

who was making his way into the station, and stoned the station until the police force came to the rescue, firing a volley into the mob which drove it back. It returned to the attack, however, and followed the police who fired repeated volleys at it as it moved away. About 20 strikers, all foreigners, were shot, some of them fatally. State troops have been ordered to Shenandoah. Smaller riots are reported from other places in the anthracite region. The officers of the coal miners' union have posted bulletins disowning any connection with the rioting and calling upon all miners to aid in maintaining the peace. It appears that the rioters are all foreigners.

Prior to this turn in the strike attention was concentrated upon the action of two United States judges in West Virginia in connection with the use of labor injunctions. Judge John Jackson has issued an injunction early in July against the West Virginia strikers (p. 119). The law suit, though brought in behalf of the Clarksburg Fuel Co., was not brought by that company, for it is a West Virginia corporation and at its suit the Federal Court would have had no jurisdiction against residents of West Virginia. But its bonded creditor, the Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, a New York corporation, instituted the proceedings on the ground that its loan was jeopardized by the strike. The injunction which Judge Jackson granted prohibited the strikers from intimidating or doing things tending to intimidate miners in the employment of the Clarksburg Fuel Co., and on the 24th he imposed sentences for its violation upon several labor union organizers who had held public meetings and made pro-strike speeches within 250 feet of the company's property and 1,000 feet of the mine opening, and upon a vacant lot which they had rented for the purpose. The judge sentenced Thomas Haggerty to 90 days' imprisonment and five of the others to 60 days each. He convicted Mrs. Mary Jones, known to the labor world as "Mother Jones," but, explaining that "as she was posing as a martyr, he would not send her to jail or allow her to force her way into jail," he discharged her with a warning that it would "go exceedingly hard" with her should she be guilty of another violation of the injunction.

Officers of the National Associa-

tion of Mine Workers declare their intention of pressing impeachment proceedings against Judge Jackson. As the basis of such proceedings the secretary-treasurer enumerates the following grounds:

(1) The court was without jurisdiction because the Clarksburg Fuel company is chartered by the state of West Virginia, and its interests are wholly within that state. (2) Judge Jackson used his position as judge to protect his interests as a stockholder in a coal company. (3) Judge Jackson, before the trial began, bullied the defendants in open court and told them they were guilty before a witness had been sworn. (4) After the evidence was in, and before the case had been argued by the attorneys, he admonished the defendants that he would make their punishment accord with their subsequent acts. (5) That before a witness was sworn he told them if they would leave the state and promise never to come back he would not send them to jail. (6) That he violated all rules of equity to protect his interest in a coal company. (7) That Judge Jackson used private 'inquiry' in lieu of sworn testimony to influence his decision, and he so stated in open court during the trial.

The other injunction proceedings were before Judge B. F. Keller, another Federal judge of West Virginia. On the 28th he granted an injunction which, while not in terms forbidding the distribution of food and other supplies among the strikers, is generally regarded as designed to do so. The suit is brought by the Gauley Mountain Coal company against national officers of the miners' union. They are charged with sending supplies from national headquarters to support strikers who gather in camps in large crowds in the vicinity of the colliery and assert their purpose of staying there until the employes in the mines join them in their strike.

A serious strike of telegraph messenger boys began in Chicago on the 25th. It had its inception in the offices of the Western Union and spread at once to the Postal. The young strikers demanded \$6 a week, an eight-hour day, and recognition of their organization; and for several hours business was injuriously affected by non-delivery of telegrams. The Postal company soon settled with their messengers, but the Western Union held out, employing men at \$40 a month instead of the boys whom they had been paying \$15 a month. But the striking boys intim-

idated the men, and at last the company agreed to meet a committee. As the result of an interview, a peace was patched up, the boys going back to work under an agreement for 75 cents a day, with ten cents an hour for over time, the regular hours to be ten as before.

An enormous strike of farm laborers is reported from Galicia, part of old Poland and now the northeastern province of Austro-Hungary. It is raging in the east of the province, near the Russian border, and 100,000 agricultural laborers, most of them Russians, are reported as being engaged in it. Russian students, also, are said to be participating in the strike, which is supposed to derive from that fact some political significance. Near Lemberg, about 60 miles by rail from the Russian frontier, extensive stores were fired on the 25th, and similar acts of violence were reported from neighboring localities. The landlords have applied to the government for troops, but the local authorities recommend instead that they try conciliation by increasing agricultural laborers' wages.

In another part of old Poland the German emperor is pressing forward his drastic policy of Germanization. To that end a bill appropriating \$62,500,000 for the purchase of land from Polish proprietors in Prussian Poland and the settlement of Germans there has passed to its third reading in the Prussian diet. In the debates upon this bill the imperial chancellor, Count von Buelow, characterized the Poles most offensively, and afterwards by a domineering speech at Marienburg the emperor himself excited universal Polish hostility. The popular feeling in Posen is so bitter that Polish noblemen have begged the emperor to postpone his proposed September visit, lest he be assassinated. His response is an expression of his intention to show that he is master by entering Posen at the head of his troops, 90,000 of whom are to attend the Fall maneuvers there.

What gives most importance to all this, perhaps, is its possible effect upon the "dreibund" treaty (p. 200) between Germany, Italy and Austria. The Austrian Poles are so angered by the offensive speeches of the German emperor and his chancellor that their representatives in the Austrian reichsrath have decided

to oppose the whole "dreibund" policy. The German emperor's name was hooted by them in the reichsrath, and while denouncing him they also denounced the Austrian government for cowering before him. To intensify this danger to the "dreibund" treaty the Russian government, against which in part the treaty is made, is pursuing a policy of giving exceptional freedom to Russian Poles along the Prussian frontier with a view to creating Russian sympathies among the Prussian Poles by bringing Russian liberality to the Poles into sharp contrast with the drastic Prussian policy.

France is stirred profoundly by a religious agitation which threatens open revolt. The struggle is due to the rigid enforcement by the new ministry (p. 150) of the "associations law," enacted a year ago (p. 202), which subjects the Catholic orders to regulation by the civil powers. When the new ministry with M. Coombes at its head faced the new parliament at its first session, a vote of confidence in the determination of the ministry to apply the policy of "laicism (anti-clericalism), fiscal reform and social solidarity" was carried in the chamber of deputies by 329 to 124. That was on the 12th of June. Two days afterwards, June 14, the ministry outlined its policy as follows:

- (1) Vigorous anti-clerical policy;
- (2) reduction of military service to two years;
- (3) imposing an income tax either rigidly proportional or progressive;
- (4) withdrawal of educational privileges from all religious institutions, leading up to a future state monopoly of schools and universities;
- (5) radical reforming of the judicial machinery, implying, perhaps, a revising of the criminal and civil codes in order to rescue justice from a tangle of contradictory jurisprudence;
- (6) the pensioning of aged and disabled workers and widows with children;
- (7) state ownership of the railways.

Pursuant to the first and fourth items of this policy, an order was issued on the 10th enforcing the "associations law" by directing the police to close all religious schools which did not apply for special authorization under that law and which might remain open at the end of six days. For doing this the ministry was interpellated on the 11th, but by a vote of 328 to 218 the interpellation was at the premier's request, postponed.

Great popular excitement followed the subsequent efforts at closing Catholic schools. All France was in a turmoil, and in many cities and towns the resistance was so great that the gendarmes were called in to support the police. Throughout the country, schools and cloisters were turned into fortresses, around which the Catholic peasantry formed protective cordons and defied both police and gendarmerie. A mass meeting held in Paris on the 26th to protest against the closing of the Catholic schools was broken up by mobs, which organized counter demonstrations. On the 27th two mass meetings were held in Paris, one for the suppression and the other against it, the attendance at each being about 15,000. Neither was seriously disturbed, though there were several violent encounters in the neighborhood. In the midst of the enforcement of this anti-clerical policy the chamber of deputies took a recess on the 12th until October.

To the closing days of the present session of the British parliament a vigorous debate over maladministration in Ireland has lent excitement. When the appropriation estimates for Ireland came before the House of Commons on the 23d, John Redmond, leader of the Irish parliamentary party, moved a reduction of the salary of George Wyndham, chief secretary, and the acrimonious debate followed. The question came to vote on the 25th and the motion was defeated, 168 to 117; but the object of the Irish party was accomplished in laying bare the oppressive system of government prevailing in Ireland, the main features of which the ministry were unable to deny.

Another motion, made and supported by the Irish party, but which was opposed by the Liberals as well as the Conservatives, was a protest against the appointment of Lord Alverstone, Sir John Bigham and Sir John Ardagh as a royal commission to inquire into the question of remitting or reducing the sentences imposed in South Africa by British military courts during the war. It was urged that the approving attitude toward the Jameson raid of two of these appointees, Alverstone and Bigham, made them unfit to serve on such a commission. The protest was defeated, July 28, by a vote of 210 to 64.

Mr. Chamberlain took occasion on

the 30th to make a speech from the floor of the Commons dealing comprehensively with the South African question. Regarding the status of the defunct republics he is reported as saying that—

the imperial government had established a crown colony in the strictest sense. The next step would be to add a nominated official element, and then nothing but circumstances and time would separate the new colonies from full self-government, the ultimate goal of their ambition. That consummation would not be delayed; if for no other reason, because it might relieve the government of the tremendous burden of responsibility involved in the present situation, but all must understand that the government would not be rushed nor hustled into any action which circumstances did not warrant. The speaker said he was one of those optimistic enough to believe that the new colonies would reach the ultimate goal of their ambition much sooner than many persons now thought possible. So far as the government was concerned, the surrender promises would be kept, in spirit as well as by letter. The government, he said, was bound both by honor and interest to this course.

After many days the Boer resolutions of surrender adopted at the conference at Vereeniging (p. 137) on the 31st of May by a vote of 54 to 6 have been transmitted in full text. They are as follows:

This meeting of representatives both of the South African Republic and of the Orange Free State, held at Vereeniging, from May the 15th till May the 31st, 1902, has received with regret the proposal of His Majesty in connection with the cessation of the present hostilities, and the communication that this proposal must be rejected or accepted unchanged. It regrets that H. M.'s government have absolutely refused to negotiate with the governments of the two republics on the basis of our independence or to allow our governments to communicate with our delegation. For our nation has always thought that not only on grounds of justice it has a well-founded claim to that independence but also because of its great material and personal sacrifices made for that independence.

This meeting has earnestly considered the state of our country and people and paid special attention to the following facts:

1. That the war policy of the British military authorities has led to the total devastation of the territory of the two republics, with the burning of farms and villages, the destruction of all means of existence and the exhaustion of all resources necessary for the