

# The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 8, NO. 51

Lincoln, Nebraska, January 1, 1909

Whole Number 415

## CONTENTS

SAMUEL GOMPERS IN CONTEMPT?  
THE DOCTRINE OF MONARCHY  
TAINTED EDITORIALS  
EX-SECRETARY SHAW ALARMED  
GARY OR POWDERLY?  
PLAYING WITH FIRE  
ANDREW CARNEGIE ON THE WITNESS  
STAND  
MARTIN'S REPLY TO ROOSEVELT  
SOLVING THE MYSTERY  
COMMENT ON CURRENT TOPICS  
HOME DEPARTMENT  
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT  
NEWS OF THE WEEK

### THE WINDOW-WISHERS

Window wishers, window wishers, everywhere  
we go;  
In front of every shop and store they're stand-  
ing in a row;  
Some are old and some are young; sober ones  
and gay,  
Drifting in a wishing dream as every mortal  
may.

Mothers with their hearts of love are gazing at  
the toys,  
Wishing for the gifts to glad their precious girls  
and boys;  
Women, women, everywhere—sweethearts, sis-  
ters, wives—  
Wishing for the joys they know would lift their  
patient lives.

Oh that every empty hand might have its fill  
of gold,  
And every gift the wishers ask be theirs to have  
and hold,  
And wreathed with every happy dream an an-  
swer should be blent  
Till all the hungry hearts might breathe the  
blessed word "content."

'Tis good the hapless ones of earth who feel  
Dame Fortune's frown,  
May yet a-window-wishing go through all the  
streets in town;  
For earth still holds its meed of gold, despite  
its dark alloy,  
So long as we may dream of things to fill the  
heart with joy.

And life's a window wishing play since all our  
fleeting years  
We're gazing at the "great beyond," and wish-  
ing through our tears;  
But "over there" each thirsting rose is kissed  
with blissful dew,  
And every wish will be fulfilled and all our  
dreams come true.

—Nixon Waterman.

### THEY KNOW

An American writing from Cavite, Philip-  
pine Islands, reports the following vote among  
the blue jackets on the Rainbow and the Wil-  
mington: On the Rainbow the vote stood—  
Bryan, 131; Taft, 31; Debs, 8; Chaffin, 5; His-  
gen, 2. On the Wilmington the vote stood—  
Bryan, 24; Chaffin, 22; Debs, 12; Taft, 4; His-  
gen, 1; Watson, 1. The soldiers and sailors  
who have visited the Philippine Islands are  
able to appreciate the democratic position on  
imperialism.



TO EVERYONE, EVERYWHERE—AND FOREVER!

## SAMUEL GOMPERS IN CONTEMPT?

The fining of Gompers, Mitchell and Mor-  
rison by Justice Wright, of the District of Co-  
lumbia, is likely to focus attention upon the  
subject of injunctions as nothing else could do.  
This is really a controversy between a large  
corporation and its employes, and the writ of in-  
junction is being used to assist the corporation  
in its contest against those who were employed  
by it. In order to further its cause and to  
obtain an advantage against the workmen, the  
stove company secured an injunction restraining  
the American Federationist (the official  
organ of the Federation of Labor) "or any other  
printed or written newspaper, magazine, circu-  
lar, letter or other document or instrument  
whatever," from referring to the complainant,  
its business or its business product in the "we  
don't patronize" or "unfair" list, etc.

Mr. Gompers, Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Mor-  
rison were accused of violating this injunction  
and sentenced to imprisonment; the case is be-  
ing appealed to the higher courts, and full dis-  
cussion of the principles involved will be de-  
layed until final decision. However, as the cor-  
poration papers are loudly condemning Mr.  
Gompers and his associates and insisting that  
they ought to have obeyed the restraining order  
whether constitutional or not, it is worth while  
to present the side of the defendants. The re-  
straining order was believed by Mr. Gompers,  
Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Morrison to be an unconsti-  
tutional interference with the right of free  
speech, and a court decree which violates the  
constitution is null and void just as an unconsti-  
tutional statute is null and void. Now, how could  
the unconstitutionality of this decree be tested?  
Two ways were open. The defendants could  
have obeyed it and contested it at the time of

the hearing, taking an appeal in case of an  
adverse decision, but this course would have  
left the stove company in possession of the  
field; it would have given it the advantage pend-  
ing the litigation, and with this advantage, the  
corporation might have won its fight against  
the employes before a final decision could have  
been obtained. It might have dismissed its  
suit, after winning its contest, and left the de-  
fendants without even the advantage of a final  
decision sustaining their position.

There was another method of testing the  
injunction, and this they adopted. They con-  
demned the decree as unconstitutional and pro-  
tested against such interference with the free-  
dom of speech and the freedom of the press.  
They denied doing the things specifically en-  
joined, but that question is not so material as  
the question whether they had a right to test  
the constitutionality of the order by disobedience  
to it. Let the case be stated as favorably as  
possible for the stove company; let it be as-  
sumed that Mr. Gompers, Mr. Mitchell and Mr.  
Morrison deliberately disobeyed the order issued  
by the judge on the ground that it violated the  
constitutional guarantees which surround free-  
dom of speech and freedom of the press. Are  
these men to be condemned for thus testing the  
question by disobedience?

Judge Parker, their counsel, calls attention  
to the effort that is being made to invest a judi-  
cial decree with a sacredness superior to that  
which surrounds a statute, and he is perfectly  
right in insisting that a statute enacted by a  
legislature and approved by an executive officer  
is entitled to as much respect as an order issued  
by a judge. And yet nearly every statute which  
is passed is tested by disobedience, and where