

but because they suspend the right of trial by jury. Just as the offense of the injunction-governing judge lay in enjoining a striker from committing an offense already prohibited by law—thereby enabling him to punish the accused for contempt of court, instead of for breaking the law—so the proposed bills offend against democracy not by making acts unlawful that are morally wrong, but by putting their determination and punishment wholly in the hands of a department official. Even should there be a universal agreement as to the immorality of the acts, yet the determination of the fact itself would remain; and no citizen could be assured of even handed justice if placed at the mercy of a judge whose decisions were not subject to appeal or revision.



If there is a single political right that American democracy is agreed upon it is that a man accused of crime shall be tried by a jury in the place where the crime was committed. To permit a postal official at Washington to bar any newspaper from mailing privileges—which means to destroy it—because of an alleged offense is to place publishers at the entire mercy of the Postmaster General. Upon charges of an unknown accuser, that official may gather evidence with his own detectives, and condemn the accused without fear of an overruling by a higher court, thus denying both the right to a trial by jury, and the right to be tried where the offense was committed.



The claim that this authority would be exercised only for the suppression of acts universally condemned by a public sense of decency is entirely aside from the point, since it leaves the determination of the fact to a single human being, who may be subject to political bias, religious prejudice, or economic pressure, and who is fortified in his exercise of arbitrary authority by the knowledge that the Supreme Court has held the rulings of the postoffice department to be of the nature of the army and navy rulings which are not subject to revision by the courts. No more authority should be given the Postmaster General. Rather should some he now has be taken from him.

S. C.

### A Significant Decision.

In annulling the Kansas law which prohibited an employer from compelling employes to renounce trade unionism, the United States Supreme Court has made clear that existing economic conditions nullify Constitutional guarantees of religious free-

dom, freedom of speech, or any other rights. If the Kansas law had forbidden coercion of employes in religious or political matters, it would have been just as unconstitutional under the Supreme Court's ruling. This does not mean that the court's reasoning was wrong, but it does mean that if the court is right then the laws must be wrong which make jobs so scarce that in order to get one a worker may be compelled to surrender his Constitutional rights. If it does not mean that then the United States Constitution is but a "scrap of paper."

S. D.



### A Safety Valve.

Speaking at a meeting at the Chicago City Club regarding the disturbance at a meeting of the unemployed at Hull House, Jane Addams said she had noticed that young men from abroad were sometimes inclined to speak recklessly when they arrive in this country; but that they grow more conservative after they have become better acquainted with our institutions. It were better, she thinks, that the problem of the unemployed were not so much in the keeping of the young and less experienced; but that if they do wish to talk it will be well to let them. Talking relieves a stress of feeling that may otherwise find expression in violence. If only we had enough Jane Addamses to appoint one as the Chicago Chief of Police!

S. C.



### Lawless Anti-Anarchists.

Considering what little respect Chicago's police heads have for law or Constitution, the horror, hate and fear they express concerning anarchy and anarchists seem a trifle inconsistent, if not hypocritical. And the same may be said of police heads in New York and other cities.

S. D.



### A Politician's Ideal Mayor.

There are four candidates in Chicago for the Democratic and Republican mayoralty nominations. Each has had much to say about what he thinks an ideal mayor ought to do. According to the expressed views of these gentlemen they seem to feel unanimously as follows: An ideal mayor should not worry about the question of unemployment beyond encouraging charitable donations for the unemployed. He should have no opinion to express concerning an effort, which he must know is being made, to bunco the city out of its rights to a telephone system. He should ignore unprovoked attacks by policemen on peaceful