

ployment of the W. B. Conkey company.

The injunction restrains the men also from compelling the company, by threats, intimidation, force or violence, to employ or discharge any person whatsoever against its will; and forbids them—

from congregating or being upon or about the sidewalks, streets, alleys, approaches, places adjoining or places adjacent to said factory, and the premises of said complainant in the city of Hammond for the purpose of interfering with the business of the said firm.

The order further restrains the pressmen from gathering, singly or in small bodies, about the approaches to the factory "for the purpose of picketing or patrolling or guarding the streets, avenues, gates and approaches to the property of the W. B. Conkey company with the intention of intimidating or hindering persons from seeking employment at the factory or of interfering with the employes in the shop;" and in closing it reads:

And that said defendant and each and all of them be, and they are, and each of them is hereby enjoined and restrained from going either singly or collectively, to the homes of employes of said W. B. Conkey company, or any or either of them, for the purpose of intimidating or coercing any and all of said employes to leave the employment or service of said W. B. Conkey company or from entering into the employment or service of said W. B. Conkey company, and, as well, from intimidating or threatening in any manner the wives and families of said employes at their homes or elsewhere.

It was suggested by some papers that the restraint upon efforts at "persuasion," embodied in this injunction, had slipped into the order by accident; but in an interview published in the Chicago Tribune of the 25th the Conkey company's lawyer killed this suggestion by saying—

That "persuasion" means just what it says. I put it in for that purpose and Judge Baker copied my words. It means just this—that if anyone of those strikers should go to the house of any employe or stop him on the street or any other place and endeavor to talk him or her into joining the strike that person or persons is in contempt of court.

A different method from the process of injunction has been adopted in Florida for fighting strikes. It is used against the cigar makers' strike

at Tampa. We referred to this strike two weeks ago at page 298. All the strike leaders had then been kidnaped and secreted. This was done under the direction of a local business men's vigilance committee—"Citizens' Committee," as it is called. But the place of the missing leaders was supplied by the substitution of Alejandro Rodriguez for the kidnaped J. C. Padilla, as secretary of the union, and the appointment of Amelio Valdez to the vacant editorial chair of La Federacion, the union organ. These men were promptly notified, however, by the vigilance committee, to leave the city within 24 hours. They neglected to obey, and an officer of the vigilance committee arrested the secretary while he was at dinner in a restaurant. Later in the day the editor also was arrested. "Both men," says the news dispatch, "have been secreted in the woods, and it is not known what will be done with them." Of the 13 leaders previously kidnaped only one has yet been heard from.

In American politics the only facts to record for the week are that the "middle-of-the-road" populists of Iowa have nominated ex-Congressman L. H. Weller for governor; that the chairman of the state committee of the populist party of Pennsylvania announces that the party will not nominate a state ticket this year, but will ask its members to vote against the republican machine; and that the republican convention of Nebraska, meeting at Lincoln on the 28th, has named S. H. Sedgwick for supreme court judge, which office is the head of the Nebraska ticket this year.

War news from South America is contradictory, each party having representatives in this country who furnish their own kind of news. The Liberal agent for Colombia, located at New York, gives out a dispatch from the Liberal agent at Quito, Ecuador, saying that a battle was fought on the 17th near Pasto, just north of the Ecuador line, between the forces of the Colombian government and those of the Colombian Liberals, which resulted in a great victory for the latter. On the other hand, the Colombian minister at Washington gives out an official dispatch from the Colombian minister at Quito, which reports a defeat of the Liberals near Tomaco. A later

dispatch, a special news dispatch of the 24th, tells of an announcement of that day at Caracas, capital of Venezuela, that the Colombian government forces had been completely defeated by the revolutionist forces in the department of Cauca. Still another news dispatch, dated the 22d, and coming from Curacao, off Venezuela, states that Venezuela has sent war vessels with troops upon an expedition in aid of the Colombian revolutionists. But this is doubted by the Colombian minister at Washington, war not having been declared; and expectations of continued peace between Colombia and Venezuela are held out. The reports noted last week, that Ecuador was about to join with Venezuela in a war upon Colombia are also discredited. On the 26th the United States gunboat "Machias" arrived at Colon, on the northern coast of the Isthmus of Panama, for the protection of traffic across the Isthmus.

While this war cloud at the south of us looms up, the stubborn resistance of the Boers in South Africa to British occupation not only continues, but strengthens, and evidence accumulates that the British government is worse baffled than ever. Enlistments for South African service fall far below the mark, notwithstanding the high pay offered for "rough riders" to chase the Boers; and of the recruits that arrive in South Africa, Lord Kitchener complains that large numbers are physically incompetent for army life and work. Yet the Boers have carried the war far down into Cape Colony. One dispatch tells of a British proclamation of martial law, closing all the country stores in the Queenstown district, and "requiring that all goods likely to be useful to the enemy shall be taken to certain specified towns, and forbidding country residents to have in their possession more than a week's provisions." The significance of this is obvious when it is explained that Queenstown is a district of Cape Colony far south of the Orange Free State boundary. It is about midway between that boundary and the coast. Other dispatches give still further indications that the British colonies themselves are aflame with revolt. One tells of a Boer force having almost reached the coast at a point about midway between Cape Town and Port Elizabeth. Another reports an attack upon a British convoy on the way from Kimberley to Griqua-

town, about 100 miles west. The attack was repulsed, but at a loss to the British of 9 killed and 23 wounded. Still other dispatches tell of the cutting of telegraph lines in Cape Colony and Natal. One of the most significant facts, however, besides the proclamation with reference to the Queenstown district already noted, is the military arrest of Mr. Merriman, the Liberal leader of Cape Colony, whose offense consists in urging leniency for the Boers. It was he who came to England on that mission and was refused a hearing before parliament. Mr. Merriman had written a letter to a friend, dated August 6, describing martial law in Cape Colony, which was published on the 27th. In it he said:

Public meetings are forbidden by military force. Quite recently a member of parliament, living 50 miles from Cape Town, who had a few men to see him, was hauled before a military tribunal. At another place a man was deported because he refused to join the town guard. To crown all, our parliament, where the voice of the people should be heard in a legitimate, responsible fashion, is suspended, contrary to law. The administration of the whole country is carried on by means of the illegitimate issue of public money. You gag a man and because he does not make his voice heard you declare he is contented with his position.

The foregoing indicates that the British proclamation of the 7th (see p. 298), demanding that the Boers surrender by September 15th, or be perpetually banished from their country when captured, has quite failed of its purpose. But beyond these indications there is positive evidence. President Kruger, interviewed on the 27th, said that peace is only possible on the basis of the independence of the two republics and free pardon for the colonial Afrikaners who have taken part in the war. In this interview, also, to the question: "Have you any objections to the proclamation, based on international law?" Mr. Kruger replied:

Great Britain recognized the Boers as belligerents. Now the proclamation says they will be shot as belligerents where possible, and when captured will be punished as rebels. Moreover they are to be continually weighed down by the thought that in offering legitimate resistance they are bringing ruin upon their wives and children. If that is international law then international lawlessness

would be better, for under it everybody could defend himself.

President Kruger's assertion that Boer resistance will continue is borne out not only by the circumstances we have already described, but also by proclamations of the Boer leaders in the field, which are reported by Lord Kitchener. In a dispatch of the 25th, Lord Kitchener said:

De Larey has issued a counter proclamation warning all Boers against my latest proclamation and declaring that they will continue the struggle. Steyn, De Wet and Botha are reported by Kitchener as having replied to the same effect. Lord Kitchener claims that, nevertheless, surrenders have increased; but he reports only 118, inclusive of captures, since the 9th. He also reports, August 26th, that—

three officers and 65 men who were sent north of Ladybrand (Orange River Colony), on the right of Elliot's columns, were surrounded on unfavorable ground and captured by a superior force August 22. One man was killed and four were wounded. The prisoners were released.

Military men in London are said to account for this easy Boer victory—only one killed and four wounded, but the whole force of 69 captured—with the explanation that it is difficult to keep jaded men to their work when they know that surrender to a superior force is followed by speedy release after deprivation of arms, powder and shot.

It is not at all likely that Turkey and France will come to blows (the post-mortem interests in Turkey of all the other European powers standing in the way); but all political communication between these two countries has been severed. The questions at issue are purely financial. The "Constantinople Dock and Quay Company," a French concern, claimed Constantinople dock concessions, which the sultan ignored. That is the basis of one question. Another rested upon a confiscation by Turkey of land in Albania from a French subject. Two others concerned money due to French subjects for advances made to Turkey for railroad construction. Until the 27th it was supposed that the whole dispute had been diplomatically adjusted. An agreement had in fact been made. But France, charging Turkey with breaking this agreement, ordered her ambassador, M. Constans, to withdraw from Tur-

key, leaving only a charge d'affaires at Constantinople, and announced that the Turkish ambassador to France would be given his passports. This international rupture was completed by the departure of the two ambassadors from France and Turkey respectively on the 27th.

The semi-official explanation of France is as follows:

On August 17 an arrangement concerning the various disputes between France and Turkey was effected with the Porte. The terms were drafted by the Ottoman minister of foreign affairs, Tewfik Pasha, with the approval of the sultan, who promised M. Constans, the French ambassador to Constantinople, that the full text would be handed to him on August 18. M. Constans telegraphed on August 19 that none of the porte's promises had been fulfilled. On August 21 M. Delcasse, the minister of foreign affairs, telegraphed M. Constans that in view of the complete disregard of its undertakings by Turkey, France was unable to continue the negotiations. M. Delcasse requested M. Constans to inform the porte that he had received orders to leave Constantinople. M. Constans communicated this to the porte on August 23 and announced that he would depart on August 26. As none of the porte's promises had been kept, on that date M. Constans left Constantinople.

Following is a dispatch from Constantinople, giving unofficially the Turkish version of the controversy:

The porte was showing a disposition to regard the French demands as settled by the irades referred to in yesterday's dispatches providing for the payment of 700,000 francs (\$140,000) to the French Quays company as compensation for the company's loss of rights for two years, and also the payment of £27,000 Turkish (\$121,500) as compensation to a French subject whose land in Albania had been arbitrarily taken. The French embassy, in order to prevent a misunderstanding, sent a letter to Tewfik Pasha, the Turkish minister of foreign affairs, pointing out that France also expected a settlement of the two claims in behalf of French subjects, which M. Constans in his note of August 11 had included, and stating that unless these were conceded M. Constans would leave Constantinople and Munir Bey, the Turkish ambassador to France, would receive his passports. No irade dealing with these two claims appeared and the porte yesterday endeavored to obtain 24 hours' delay before complying with