To nullify such decisions by popular vote is what Mr. Roosevelt appears to have in mind in proposing his ridiculous "recall of judicial dericions"—his "recall of legalism to justice" as he quaintly puts it—as a substitute for allowing the regular Recall to apply to judges.

The evil to which Mr. Roosevelt alludes is indeed a serious one. Popular government is menaced by the judicial power of making law. But Mr. Roosevelt's amazing plan, which would be clumsy if it were necessary, would be neither necessary nor excusable with the popular Initiative in operation. Surely this is plain. If judges so construed a Constitutional provision as to make it unacceptable to the people, or to tie them up in the leading strings of dead men, the people could by the Initiative amend the Constitution. And they could do this without disturbing judges in whose ability and good faith they might really confide, or unsettling private contracts made on the basis of objectionable precedents. Doubtless this is what would be done under the Initiative, Referendum and Recall—with the latter "unimproved" by Mr. Roosevelt. If, after such amendment, the judges pettifogged, with the evident purpose of nullifying the amendment, doubtless the Recall would then be invoked. It ought to be invoked in such cases. But it would seldom otherwise be successfully invoked against judges.

The Initiative, Referendum and Recall would not be used idiotically. They would be used sanely. All experience thus far testifies to this. Even without special experience, it might safely be inferred. The people as a whole are no such fools as a few of them like to think all the others are. They would be fools, however, if they fell into any such pit as the substitution of a popular "recall of judicial decisions" for a popular Recall for all elective officials. For thereby they would make law suits instead of judges subjects of trial at the polls, where the latter but not the former ought to be tried; and while providing an unnecessary and clumsy remedy for unjust "legalism," they would make no efficient remedy for judicial usurpation, judicial despotism, judicial incompetency and judicial corruption.

Death of Joseph Keane.

Joseph T. Keane, whose death at Santa Monica was reported last week, will be recalled by hundreds of Chicago radicals of various kinds, and by their guests from other States and other lands, as the "Joseph" whose supervisory social service at the "Washington" furnished forth daily the table at which they daily met to wrangle while they ate. And wider than that was Mr. Keane's circle of friends in Chicago. His interest in politics, his sensitiveness to the currents of political opinion, and his honesty of purpose and thorough-going loyalty, cemented many friendships for him among leading citizens. At the time of his death, when 52 years of age, he was president of King's restaurant company, of which Oscar Smedberg is the manager. His wife and a child of six are the family he leaves.

Death of "D. K. L."

Every reader of The Public for three years past will recall the excellent contributions which have appeared in its columns, some as Editorial Correspondence and some as signed editorials, over the initials "D. K. L." Many a reader has asked with friendly interest who the writer was; and well they might, for his contributions were among the most useful and most acceptable that have come to us. Perhaps there was never a very good reason for concealing "D. K. L.'s" identity, but all such reasons as there may have been, disappear with the death of David K. Larimer.

Mr. Larimer, who died suddenly of Bright's disease at Sioux City on the 8th, was telegraph editor of the Sioux City Tribune. He came into that connection after a long and varied newspaper experience. Beginning on the Spokesman-Review of his native city, Spokane, he served on the Portland Oregonian, on the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, on the Salt Lake City Tribune, and on the Omaha Bee, before going in August, 1909, to the Sioux City Tribune, where for a man of his rigorous non-partisan democracy he found delightful editorial companionship. Not long before his employment on the Omaha Bee, Mr. Larimer grasped the doctrines of Henry George, and it was early in his employment there that he introduced himself to The Public with an expression of a wish to give work for the promotion of Henry George democracy, since he could not give money.

After that, from time to time, when there was something to be said which he felt it incumbent upon him to try to say and in the line of The Public's policy to publish, his welcome contributions

came. They were always informative, acute, lucid, interesting and genuine; and more than once, entirely apart from his contributions that it published, The Public has been indebted to Mr. Larimer for facts, hints and suggestions which have entered satisfactorily into its decisions on questions of editorial policy. Though a mere boy in years, for he died at 36, and a friend whose face we have never seen, David K. Larimer is one whose death touches us more than most deaths have, with a tenderly affectionate realization of his fidelity to the truths that came within his vision and the readiness and ability with which he sprang to their service.

❁ ❁ ❁

THE DAMNING CLAUSE IN ANY THIRD-TERM CREED.

An English writer has commented with surprise and admiration on the capability which the typical American has shown of rising to the occasion when placed in a position of political importance. This writer cited McKinley as an illustration. There are instances of lesser note in the nation, in each State, and in each community. I recall at this moment the case of a mayor in one of our larger cities. There was nothing in his previous career to warrant a prediction of successful administration. He was a man without much education, just a commonplace semi-political citizen, nominated by the organization, it would seem quite by accident, and elected in a spiritless campaign. And yet this man made, even by the confession of opponents, a splendid official. He was more than faithful to the prescribed duties of his position. He was an aggressive leader in all matters of civic improvement.

The point is that we have plenty of citizens in this Republic capable of filling any political position, from President down. George Washington thought so in his day. He did not think that George Washington was necessary to keep the country from collapsing. All the Presidents of the United States have been capable men, and some of the least celebrated have been the most useful. Let us remember that we are not seeking for rulers but for intelligent public servants. If our democracy cannot find and supply these in amply sufficient numbers, then we had better confess failure and go back a couple of centuries. It is all right in a monarchy for the king or his minister to say, I alone can save the state. But such an utterance is an insult or a joke in a democracy, if it is a democracy.

So, coming to the present situation in our political affairs, we object to the solemn-sounding words of certain men in high position that Mr. Roosevelt is the one man who can fill at this time for the good of the nation the position of President. We have no objection to Governor this or Senator that saying that Mr. Roosevelt is the one man who can save the Republican party from defeat. That is all right. That is a party matter. But to say openly, or even to suggest or imply, that Mr. Roosevelt, or any other man, is necessary to save this nation is a slanderous utterance against the nation. This is the damning clause in any third-term creed. The very advocacy of a third-term candidacy in the face of a splendid tradition is the confession of weakness, incapacity and failure, unworthy of American citizenship, and the mere suggestion of the necessity of such action is utterly and pitifully destructive to the ideals of democracy. The men who are advocating a third, and maybe a fourth, and so forth, term for Mr. Roosevelt are blind to the fact that, in trying to cure certain grievances which they see, they are flying to the chiefest of evils in a popular form of government. This chiefest of evils, which Washington foresaw and others since have foreseen, is the insidious idea of some emergency in which resort must be had to what has been known in history as "the strong man," or "the man on horseback," or to what the American people themselves have called Mr. Roosevelt, "the man with the big stick." It seems strange that those who are now supporting Mr. Roosevelt do not see this danger of weakening the ideals, and the still young tradition, of our republican government. It seems strange that the very men who are professing themselves champions of the people should be rushing into a course which is the negation of democracy. These men would pay too high a price for what they want. We cannot give up the tradition against the third term. This tradition is worth more to us than any reform that can be conceived in the brain of any of the seven Governors.

J. H. DILLARD.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

SINGLETAX CAMPAIGNING IN SEATTLE.

Seattle, March 7.

It was a great battle, that of day before yesterday in Seattle. Not for the Singletax, for this it was only a preliminary skirmish; but for civic decency and manhood and womanhood. And in the election of George F. Cotterill for Mayor, manhood and womanhood won.