

labor movement. In these respects the report here-with presented is entitled to greater consideration than any of the views emanating from ostensibly disinterested or frankly prejudiced sources. In any event the report contains a great deal of information which will be helpful in reaching a thorough understanding of the situation in Los Angeles prior to and following the Times explosion.



### The "Herring" Business in Politics.

Another "herring across the trail" (p. 1082) is being drawn in Illinois politics. It is by the Legislative Voters' League. We don't yet know whether this is intentional or not. Some members of that organization are above suspicion; but it is no slander of others in its membership to suspect that they have a reason up their sleeves. The question of intent, however, is unimportant. The important thing is the fact. And the fact is that the declared post-election policy of this League is certain to operate harmoniously with the plans of the "Jackpot" politicians and those business interests that "sweeten" legislative "jackpots," to sidetrack the popular demand for the Initiative and Referendum.



The objectionable policy of the Legislative Voters' League is expressed in its urgent plea for a Constitutional convention. Now, the people of Illinois have not demanded a Constitutional convention, and they have demanded a Constitutional amendment providing for the Initiative and Referendum. Nothing was said before election about a Constitutional convention, whereas a vigorous campaign was made in behalf of the Initiative and Referendum. To push the former is therefore to put the League into a dubious position. Whom is it trying to serve—no, not trying, for that involves intent, and intent is not the question; but whom is it actually serving, the people or the "jack-potters"?



To appreciate the point fully, several facts must be definitely understood. For one thing, under the Illinois Constitution only one Article can be amended at any election. For another, both parties declared for the Initiative and Referendum in their platforms. For a third, the people voted, under advisory Initiative, for the mandatory Initiative and Referendum. For a fourth, an effort is under way to submit a tax-reform amendment, badly enough needed if a good one, but calculated at this time to sidetrack the popular demand for the Initiative and Referendum. For a fifth, the Legislative Voters' League wishes to abolish the

abominable minority representation system and therefore calls for a Constitutional convention. For a sixth a terror of the Initiative and Referendum spreads through the whole dishonest section of the business and political world. Finally, a controversy among sincere advocates of Constitutional reform is likely to afford the best possible excuse for dodging the whole matter. In these circumstances the Legislative Voters' League's proposal for a Constitutional convention looks to the demoralized "jackpotters" as good as "money from home" to a prodigal wanderer.



From every point of view which the Legislative Voters' League ought to represent and professes to represent, the demand for a Constitutional convention is ill-timed. Is it desired the more quickly to abolish minority representation? This can be abolished without the aid of a boss-ridden convention, as soon as we have the Initiative and Referendum. Meanwhile it is not a pressing reform; for States without minority representation are "bossed" and "jackpotted" quite as scandalously as Illinois. Oregon was before getting the Initiative and Referendum. Is it desired to reform the antique tax laws of Illinois? This can be done in harmony with public sentiment instead of Big Business greed, when the Initiative and Referendum are secured. A Constitutional convention, bossed by the politicians and their business allies, as it would be, would probably exclude the Initiative and Referendum, and thereby prevent popular mandatory action on that point; for, by embodying two or three desirable reforms, along with a lot of the other kind, it could leave the bitter alternative to the people of retaining the old Constitution or adopting one "equally as good." This would completely sidetrack the popular demand of November 8 for the Initiative and Referendum, and postpone its adoption for years. The difference between a Constitutional convention and the Initiative and Referendum, in public estimation, was clearly shown at the recent-election in Oregon, where the people know from experience what the Initiative and Referendum are. They voted down the Constitutional convention proposal by the tremendous majority of 34,326 in the large total vote of 85,180.



Let the Legislative Voters' League be advised. The "question before the house" in Illinois politics now, is not Constitutional convention, nor minority representation, nor tax reform, nor any other secondary proposal; it is the fundamental

proposal, endorsed by three to one of the intelligent electorate, of the Initiative and Referendum. Whoever affords the "jackpotters" a plausible excuse for dodging this question makes himself one of them in effect, though his intentions be as white as falling snow.

\* \*

### Mayor Dunne's Candidacy.

All that is discriminating and fair in the Democratic party of Chicago will welcome ex-Mayor Dunne's announcement of his candidacy for Mayor of Chicago at the Democratic primaries. His defeat four years ago was due to treachery and false counting in the slum sections of his own party, the result of which—the election of the fragrant Busse—has been a shame to Chicago from the hour of Busse's flippant taking the oath of office to the present.

\* \*

There was at that time good municipal work for Dunne to do in connection with the traction question; but this was settled with his defeat, and settled for the worst. The Plunderbund owns Chicago traction now, and will continue to own it no matter who becomes mayor. But the city needs a mayor like Dunne for general administration. He is a clean and honest man personally; Big Business has no grip upon him and can get none; his Democracy is democratic; and in one or more of these respects his prospective adversaries fall short of the mark.

\* \*

One of them, several times mayor, left office with an official record O. K.'d jointly by the hinkey-dinks and Big Business; and four years ago he committed the unpardonable political sin of running at the primaries yet "skipping" the campaign and election when the better man got the nomination. The other is an agent of the Interests and always theirs to command. Between Harrison, Graham and Dunne, the citizen who rejects Dunne identifies himself with the worst Democratic elements in the political life of Chicago.

\* \*

### Municipal Amusement in Milwaukee.

A municipal dance is one of the innovations of the Socialist administration in Milwaukee. Mayor Seidel presided over the festivities. He was assisted by the head resident of the University Settlement, the director of physical culture in the public schools, 100 young men from the Y. M. C. A., 50 young women from the Y. W. C. A., and the rector of a local Episcopal church. The admission fee was 20 cents, refreshments were

served at moderate prices, dress suits were left at home, all classes were there, everybody was introduced to everybody else, no one was allowed to be a wall flower, there was an exhibition of European folk dances, the guests danced with no lack of partners, the affair broke up just before Sunday came in, and it was throughout the democratic play-time of a socialistic city. Mayor Seidel expressed the hope in a little speech that the city might regularly conduct these municipal dancing parties to prevent her youth from seeking dance halls where intoxicants are sold and vice holds sway.

\* \*

### What's the Difference?

The Washington authorities—President Taft is mayor of Washington—prevent Emma Goldman from lecturing in that city. This is in defiance of the law, but what's the difference? Warren, the publisher of the Appeal to Reason, is sentenced to imprisonment for sending through the mails an open advertisement offering a reward for the kidnapping and return to his State for trial of a Republican politician indicted for murder, just as workingmen in Colorado were kidnapped with the approval of the United States Supreme Court. The postal law in Warren's case, constantly violated by bankers, etc., with impunity, is enforced only against this publisher of a Socialist paper; but what's the difference? A labor procession in Los Angeles is forbidden unless the ordinary labor union inscriptions on the banners are effaced, while a plutocratic gang is hard at work trying to indict law-abiding workingmen for perpetrating a "dynamite outrage" which was in fact caused by an accidental explosion of gas; but what's the difference? In the name of law, plutocracy tramples upon the law; in the name of free speech, free speech is forbidden; in the name of equal rights, the principle of equal rights is being destroyed. But what's the difference? Now it is a Goldman, a Socialist, a labor unionist, that guardians of the law assail in defiance of the law; soon these aggressions will go higher up. But what's the difference? The difference! Read Carlyle's "French Revolution" if you wish to know. Society has its diseases, which sometimes become violent in spite of palliatives and heroic treatment.

\* \*

### CHAMP CLARK FOR SPEAKER.

Immediately upon the authentic announcement that Champ Clark would be the Democratic candidate for Speaker of the next House, Henry George, Jr., Congressman-elect from New York (pp. 1092,