

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