

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 511

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 25, 1900.

Number 125.

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 column of last page.

Since the Grand Army of the Republic objects to the admission to membership of soldiers of Philippine campaigns, the latter might, as has been wisely suggested, organize a Grand Army of the Empire.

It is to be observed that President McKinley still keeps up a press censorship at Manila. This is not to conceal military movements from Filipino soldiers, but to conceal political movements from American voters. From the white house onward the march of empire takes its way.

Mr. Hanna needs the dexterity of a juggler to manage his two issues without their coming in conflict. He gives warning to the east, where "goldbugs" abound, that free silver is the dominant issue; but in the west, where the republicans want free silver coinage, he explains that Bryan has abandoned that issue. Can he keep both frauds going throughout the campaign?

All through the spring the Chicago newspapers accounted for the falling off in building operations here by reference to the building trades strike. They accordingly held organized workmen responsible for the depression, and the press of the country echoed their complaint. But now that the steel trust has arbitrarily reduced the price of structural steel, a building boom in Chicago is predicted. Yet the labor situation is substantially unchanged. It is the steel trust,

after all, then, and not the strike, that has been strangling Chicago building operations.

The horrible story reported by the daily press as from the lips of Mrs. E. B. Drew, wife of the British commissioner of customs at Tientsin, and which we reproduced last week on page 290, is now denied. But the denial, like the story, rests upon the authority of a newspaper interview. On one side or the other, then, here is an example of the lack of responsibility which newspaper "enterprise" has bred in the reporter. No one knows whether to believe the story or the denial.

McKinleyites are beginning to assert that "commerce is the life-blood of nations." For once they are right. But if they believe it, why have they so long insisted upon damming up the stream by their policy of protection? How happens it that they look upon commerce as vital when they seek to extend it by fire and sword and shell and slaughter, but denounce it as destructive to home industries when peaceable men seek peaceably to extend it by means of free trade?

The sensational arrest of two Italian immigrants at New York, upon a hint from the Roman police that they intend to murder President McKinley, is another bit of humbug for campaign consumption. More serious is the admission of Italian police spies officially into this country under the patronage of the federal government. To appreciate its significance, let us imagine that the federal government had at the time of the Irish troubles taken a pack of Scotland Yard detectives under its protection and turned them loose among

American Irishmen. Our republic is going fast and going far toward the home dangers of imperialism when it invites monarchical policemen officially to invade this country upon man-hunting expeditions.

"If Bryan and Stevenson are good populists," says the New York Evening Post, "they cannot be good democrats." Why not? The names are the same. Both mean government of and by and for the people. And if "democrat" is now a more reputable term among the aristocrats of democracy, it was in Jefferson's day as offensive as "populist" is in Bryan's.

The liberty congress at Indianapolis adopted the only rational course open to it when it indorsed Bryan. The paramount issue this year is the question of approving or condemning McKinley's imperial policy. It is paramount not because the democrats have declared it to be, but because McKinley himself has made it so. No one can vote or refrain from voting without either indorsing or condemning that policy. If he votes for McKinley he certainly indorses it. If he votes for Bryan he as certainly condemns it. If he stays at home or votes a "side-show" ticket, he condemns or approves accordingly as his convictions favor imperialism or oppose it. That is, if he favors imperialism, his vote for a "side-show" ticket or his refusal to vote at all, counts for Bryan, whereas if he opposes imperialism, it counts for McKinley. No voter can escape this responsibility unless he is neither for nor against imperialism. And as such a voter doesn't count in this campaign anyhow, it makes no difference which way he votes or whether he votes at all. In these circumstances the lib-

erty congress would have stultified itself had it nominated and seriously supported an anti-imperialist party. Honorably, then, as well as wisely, it refused to do this. Honorably and wisely also it advised anti-imperialists to vote for Bryan.

A few members of the Liberty congress urged the organization of an independent party upon moral grounds. They claimed to represent men who will not vote for McKinley and cannot vote for Bryan. Their objection to McKinley is his imperialism; their objection to Bryan is his populism. Yet these men, if they nominate an independent ticket, will, as we have already indicated, throw the weight of their votes in favor either of Bryan or of McKinley. If they are really anti-imperialists they will throw it in favor of McKinley. And with most of them we venture the guess that that is where they wish to throw it. Driven to the alternative of McKinley or Bryan, we suspect that McKinley would be the choice of most of them.

Mr. Hanna's system of intimidating voters, which he worked so successfully with the mechanic classes four years ago, is this year to be tried also upon classes that have been supposed to be more independent. Even corporation lawyers are bluntly warned that their votes bear a close relation to their fees. One of the men to whom this warning has evidently come is Edward M. Shepard, a prominent corporation lawyer of New York. Mr. Shepard is best known outside of his state as the author of the Van Buren biography in the American statesmen series. In 1896 he opposed Bryan. He was then as he still is a gold democrat. But now that imperialism has become the paramount issue Mr. Bryan has his cordial and disinterested support. Declaratory of his position, Mr. Shepard writes for the Brooklyn Eagle a clear-cut review of the po-

litical situation, of which the burden is that if compelled to choose between foreign aggression and a free silver bill he would instantly choose the latter. It is in this communication to the Eagle that he alludes to the attempt to intimidate professional men like himself. At the same time, he makes a manly response.

After mentioning "threats plainly enough expressed by influential journalists and not less plainly by others," Mr. Shepard says:

The men who in 1896 were steadfast for the cause of sound money and enjoy some measure of esteem in business and social life have been told, and sometimes with what is called brutal frankness, that, if they should now remain as loyal to the cause of democratic self-government when in danger as they were to sound money when that cause was in danger, they must suffer not only loss of influence, but also a sort of contempt and even ostracism. Such men have been warned—and with rather ugly distinctness—of the fate awaiting them and their reputation and even their material interests if they should persist in saying what was in their mind. These threats come measurably near to raising another issue not to be evaded. The boycott is a barbarism the privileges of which are not confined to one side, and against which, whatever its purposes or methods, we are bound to make effectual protest. Frankness and courage in speaking on public matters are absolutely essential to our ideals of government and civilization. If such threats do not of themselves make a reason to support Mr. Bryan, they have, nevertheless, driven men of intellectual self-respect out of their hesitation over to his unqualified support. I am vain enough to believe that the insolent stupidities of some of Mr. McKinley's supporters have had no part in my present determination. When . . . the question is present and crucial, and one's own view remains perfectly clear, and his conscience is peremptory, nothing remains for him but to truly speak his mind. If this mean, as it often does, a loss of personal influence, it is better that such personal influence should be lost than that it should be maintained upon the false and insincere basis of prudent concealment.

If all the subjects of Mr. Hanna's intimidation machinery prove to be as true to their convictions, at whatever loss, as Mr. Shepard, the ideals of our government and of civilization will be maintained; and no one

will lose either in material interests or personal influence. Intimidation, like blackmail, hurts only when its demands are yielded to.

If the McKinleyites had left any room for doubting their desire to throw the constitution aside, they remove the doubt by their clamor about treason, based upon American letters of sympathy sent to the Filipinos. That they aim, with reference to "our new possessions," to disregard the constitution, they cheerfully admit. It is part of their declared policy. But this treason cry shows how they itch to do away with it also as a shield for the rights of Americans at home. But for the constitution, almost anything disagreeable to the administration might be denounced as treason. Foreseeing that, the fathers inserted in the constitution (section 3, article 3) a clause defining treason against the United States as consisting "only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort." It follows that no American citizen can possibly be guilty of treason, constitutionally, when the United States is not legally at war. Unless at war, the United States can have no enemies to be aided and comforted. Now, the United States is not at war legally with the Filipinos. For, according to paragraph 11 of section 8, article 1, of the constitution, congress alone has power "to declare war;" and against the Filipinos no war has been declared by congress. To accuse Americans of treason, then, for giving aid and comfort to the Filipinos, as the McKinley press and some McKinley officeholders are doing, is to exhibit either dense ignorance of elementary constitutional law, or brazen indifference to constitutional safeguards.

Whatever may be thought of the justice of the verdict against Caleb Powers, the republican ex-secretary of state of Kentucky, who has been