

Dunne's Defeat.

The bare defeat of Edward F. Dunne at the Democratic primaries as candidate for Mayor (p. 201) is ascribed in some quarters to his "inefficiency" as Mayor from 1905 to 1907. This is pure clap trap. Judge Dunne was defeated by causes that are complimentary to his efficiency and also to his honesty. The "inefficiency" charged to him as Mayor was the inefficiency of an honest man hampered at every turn by the opposition of crooks—big crooks and little crooks, rich crooks and poor crooks, "good" crooks and bad crooks, priestly crooks and crooks of the pews, political crooks and business crooks—all kinds and degrees of crooks, from the plain garden variety to those of purest orchidean culture. His was an "inefficiency" that his well informed accusers could not afford to be specific about. In truth it was not for inefficiency at all, but for faithfulness that they complained of Mayor Dunne.

+

For instance, Mayor Dunne refused a rich bribe to let the "red light" district go on in its accustomed vicious and lawless way. That was in the order of his faithfulness. If he failed to turn the district into a Methodist camp meeting, this may have been inefficiency to that extent; but he kept it in better order than it had been kept in before, and if he didn't keep it in still better order, the reason was that he could not wholly control police officers long accustomed to regarding all such efforts as "bunk." Mayor Dunne controlled the "red light" district well enough, however, to win the undying political enmity of the "Hinky Dink" outfit, which turned against him in 1907 and elected the unspeakable Busse. And now it has nominated Harrison; for let it be noted that if the majority for Harrison in "Hinky Dink's" local sphere of influence were eliminated from the primary vote of last week, Harrison would be defeated, and Dunne would be the Democratic nominee.

+

For instance again: Mayor Dunne stood sternly by the people's interests and rights in the matter of public utilities, against odds and temptations and threats of a magnitude that few men in politics withstand. To protect the public interests he needed legislation; but Deneen and Lorimer and the latter's Democratic friends were in control at Springfield, and Dunne was not "efficient" enough to bargain effectively with them. To protect the public interests he needed a majority vote of the people on one phase of the

Mueller traction law and a three-fifths vote on another; but while the people gave him the first, they did not give him the second, and he was too "inefficient" to perform the legal miracle of accomplishing results without legal authority. To protect the public interests, he needed the co-operation of the City Council; but this was controlled by two kinds of grafters, those who take their graft raw and those who want it cooked, and he was not "efficient" enough to influence them without becoming a grafter too. To protect the public interests against the maneuvers of Pierpont Morgan in the traction deal, Dunne relied (too blindly, it may be) upon the ability and good faith of men whom all Chicago trusted, to bring the City Council and the traction company to an agreement whereby the city should own the lines and the companies should operate as mortgagees in possession until paid off. But when he turned from other official duties that had engrossed him, to consider the agreement in its final form, he found his plan turned squarely around. The companies, instead of being mortgagees in possession with a right in the city to redeem, were to be owners in possession with a right to the city to buy. And the right to buy was subject to terms making it impracticable if not impossible. Those who had the "efficiency" which Mayor Dunne lacked, had been outdistanced by "efficiency" which Pierpont Morgan hired. To protect the public interests, Mayor Dunne then appealed to the people. But he was not "efficient" enough to control the newspapers; they had or expected to have some of the "pork." He was not efficient enough to control the big lawyers of Chicago; they didn't know when some of the "pork" might come their way if they were "good." He was not "efficient" enough to make the people see—he tried to, but he failed—that they were being buncoed by a "strap-hangers' league" financed by the traction companies, and by a Lorimer-Busse-Sullivan-Deneen-Roosevelt combine in local politics with Harrison in the role of an abettor.

+

Another instance: Mayor Dunne refused to appoint as chief of police a man named by William Randolph Hearst's Chicago representative. Mayor Dunne refused to appoint this particular man because he was unfit for the place. His record damned him. But with Mr. Hearst's representative it was that man or none. Hearst needed delegates to the next national convention, and in this branch of the public service chiefs of police are supposed to be valuable political assets. His

choice being restricted to that particular man or none—the reward for compliance a continuation of the support of the Hearst papers, their hostility the penalty for refusal—Mayor Dunne chose not to appoint that man. In the estimation of the Hearst papers it made Dunne a “dreamer.” The incident may be somewhat suggestive of the terms upon which Mr. Harrison, a black beast in the Hearst menagerie when he was Mayor, has now secured from the Hearst papers their label of “the best Mayor Chicago ever had.”

+

Defeated for nomination last week because he was “inefficient” when Mayor! Dunne? Not at all. Inefficient candidates with no organization and no newspaper support don’t come as near as he to defeating candidates with both. Dunne’s defeat is easier explained. He was defeated because the Hearst papers were able to fool enough Dunne Democrats—Dunne having no newspaper support—to give Harrison a bare plurality over Dunne of only 1,420. Or, if you choose to disregard the influence of the Hearst papers, Dunne was defeated because “Hinky Dink” rolled up for Harrison, in the slums of the First Ward, a plurality of 2,979, two thousand more than enough to shift the choice from Dunne to Harrison. With “Hinky Dink” and the Hearst papers, Harrison barely wins.

+

Dunne was not defeated for any “inefficiency” other than the kind his friends ought to be proud of his having. The obvious reasons for his defeat should endear him to the democratic Democracy, not alone of Chicago but of the State of Illinois.

+ +

Harrison’s Nomination.

What the democratic Democrats of Chicago ought to do with Harrison’s nomination is a question easy to answer. Harrison should be voted for only by such of them as wish to turn the government of Chicago over to Hearst, Harrison, and “Hinky Dink.” That is the delectable dish of political porridge that is now before a hungry Democracy in this city. Democrats who don’t like the odor and question the flavor—as we surmise is the case with most democratic Democrats—will of course vote for some other candidate than Harrison. There are three—the Socialist, the Prohibitionist, and the Republican.

+ +

The Outlook for Chicago Democrats.

What is it best for democratic Democrats to do

at the Chicago election in April? Some have urged that Dunne become an independent candidate. We doubt their wisdom. The effect would be to divide the progressive vote in Chicago at a critical juncture, nationally critical as well as locally. This might be well if the votes that went to Dunne as an independent would go to Harrison if Dunne were not running; but we do not believe they would. Moreover, and by the token of those national tendencies in politics which the result in Chicago is almost certain to affect, there are patriotic uses ahead for Dunne, as the best tried and most distinguished progressive Democrat in Illinois, and both he and his friends should be slow to ignore them and their possibilities. The true course for the democratic Democrats of Chicago, as it seems to us, and we believe that in this we have the approval of most of them, is to take advantage of an unusually good opportunity to prove to the whole country their sympathy and their sense of political identity with the progressive Republicans, at the same time helping to elect the best kind of man for Mayor.

+

The progressive Republicans are organizing throughout the country along genuinely democratic lines and for genuinely democratic purposes. Mr. Bryan has suggested that it may be time for progressive Democrats to do something of the same kind. It is certain that progressive Democrats have less in common with mere party Democrats than they have with progressive Republicans, and that progressive Republicans have less in common with mere party Republicans than they have with progressive Democrats. The progressive Democrats of Chicago who agree with us in this will best express it next month by voting for Charles E. Merriam for Mayor. Democrats who are democratic have less in common politically with Harrison than with Merriam.

+ +

Charles E. Merriam.

At the Republican direct primaries, not only was the worst candidate badly beaten, as at the Democratic primaries, but, unlike the result of the Democratic primaries, the best candidate was nominated, and by an overwhelming plurality. Alderman Merriam’s plurality was so large that in a contest with four adversaries he polled within 100 of a majority over all. His triumph has amazed the prophets who learned to prophecy under the old primary system; and it is especially interesting because he had against him all the influence, not only of the Busse administration of Chicago, but also of the Deeneen administration