

the meetings—some with money and some in collecting money, some as speakers and some as committee workers and distributors of literature—that it is almost invidious to mention any. But the continuous service of F. H. Monroe as chairman of the executive committee and of L. S. Dickey as manager, call for special recognition. The club turned out over 1,000 marchers in the Bryan parade.

✓ OVER THE BRINK.

With an enormous electoral majority the voters of this country have decided to approve President McKinley's imperial policy. Regardless of what any or all of them may have intended to do by voting for McKinley, this is what they have done. That imperial policy is now, and it will continue to be until reversed at a future election, no longer the McKinley policy alone, but the American policy.

The vote of Tuesday will be construed in no other way. Imperialism as applied especially to the Philippines was the paramount issue. The money question only served the republicans as a red herring to draw across the trail. And most dexterously did they use it so as to make the silver issue appear to be a live one in the east, where free silver is feared, and a dead one in the west, where it is popular. The inconsistency mattered not to them. They relied upon Lincoln's aphorism that "you can fool all of the people some of the time." What they wanted was a popular indorsement of the policy of imperialism, and they have got it.

There was but one concrete issue in the recent election. That issue was imperialism as expressed in the Philippine policy. And everybody who voted for McKinley voted in effect to approve imperialism to the extent to which it has gone—the criminal aggression of forcibly annexing the Philippines. As to that question, this country has voted itself over the brink, and the deepest and darkest chasms of imperialism yawn beneath it.

REASON FOR HOPE.

While obliged to concede that the reelection of McKinley is a formal

indorsement of his policy, we have no notion that the voters deliberately indorsed it. We do not believe that the people of this country are imperialistic at heart. If we did we should give up hope. We do believe, however, that they are not yet awake in great masses to the imminence of imperialism. They have forgotten the revolutionary caution that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and are easily lulled into a false sense of security. We agree with the Philadelphia Times when it says that "the people have not approved—they have been overawed;" only we should say "deluded and overawed." To quote approvingly the text of this most excellent comment of the Times:

The reelection of President McKinley in the face of the general condemnation of his policy is the fullest justification of the battle the democracy has made in defense of popular rights—a battle that begins anew today and will continue until it is won. The enormous concentration of capital under corporate control has become the dominant power in this country. It controls our legislatures; it controls the national government; it controls our elections. Through its countless channels of influence, by corruption, intimidation and misrepresentation of every kind, it has compelled the election of its chosen candidate against the deliberate judgment of the American people. Imperialism in government goes hand in hand with this tyranny of money that finds expression in the trusts. The people have not approved—they have been overawed. The false cry of danger to "business interests" has terrified and coerced men against their judgment.

A volume could not more vividly and accurately describe the circumstances which have made this republic indorse with an overwhelming vote a monarchical policy against which the people in their hearts protest.

THE FUTURE.

Though imperialism, as exemplified by what may be called the American policy in the Philippines, has been approved by the American people, the revolt against the principle of imperialism is not yet put down.

This principle goes deep. It involves not only the right of the American republic to organize crown colonies and govern a subject people, but also its right to subject its citizens at home to the dominion of a privileged class.

Over that principle the politics of this country have been more or less deeply agitated for nearly two decades. It gained expression first in the tariff question; then, more superficially and less appropriately, in the silver coinage question; and in the recent campaign more fundamentally than ever in the Philippine question. What form of expression it may next adopt cannot be foretold, nor is it important. The vital thing is that the conflict between elementary natural rights and mere legal privileges has begun at the American ballot box.

The election of Tuesday did not determine this conflict. That was only a battle. The war is still on. It has had its Bunker hill. It has had its Long Island. It may have its retreat across the Jerseys. Even a Valley Forge experience may await it. But the sun will yet rise upon a Saratoga and a Yorktown in this war of ballots between the impoverished and their despoilers as it did in the war of bullets which Washington's half-starved ragamuffins waged against the well-fed troops of King George.

On our side, notwithstanding one defeat in the early stages, one victory followed by unexampled treachery, and two dispiriting defeats in the more recent stages of the conflict, we have made a great advance. We have for one thing identified one of the great parties of the country with the principle of imperialism, and the other with that of democracy. The republican party now stands in this country, like the tory party of England, for privilege and paternalism; whereas the democratic party, no longer the tool of the slave power, has at least reached the place of opposition. We refer, of course, not to what these parties say they stand for, nor to what some of their managers are trying to make them stand for, but to the now evident trend of each. The issue of restriction, regulation, governmentalism on the one hand, and of individual liberty on the other, has been raised between them. The rest is only a matter of keeping on. Be the results of elections what they may, every contest like the last one will emphasize that issue, provided these

parties continue to hold the same relations toward each other.

That the republican party will remain what it is and advance in the direction in which it is now going, there is no room for doubt. The plutocratic interests of the country have its machinery and its influential members completely at their mercy. But there is not the same certainty that the democratic party will do so. A supreme effort will be made between now and the next presidential election to turn it back in its course. The republican press is already urging that this be done, giving as a reason for it that the democratic party has been so badly defeated that it can never win with the principles it now represents. Why the republican press should be anxious to have the democratic party in a winning position must be inferred, for it is not explained. But the republicans are not alone in their anxiety to reverse the policy of the democratic party. So-called democrats are preparing to make a crusade within the party for that purpose.

It is known that some of these voted for Bryan with no other motive than to give them again a place in the party organization where they might obstruct its present movement. There are others who voted for McKinley for the declared purpose of helping to produce a defeat for Bryan that might force his party to turn in its tracks. Such men, aided by others who care nothing for political principle but everything for political spoils, intend to reverse the direction of the democratic party so that instead of fighting republican corruption it may share in it. And the preliminary steps to this end consist in discrediting Bryan as a leader.

That is the first danger to be guarded against. The democratic party must be held upon its present general course, and the only truly democratic leader it has had since Jackson should be assured of the confidence of all democratic democrats. Not that Bryan is the only person for democratic leader. There may be others, and it may be wise to accept another before the next election. Of that no one can judge now. But Bryan is the one leader of whom anything is yet known. He is the only demo-

crat of this generation of democrats who has proved both his ability as a popular national leader and the depth and genuineness of his democracy.

To Bryan, then, in the immediate future, at any rate, will true democrats turn for advice and support in maintaining the integrity of the new democracy; and to him will they look for that reasonable advance along democratic lines which his defeat of last Tuesday necessitates. The democracy, like revolutions, can neither stand still nor go backward. It must press on, come victory or defeat, toward the ultimate contest of our era—the contest which shall be to plutocracy and democracy what the fateful battle of Tours was to Saracen and Christian.

NEWS

Details of the voting at the presidential election on the 6th are as we write (November 8) not yet available. No report of the popular vote, therefore, can be given. But President McKinley has been reelected by a larger electoral vote than he received in 1896.

Mr. Bryan began his final speaking campaign in Chicago on the 1st, immediately upon his arrival, which was reported last week, and from then until the 3d, when he reviewed a night parade of about 40,000, he addressed audiences in different parts of the city every day from early in the forenoon until late at night. Most of the meetings were out of doors. Among the few indoor meetings at which he appeared was that of the Henry George Bryan and Stevenson Campaign club at Handel Hall, where his speech dealt impressively with fundamental moral principles. It is reported verbatim in the department of Miscellany. Leaving Chicago on the 3d, Mr. Bryan made a rapid tour of Nebraska on the 5th, returning to Lincoln in time to vote on the 6th. President McKinley went to his home in Canton a few days before election day and voted there. At the close of the campaign on the 5th the managers of both parties issued manifestoes claiming the election by large majorities of their respective candidates.

The electoral vote, as the newspaper reports now estimate it, is as follows:

FOR M'KINLEY.		FOR BRYAN.	
California	9	Alabama	11
Connecticut	6	Arkansas	8
Delaware	3	Colorado	4
Illinois	24	Florida	4
Indiana	16	Georgia	13
Iowa	13	Idaho	3
Kansas	10	Kentucky	13
Maine	6	Louisiana	8
Maryland	8	Mississippi	9
Massachusetts	15	Missouri	17
Michigan	14	Montana	3
Minnesota	9	Nebraska	8
New Hampshire	4	Nevada	3
New Jersey	10	North Carolina	11
New York	36	South Carolina	9
North Dakota	3	Tennessee	12
Ohio	23	Texas	15
Oregon	4	Virginia	12
Pennsylvania	32		
Rhode Island	4	Total	163
South Dakota	4		
Utah	3		
Vermont	4		
Washington	4		
West Virginia	6		
Wisconsin	12		
Wyoming	3		
Total for McKinley		284	
Total for Bryan		163	
Majority for McKinley		121	

Though the returns of the popular vote are exceedingly defective, we give the pluralities as reported, along with the pluralities in 1896, for purposes of comparison:

	1900.		1896.	
	Rep.	Dem.	Rep.	Dem.
Alabama	45000	76489
Arkansas	60000	72591
California	40000	1922
Colorado	35000	134792
Connecticut	28415	53545
Delaware	2000	3360
Florida	22000	21448
Georgia	40000	34141
Idaho	3000	16968
Illinois	100000	141517
Indiana	30000	18001
Iowa	80000	65452
Kansas	25000	13509
Kentucky	8000	281
Louisiana	30000	55138
Maine	28500	45777
Maryland	15000	32224
Massachusetts	82888	173265
Michigan	90883	56868
Minnesota	50000	53875
Mississippi	45000	58750
Missouri	50000	58725
Montana	17000	32043
Nebraska	4000	12935
Nevada	1000	6439
New Hampshire	18000	35794
New Jersey	52900	87692
New York	147000	268469
North Carolina	28000	19266
North Dakota	10000	9465
Ohio	79000	48494
Oregon	15000	2117
Pennsylvania	300000	295072
Rhode Island	15000	22998
South Carolina	30000	49517
South Dakota	16000	183
Tennessee	25000	19403
Texas	175000	202914
Utah	5000	33116
Vermont	30000	40490
Virginia	30000	19341
Washington	15000	12493
West Virginia	13000	10888
Wisconsin	106000	102612
Wyoming	3000	583
Totals	1391686	648000	1571378	961675

Chicago newspaper returns give the popular vote in that city. The figures are inexact but will probably