defense. This release and this necessity are emphasized by the persistent refusal of the United States to arbitrate the Panama question with reference to that treaty with Colombia.

If difficulties arise between the United States and Germany over the cession of territory to Germany by Colombia, the fault is clearly with the administration of President Roosevelt for riding rough shod over the Colombia-American treaty, and with the administration of President Taft for refusing Colombia's urgent and repeated requests for arbitration. Very well may Colombia feel that a Monroe doctrine which thus exposes her to *American* aggression, might wisely be modified by guarantees of *German* protection. Reasonably may her statesmen argue that if these harbor concessions had been made to Germany before the secession of Panama from her federation of States, Mr. Roosevelt would not in a twinkling have recognized Panama as a sovereign nation, or if he had Mr. Taft would not have refused arbitration of the act as a breach of the Colombian treaty.

Foreign Potentates in American Politics.

Those Catholic ecclesiastics who persistently try to plunge their Church into American politics, as a church, may begin now to see some of the signs of danger to which we have repeatedly called attention.* Perhaps they themselves won't see these signs even now; but the signs may be seen and heeded by American Catholics who have no sympathy with this ecclesiastical aggression and yet would be involved in any catastrophe that might result from it. The particular sign to which we allude is the reported organization of the "Guardians of Liberty," with General Miles as "a leading light."

This organization is said to aim at preventing the election of Roman Catholics to public office. Now the exclusion from public office or citizenship of any person for religious reasons is intolerable to the spirit of democracy. There is no reason why Roman Catholics should not be citizens and public officials, no reason why they should not participate in all political activities. Indeed there would be no reason of citizenship why they should not bring even religious questions into politics, provided they were actuated by their own motives of citizenship and not by obedience to authoritative instructions from a foreign ruler. This latter is the real point at issue.

We do not say that any American Catholic is governed in his politics by instructions from Rome. We know many Catholics who distinctly are not. We understand that the imputation is denied by or for all Catholics. But there is that in the history of the Catholic hierarchy in the past, there is that in its current history in Europe, and there is that in the conduct of some of its ecclesiastics in the United States, which affords reason for just fears that American Catholics are subject to foreign control, not only in their religion but in their politics. Even now the Socialist administration in Milwaukee is under attack from Catholic pulpits in circumstances which create an impression of the exercise of ecclesiastical authority.

Many Catholics in Milwaukee are opposing this crusade, more or less openly; but the fact itself lends color to those suspicions and fears of the "Guardians of Liberty" which they express in these terms: "We maintain it to be inconsistent with and destructive of free government to appoint or elect to political or military office any person who openly or secretly concedes superior authority to any foreign political or ecclesiastical power whatsoever." The fears which that clause expresses —and they are by no means upon a small scale in the public opinion of this country—could be allayed readily and effectually by Catholics themselves. If those of them, both clerical and lay, who hold themselves in freedom from Roman dictation in American politics, would promptly and publicly denounce the utterances of ecclesiastics who speak authoritatively as such in political affairs, there would soon be no such plausible reason for "Guardians of Liberty" as it must be conceded that there is now.

The Seattle Election.

With the election of one of their own group for Mayor of Seattle and the polling of over 12,000 votes for the incorporation of their most ultra preliminary demands into the city charter, the Singletaxers of Seattle have nothing to mourn over. On the mayoralty their candidate was opposed by the candidate of disreputable interests that make money out of vice, supported naturally enough by reputable interests that make money out of the economic conditions upon which money-making vice flourishes; and, although by a narrow

*See Publics of October 6, 1911, page 1017; November 3, 1911, page 1115, and November 24, 1911, page 1186.

margin, their candidate won. On the singletax amendment, they drew the full fire of the enemy. Every daily newspaper but one was against them, every disreputable business interest was against them, every investor in vacant lots angling for a prize at the expense of the common interest was against them, and education on the subject had not gone far enough to enable the average citizen of unselfish instincts to understand. Under these circumstances a vote of 12,000 for the Singletax in 40,000 cast on the question, is a guarantee for the early future. Those were intelligent votes. The voters who cast them knew what they wanted and why. And now, with the arguments of the opposition laid bare in the cleanest cut and most vigorous contest over the Singletax ever had anywhere, Singletax progress in Seattle is hardly more than a matter of keeping at it. With the excitement of the campaign over, and a people aroused to the thinking point, those hostile arguments that served so well in the heat of the fight will look naked and forlorn in the calmness of the coming months. That an election should be carried frankly and brazenly in the interest of obstruction to improvement, in the interest of squatters on vacant lots, in the interest of a little group of rich monopolists of the most desirable locations in Seattle, and as frankly and brazenly against the interests of improvers and workers, is in itself the best kind of indication that the result was abnormal. But a chestnut burr was put under the saddle of the land capitalists by the Singletaxers of Seattle last week that will soon unhorse them.

❁ ❁

The Judicial Recall and Mr. Roosevelt.

Nothing in the mechanism of government could be simpler than the judicial Recall. The question it raises is not whether we shall have a Recall especially for judges. It is whether or not, if we have a Recall at all, we shall exempt judges from its operation. The Recall for judges elected by the people, stands or falls upon the merits of the general Recall as a method of securing to the people constant control over all the officials they elect.

❁

If there are sound objections to the popular Recall for administrative and legislative officers elected by the people, then there are sound objections to the popular Recall for judges elected by the people. But if it is reasonable to reserve to the people the power to recall elected executives for corruption, incompetency, despotic conduct in office or other defiance of the popular will, or if it is reasonable to reserve to the people the power to recall elected legislators for corruption, incompetency, treachery to pledges, or other misrepresentation of their constituents, then it is reasonable to reserve to the people the power to recall elected judges who prove to be corrupt, incompetent, despotic or otherwise false to the duties of the judicial office.

❁

Every attempt to make an exception in favor of judges may be traced to one or the other of two sources. It is either rooted in a survival of the influence of the "divine right" superstition, which now bolsters the bench as once it bolstered the throne, or else it is strategy on the part of persons who oppose all applications of the Recall but dare not meet the issue directly with reference to executives and legislators. The question is in reality the exceedingly simple one of Recall or no Recall, of Recall *with* exemption of bad judges, or Recall *without* exemptions. As someone has well defined the principle of popular Recall, it leaves to the people themselves the power to shorten at their own discretion the term of any office which they have the power at their own discretion to fill.

❁

With so simple an issue before him and with his Napoleonic temperament, it is not strange that Mr. Roosevelt in advocating the Recall should undertake to improve upon it. Without his own hall-mark of ingenuity, nothing seems to him to be sterling. According to his Boston speech* he would not recall judges, but their decisions—God bless us! Here indeed would be a trial of lawsuits at the polls, something which no intelligent advocate of the Recall expects or desires. It is an "improvement," this of Mr. Roosevelt's, which plays so straight into the hand of objectors to judicial applications of the Recall that one must wonder if Senator Lodge or Senator Root didn't have "a finger in the pie." Nobody with any sense wishes to have the facts in lawsuits tried at the polls, nor technical questions of law. To avoid that necessity is the one reason for having courts at all. Their function is to settle disputes for the people—to settle them by ending them with as near an approximation to substantial justice as possible. Back of Mr. Roosevelt's proposal, however, lies the thought that in settling disputes, the courts interpret Constitutions and thereby make precedents which operate as laws, judge-made laws—not alone in a given dispute but throughout the whole domain of government.

*See current volume, page 201.