N.E.R. 1077. It was therein held that the maintenance of a patrol of two men in front of plaintiff's premises, in furtherance of a conspiracy to prevent, whether by threats and intimidation or by persuasion and social pressure, any workman from entering into, or continuing in his employment, would be enjoined.

There has, however, been some adverse comment upon that decision in periodicals of excellent standing. The theory of hostile criticism, as stated in the dissenting opinion of Judge Holmes and amplified by editorial comment, is that a controversy of the kind involved was outside of the legitimate purview of the law courts; that such controversy represented one phase of a great industrial evolution, or revolution, now in progress; and that it was the duty of the courts to keep hands off when novel questions arose, in order that economic and social forces might adjust themselves. While the courts, of course, should not officiously interpose in matters of individual or confederate concern, in our judgment it would be shirking an essential function of tribunals of justice to decline jurisdiction in labor controversies simply because novel phases of fact arise.

It is in the highest degree important that the courts protect fundamental rights and impartially enforce them as to all parties and classes. The courts have, therefore, quite unanimously condemned boycotts of many and various kinds, because they tend to do away with freedom of competition and personal liberty and security in general. Attempts by one person or an organization of persons to coerce another person, by affecting his standing or relations with a third person, are held unlawful. If the boycott principle were countenanced by the courts and permitted to grow into a regular rule of procedure, there could be no safety for individual liberty of conduct and contract against the despotism of industrial associations and cliques.

The decision of the New York Court of Appeals in *Curran* v. *Galen* (N.Y.L.J., March 9, 1897), is very consistently in line with the Massachusetts case above referred to, and the general judicial attitude toward industrial controversies. It appeared that plaintiff, who had been discharged from employment by a brewing company, brought an action for damages against the defendants for conspiring and confederating together to procure his discharge and prevent him from obtaining employment. The defendants in their answer alleged as a defence that they were