

brought to an end last week by a message from President Wilson to their leader, William L. Hutcherson, in which the President stated with his characteristic felicity of expression the fundamental issue at stake:

I feel it to be my duty to call your attention to the fact that the strike of the carpenters in the shipyards is in marked and painful contrast to the action of labor in other trades and places. Ships are absolutely necessary for the winning of the war. No one can strike a deadlier blow at the safety of the Nation and of its forces on the other side than by interfering with or obstructing the ship-building programme.

All the other unions engaged in this indispensable work have agreed to abide by the decisions of the Ship-Building Wage Adjustment Board. That Board has dealt fairly and liberally with all who have resorted to it. I must say to you very frankly that it is your duty to leave to it the solution of your present difficulties with your employers and to advise the men whom you represent to return at once to work pending the decision. No body of men have the moral right, in the present circumstances of the Nation, to strike until every method of adjustment has been tried to the limit. If you do not act upon this principle, you are undoubtedly giving aid and comfort to the enemy, whatever may be your own conscious purpose.

I do not see that anything will be gained by my seeing you personally until you have accepted and acted upon that principle. It is the duty of the Government to see that the best possible conditions of labor are maintained, as it is also its duty to see to it that there is no lawless and conscienceless profiteering, and that duty the Government has accepted and will perform. Will you co-operate or will you obstruct?

No better statement could be made of the paramount present-day duty of every American citizen from the President down to the youngest office boy. Every American must do his utmost to help win this war. While questions of domestic economy, National efficiency, and individual justice may be discussed, they must be discussed in such a way as to aid and not to interfere with victory. A man who strikes at a time of National emergency simply because he sees a chance selfishly to increase his income, whether he be a profiteer or a day laborer, is really an enemy to his country. That this is recognized by many of the ship carpenters themselves is indicated by the fact that at least in one shipyard of which we know many of the men not only refused to go out but themselves posted up placards urging their fellow-workers to "build ships and beat the Germans." Even before the President's intervention the number of workers who actually went out on strike was much less than some of the sensational accounts indicated.

THE MOONEY CASE: AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT

When, many months ago, cable despatches from Petrograd reported a riotous demonstration against the American Embassy in the Russian capital, and added that it was in protest against the Mooney conviction in California, not a few Americans asked in surprise who Mooney was, what he had done, and why Russian Socialists should be excited about his conviction.

The other day another unusual chapter was added to the history of the case when the Federal Mediation Commission recommended that President Wilson use his good offices with the California authorities to bring about a new trial for Mooney in case the California Supreme Court sustained his conviction. The Mediation Commission, in reviewing the history of the matter, says that "the Mooney case soon resolved itself into a new aspect of an old industrial feud instead of a subject demanding calm search for the truth."

The offense with which Thomas J. Mooney (together with others) was charged was the throwing of a bomb into the Preparedness Parade in San Francisco on July 22, 1916. Six persons were killed and many injured by this outrage. Mooney was duly convicted, but largely on the direct testimony of Frank Oxman. After the conviction letters from Oxman came to light which, in the words of the Mediation Commission, had the plain import of an attempt by Oxman to suborn perjury to corroborate his testimony in this trial against Mooney. Naturally, when Oxman was thus discredited, a stain was placed on his own evidence. Oxman was indicted, but the jury failed to

convict. When Mrs. Mooney and Israel Weinberg were tried for the same offense as Mooney, but without the Oxman evidence, they were acquitted. The other alleged accomplice, Warren Billings, had been convicted, and, like Mooney, is under sentence.

The labor leaders and Socialists in San Francisco aver that a plot existed to make organized labor bear the infamy of murder and disloyalty; justly or unjustly, this feeling grew passionately, and meetings of protest were held by Socialists from California to Russia. The Mediation Commission so far indorse this feeling as to say that the "circumstances of Mooney's prosecution, in the light of history, led to the belief that the terrible and sacred instruments of criminal justice were consciously or unconsciously made use of against labor by its enemies in an industrial conflict."

It is not quite clear how the President's intervention is expected to bring about a new trial—the case is not in Federal courts. But in view of the facts above stated, the ordinary American citizen, who has no opinion whatever as to the guilt or innocence of Mooney and Billings, and who also earnestly wishes to see the despicable perpetrators of the outrage punished, may yet feel that common fairness calls for a trial in which an alleged suborner of perjury who is also suspected of perjury shall not be the State's chief witness.

THE ADMINISTRATION, PRO AND CON

With the oratorical fire for which he has earned a reputation, Senator Ollie James, of Kentucky, continued in the Senate the defense of the war activities of the Administration. His speech was made on February 14. However biting some of his words may seem in print, it is impossible to think of them as being accompanied by anything less than the good-natured smile of this massive Senator from Kentucky. His line of argument was much the same as that which Mr. Glass followed in the speech which he made in the House and which we reported last week.

During the course of the debate there have been charges of partisanship against those who criticise certain aspects of the Administration's management of the war. This point, as well as others, was taken up by Senator Weeks in his speech on February 15. Unlike Senator James, Senator Weeks made no effort for rhetorical effect, but read his manuscript closely. The Senator from Massachusetts declared near the outset of his speech that never in his experience in the House of Representatives or in the Senate had he seen a Congressional investigation so devoid of partisanship; that the investigation had been conducted on the principle that the people have a right to examine and regulate the administration of their Government. He acknowledged the difficulties with which the War Department had to wrestle, and said that the Committee that made the investigation had just cause of pride in much that had been accomplished. But he gave facts in evidence of shortcomings, prefacing them by the following statement:

If I were to criticise the Secretary of War personally, it would be that he has undertaken to do too many things himself, some of which, at least, might have been attended to by subordinates, and that he has been too open to access to people who might have had their needs provided for through some subordinate officer, leaving him too little time to deliberate over the many larger problems coming before his Department.

If I were to make a further criticism, it would relate to his temperamental relationship to war. Doubtless he himself would admit that he is a pacifist by nature. For example, he is even now opposed to universal military training, one of the benefits we ought to get out of the great sacrifices we are making; and I cannot divorce myself from the conclusion, based on his own testimony, that he has been inclined to plan for the prosecution of the war—and this condition has to some degree permeated the Department—on the basis that we are three thousand miles from the front, instead of hastening preparation with all the vigor we would exercise if our borders were the battle-front.

In reference to the charges of political bias Senator Weeks said near the conclusion of his speech:

Not a question indicating partisanship was raised until the President deliberately injected politics into the situation by an

CARTOONS OF THE WEEK

Kirby in the New York World



DOWN WITH CAPITALISM!

THE BOLSHEVIK'S SENIOR PARTNER

Kirby in the New York World



DRIVING THE WEDGE DEEPER

PRESIDENT WILSON SPLITTING THE TEUTONIC ALLIES

Rogers in the New York Herald



SHOOT AT THE ENEMY, NOT AT ONE ANOTHER

GOVERNMENTAL CO-OPERATION NEEDED TO WIN THE WAR

Harrison in the Sketch (London)



TOMMY SEES THE SIGHTS AT THE BRITISH MUSEUM

Tommy (inspecting an Egyptian mummy, he addresses a scholarly visitor:) "Beg pardon, sir, but who is this 'ere party in puttees?"

Newbould in the Passing Show (London)



A VALUABLE OBJECTIVE

Voice from the distance: "Fall back, ye daft loons! You posection is of nae value at a'!"

Chorus of Kilties: "Nae value? Why, mon, we've just drapt a saxpence!"

HUMORS OF THE WAR AS SEEN BY BRITISH CARTOONISTS