performing more labor than before. The eight-hour system would result in further breaking down small manufacturers and increasing the larger establishments, while over-production would still remain. It is said that capital is rightfully a servant of labor, and when it oversteps its bounds becomes a trespasser. But capital is not the servant of labor, but of its possessor.

"In regard to the proposed strike next spring, a few practical words. There are eight hundred thousand organized workers in the country, and about two million unemployed men. When the demand is made, it will be denied, and the employers will draw from this army of the unemployed. The strikers will attempt to stop them. Then comes the police and the militia. Say, workingmen, are you prepared to meet the latter? are you armed?" Signed "A."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 51. The Alarm, October 17, 1885.

"Eight Hours. Trades unions gather in mass meeting at Turner Hall. They prepare for the inauguration of the eight-hour working day. Resolutions to arm and defend themselves against the starvation, prisons and cold steel of capitalists."

Samuel Fielden, the first speaker, reviewed the conditions existing between capital and labor, as evidenced by strikes, etc., dwelt upon the

grinding tyrrany of capital, referred to the St. Louis strike, and the policy pursued by the owners of the Pullman car works to prevent organization of skilled labor, although the capitalists themselves organize and band together. The Saginaw lumber owners asked their employes to agree even not to appeal to the law. The capitalist can destroy the satisfactory working of the eight-hour law. The real remedy is the abolition of the right of private property. The eight-hour law on the statute books of Illinois is a dead-letter. These things show that the wage-worker must look, not to the law, but to themselves to assert their rights. August Spies introduced resolutions, reciting that, whereas, it was believed that the capitalists would oppose the eight-hour movement, calling to their assistance the Pinkerton's police and state militia; therefore, resolved, that wage-workers be urged to prepare to meet their enemies with their own argument, force. That while skeptical as to the results of an eight-hour day, they yet pledged themselves to co-operate to bring it to pass, and to combine with their brethren in the class struggle against the aristocratic class: the brutal murderers of comrades in St. Louis, Lemont, Philadelphia, Chicago and elsewhere, and that our war-cry may be " Death to the enemy of the human race, our destroyers." Mr. Spies said that with nine million people in this country in industrial trades, only one million of them organized, and with two million unemployed people, the movement to be made successful must be revolutionary. " Don't let us," he exclaimed, " forget the most forcible argument of all—the gun and dynamite."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 52. From the Alarm, May 2, 1885.

" Our Vampires." At the conclusion of Mr. Fielden's speech, Mr. Parsons said: At 5 o'clock this morning one hundred thousand wage-workers in Chicago rose, and after their frugal breakfast went to their factories, where they gave from ten to sixteen hours for wages barely sufficient for subsistence. Twenty thousand able-bodied men, unemployed, tramped the streets, unable to find employment. To-night the robbers of labor's product are dedicating a temple to the God of Mammon, to be used to plunder the people. We have met, as anarchists and communists, to protest against the methods and practices of the existing society. The board of trade is an institution devoted to making the food of the people dear and scarce—dedicated to chicanery and legalized theft. It runs corners and manipulates prices. There is not a stone in the building that has not been carved out of the flesh and blood of labor

and cemented by the tears of the women and children of toil. The practices of these men send our little ones supperless to bed and bring wretchedness where peace and plenty should prevail. Is not our natural right to life, liberty and happiness equal to any one else's? But the present private property system creates classes and inequalities, "conferring upon the holders of property the power to live upon the labor product of the propertyless. Whoever owns our bread owns our ballots, for a man who must sell his labor or starve must sell his vote when the same alternative is presented." This conspiracy is maintained by statute law and enforced by military arms. If we would achieve our liberties, we must arm ourselves, then raise the standard of revolt, the scarlet banner of liberty, fraternity and equality, and strike down every tyrant. Therefore, agitate for the purpose of organization, organize for the purpose of rebellion, for wage slaves have nothing to lose but their chains; they have a world of freedom and happiness to win.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 54.

The following advertisement, contained in the Alarm, from August 17, 1885, to its last issue: "The armed section of the American group meets every Monday night at 54 West Lake street."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 54. From the Alarm, December 26, 1865.

"(A free translation from the German.) Bakunin's groundwork for the social revolution. A revolutionist's duty to himself."

1. The revolutionist is self-offered; has no personal interest, but is absorbed by the one passion, the revolution.

2. He is at war with the existing order of society and lives to destroy it.

3. He despises society in its present form and leaves its reorganization to the future, himself knowing only the science of destruction. He studies mathematics, chemistry, etc., for this purpose. The quick and sure overthrow of the present unreasonable order is his object.

4. He despises public sentiment and acknowledges as moral whatever favors the revolution; as criminal whatever opposes it.

5. He is consecrated; he will not spare, nor does he expect mercy. Between him and society reigns the war of death or life.

6. Stringent with himself, he must be stringent with others. All sentiment must be suppressed by his passion for the revolutionary work. He must be ready to die and to kill.

7. He excludes romance and sentiment and also personal hatred and revenge; never obeying his personal inclinations, but his revolutionary duty.

TOWARD HIS COMRADES.

8. His friendship is only for his comrade, and is measured by that comrade's usefulness in the practical work in the revolution.

9. As to important affairs, he must consult with his comrades, but in execution depend upon himself. Each must be self-operating, and must ask help only when imperatively necessary.

10. He shall use himself and his subordinates as capital to be used for the work of the revolution, but no part of which can he dispose of without the consent of the persons involved.

11. If a comrade is in danger, he shall not consider his personal feelings, but the interest of the cause.

HIS DUTY TOWARD SOCIETY.

12. A new candidate can be taken into the company only after proof of his merit, and upon unanimous consent.

13. He lives in the so-called civilized world because he believes in its speedy destruction. He clings to nothing as it now is, and does not hesitate to destroy any institution. He is no revolutionist if arrested by personal ties.

14. He must obtain entrance everywhere, even in the detective agency and the emperor's palace.

15. The present society should be divided into categories, the first including those sentenced to immediate death, the others classifying the delinquents according to their rascality.

16. The lists are not to be influenced by personal considerations, but those are to be first destroyed whose death can terrify governments and deprive them of their most intelligent agents.

17. The second category embraces those permitted to live, but whose evil deeds will drive the people to open revolt.

18. The third category embraces the dissolute rich whose secrets must be discovered in order to control their resources.

19. The fourth category consists of ambitious officials and liberals whose purposes we must discover so as to prevent their withdrawing from our cause.

20. The fifth category consists of doctrinaire conspirators; they must be urged to action.

21. The sixth category is the women, who are divided into three classes: First, the brainless and heartless; second, the passionate and qualified; and, third, the wholly consecrated, who are to be guarded as the most valuable part of the revolutionary treasures.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 55. From the Alarm, February 6, 1886.

Capt. Bonfield has written that but for his interference and clubbing in the July carmen's strike, many an American sovereign would now be in a felon's grave. "Paste this in your hats, American sovereigns." That a felon's cell or grave awaits you as soon as you try to exercise your rights.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 56. From the Alarm of January 9th, 1885.

"Bureau of information," designated to act for the ensuing year, consisting of Joseph Back, B. Rau, August Spies, A. R. Parsons and Hirschberger.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 57. From the Alarm, March 20, 1886. Note on third page.

Argument is useless unless you can compel your antagonist to listen. When he refuses, force becomes necessary.

PEOPLES' EXHIBIT 58. From the Alarm of April 3, 1886.

"American group," etc. "Mr. Parsons thought the organization of the vast body of unskilled and unorganized laboring men and women a necessity, in order that they formulate their demands and make an effective defense of their right. He thought the attempt to inaugurate the eight-hour system would break down the capitalistic system, and bring about such disorder and hardship that the social revolution would become a necessity. As all roads in ancient times led to Rome, so now all labor movements of whatever character inevitably lead to socialism." The unskilled laborers' eight-hour league was then organized, thirty joining.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 59. From the Alarm of April 24, 1886.

"Workingmen, to Arms." "War to the palace, peace to the cottage and death to luxurious idleness. The wage system is the only cause of the world's misery.

"One pound of dynamite is better than a bushel of bullets. Make

your demand for eight bours with weapons in your hands to meet the capitalistic blood-hounds, police and militia in proper manner."

Above handbill, sent from Indianapolis, Indiana, as posted all over that city last week.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 60. From the Alarm April 24, 1886.

Same as People's Exhibit 56.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 60A.

The sensible laboring man, in the eye of the extortionist, is a fellow who lets his family starve to please his boss; a coward who crawls when men are needed; a ragamuffin who kisses the rod.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 61. From the Alarm, April 24, 1886.

" Knaves or fools." In the contest between labor and capital now in progress, pretended leaders deprecate the use by the toiling masses of the only weapons which they possess against capitalistic conspiracy. and organized murder, starvation and wage slavery. These creatures desire place for themselves, or are tickled by being quoted as leaders. They play the role of harmonizers and peacemakers between wage slaves and their despoilers. The toiling masses never authorized Mr. Powderly to issue a proclamation against the eight-hour movement, nor to forbid strikes or boycots. " The social war has come, and whoever is not with us is against us."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 61 A.

Refers to the Haymarket meeting, and calls upon the people to be present.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 62.

Same as page 32 of Herr Most's book.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 63. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of May 4th (local column).

" Blood." " Lead and powder as a cure for dissatisfied workingmen. About six laborers mortally, and four times that number slightly, wounded. Thus are the eight-hour men intimidated! This is law and order! Brave girls parading the city! The law and order beasts frighten the hungry children away with clubs. General news."

Six months ago, when the eight-hour movement began, representa-

McCormick's factory. Policeman West tried to hold them back with his revolver, but was put to flight with a shower of stones and roughly handled. The crowd bombarded the factory windows with stones and demolished the guard house. The scabs were in mortal terror when the Hinman street patrol wagon arrived. They were about to attack the crowd with their clubs when a shower of stones was thrown, followed the next minute by the firing by the police upon the strikers. It was pretended subsequently that they fired over their heads. The strikers had a few revolvers and returned the fire. Meantime, more police arrived and then the whole band opened fire on the people. The people fought with stones, and are said to have disabled four policemen. The gang, as always, fired upon the fleeing, while women and men carried away the severly wounded. How many were injured cannot be told. A dying boy, Joseph Doebick, was brought home on an express wagon by two policemen. The crowd threatened to lynch the officer, but were prevented by a patrol wagon. Various strikers were arrested. McCormick said that August Spies made a speech to a few thousand anarchists and then put himself at the head of a crowd and attacked our works. Our workmen fled and meantime the police came and sent a lot of anarchists away with bleeding heads.

Last night thousands of copies of the following circular were distributed in all parts of the city.

Then follows a translation of the German part of the Revenge circular, as follows:

"Revenge! Revenge! Workmen to arms!

"Men of labor, this afternoon the blood-hounds of your oppressors murdered six of your brothers at McCormick's. Why did they murder them? Because they dared to be dissatisfied with the lot which your oppressors have assigned to them. They demanded bread, and they gave them lead for an answer, mindful of the fact that thus people are most effectually silenced. You have for many years endured every humiliation without protest, have drudged from early in the morning until late at night, have suffered all sorts of privations, have even sacrificed your children. You have done everything to fill the coffers of your masters—everything for them! And now, when you approach them and implore them to make your burden a little lighter, as a reward for your sacrifices, they send their blood-hounds, the police, at you, in order to cure you with bullets of your dissatisfaction. Slaves, we ask and conjure you, by all that is sacred and dear to you, avenge the atrocious

murder that has been committed upon your brothers to-day and which will likely be committed upon you to-morrow. Laboring men, Hercules, you have arrived at the crossway. Which way will you decide? For slavery and hunger or for freedom and bread? If you decide for the latter, then do not delay a moment; then; people, to arms! Annihilation to the beasts in human form who call themselves rulers! Uncompromising annihilation to them! This must be your motto. Think of the heroes whose blood has fertilized the road to progress, liberty and humanity, and strive to become worthy of them!

"YOUR BROTHERS."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 63A. Arbeiter Zeitung, May 1.

"Bravely forward." The conflict has begun. An army of wage laborers are idle. Capitalism conceals its tiger claws behind the ramparts of order. Workmen, let your watchword be: No compromise! Cowards to the rear! Men, to the front. The die is cast. The 1st of May has come. For twenty years the working people have been begging extortioners to introduce the eight-hour system, but have been put off with promises. Two years ago they resolved that the eight-hour system should be introduced in the United States on the first day of May, 1886. The reasonableness of this demand was conceded on all hands. Everybody, apparently, was in favor of shortening the hours, but as the time approached a change became apparent. That which was in theory modest and reasonable became insolent and unreasonable. It became apparent at last that the eight-hour hymn had only been struck up to keep the labor dunces from socialism.

That the laborers might energetically insist upon the eight-hour movement never occurred to the employers. And it is proposed again to put them off with promises. We are not afraid of the masses of laborers, but of their pretended leaders. Workmen, insist upon the eight-hour movement. "To all appearances it will not pass off smoothly." The extortioners are determined to bring their laborers back to servitude by starvation. It is a question whether the workmen will submit or will impart to their would-be murderers an appreciation of modern views. We hope the latter.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 24. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, May 4, 1886.

Heroes of the club with their cudgels in a brutal manner yesterday dispersed a crowd of girls. Many of them had scarcely outgrown their

baby-shoes. Whose blood does not rush quicker when he hears of this atrocity? Men, to the front!

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 64A. From Verbote of May 5.

"To Arms." As we go to press the law-and-order rabble are shooting down our brothers in the vicinity of McCormick's factory. Details are wanted.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 65. From the editorial notices Arbeiter Zeitung, May 4, 1866.

The reports of the capitalistic press were dictated by the police. The reporters skedaddled at McCormick's.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 66. From the editorial notices Arbeiter Zeitung, May 4.

The armory is guarded by militia tramps. As long as the youngsters stay in their barracks they will probably not be molested, but if they appear on the streets it might be otherwise.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 67.

Milwaukee was yesterday the scene of labor riots. "You will never bring about the eight-hour system in your Sunday clothes and by parading the streets."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 68. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, local column, May 3.

"A Hot Conflict. The determination of the radical elements brings the extortioners in numerous instances to terms. The capitalistic press has good grounds for abusing the Reds. Without them no agitation."

The general situation at noon to-day, encouraging. A number of capitalists have capitulated and others are looked for. The freight-handlers are marching from depot to depot and the police are entrenched in the armory. The laborers in the stone-yards have formed a union, and went on a strike upon the refusal of their demand of nine hours' pay for eight hour's work. A strike will probably take place in the lumber districts, etc.

Courage, courage is our cry. Don't forget the words of Herways: "The host of the oppressors grows pale, when thou, weary of thy burden, in the corner puttest the plow; when thou sayest 'it is enough.'"

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 69. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, April 28, 1886. Editorial on the second page.

" In quiet times the shackles of law were forged, to apply them in tempestuous times. An effort is made to build a wall against the stream of the laborers' movement by using their musty law books. We will break these. The power of associate manufacturers must be met by labor associations. The police and soldiers who fight for that power must be met by armed bodies of workingmen. Stones and sticks will not avail against the assassins of the extortionists. It is time to arm yourselves by firearms. The eight-hour movement is modest, yet the capitalists rage and threaten with their police and militia.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 70. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of April 29th. Editorial notice, first page.

" When legitimate means are exhausted the extortioners resort to force. A wage slave, not utterly demoralized, should have a breach-loader and ammunition."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 71. From the Arbeiter Zeitung local column, April 30th.

"'What will the 1st of May bring? The workingmen bold and determined.' The decisive day has arrived. The workingman, inspired by the justice of his cause, demands an alleviation of his lot, a lessening of his burden. The answer, as always is: 'Insolent rabble! Do you mean to dictate to us? That you will do to your sorrow. Hunger will soon rid you of your desire for any notions of liberty. Police, executioners and militia will give their aid.' Men of labor, so long as you acknowledge the gracious kicks of your oppressors with words of gratitude, so long you are faithful dogs. Have your skulls been penetrated by a ray of light, or does hunger drive you to shake off your servile nature, you offend your extortioners. They are enraged, and will attempt, through hired murderers, to do away with you like mad dogs. In this grand struggle for existence on the part of the people, it is claimed that the whole movement is instigated by a few German communists. They do not deserve the compliment. It is true that the intellectual thought underlying the modern labor movement is socialism, and that communists have a hand in the game, but it is the people who in their obscure aspiration follow on the ladder of historical development, conscious of the true way. The masses simply act under the law of necessity."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 72. From Die Fackel of May 2d.

"Now or never. The mortal enemies cross swords. The most modest demands of the bees of labor insolently refused by the drones. Numerous strikes."

Let us review the situation of the contending forces. Fanatics have said that the modest eight-hour demand would meet no serious opposition. But, as we always predicted, the proprietor class make no concessions—it only yields to force. The exception does not change the rule. Even where workmen propose to accept a corresponding reduction of wages, their appeal for a reduction of hours is denied. In the face of these facts, it is treacherous to warn workmen against energetic measures. Everything depends upon quick and immediate action. The tactics of the strikers must be to grant no time. The battle must be won immediately or not at all. To accept the nine hours is to defeat the eight-hour system. The feeling among radical labor organizations is encouraging.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 73. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, May 4. Editorial.

"Blood has flown." It happened as it had to. The militia have not been drilling in vain. It is historical that private property had its origin in violence. The war of classes has come. Yesterday, in front of McCormick's factory, workmen were shot down whose blood cries for vengeance. In the past countless victims have been offered on the altars of the golden calf amid the shouts of capitalistic robbers. One has only to think of East St. Louis, Chicago and other places, to recognize the tactics of the extortioners. The white terror will be answered with the red, for the workmen are not asleep. They modestly asked for eight hours. The answer was to drill the police force and militia, and browbeat those advocating the change. And yesterday blood flowed—the reply of these devils to this modest petition of their slaves. Death rather than a life of wretchedness. The capitalistic tiger lies ready for the jump, his eyes sparkling, eager for murder, and his clutches drawn tight. Self-defense cries, "To arms, to arms." If you do not defend yourselves you will be ground by the animal's teeth.

The powers hostile to the workingmen have made common cause, and our differences must be subordinated to the common purpose. The statement of the capitalistic press, that the workmen yesterday fired first, is a bold, barefaced lie.

In the poor shanty miserably clad women and children are weeping

for husband and father. In the palace they touch glasses filled with costly wine and drink to the happiness of the bloody bandits of law and order. Dry your tears, ye poor and wretched; take heart, ye slaves; arise in your might and overthrow the system of robbery.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 74.

An outbreak was expected in the south-west side this morning, and the entire force was held ready. Stir, free workmen, if you want to be shot down.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 75. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, October 8, 1885.

All organized workingmen should engage in a general prosecution of Pinkerton's secret police. Every day somewhere one of their carcasses should be found. This should be kept up until nobody would consent to become the blood-hound of these assassins.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 76. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, October 5, 1885. Second page, editorial.

In Milwaukee, as in England, the work of persecuting socialists goes on, but here they use the whip of hunger, blacklisting every agitator. This, in the Hocking valley, in the lumber regions of Michigan, and elsewhere. The worst of this is that nearly every such man has a little home or cottage, representing the savings of a life-time, and which is valueless to him if he loses employment where he is. The question is whether this kind of treatment will be tolerated. Every man who is opposed to it should at once join the revolutionary army.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 77. November 17, 1885. Fourth page.

At a meeting of the north-west side group of the I. A. A., 58 Clybourn avenue, it was resolved to drill every Sunday in their hall, and that workingmen should be invited who, on the 1st of May, want to come to the front for an eight-hour day.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 78. Arbeiter Zeitung, fourth page, November 27th, 1885.

"Letter-box." "S. Steel and iron are not on hand, but tin two or three inches in diameter; the price is cheap. It does not amount to fifty cents apiece.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 79. Arbeiter Zeitung, November 27th, 1885. Fourth page.

Report of meeting on Market square, Thanksgiving. Speakers: Parsons, who presided, Holmes and Spies. Parsons said: The president of the United States has asked this people to be thankful. This is so good a joke that Hendricks couldn't stand it, and died. To whom should they be thankful, and for what? That all the workingmen in the Hocking Valley have not died of hunger? That more workingmen have not been murdered through the avarice of manufacturers and miners? and that the three hundred new policemen of Chicago have not killed all our citizens? The speaker showed that machinery more and more deprives workingmen of employment; that everything points to the coming revolution; that the capitalist sees this and prepares for it, evidenced by the milita drilling on the lake shore for the purpose of cutting down the rebellious people. Workingmen must also prepare; must arm themselves with all means of warfare.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 80. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of December 28th, 1885, second page, editorial.

Chicago at last has its dynamite sensation. A little can found on the door of Lambert Tree's palace. Evidently the dynamiter proposed to explode into the moon this stone palace with a quarter of a pound of dynamite. It is a clumsy humbug. The half-burnt fuse proves this, for a fuse lighted in a dry night never goes out of itself. Clearly, the can was put there by the Pinkertons—a business trick to secure the employment of their force of guards. We caution capitalists that a true dynamiter don't joke in such matters.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 81. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, December 29, 1885, fourth page.

Report of meeting of north-side group at 58 Clybourn avenue. A resolution was adopted that the group pledges itself to work for the eight-hour day, beginning May 1st, but cautions the workingmen not to meet the enemy unarmed. It urges workingmen to eliminate from their meetings demagogues and slanderers.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 82. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of December 29th, 1885, repeated in the numbers issued during December, 1885, and January, February and March, 1886.

Workingmen willing to drill every Sunday invited to attend at 58 Clybourn avenue.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 83. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of December 31, 1885, fourth page.

Report of meeting of north side group in Louff's Hall, 519 Larrabee street, on the eight-hour question. Schwab said : It is only four months until the 1st of May. Little has been said to insure the success of the eight-hour movement. "The workingmen should arm before the 1st day of May to meet Pinkerton's scoundrels, the police and the militia." The lessons of the past should serve as a warning. Anarchists armed themselves because they are workingmen, and they preach arming that the workingmen may be able to liberate themselves.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 84. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of January 6, 1886, editorial.

"A new militia law." After the adoption of the militia law the Lehr und Wehr Verein gradually disappeared. The lesson of 1877 has been forgotten. It ceased to pay to be a socialist and the party dwindled, but what was left was effective. Where, six years ago, a thousand men were armed with muskets, to-day we have a power which cannot be fought by law or force—an invisible network of fighting groups.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 85. From the Arbeiter Zeitung January 22, 1884, fourth page; from a letter signed R. B., dated January 21, 1866.

The writer states that he is not a member of any organization or association; that the eight-hour question should not be the end of the present organization; that in the opinion of the writer it is impossible to enforce the eight-hour day otherwise than with armed force. That only if prepared to meet the militia with dynamite and bombs, can they expect success of the eight-hour movement. And closes : "Therefore, workingmen, I call upon you, arm yourselves."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 86. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of February 15, 1886, fourth page, letter signed August Kiesling, about the eight-hour movement.

The writer states that the workingmen feel that something must be

done. That a great mass is without means of subsistence, and growing poorer and poorer. And calls upon his associates in misery not to treat peaceably with their deadly enemies on the 1st of May. That the capitalists will have the working people's skulls crushed. And concludes: "Therefore, comrades, arm to the teeth. We want to demand our rights on the 1st of May; in the other case there are only blows of the club for you."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 87. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of February 15, 1886, fourth page.

Report of a mass meeting in the 12th street Turner Hall in regard to the London riots; Oscar Neebe presiding; Fielden and Schwab speaking.

Fielden said, in substance, that in former times the rich were accustomed in London to visit the proletarian quarters and sneer at the poverty and filth about them; but last week the proletarian visited the rich quarter and showed his invincible power. That the rioters showed their unwisdom by appealing to the government, which cannot and will not do anything for the poor. That the people must rely upon their own power, and the lesson of the hour is that the poor should arm themselves.

Schwab said, in substance, after comparing the workingmen in London and America, and describing the socialistic movement in England: "We greet the London events as the announcement of the near approach of the social revolution."

Resolutions were adopted declaring the meeting in harmony with the rioters of England, and calling upon the workingmen to rally around the red flag of revolution.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 88. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, February 17th. Editorial on second page.

In France, during strikes, etc., a new method is lately adopted. The workingmen barricade themselves in the factories with provisions, taking possession of the property which the manufacturers desire to preserve, and will only resort to force for their ejection in the most extreme case. The conflict between capitalism and workingmen is growing constantly sharper, and the indication is that force will bring about decisive results in the battle for liberty.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 89. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, April 20th. Editorial, second page.

Unless the people in the kitchen of life are satisfied with the smell of the roast, so long is the glutton for liberty. Does not the coal-miner come voluntarily to the coal baron for employment, and are they not content with wages from three to four dollars per week? Don't the idle workingmen wear out their shoes to obtain employment at small wages? Yes, and the laborer often buys from the stores of his extortioners, in spite of prohibition of the law. What law ordains that the head of a family shall send his wife and children into the factory to labor? Is this liberty? And yet they say the working people are free as the bird in the air. If the workingman proposes to disturb this liberty, militia, police, deputy sheriffs and United States troops are put in motion. Sneered at and despised, the workingman will be as long as he omits to arm. Every trade union should make it obligatory upon every member to keep a good gun and ammunition at home. The demand of the capitalistic classes are by muskets and gatling guns. The workingman should follow their example.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 90. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, April 21, editorial second page.

He who submits to the present order of things has no right to complain about capitalistic extortion, for order means sustaining that. He who rebels is a rebel, and a rebel who puts himself opposite the cannon's mouth with empty fist is a fool.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 91. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, April 22d. editorial notice, first page.

Refers to the New York street car strikes and the strikes in the Brooklyn sugar refineries. Also to the rumor that the strikers intend to burn the house of the street car superintendent, stating that this is characteristic of the feeling of the working circles. "The month of May may bring many a thing about which nobody dreams of to-day."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 92. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of April 26th. From a report of a mass meeting on the lake shore.

Speakers, Parsons, Schwab, Randa and Spies. Schwab said: "This is Easter; our forefathers celebrated on this day the resurrection of nature. To-day the workingmen celebrate their

resurrection from laziness and indifference. From May 1st, we will work eight hours a day. No force is able to withstand the power of labor. Let us be united, and we will succeed. Everywhere police are murderers. Arm yourselves. After the 1st of May eight hours and not a minute more.

Spies said, after speaking of the struggle between the workingmen and the capitalists, in effect: Be men now. Break down the doors of your extortioners instead of timidly knocking on them. Conquer the lost manhood. "Onward" is the motto in the march of triumph until the last stone of the labor bastile is removed and enslaved humanity is free.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 93. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of April 30th editorial notice, first page.

We are advised that the police are ordered to be ready for a conflict upon Saturday of next week. The capitalists are thirsting for the blood of workingmen. The workingmen refuse to be tortured and treated like dogs any more, and for this opposition, the capitalists cry for blood. Perhaps they may have it, and lose some of their own. To the workingmen we again say: "Arm yourselves, but conceal your arms unless they be stolen from you."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 94. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, May 1st, first page, editorial.

Away with all rolls of membership and minute books. Clean your guns; complete your ammunition. The police and militia are ready to murder. No workingman should leave his house with empty pockets.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 95. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of March 15, 1886.

Letter box; a concussion primer is necessary to explode a dynamite cartridge.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 96. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, March 19, 1886, fourth page.

A correspondent writes that the oppressed prepare to demand the eight-hour day is a good sign, but the eight-hour day is not relief enough in view of the increase in the power of producction and the surplus on hand. The present industrial system ruins the middle class. The only business which flourishes is that of the capitalist. The only aim of the

workingman should be the liberation of mankind from the shackles of wage slavery. Here in America, where the workingman possesses the freedom of meeting, of speech and of the press, the most should be done for the emancipation of mankind, but the tendency in the press and with the teachings of to-day is to degrade mankind, and if we do not soon bestir ourselves for a bloody revolution we cannot leave anything to our children but poverty and slavery. Therefore, prepare in all quietness for the revolution.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 97. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, March 24, 1886, first page, editorial.

The capitalists are apprehensive of a concerted movement of the K. of L. in connection with the Gould-South-western fight. To the organized laborers we call, "Keep your powder dry."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 98. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, Friday, January 2, 1884, editorial, second page.

Behind us the past; before us the new year. Backward our glance sweeps over endless shores of human misery. The column points to idle factories and mines, the cold huts of starving laborers, with freezing women and children. We see also the incendiarism of the business man who burns his building to get his insurance, a smart business trick, and because he succeeds he is respected. We look on another picture and see a poor man who shot his employer because that employer desired to cheat him of his earnings. Nothing can save him from punishment. He who sheds blood, his blood shall be shed. Again, we see another picture: In the temple presided over by the Goddess of Justice a man being tried who killed an employe because he demanded his wages, but this time justice reaches out her hands and says, "He who kills his servant is no criminal. Thou art free." Indignation wakes in us, and the world playing around us becomes a horror.

Deep in the background appears a group of men whose faces express courage and power of action. They unfurl the red flag, and the motto shows "Death to tyrants," "Death to deception and lies." Our confidence in humanity returns, for we see from the faces of these men that they not only have the will, but the power to act and to free the race from the marsh of rottenness and the chains of despotism. They dig a mine here and there, are arrested by the minions of order

and hurried to execution where they joyfully sacrifice their life blood with a malediction upon their executioners and a prophecy that the avengers will arise.

We turn our backs upon the past and look to the future. All is misty before us and indistinct. We discover in the picture presented that the prediction is fulfilled, that the avenger has risen.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 99. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of January 4th, eighth page.

Nitro-glycerine. The article says that a letter signed K., requesting simple directions as to the manufacture of nitro-glycerine, had been received. The editorial answer proceeds: The most simple method is as follows: Take one part nitric acid (1.52 specific weight) and two parts strongest sulphuric acid (1.83 specific weight). Make this mixture in a cooler surrounded by ice, and, when well cooled, add fifteen and a half grains of pure glycerine, pouring as quickly as possible into a larger quantity of cold water. Nitro-glycerine is then precipitated to the bottom, from which the fluid is poured off and the nitro-glycerine is carefully washed in fresh water several times, and then with a weak solution of soda. A layman ought not to venture the experiment, but only an experienced man.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 100. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, January 5th, 1885.

Under the head of socialistic meeting, the paper quotes comrade Spies to have said at 52 West Lake street, on the afternoon of the 4th: " When we resort to murder we only follow the law of necessity and the force of self-preservation. We murder to put an end to general murder. We put murderers out of the way."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 101. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, January 18, 1885.

Notice signed " Committee " calling a meeting in the interest of arming for Saturday, the 24th, at 8 o'clock, at Steinmueller's Hall.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 102, report that at Mueller's Hall, January 18th,

Comrade Schwab spoke thus: Nothing is to be expected of the present political parties. If they had meant their promises they would have fulfilled them, and because we know that the working class will make no concessions we have severed all connection with it and prepared for a revolution by force. Spies said that he was accused by a little paper to have advised workingmen to commit criminal acts. What is

crime? "When the workingman was putting himself in the possession of the fruits of his labor stolen from him, that was called a crime. The emancipation of the laborer from the ballot was impossible; it was serving only as a cover for capitalistic tyranny." He spoke of the miserable condition of the coal miners in the Hocking Valley, and concluded by advising his hearers to inform thewselves.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 103. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of January 24, 1885, editorial notices.

The police claim that Funk was a socialist, and has spoken at socialistic meetings. This is untrue. A socialist he may be. It is a pity he did not blow up the Arson gang.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 104. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, January 29, 1885.

Announcement: Group Jefferson No. 1, agitation meeting, Saturday, January 31st, at 600 Milwaukee avenue, at 8 P. M. Order of the day: One, essay on the theme, Civilization and Murder.

Second, free discussion of this theme and other business. New members will be initiated.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 105. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, Thursday, February 12th, editorial.

The sardonic judge Bailey, in a recent decision in the case of Standard against the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul railway, setting aside the verdict of the jury, gave this decision: "It is true it has been proven that the locomotive which caused the injury to the plaintiff was in a dangerous condition, but as he, the plaintiff, had also been informed thereof and notwithstanding continued that work, then he alone has to bear the consequences of his risk." Whether the plaintiff had knowledge was immaterial. The road knew the engine was in a dangerous condition, and the employe had to use it because commanded by the management; but, it is asked, could he not have refused? Certainly, but at the same time he would have had to look for another master. This alternative was as dangerous as the risk on the engine. The choice was between death by starvation and cold on one side and danger from the engine on the other. The liberty of the plaintiff was to choose his method of destruction. Perhaps the proletarians will sometimes be courageous enough to accord to the judge the freedom of choice between a hemp necktie and a nitroglycerine pill."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 106. Editorial, Arbeiter Zeitung, Monday, February 23d.

We believe the present struggle will not end without a mighty storm, bringing terror and blessing, destruction and freedom. The approaching revolution promises to be grander and more terrible than any in history—it will be general and will make itself felt everywhere.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 107. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, Monday, March 2, 1885. Editorial.

One who uselessly exposes himself unarmed to a vicious dog again and again has only himself to blame for the consequences. We censure those dirty souls who carry on the business of quieting the working classes under idle promises of reform in the near future. What has recently occurred in Philadelphia could not have occurred here without the hanging of a dozen policemen on the telegraph poles and house cornices, and this is due to the revolutionary propaganda carried on here. Let the workingmen in other cities take a lesson from this and supply themselves with weapons, dynamite and prussic acid.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 108. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, Wednesday, March 11, 1885.

Soon the people must choose, either the police must be and the community cease, or the community must be and the police cease.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 109. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, Monday, March 15, 1885, About revolutionary deeds. An article signed Z.

The life of humanity bears an analogy to a sea, usually clear and even, but sometimes wrought by storms into fury, and then sinking into peace. The daily occupations of men usually absorb most of their time. But when the race approaches a time of transmission to a higher civilization, gigantic forms rise above the level of the common daily life, and the enthusiasm, the storm of deeds, communicates itself more and more mightily until the heart of the whole world throbs with an excited beat. We now live in such an epoch. The blood of noble champions has flowed, which, like the dragon teeth, will bring forth Spartans. In all revolutionary actions three epochs are to be distinguished. First, the time for preparation, then the moment of action, and finally the period which follows the deed. First, the revolutionist should study to save combatants, to avoid danger of discovery. It is easy to be seen that the

danger of discovery is increased by the number of actors and *vice versa*. Therefore, in the commission of a deed, a comrade not living in the locality should be chosen for the act. And, again, if one comrade is able to perform the deed alone, he should call no one to his assistance.

The forming of special groups of action is a necessity. Especially should publicity be avoided in a country like America. In the formation of a group of action the greatest care should be exercised to select men whose heads and hearts are in the right spot. When an action is resolved upon, it must be executed as speedily as possible, to prevent the dangers of delay. In the action one must be upon the spot. When the action is completed the group scatters. If this rule is acted upon the danger of discovery is greatly reduced. Because of the neglect of these precautions, most of the failures of the past have occurred. The complete success of an action is the best possible impulse to a new deed. Already this small warfare has commenced at many points. Finally will come an early rising *en masse*.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 110. From the Arbeiter-Zeitung, Friday, March 20, 1885.

Frank Bridges, one of our wise law-givers, has kicked the bucket of his own accord, and therefore saved a shot.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 111. From Die Fackel of March 22, 1885.

Account of the meeting at north side Turner Hall, the day previous. First Mr. Fielden praised the love of sacrifice, the heroic courage of those who shed their blood upon the barricades, the altar of the people, during the commune of Paris. He denounced the present civilization as a lie, and called upon those present to join in the effort for the overthrow of the present system. He was followed by Comrade Holmes. Both speakers were applauded.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 112. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, Monday, March 23, 1885. Editorial.

We characterize as criminal the continued suggestion that the question of arming ought not to be considered, while every day brings news of collisions between the murdering serfs of the bourgeoise and the unarmed crowds of the people. Every workingman ought to have armed long ago, and ought to arm now. Daggers and revolvers are easily to be gotten, hand grenades cheaply procured, and explosives can be obtained. The demand is that we should not enter upon the struggle with empty hands.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 113. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, Monday, February 22, 1886.

An effort is made to bring dissension among the locked-out wage slaves of McCormick's by the capitalistic press, by attacking the anarchists, who are charged to have instigated the wage slaves to rise against their friend McCormick. Perhaps the trio—Averill, Butler and McCormick—will be taken to account sooner than they anticipate.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 114. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, Tuesday, March 2, 1886.

Yesterday morning the order scoundrels, with the aid of their natural allies, the professional cut-throats, otherwise called detectives, succeeded in taking some of the scabs to the factory, and this morning the number was materially increased. This report shows for what purpose the police exist—to protect the workingman if he works for starvation wages and is obedient, and to club him if he refuse. Force only gives way to force. Who would attack capitalism in earnest, must be prepared to kill if he does not want to be killed. "The time up to the 1st of May is short—look out."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 114. Article on nitro-glycerine in the Arbeiter Zeitung of March 24, 1885.

Substantially the same as the passage upon that subject in Most's book.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 115, from the Arbeiter Zeitung of Tuesday, March 26, 1885.

Notice of the Reinsdorf pamphlet recently published by Johann Most, containing the biography of Reinsdorf and letters.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 116, from the Arbeiter Zeitung, Wednesday, April 8, 1885, among the editorial notices.

Something worth hearing. Yesterday some Quincy strikers fired on their bosses, and not on the scabs.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 117, from the Arbeiter Zeitung, Sunday issue, April 12, 1885.

McCormick capitulates. He surrenders without conditions, and the workingmen secure the acceptation of all their demands. The order police had no inclination to take up the fight with fifteen hundred armed

workingmen, and the strikers will return to their work Monday. Now, that it is over, we want to say that not only the strikers were well armed with revolvers, but that the stronger laxatives were not wanting. And now, let it be understood that the captured rifles, revolvers, etc., are in safe hands, and will be held on the principle that to the victors belong the spoils.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 118, from the Arbeiter Zeitung, Friday April 24, 1885.

The board of trade gambling hell is proposed to be dedicated on Tuesday next, at 8 o'clock. The workingmen propose to celebrate this by a meeting on Market square, followed by a serenade of the members in the hall. All the workingmen of the city are invited to participate.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 119, from the the Arbeiter Zeitung, Saturday, April 25, 1885.

The local commercial paper reports that Rosenberger's orchesta will furnish the music at the dedication of the new board of trade, and E. A. Storrs will conduct the dedication. The rest will be attended to by the anarchists.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 120, from the Arbeiter Zeitung, Tuesday, April 28, 1885.

Everybody should attend the board of trade demonstration to-night.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 121, from the Arbeiter Zeitung, April 2,9 1885.

From a report of the demonstration on the preceding night, under title, "Thieves in League." The march formed, headed by a company of the Bohemian groups, splendid looking fellows; next, three female comrades with two red flags and one black. Then the procession, which could not be kept in good order, a matter much to be regretted. Behind these, a strong company of well-armed comrades of various groups, in which the nitro-glycerine pills were not missing. They were prepared for a probable attack, and had a collision come there would have been pieces. The procession, which was stopped some distance from the brightly-lighted place, sang the Marseillaise. About five hundred policemen were stationed around the building, who accepted quietly many derisive utterances. The procession returned to 5th avenue, where Parsons, Spies and Fielden spoke from the window of the Arbeiter Zeitung building.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 122. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, Tuesday, May 5, 1885.

"When, anywhere, a small party of workingmen dare to speak of rights and privileges, the 'Order' draws together the murdering scoundrels from all about, and the entire government is ever ready to suppress every petty demonstration by force. The workingmen ought to take aim at every member of the militia, and to do with him as one would do with some one of whom it is known that he is after taking one's life. It might then sooner become difficult to obtain murdering tools." "Workingmen, arm yourselves. Let the butchery of La Monte be a lesson to you."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 123. From the same issue, at the close of an editorial.

"Before you lies this blissful Eden; the road to it lies through the smoking ruins of the old world. Your passport to it is that banner which calls to you in flaming lines the word 'Anarchy.'"

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 124. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, May 9, 1885.

Last night valuable fixtures and machines in the quarry of Singer & Talcott were destroyed by fire. That is something. Singer was the instigator of the La Monte butchery.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 125. From the Arbeiter Zeitung, June 19, 1885. Conclusion of an article headed "Contribution to the Question of Arming."

To attempt to meet the serfs of order with empty hands is insane, and one should arm as soon as possible. Workingmen, arm yourselves with the most effectual means. The better you do this and the quicker the fight, the sooner the victory is won. Signed "Z."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 126. Continuation in the issue of June 20, 1885, of the last mentioned article, by the same author.

Advises the formation of groups, who, by small regular contributions, may accumulate funds to buy arms. Suggests that dynamite bears in America the name of Hercules and giant powder. He refers to the fables of Romulus and Remus, and calls upon the workingmen to found and establish "the temple of the noble Goddess of Liberty upon the whole face of the globe," concluding, "But to this end you must be wolves, and as such ye need sharp teeth. Workingmen, arm yourselves."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 127. From the Arbeiter Zeitung of June 24, 1885. Editorial headed "Delusive Imaginations," closing as follows:

"Fellow-Agitators! Dark, threatening economical storm clouds have arisen in the United States; they become thicker above our heads; they will discharge themselves and bring a flood of inexpressible misery upon us. A terrible crisis is coming. Let us close our ranks, and do not let us pierce our own flesh, but that of capital. The time is too serious. Let us rather see in every comrade a welcome fellow-confidant. Let us do this, and then the day of liberation, which will be celebrated here in a short time, and which celebration must seem to us as derisive laughter of hell, will soon be followed by the true and real day of liberation. That is our most earnest desire."

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 128. From the Alarm, January 9, 1885.

A notice that in the absence of the editor and the assistant, their work devolved upon August Spies.

"The right to bear arms."

After the conspiracy of the workingmen, the working classes in 1877, the breaking up of the meeting on Market square, the brutal assault upon a gathering of furniture workers in Vorwart's Turner Hall, the murder of Tessmann, and the general clubbing and shooting down of peaceably inclined wage workers, the proletarians organized the Lehr und Wehr Verein, which in about a year and a half had grown to a membership of one thousand. This was regarded by the capitalists as a menace, and they procured the passage of the militia law, under which it became an offense for any body of men, other than those authorized by the governor, to assemble with arms, drill or parade the streets. The members of the Lehr und Wehr Verein, mostly socialists, who believed in the ballot, made up a test case to determine the constitutionality of this act, rejecting the counsel of the extremists. Judge Barnum held the law to be unconstitutional—an appeal was taken—and the Supreme court upset this decision and held the law constitutional. Thereupon the Lehr und Wehr Verein applied to the Supreme court of the United States, which within a few days affirmed the decision of the Supreme court of the state. Do we need to comment on this?

That militia law has had its uses. Where there was before a military body publicly organized, whose strength could be easily ascertained, now there exists an organization whose members cannot be estimated, and a

network of destructive agencies of modern military character that will defy suppression.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBITS 129 and 130. Four photographic views of a globular bomb shell.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 131. Two photographic views of an inflammable bomb.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 132. Photograph of ladel and can referred to in testimony.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 133. Two photographic views of a galvanized iron construction, delivered by Engel to the police and described by Inspector Bonfield.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 134. Photographic view of four supposed gas pipe bombs.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 135. Photographic view of four short pieces of gas pipe.

PEOPLE'S EXHIBIT 136. Same.

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 1. Call for the Haymarket meeting as issued, omitting altogether the line " Workingmen, arm yourselves and appear in full force."

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 2. From the Alarm of June 13, 1885, " Victor Hugo, his memorable address to the rich and poor. His most precious legacy to humanity. One message to the rich, the other to the poor. The sum of human wisdom—read and reflect."

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 2.

Victor Hugo's address to the rich and poor, from the Alarm of June 13, 1885.

Amongst other things in the address the writer says: " To the rich. What is the father of privilege? Chance. What is his son? Abuse. Neither chance nor abuse is nature. They have both of them an evil to-morrow. I come to warn you. I come to denounce to you your own bliss. It is made out of the ills of every one. Your paradise is made out of the hell of the poor. * * *

Abandoned, an orphan, alone in boundless creation, I made this entry into this gloom that you call society. The first thing I saw was law under the form of a gibbet. The second was wealth—it is your wealth—under the form of a woman dead of cold and hunger. The third was luxury under the shape of a hunted man chained to prison

walls; the fourth was your palaces beneath the shadow of which cowered the tramp. The human race has been made by you slaves and convicts. You have made of this earth a dungeon. Light is wanting. Air is wanting; virtue is wanting.

"The workers of this world whose efforts you enjoy live in death. There are little girls who begin at eight by prostitution and who end at twenty by old age. Who among you have been at Newcastle-on-Tyne? There are men in the mines who chew coal to fill the stomach and cheat hunger. Look you in Lancashire, misery everywhere. Are you aware that the Harlem fishermen eat grass when the fishery fails? Are you aware that at Burton La Zess there are still certain lepers driven in the woods who are fired at if they come out of their dens? In Peckridge there are no beds in the hovels, and holes are dug in the ground for little children to sleep in, so that in the place of beginning with the cradle they begin with the tomb. Mercy, have mercy for the poor! Oh, I conjure you, have pity! But no, you will not. I know ye all, devils bred in hell and dogs with hearts of stone. Upward to your golden thrones for ages has gone the cry of misery, the groan of hunger and the sob of despair, and ye heeded it not. What mercy thou hast given shall be meted out to you in turn. Bear in mind that the series of kings armed with the sword was interrupted by Cromwell with the ax. Tremble, the incorruptible dissolutions draw near. The clipped talons push out again. The torn-out tongues become tongues of flame scattered to the wings of darkness, and they howl in the infinite. They who are hungry show their idle teeth. Paradise is built over hell's totter. There is suffering. There is suffering; and that which is above leans over, and that which is below gapes opens. The shadow becomes light; the damned discuss the elect. It is the people who are oncoming. I tell you it is man who ascends. It is the end that is beginning. It is the red dawn of catastrophe.

"Oh, this society is false. One day, and soon, the true society will come. Then there will be no more lords; there will be free, living men. There will be no more wealth; there will be abundance for the poor. There will be no more masters, but there will be brothers. They that toil shall have. This is the future. No more prostration, no more abasement, no more ignorance, no more wealth, no more beasts of burden, no more courtiers, no more kings—but *light*."

EXHIBIT 3.

From the Alarm of 22, 1885. "Anarchy *v.* Government."

"Anarchy, from the Greek, meaning no government, is the denial of the right of coercion—the abrogation of statute law, a constitution by means of which man governs his fellow man. In behalf of government it is argued that man is wicked and must be restrained, and therefore government is necessary. The free society which anarchy would establish proceeds upon the theory that under natural law men could not but act right, since none would be protected in wrong-doing.

"Under government we see the standard of right and wrong regulated by enactments. One portion of society dictating to the other and exacting service. Anarchy teaches that law is to be discovered, not manufactured; and that conformity to natural law means happiness; disregard thereof, misery. The form of government is material. Anarchy denies the right of one man to rule another, and to the shibboleth, 'The greatest good to the greatest number' answers 'The greatest good *to all.*' Under anarchy, arbitration would take the place of courts; asylums, of prisons; voluntary co-operation, of wage-slavery. Exchange of equivalents would take the place of the system of competition and modern commerce. The workshops would belong to the workers, the tools to the toilers, the product to the producers, while the means of existence would become the heritage of the race. Occupation and use would be the sole title. But under government natural law is set aside by statutory enactment. Natural law is self-enforcing—statutory law requires the paraphernalia of courts, jail, police and armies to its enforcement." Signed "P."

DEFENDANTS' EXHIBIT 4.

From the Alarm of June 2, 18857.

John Stuart Mill says: "If, therefore, the choice were to be made between communism, with all its chances, and the present state of society, with all its sufferings and injustice; if the institution of private property necessarily carries with it as a consequence that the produce of labor should be apportioned, as we now see it, almost in an inversed ratio to the labor—the largest portion to those whose work is almost nominal, and so on, in a descending scale, the remuneration dwindling as the work grows harder and more disagreeable, until the most fatiguing and exhausting bodily

labor cannot count with certainty on being able to earn the necessaries of life; if this or communism were the alternative, all the difficulties, great or small, of communism would be as dust in the balance."

DEFENDANTS' EXHIBIT 5.

From the Alarm of September 5, 1885. Title, Forcible Gospel.

At a meeting held by the Sociological society of New York, recently, the Rev. Dr. Rylance spoke, and among other things said: "Patronizing talk was of no use as a remedy for existing evils. Workingmen were not to be won over by mere potent eloquence. It was no use telling a man that if he was industrious and saved his money he might become a capitalist himself, when, in many cases, the amount he received as wages was barely sufficient for a mere existence. The tyranny of capital was fast becoming as bad as European despotism. He contrasted the squalid tenements and crowded neighborhoods in which the working people were huddled together with the stately residences of those who lived in luxury from the results of labor, and maintained that poverty was not the result of ignorance, and that wealth was the result of the co-operation of labor and capital. The present condition of capital was founded on force and not on knowledge."

IN THE

preme Court of Illinois,

NORTHERN GRAND DIVISION.

March Term, A. D. 1887.

Error to the Criminal Court of Cook County.

August Spies et al.,
Plaintiffs,

vs.

People of the State of Illinois,
Defendant.

---

bstract of Record.

Vol. I.

AINING ABSTRACT OF VOLS. 1, O, A TO H, INCL.,
AND VOL. OF EXHIBITS.

W P. BLACK AND
SALOMON & ZEISLER,
Attorneys for Plaintiffs in Error.
D SWETT,
Of Counsel.

GUNTHORP, LAW PRINTERS, 44 & 46 LASALLE STREET, CHICAGO.

*
KF
223
S5
I39
1987
v.1
RARE
BK RM