

a fight instead of a false truce within the old party. The method is simple and can be made effective. Let the democratic Democrats organize everywhere within the party, between now and the next national convention, with a determination to carry that convention. Not for a man, but for radical democratic principles. In doing so, let them adopt a policy with reference to their principles, which will be too democratic for the conservative element even to pretend that they accept it, and stand or fall by that policy. Should democratic Democrats succeed in defeating the plutocratic wing of the party at the next convention, upon a platform genuinely and radically democratic, the defeated wing would soon be driven out of control everywhere. They would either disintegrate and join the Hanna Republicans, or make a party of their own and bid against the Republicans for Wall street support. In either case the renovated Democracy would soon command the confidence of all democrats. If, on the other hand, the plutocratic wing should defeat them in the convention, then let them organize a distinct Democratic party, based upon democratic principles and the best democratic traditions. They would not win that year, but they would assure the defeat of the old organization under circumstances that would make resurrection impossible; and at the ensuing elections the new Democracy would have the democratic field to itself and inspire the democrats in all parties with confidence. That can never be done while this drama of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde is annually played in the Democratic party. The fast forming issue in this country is between democracy and plutocracy, and parties as well as voters must align themselves accordingly.

Bigelow's defeat in Ohio and its temporary check upon Tom L. Johnson's campaign for home rule and just taxation was caused by the anomalous association of conflicting

elements in the same party organization to which we have already referred. These two men, genuine democrats both, were opposed by all the plutocratic influences of both parties; yet, being nominally associated with the plutocrats of their own party, they could not secure the confidence in large degree of Republicans whose political principles are essentially democratic. It is only as Johnson comes to be recognized for what he is, as the foe of economic privilege and political rascality in both parties, that the movement he leads can cut its way through the barricades of the party "bosses" of the State.

But let no one imagine that this repulse which Johnson has met in Ohio is equivalent to defeat. As the civil war was not won at Bull Run nor the Revolution at Bunker Hill, neither could Johnson be expected to win the State of Ohio in his first fight against the plutocrats of the two parties. But he has planted the seeds of popular confidence, which will sprout and grow as the befooled and befuddled people of the State begin to realize that in voting against his wing of the Democratic party they were voting with the plutocratic wing of the same party as well as with the commercial combines and political rings of the Republican machine. Neither he nor Bigelow could have more than hoped for victory in the first battle. Both of them know that the forces which oppose democracy never have been weak, for both have long taken their democracy from Henry George, who wrote:

Let us not disguise it. Over and over again has the standard of Truth and Justice been raised in this world. Over and over again has it been trampled down oftentimes in blood. If they are weak forces that are opposed to Truth, how should Error so long prevail? If Justice has but to raise her head to have Injustice flee before her, how should the wail of the oppressed so long go up?

Both of these men, resting now under the shadow of disappointed hopes, not for themselves but for mankind, have pinned their faith to the doctrine that Truth and Justice, though

they often lose battles, never lose a war; and no sooner shall the reports of the contest of Tuesday be fully in, than both will be preparing for the municipal contests of next Spring, which in turn will be but the prelude to more important ones later on.

One especially gratifying fact about the Ohio election is the discovery that the heavy plurality against Bigelow was due altogether to the combination of the bi-partisan "bosses" of Cincinnati. The Republican "boss," Cox, cooperating with Bernard, the lieutenant of the Democratic "boss," McLean, and thereby controlling all the election machinery of both parties, was able to make Hamilton county appear to have cast a plurality of 30,000 against Bigelow. So it appears in the count. This is at least 30,000 more than a normal Republican plurality, and it more than accounts for Bigelow's loss in the State as a whole. He falls less than 20,000 in the State behind the Democratic plurality of last year, the plurality against him being less than 90,000, while that against Kilbourne last year was almost 70,000. Outside of Hamilton county, therefore, Bigelow made gains. What is more important, he carried Senator Hanna's own county, Cuyahoga, which is normally Republican, and where Hanna did his strongest campaigning, by 2,500 plurality, and Hanna's Republican city of Cleveland by 5,000. Upon these facts it is to be reasonably expected that the Cox-Bernard-McLean "combine" of Cincinnati will be read out of the Democratic party of Ohio at the next State convention, and that a thorough canvass of the State will elect a democratic Democrat for governor next year.

The most satisfactory election result in Illinois, with reference to candidates, is the brilliant victory of Clarence S. Darrow, the counsel for the coal miners before the arbitration commission, who has been elected as an independent to the Illinois