

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 14, 1903.

Number 258.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

Although there is an impropriety, as a rule, in discussing in the press questions that are pending before courts for decision—an impropriety which is the same whether it is or is not within the power of the court to punish it,—that rule applies rather to questions of fact, regarding which a tribunal might be easily influenced, than to questions of law, which are subject to generally recognized principles. This consideration, together with the fact that the press of the country has very freely discussed the question, will warrant, even before a final decision, some examination into the injunction against strikers intending to strike which a Federal judge at St. Louis has issued.

No strike had occurred, but the employes of the Wabash railroad had by vote ordered the officers of their organization to call one; and it was to prevent those officers from obeying that order that the injunction under consideration was granted. Here was such a wide stretch of judicial power, an act so distinctly marked with the characteristics of revolutionary usurpation, that much allowance may be made for the opinions of men who advise revolutionary resistance. But inasmuch as regular methods of resistance are still open, the intending strikers have doubtless adopted the better course.

Observe the nature of this injunction. It does not in terms prohibit any employe of the road from

quitting work; and all might quit at once, provided they did so without concerted arrangement. For men have as much right to discharge their employer as he has to discharge them. So, at least, the injunction order is generally construed, though we fear the lawyer who should advise the strikers to that effect would be a bold man. But take it so, and still there is a most extraordinary situation. For in that case a judge has ordered men "absolutely to desist and refrain from persuading, inducing, or otherwise causing, directly or indirectly," other men to do what it is conceded they have a right to do!

One would hardly expect an injunction to be issued against men forbidding their quitting work individually. Neither should we expect one forbidding their quitting work in a body. Yet this St. Louis injunction does the latter in effect, and if it can do the latter it is absurd to suppose it cannot do the former. If it may lawfully prohibit one man from advising another to stop work, it may lawfully forbid the other's stopping work; or else Dickens's old beadle was right when he denounced the law as an ass. When an injunction forbids the "ordering," "persuading," "inducing," "or otherwise causing" a strike, it certainly does forbid striking. For striking consists not merely in the coincident quitting of work by individuals; it consists in a cooperative quitting, which is impossible unless some one "orders," "persuades," "induces," or "otherwise" causes it. Such an injunction being lawful, an injunction forbidding individual quitting of work would soon be forthcoming, even if it is not practically involved in the injunction now under review. With

that, the legal relations of master and servant would be fairly adjusted for this era of revived feudalism. It would be rounded out in accordance with the principles of law that originated in the institution of villeinage from which some American judges are drawing their legal principles.

It is instructive to learn from New York dispatches that in financial circles there the opinion prevails that "if the Wabash Railroad company can sustain its position the death knell of strikes on inter-State railroads has been sounded." The opinion seems to be well formed. But those who congratulate themselves upon this method of ending railroad strikes, are curiously oblivious to the fact that great bodies of workingmen who strike don't do so for the fun of the thing. They do it because they have grievances. Even a child in intellect and experience ought to know what happens when opportunities for redress of grievances are arbitrarily denied to large numbers of people. A very serious question occurs, therefore. When the death knell of railroad strikes is sounded by arbitrary suppression under government by injunction, then what?

"Prosperity" touters will find something of interest to them in the London Times of the 9th, which predicts commercial disaster in the United States. It goes so far as to assert that the evil day has already arrived and has been postponed only through the grace or cupidity of London bankers. Here is its language:

The mysteriously large reductions of net deposits effected in the last quarter of 1902 have been the result of transfers of indebtedness to European capitalists, who were ready for a

handsome consideration to take over for a time these attempts to put off the evil day when the United States business world will have to own that it has bitten off more than it can chew.

That commercial disaster is, indeed, at hand in this country is evident. Our fictitious prosperity is about exhausted. Prosperity in any general and true sense we have not had for many years. Among the masses, while there has been a falling off from the army of the unemployed, there has been no substantial increase of net income. The only classes to prosper have been the plundering classes. Prosperity of that limited kind is predestined to culminate in a crash. There is consequently nothing peculiarly interesting in the prediction of the London Times. But its incidental remark about "the transfer of indebtedness to European capitalists" may well excite our special wonder.

Why should American indebtedness be transferred to European capitalists, if Europe is indebted to us and not we to Europe? In other words, how comes it that we have a debt which we can transfer to Europeans, if our "favorable" balance of trade has been making creditors of us and debtors of them? Debtors do not relieve creditors. The debtor has nothing to relieve with, and the creditor has nothing to be relieved of. Since we are transferring our debts to Europeans, we must be the debtor and they the creditor. Here, then, is another indication to sane minds that, after all our boasting about our excessive export balances of hundreds of millions, we have been getting into debt instead of piling up a credit. Our "favorable" balance is turning out to be a most unfavorable drain. Instead of exporting to create a credit, we appear to have been exporting to pay tribute. Yet the protectionists have boasted of our phenomenal exportations as the best of all evidence that we are prosperous. Is

it not time for them to stop boasting and begin explaining?

In the closing hours of Congress Senator Carmack introduced a public document into the Record which should put a quietus forever upon all cant about "the honor of the army" in the Philippines. It proves irrefutably that the American soldiers in the Philippines murdered prisoners of war under orders, and that the authorities at home have condoned the crime.

Senator Carmack had been nastily criticized by the Army and Navy Journal, a military trade paper, for having said in the Senate that "murders by American soldiers in the Philippines have become so common that they will not bear investigation." Declaring this to be "a wicked libel," the Army and Navy Journal of February 14 described it as "the topmost note in all the malevolent chorus of misrepresentation with which the 'anti-imperialist' demagogues have assailed the honor and manhood of the United States army." Mr. Carmack replied in the Senate on the 2d. He said that a letter from a private soldier of the name of Brenner, written to his people at home after the battle of Calococan, told of the murder of Filipino prisoners taken at that battle. In consequence of the publication of this letter an investigation was ordered by the Secretary of War, in the course of which a private of the name of Putnam admitted that he was one of the soldiers who had assisted in murdering these prisoners and explained that he had done so under orders. When the report came to Gen. Otis he forwarded it to the judge advocate, Col. E. H. Crowder, with a recommendation that court martial proceedings be instituted against Putnam. Instead of obeying, Col. Crowder sent to Gen. Otis the following recommendation, now on file in the war department, which was affirmed by

Otis and acquiesced in by the Secretary of War:

The offense of Private Putnam, if he has committed one, is manslaughter. His only defense would be a lawful order of his superior officer. If put on trial, it is probable that acts would develop implicating many others. I doubt the propriety of his trial and am of the opinion that considerations of public policy, sufficiently grave to silence every other demand, require that no further action be taken in this case.

E. H. CROWDER,
Lieutenant Colonel and Judge Advocate
U. S. Volunteers.

What American who really respects the honor of his country can read that official army report, a plain condonation of infamous atrocities committed by American soldiers under the orders of American army officers, without contempt for the official and journalistic apologists for army crimes in the Philippines? What is this "honor of the army" which demands that army crimes go unpunished and uninvestigated?

For the good of the cause he stands for it was lucky that Congressman Robert Baker, of Brooklyn, had never seen a Congressional Directory before complying with the request of the editor for a biographical sketch. Had the book been familiar to him he might have followed the common place example of other Congressmen and written a perfunctory sketch which no one would have read or cared to see. As it was, he unconsciously disregarded the limitations of space and produced a sketch of a live man, with live thoughts, expressing themselves in insuppressible energy, which occupies something more than a page of the book and is full of human interest. This sketch consequently attracted the attention of the Washington correspondents, for they thought it showed that Baker was a vain Congressman, which gave it in their experienced estimation the character of "news" having much space value. The result is that Baker has been well advertised over the country as a Henry George man, whose election from a