

either has no convictions regarding the equitable distribution of wealth, or that his convictions are plutocratic. In either case he lacks the essential quality of an available Democratic candidate for the presidency at a time when democratic principle is needed to solve industrial problems.

During the New York mayoralty campaign we endeavored to explain the real causes of Tammanyism, insisting that they lie deeper down than dilettante "good government" politicians like to admit. In concluding that explanation we said that Tammanyism can be uprooted only by one or the other of two things:

Either the ballot must be taken from the poor, which would enable the comfortable classes to realize their own ideal government; or poverty must be abolished, by destroying privilege, which would lift the poor to higher planes of citizenship.

Commenting sympathetically and intelligently upon this conclusion, the *Dubuque Telegraph-Herald* draws attention to the remarkable declaration of Abraham S. Hewitt (a Democrat!), made in behalf of Mayor Low's candidacy, in these refreshingly candid terms:

If Shepard thinks that universal suffrage is the best form of government for large aggregations of men he differs with most statesmen and the best thinkers of the day. They all agree that municipal government is a matter of business, and not of general politics. They think that ignorance should be excluded from control, and that the city business should be carried on by trained experts selected upon some other principle than popular suffrage. In this view I concur.

The *Telegraph-Herald's* suggestive, thoughtful and democratic comment is as follows:

Abram S. Hewitt, ex-congressman and ex-mayor, agrees with *The Public's* conclusions, and as he is opposed to elevating the poor by destruction of privilege and incidental abolition of poverty, he holds that city officials ought to be chosen by some other method than a popular vote. He would prevent the poor from voting at municipal elections by disfranchising them. In time, the concentration of wealth continuing, this may be done. Whenever and wherever organized and

combined privilege finds itself unable to dictate the votes of the poor by the methods so successfully employed in the national campaign of 1896, it will favor use of the methods in vogue in the South against the Negro. But with control of the transportation lines and of the productive industries rapidly concentrating in fewer and fewer hands, open, wholesale disfranchisement will hardly be necessary. The concentration of wealth and of power over future wealth is steadily rendering the masses of men less and less independent and more and more dependent, and a consequence of this process of degradation must be subjection of the votes of the dependent to the will of the industrial masters.

It is gratifying to learn from the *Platt papers* that popular suffrage is a success. Mayor-elect Low also calls it a success. That is because it defeated Shepard. Had Shepard been elected, then, according to the amiable ex-Mayor Hewitt and democrats of his particular brand, popular suffrage would have been proved a failure. Some classes of people are so well satisfied with themselves and their manifold and manifest virtues that they test everything by its effect upon their own class. If it serves them, it is successful; otherwise it is a failure.

Constitutional lawyers of Great Britain, as well as believers in British liberty everywhere, are shocked by a decision of the judicial committee of the king's privy council. This committee has apparently decided that the British courts are not open for the protection of individual liberties, when the protection of those liberties might endanger, in the opinion of the courts, the interests of the empire.

The case passed upon came up from South Africa. A British subject of the name of Marais had been arrested in Cape Colony, and is now in prison. He had no connection with the British army, but was arrested and is confined solely by military authority. No charge has been made against him, and he is ignorant of the reason for his arrest. Early in September he appealed to the supreme court of Cape Colony on habeas corpus proceedings,

on the ground that as a civilian he was subject to the process only of civil tribunals, and could not be lawfully imprisoned by military authority. That court dismissed the writ, refusing to interfere. Had the case involved money in large sums, instead of personal liberty, Marais could have appealed to the home courts as a matter of right. But as it did not involve money, but only the liberty of a man, he had no right of appeal. He could only ask leave to do so. It was upon this application for leave that the judicial committee of the privy council is understood to have made the decision in question.

In the course of the argument the lord chancellor frequently interrupted Marais's lawyer with hostile comment. At one point, when the lawyer was arguing that in the absence of express statutory authority civilians cannot be tried by court-martial while the ordinary courts are open, the lord chancellor interjected the statement, as reported by the press dispatches, that "the courts are not open, if access to them would endanger the interests of the state." One member of the privy council, Lord Davey, protested emphatically against this revolutionary doctrine; but he was outvoted, and the leave to appeal was denied. The reason for the decision is assumed to be in substance that expressed by the lord chancellor during the argument and quoted above. Should this prove to be the case, the liberties of British subjects may be regarded as hanging hereafter by a slender thread. The British courts, whenever they choose to regard the interests of the empire as in danger, may close their doors to applicants for writs of habeas corpus; and civilians will be as much at the mercy of military law as soldiers enrolled in the army. Imperialism comes at a high price.

It is said that the Chicago traction companies are about to apply to the federal courts for an injunction prohibiting the Illinois board of tax equalization from obeying the pro-