petitioner claims that the Circuit Court was without jurisdiction to make the order committing him to jail are: (1) That the order was made in his absence; (2) that it was made without his having had any previous notice of the intention of the court to take any steps whatever in relation to the matters referred to in the order; (3) that it was made without giving him any opportunity of being first heard in defence of the charges therein made against him. The second and third of these grounds may be dismissed as immaterial in any inquiry this court is at liberty, upon this original application, to make; for upon the facts recited in the order of September 3, showing a clear case of contempt committed in the face of the Circuit Court, which tended to destroy its authority, and, by violent methods, to embarrass and obstruct its business, the petitioner was not entitled, of absolute right, either to a regular trial of the question of contempt, or to notice by rule of the court's intention to proceed against him, or to opportunity to make formal answer to the charges contained in the order of commitment. It is undoubtedly a general rule in all actions, whether prosecuted by private parties or by the government —that is, in civil and criminal cases—that "a sentence of a court pronounced against a party without hearing him or giving him an opportunity to be heard, is not a judicial determination of his rights, and is not entitled to respect in any other tribunal." *Windsor* v. *McVeigh*, 93 U. S. 274, 277. But there is another rule of almost immemorial antiquity, and universally acknowledged, which is equally vital to personal liberty, and to the preservation of organized society, because upon its recognition and enforcement depend the existence and authority of the tribunals established to protect the rights of the citizen, whether of life, liberty or property, and whether assailed by the illegal acts of the government or by the lawlessness or violence of individuals. It has relation to the class of contempts which, being committed in the face of a court, imply a purpose to destroy or impair its authority, to obstruct the transaction of its business, or to insult or to intimidate those charged with the duty of administering the law. Blackstone thus states the rule: "If the contempt be committed in the face of the court, the offender may be instantly apprehended and imprisoned, at the discretion of the judges, without any further proof or examination. But in matters that arise at a distance, and of which the court cannot have so perfect a knowledge, unless by the confession of the party or the testimony of others, if the judges upon affidavit see sufficient ground to suspect that a contempt has been committed, they either make a rule on the suspected party to show cause why an attachment should not issue against him, or in very flagrant instances of contempt, the attachment issues in the first instance, as it also does if no sufficient cause be shown to discharge; and thereupon the court confirms and makes absolute the original rule." 4 Bl. Com. 286. In Bacon's Abridgement, title "Courts," E., it is laid down that "every court of record, as incident to it, may enjoin the people to keep silence, under a pain, and impose reasonable fines, not only on such as shall be convicted before them of any crime on a formal prosecution, but also on all such as shall be guilty of any contempt in the face of the court, as by giving opprobrious language to the judge, or obstinately refusing to do their duty as officers of the court, and immediately order them into custody." "It is utterly impossible," said Abbott, C. J., in *Rex* v. *Davison*, 4 Barn. & Ald. 329, 333, "that the law of the land can be properly administered, if those who are charged with the duty of administering it have not power to prevent instances of indecorum from occurring in their own presence. That power has been vested in the judges, not for their personal protection, but for that of the public. And a judge will depart from his bounden duty if he forbears to use it when occasions arise which call for its exercise." To the same effect are the adjudications by the courts of this country. In *State* v. *Woodfin*, 5 Ired. 199, where a person was fined for a contempt committed in the presence of the court, it was said: "The power to commit or fine for contempt is essential to the existence of every court. Business cannot be conducted unless the court can suppress disturbances, and the only means of doing