

cent leader, and indicates the patience and endurance which it demands of those who enlist upon the democratic side.

Plutocracy against democracy! That is what it means, and it is a war to the death. By plutocracy is not meant rich men, but the ideal of government by and for the rich. By democracy is not meant poor men, but the ideal of government by and for all. It is an old, old fight, and it has had many and varied manifestations. The American revolution did not begin it. That birth pain of our republic was but an incident in this conflict of the centuries. The anti-slavery struggle did not complete it. That was only another victory for democracy added to the victories that had gone before. What distinguishes the struggle now is the more general and more perfect recognition of its true character. And what gives greater hope than anything else is the fact that Mr. Bryan, who is preeminently the leader of American democracy now, so clearly perceives and so courageously describes the issue.

All sorts of reasons are advanced for voting against Bryan by men who are ashamed, now that it is too late, of having voted for McKinley and thus approved his policy of turning this liberty-loving republic into a man-eating empire. One reason is that Bryan lowered himself by making a stumping tour. But is it more degrading to go directly to the people, when the opposition controls the press of both parties, than to pull wires in secret as Mr. McKinley did. Another reason is that he affiliated with Croker. But what right had he to affiliate with anyone else in New York? Since the democrats there have placed themselves bodily under Mr. Croker, there was no alternative for Mr. Bryan, as the candidate of their party, but to affiliate with Croker or stay away from New York, leaving that city to the immaculate Roosevelt and his delectable side partner, Platt. It was

the business of New York democrats, not of Mr. Bryan, to put Croker aside. Still another reason is that Mr. Bryan clung to his free silver principles. What should he have done? Blown hot and cold, according to circumstances, as McKinley did? But the most extraordinary reason is that he opposed imperialism. Beyond that there is no climax that would not be an anti-climax. The truth is that if Bryan had done the things which pretended democrats who voted against him say he ought to have done, he wouldn't have deserved the support of any man. He did deserve support because he never once lost the courage of his convictions nor departed from the straight line of principle as he saw it. Among the democrats of to-day Bryan towers like Saul among his brethren.

It is highly encouraging that the republican press feels constrained to prompt and promote the effort of McKinley democrats to de-Bryanize the democratic party. Why the republicans should wish to do that is clear enough. With Bryan and Bryanism out of the party there would be nothing left in it but a parcel of office seekers. The party itself would be only a faction in the republican party. Bryan and Bryanism have made the democratic party a party of democratic principle. Why should it abandon that principle? There is but one answer. It is the same answer from William C. Whitney, who carries a democratic label in his pocket for use when it pays, and from the republican press; and the answer is: So that the party can win. Win what? Without political principle there is nothing to win but office for parasitical leaders. What democratic democrats want to win is democratic principle, and unless the triumph of the party can win that for them they would prefer to see it beaten.

These democrats are not disheartened by the result of the election. They realize that defeat will tend

to make the democratic movement more radically democratic than before, whereas victory at this time, even under Bryan, might tend to check its progressive impulse. They know moreover that democracy was defeated not by an intelligent anti-democratic vote, but by unawakened democrats. The republican party is full of them. At heart the people of this country, the people who make republican majorities, believe in equal rights and government by consent of the governed. They believe in the man as against the dollar. They believe in democracy as opposed to plutocracy. They believe in the republic and not in the empire. But they have not yet awakened to the drift of events. They do not yet realize that plutocracy is sapping the democratic blood out of the republican party and trampling upon the standards of the republic. They do not understand that the trusts are an expression of plutocratic power which has got a legal leverage under our social system. They do not realize that the Philippine question raises the whole issue of colonial imperialism. They do not know that a great plutocratic revolution of worldwide scope is engulfing our republic. They know the facts as well as anyone, but they are not yet awake to the significance of the facts. They will awake, however, and it is our business to arouse them. When they are aroused the work for democracy in this generation will have been accomplished.

While the British tory press is jubilant over McKinley's reelection, it is gratifying to find that the liberal papers, especially those that maintain the democratic spirit in England, sympathize with "Bryanism." We quote from the London Speaker, which is to British democracy what the Spectator is to British toryism:

The thing which is uppermost is that man is the slave of the dollar. That seems to be the chief impression conveyed by the victory of Mr. McKinley. The veriest tyro must