sisting his nomination. They regard this as their strategic point. Were he a weak adversary his nomination would be welcome.

✣

Even for the nomination, Mayor Dunne has but one competitor, and this is ex-Mayor Harrison. It is easy to understand why Republicans want the Democrats to nominate Harrison; they are confident of defeating him at the election. It is easy to understand why the predatory interests want him; they know that it will make no difference to them which party wins if Harrison is the Democratic candidate. But it is not easy to understand why any sincere Democrat should want him, and we doubt if many do.

✣

Harrison was mayor four terms. He went in as a Democrat of the Altgeld type, and with steadily dwindling pluralities he came out Morganatic. As an administrator he was a spoilsman who escaped the brand only because he quieted the goo-goo papers by distribution of spoils agreeable to them. While professing adherence to the municipal ownership cause, and making campaign pledges in its support, he violated these pledges and worked with the Pierpont Morgan interests to fasten a stock jobbing traction franchise upon the city. His "silent referendum" of two and a half years ago was a corporation trick that would have succeeded but for Judge Tuley and Judge Dunne and the Hearst newspapers. Had it succeeded, the Morganatic interests would have secured a tight grip on the street-car rights of the city for almost a generation. Mr. Harrison's latest objectionable performance consisted in opposing the traction-operation referendum of a year ago. This proposition, though it called out a majority vote, failed for lack of the three-fifths vote required by the statute. A few more votes would have given the required number, and those few were doubtless diverted by Harrison's opposition.

✣

If the Democrats of Chicago intend to repudiate their municipal ownership pledges and to court defeat by going into the Morgan stock-jobbing camp, as the Republican machine and the soiled goo-goo newspapers have done, Harrison is the man they should nominate. But if they intend to stand for public rights against private exploitation, then the selection of Harrison would be a shameful stultification resulting in well-deserved defeat. The only possible course to maintain progressive Democratic standards and guarantee success at the polls, lies in the renomination of Mayor Dunne.

✣ ✣

The Chicago Traction Franchise.

We have looked with much interest and some hope, for a reasonable response to Mayor Dunne's objections (p. 967) to the pending traction ordinance. Responses there have been, but they are all mere rhetorical chaff. If one were to say that they are deliberately designed to throw dust into the public eye, he could justify his suspicions with the responses themselves. To denounce Mayor Dunne's objections as trifling and his object in making them as political, as these responses do, is to concede their essential importance. For political motives cannot be served by means of trifling objections, and objections that are dodged instead of refuted are probably not trifling.

✣

One at least of Mayor Dunne's objections goes to the root of the municipal ownership question. As the ordinances now stand, they place no limitation on the expenditures which the companies may make in rehabilitation, and which the city must pay to the companies if it takes over the lines. It is possible, therefore, with complaisant Morganites in the City Council, to make the expenditures exceed the ability of the city to pay for purchase. At present the ability of the city to pay is limited to $75,000,000, the amount of the Mueller certificates authorized; yet the ordinances contemplate expenditures to the amount of nearly $100,000,000. This amount cannot be paid by the city, and therefore the city cannot buy the lines, until the Council submits a referendum for the issue of more certificates. Consequently the Morgan interests would, under these ordinances, be in position for twenty years or more to prevent municipal ownership by merely influencing a majority of the Council against submitting another Mueller certificate referendum. This defect could be easily cured by providing that expenditures for rehabilitation shall at no time exceed the amount of Mueller certificates authorized. But the franchise seekers refuse even so simple a provision, and the inference is obvious.

✣

Nothing now stands in the way of these tricky ordinances but the Mayor's veto and the popular referendum. Thousands of signatures have already been obtained for the referendum; but it is necessary to obtain 87,000, and the City Coun-

cil has left but two weeks in which to do this, of which hardly more than a week remains. The attitude of the franchise seekers and their newspaper aids, together with their coadjutors who nominally represent the city, is highly significant of a determination to "jam through" a bunco set of ordinances. And what have they to urge on behalf of this suspicious speed? Only that they are in a hurry to pass the ordinances so that the people of Chicago may have good traction service. But there is nothing in these ordinances to make good service secure. The only possible guarantee of good service would be an ordinance enabling the city to take over the system upon demand and with the least possible difficulty. The companies might then give good service, in fear of losing their franchise; but they will have no fear, nor reason for any, if these ordinances are passed.

✣

Had these ordinances been drawn in good faith to effectuate the purposes of Mayor Dunne's "Werno letter," the traction question would now be settled. No one would oppose them, and everyone would welcome them. For that letter contemplated re-construction of the traction system by the old companies for the city, with a revocable license to operate until the city should decide to operate for itself. This is what the companies agreed to do when they accepted orally the terms of "the Werno letter," and this is the obligation they are now trying by these ordinances to dodge. Instead of constructing for the city, they are to construct for themselves. Instead of operating under a revocable license, they are to operate under a license so difficult if not impossible of revocation as to amount in practice to an indefeasible franchise for twenty years or more. Instead of eliminating the traction companies from municipal politics these ordinances would make them more than ever a corrupting political influence. Instead of taking "water" out of traction stock they would pour "water" in by the barrel full, as Stock Exchange reports will soon begin to show if the ordinances pass. And opportunities for stock-jobbing, instead of being removed, would be greatly augmented. These ordinances are no more expressive of the purpose of the "Werno letter," nor intended so to be, than theft is expressive of honesty.

✣ ✣

The Shea Trial.

The disagreement of the jury in the Shea trial at Chicago doubtless appears to very many well-meaning persons as a miscarriage of justice. Let them observe, however, that only a minority of the jury were for conviction, which indicates that if justice did miscarry it was because the defendants were not acquitted. But miscarriage of justice is hardly the appropriate phrase. The real conspirators in this case were not the men on trial, not the strike leaders; they were among the prosecutors if they were anywhere. This fact could have been shown at the trial of Shea and his associates, and the attempt was made, but the judge who presided ruled out all evidence tracing responsibility to any other source than the labor leaders in the teamsters' strike (vol. viii, p. 279) of two years ago. The mistrial in the Shea case was less a miscarriage of justice than of injustice.

✣

Regrets are expressed that there might not have been "a more satisfactory outcome" of the trial. The temper and source of these regrets imply that the only "satisfactory outcome" would have been conviction. But the simple truth is that no decisive outcome was possible, with a jury fairly selected. For the issue presented by the case was whether or not a sympathetic labor strike is a criminal conspiracy. At this trial five jurors thought it was and seven thought it was not. At another trial there would be the same result unless the jury were packed. A jury of Union League Club members, or members of the Employers' Association, the real prosecutors in this case, would doubtless agree on a verdict of guilty, whereas a jury of Federation of Labor delegates would as probably agree on a verdict of not guilty. But a jury consisting of representatives of both sides of the question would most assuredly disagree, while it would be impossible to find a jury of neutrals on that question outside of a retreat for idiots.

✣ ✣

Emma Goldman and the Newspapers.

A few days ago the newspapers of the country made much of the arrest of Emma Goldman for a public speech inciting to violence, the destruction of government, etc., etc. But they made nothing of the fact that when she was arraigned, the case against her was dismissed on the ground that her speech was not a lawless one but was entirely within her rights. The newspaper idea of what constitutes lawlessness offers an interesting study in the psychology of professional gossip. A woman speaker who commits no crime is haled to prison and her meeting broken up by officious policemen