

officer who, being in the presence of an enemy, fails to use his utmost endeavors to join in battle." Responsibility is thus put squarely up to the commanding officer; nor do subordinates escape their responsibility, for they are required to give the utmost that is in them under like penalties. If society demands the very life-blood of the military and naval officer if he fail in his duty as a servant of society in time of war, why may it not with equal justice demand a judge's place on the bench when he fails to use his utmost endeavors in the perpetual war against the predatory classes?

The recall of judges is merely a means for making them realize and live up to their responsibilities as commanders in the warfare against the predatory classes of society; and when that fact is as fully realized and lived up to as our army and navy officers live up to the Articles of War, the judicial recall will rarely be alluded to by the public, but will hang there ready for use.

Moreover, the navy Articles of War, quoted from above, open with this: "Every commander of a fleet, squadron, or vessel acting singly is required to show in himself a good example of honor, virtue and patriotism." When our judges show in themselves good examples of faithful service to the public weal, the public will see to it that they stay on the bench irrespective of party. Just such a case happened in a strong Republican county in New York, where, during Tilden's campaign for the Governorship, the Democrats unexpectedly elected their candidate for judge, and so good a judge did he make that he was never seriously opposed thereafter, and was re-elected time and again until he died, though the county went back to the Republicans on all other offices. This case confirms President Vail, for he practically says that "mob rule" will be unknown where public opinion is based upon full and correct information, because public opinion is always right in such cases.

No one hears any complaint from army or navy officers because the law provides the penalty of death for certain kinds of failure; they are not petitioning Congress to repeal such laws because they reflect on the "honor, virtue or patriotism" of the officers. If any officer neglects his duty, and there are such from time to time—civilian (political) appointments in the army giving a disproportionate number of such cases,—a court-martial sits and judges him. So with the recall as applied to the judiciary: If any judge gets to be negligent of his duties, or leans too much to one side where valuable rights or privileges are concerned, the recall will set him straight or remove him as the people

may decide; but if he attends to his duties, does substantial justice as a judge, and enforces laws instead of trying to make them, no attempt to recall him will be successful.

What, then, is the reason for opposition to the recall of judges? In many cases, it is due to inherent fear of change, or to ignorance; but in other cases it is a fair inference that the "fears" expressed are but covers for ulterior, unavowed and unavowable motives. It takes but little reflection upon present-day conditions in nation, State, county and municipality to perceive what the unavowed reasons may be.

R. W. BARKLEY.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE MASSACHUSETTS CAMPAIGN.

Boston, Mass.

Unless the mass of voters in Massachusetts are easily deceived and frightened by the reckless assertions of Republican campaign orators the Democrats should win hands down. I do not recall ever having been more impressed with the impudent mendacity and threatening insolence of stump orators and a superserviceable press than I have been thus far in the conduct of the Republican campaign throughout Massachusetts. It is a loathsome exhibition. Time was, before the concentration of industry in few hands, when this or that beneficiary of the protective tariff intimated to his two or three hundred employes that a vote for the Democratic candidate would be construed as a vote for shortening production, and that naturally those who voted thus would be the first to go when the time for reducing the force arrived. Sometimes, as we know, the matter was put more bluntly in a note tucked away in the pay envelope some day before election, and there were a dozen other methods of bringing it home to the workman that his employer demanded his vote for the party of Protection. No such crude methods are now necessary, though doubtless they are resorted to in particular instances. The supposed direct relation of a State election to the immediate future of the workingman's fortunes is set forth with sufficient point and pith by campaign orators who address meetings in communities where nine families out of ten are directly dependent for bread upon the prosperity of factories turning out cotton goods, shoes or what not, and prophesy the wreck of business as a certain and early result of re-electing Gov. Foss. Reckless untruth distinguishes the tone of the Republican speakers in the current campaign, and there is an implied threat directed immediately at the workingman in every breath of the men who are now seeking to make the tariff the sole issue in the State election. Of course there are honest men who believe that the election of Mr. Foss means the eventual closing of the mills and the impoverishment of wage earners. As a systematic campaign cry, however, the tariff issue is absolutely insincere, and nothing better proves its insincerity

than the adhesion to the Republicans of such men as Mr. Whitney. His personal insincerity in this matter is admirably illustrated by his stooping to use the long exploded argument that we should have a tariff so adjusted as to assure to the home manufacturer protection equal to the difference in wages at home and abroad, and in his endorsement of that transparent scheme for delay by the "scientific" employment of a tariff board.

Plainly enough the Republican campaign of Massachusetts is based upon evasion of the real State issues presented by the Democrats, and the emphasizing of the tariff question with a view to bewildering and terrorizing men whose very life depends upon the nod of the mill owners. The appeal is made with shameless frankness to the fears of the working man on one side, and to his cupidity on the other. A Democratic speaker's declaration that Massachusetts should be ashamed to demand the right to tax the whole country for her own benefit brought forth a characteristic communication to a local newspaper from a man who quoted the speaker in question and added by way of comment that a manufacturer looking every week for money with which to fill his pay envelopes, and workmen anxiously thinking of family needs, would be little influenced by any such feeling of shame. The insolent demand is made for the right to tax every consumer, the whole country over, and almost in the same breath is uttered the threat and warning to wage earners. No doubt all this will influence the timid, but wage earners in Massachusetts are not all fools and cowards as the Republican orators seem to think, and the transparent fallacy of their arguments together with the outrageous insolence of their implied threats ought to wake the indignant self-respect of thousands even in the protected industries.

Meanwhile the radical programme of the Democrats is not alarming all who belong to the comfortable classes. There are men even in the circles powerfully influenced by mere social considerations who will vote for Foss rather than for Frothingham. "I've known Louis Frothingham all my life," said a man at a club the other night, "and he's a darned good fellow, but I see no reason why he any more than a hundred other men should be Governor of Massachusetts." Of nine men recently dining together, all but one members of what the newspapers like to call "exclusive" clubs, four were going to vote for Foss, and three of the four were club members. Oddly enough, only one other man of the party definitely indicated his intention to vote for Frothingham. It is among such men, mainly of the academic classes, that are found those who have long been in revolt against the Protective system, and no small number of such will accept the Democratic programme, Initiative and Referendum, as well as the rest, with perfect equanimity. Old New England Federalism is shaken in its very center, and the appeal for Frothingham in the name of social esprit de corps will be often made in vain. I hear of bets of two to one in favor of Foss, and only a stampede of intimidated workers can elect Frothingham.

EDWARD N. VALLANDIGHAM.



He makes a solitude, and calls it—peace.—Byron.

DEMOCRACY IN CALIFORNIA.

Portland, Oregon, Oct. 13.

Republican California is democratic; and if the people of a State are democratic it makes no difference what partly labels they wear. It's the man behind the label that counts at the ballot box, and it's no violation of the pure food law if the vote is not strictly according to the label.

I visited California in September, just twenty months after leaving the State. In February, 1910, the Southern Pacific political machine appeared to be supreme in California; in September, 1911, nothing could be seen of that machine except wreckage and a few newspapers—the latter acting as official mourners. In one election California had moved up to the front rank of progressive States; the seed of the woman had put its heel firmly upon the head of the political serpent.

It wasn't a sudden revolution; of course not, for revolutions must grow, and for more than a quarter of a century the Southern Pacific political machine had nursed that revolution very carefully, but always with the idea that it was strangling the infant. It seems that oppression and repression are necessary for the health and early growth of the democratic spirit.



September 4, at the Palace Hotel in San Francisco, some 250 "Advocates of Popular Government" met in conference to open the campaign for the Initiative and Referendum and the Recall amendments to the State Constitution, submitted by the legislature last winter. In the evening about the same number sat at a banquet in the Palace Hotel, with Senator Moses E. Clapp of Minnesota as the guest of honor, and with Governor Hiram W. Johnson as the toastmaster.

It was almost like a dream, too good to be true. I remembered the meeting in Milton T. U'Ren's law office in 1908, when the Direct Legislation League of California was reorganized with about a dozen men present. Then my memory journeyed back twenty-three years ago to the time when I myself was bitten by the Direct Legislation "fad," as the reactionaries call it, and some of my friends thought I was booked for the Kankakee hospital for the insane. At that time such a gathering as met in the Palace Hotel last month could not have been collected in the whole territory of the United States. Two years ago such a collection of men could not have been got together in the State of California. The spirit of God has not ceased to brood upon the face of the waters.

At that Palace Hotel conference and banquet were Republicans and Democrats, Socialists and Labor party men; yet there was no talk of party. The dominant note, practically the only note and text, was "democracy." Not as a tool, not as a thing, not as a weapon of offense or defense, nor as a political patent medicine, but as a life; and as the only life that gives physical, mental and spiritual freedom, the only life that opens wide the doors of opportunity and keeps them open. That is what made the conference so interesting and inspiring.

Very appropriately, the morning conference was presided over by Dr. John Randolph Haynes of Los Angeles, a California veteran in the fight for the