Recall, Case Study of the United States Legal System

Mohammad Khalilzadeh[1]| Mohammad Jalali[2*]

1 Master's student of public law at the University of Illinois, USA

2 Assistant Professor, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

[*] Corresponding Author Email: mdjalali@gmail.com

Abstract

1. Introduction

Within legal systems governed by direct or semi-direct democratic principles, mechanisms such as popular initiative, referendum, and recall serve as vital instruments of popular supervision. Of these, the recall stands as a modern mechanism aimed at the removal of an incumbent official before the conclusion of their term, distinguishing itself within democratic environments. While the concept of recall remains unfamiliar and absent in the constitutional fabric of numerous nations, its perceived benefit in upholding democratic principles is evident.

This legal journal aims to investigate the nature and intricacies of the recall process within various states and the federal legal system of the United States. The inquiry seeks to delve into the background, classifications, and critical elements governing the application of the recall. Central to this investigation are the diverse justifiable grounds for recall, the signature threshold necessary to trigger elections, and the methodologies employed in recall election procedures. Furthermore, the study aims to analyze instances where the legislature may exclude the recall process from a purely political realm, thereby necessitating several grounds for removal of an official.
Research Question:

This study navigates the complexity of the recall mechanism within the US legal system. How does the recall process operate in various states and at the federal level? What are the different grounds and thresholds for triggering a recall election? How might the exclusion of the recall process from purely political grounds impact its validity and functioning?

2. Literature Review

The evolution of direct democracy, notably exemplified in US, underscores a significant aspect in democratic governance. However, an intriguing observation emerges - despite the introduction of direct democratic System in certain persian papers, the legal institution of recall remains absent. This absence of literature marks a notable gap in the democratic mechanisms and Checks and Balances. The contrast between the elaboration of direct democracy and the lack of incorporation of the recall process becomes an

essential point of departure, highlighting the need for a more comprehensive democratic structure that encompasses various supervisory tools. A distinctive proposition of this paper surfaces within the existing literature, emphasizing the need to expand scholarly discourse by advocating for a fairer and constitutional recall election process, with a specific focus on states like California. The proposal to reform the recall process is propelled by the identification of challenges and shortcomings observed in California's recall elections. Such observations reveal vulnerabilities that warrant reforms to ensure fairness, integrity, and constitutional validity within the recall procedure.

3. Methodology

The methodology employed in this paper involves a comprehensive and analytical approach to understand the nuances of the recall process within the US legal system and certain other countries. It combines a multi-faceted analysis of existing legal frameworks, historical contexts, and contemporary applications of the recall in various states and at the federal level.

1. Legal Framework Analysis:

The study entails an in-depth examination of the legal frameworks in multiple states and at the federal level to identify and analyze provisions, if any, related to the recall process. This involves scrutinizing constitutional texts, statutes, case law, and legal precedents concerning recall.

2. Comparative Analysis:

The methodology integrates a comparative study to assess the similarities and differences in the recall process across different states within the US legal system. This analysis enables a comprehensive understanding of various approaches and applications of the recall mechanism.

3. Qualitative Analysis:

A qualitative analysis is conducted to categorize and evaluate the grounds for recall, the signature collection thresholds, and the procedural aspects related to the recall election methods. This involves studying diverse justifiable reasons for recall and exploring the implications of the diverse typology of the recall process.

4. Stakeholder Examination:

The methodology includes an examination of stakeholder perspectives, encompassing legal experts, lawmakers, citizens, and other relevant entities involved in the recall process. This serves to comprehend the practical implications and challenges of the recall process in the US legal system.

5. Proposal Assessment:

The methodology critically evaluates proposed modifications to make the recall process fairer and constitutional, particularly focusing on reforming California's recall mechanism. This assessment involves weighing the potential impact of these modifications on the legal and democratic framework, considering both practical and

theoretical implications.

This analytical methodology combines legal, comparative, qualitative, and stakeholder analyses, offering a comprehensive understanding of the recall process and the proposed modifications within the US legal system.

4. Conclusion

In certain instances of representative democracy, an elected representative may perceive themselves without concern for oversight mechanisms during their tenure. This situation compels the electorate to endure until the conclusion of the incumbent's term, impeding their ability to exert their will during this period. The process of recall stands as a means to preserve the will of the electorate by raising this concern.

While many writers categorize this practice under direct democracy, the guarantee of direct democracy solely in legislation without the people as rulers gains significance. Notably, within Iran's laws, there lacks explicit regulation regarding the removal of a representative during their tenure. However, considering the advantages associated with the recall process, it becomes feasible to suggest its implementation.

The facets of a recall include the prediction of a replacement for the dismissed position, which, in a mixed method, involves the conduct of a single election. Success criteria are based on absolute and relative considerations in response to the first question (pertaining to the dismissal of the current official) and the second question (regarding the selection of a replacement official), respectively.

This study aims to propose a new criterion for the existing method, addressing the challenges to legitimacy observed in recent practices. At times, these practices render elections unfair for the current incumbent. By considering the absence of a direct cause-and-effect relationship between the first and second questions, the electorate's preferential vote for both questions is officially recognized. This encompasses negative responses to the first question and candidates for the second question.

If the recall process is primarily considered a political maneuver, an effective strategy might involve predicting relatively stringent conditions against previous voters. This approach not only maintains the proportionality of popular choices but also upholds equitable standards in accessing governmental positions.

Ultimately, the recall process serves as a supervisory mechanism over the representative and should not deviate from its fundamental philosophy by neglecting the need for balance and equilibrium, thereby preserving the core concept of oversight.

Keywords: Direct Democracy, Supervisory Mechanisms, Recall, Signature Collection Threshold, Recall Election Methods, US Legal System.

References

Books

1. Altman, David (2011). Direct Democracy Worldwide, New York: Cambridge University Press.

2. Altman, David (2019). Citizenship and Contemporary Direct Democracy, New York: Cambridge University Press.

3. Arnon, Harel (2008). The Theory of Direct Legislation, New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.

4. Barber, Benjamin R. (2004). Strong Democracy, Participatory Politics for a New Age, First Edition. Los Angles: University Of California Press.

5. Bird, Frederick & Ryan, Frances (1930). The Recall of Public Officials, New York: MacMillan.

6. Cronin, Thomas (1999). Direct Democracy: The Politics of Initiative, Referendum and Recall, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

7. Garner, Bryan A. (2009). Black`s Law Dictionary, Ninth Edition, Dallas: West A Thomson Reuters Business.

8. Hashemi, Seyyed Mohammad (1399). Constitutional law of the Islamic Republic, Tehran: Mizan Publishing. [In Persian].

9. Haskell, John (2001). Direct Democracy Or Representative Government, First Edition, Boulder Colorado: Westview Press.

10. Ketcham, Ralph (2003). The Anti-federalist Papers and Constitutional Convention Debates. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

11. Montesquieu, Charles (1989). The Spirit of Laws, London: Cambridge University Press.

12. Munro, William B. (1912). The Initiative, Referendum And Recall, New York: D. Appleton and Company.

13. Qazi Shariatpanahi, Seyyed Abolfazl (1400). Constitutional Law and Political Institutions, Tehran: Mizan Legal Foundation. [In Persian].

14. Rousseau, Jean-Jacques (2002). The Social Contract and the First and Second Discourses. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

15. Scalia, Antonin, & Garner, Bryan A. (2012). Reading Law, An Interpretation of Legal Texts, Saint Paul, Minnesota: Thomson/West.

16. Tabatabaei Mo'tamemi, Manouchehr (1396). Constitutional Law, Tehran: Mizan Legal Foundation. [In Persian].

17. Wilcox, Delos Franklin (1912). Government by All the People: The Initiative, The Referendum and The Recall As Instruments of Democracy. New York: The Macmillan Company, Stanford Library.

18. William, B. Munro (1912). The Initiative, Referendum and Recall. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

19. Zimmerman, Joseph F. (2013). The Recall, Tribunal of The People, Second Edition, Albany: University of New York Press.

Articles

20. Aamery, Zahra & Habibnejad, Seyyed Ahmad (1399). Investigating the Right of Expulsion of Elected Officials by the People in Legal Systems, Comparative Study of Islamic and Western Legal Rights Journal, 7(4), 94. 10.22091/csiw.2020.5782.1876. [In Persian].

21. Abbott, Frank Frost (1915). The Referendum and the Recall Among the Ancient Romans, the Johns Hopkins University Press, 23(1), 89-90.

22. Bowler, Shaun (2004). Recall and Representation Arnold Schwarzenegger Meets Edmund Burke, University of California, 40(3), 205. Doi: 10.1080/00344890408523266.

23. Briffault, Richard (1985). Distrust of democracy, Columbia Law School, Texas Law Review, 63, 1352.

24. Garrett, Elizabeth (1997). Who Directs Direct Democracy?, The University of Chicago Law School Roundtable, 4(17), 19.

25. Keane, John (2019). The Age of Monitory Democracy and the Greening of Politics, Taiwan Journal of Democracy, 15(1), 43-52.

26. Kelly, R. & Coleman, C. & Johnston, N. (2014). Recall Elections, Parliament And Constitution Centre.

27. Lund, Nelson (2004). Rousseau and Direct Democracy, George Mason University School of Law, 13(2), 497.

28. Madison, James (1787). Federalist No. 10. To the People of the State of New York.

29. Shafiee Sardasht, Jafar & Gorji Azandariani, Ali Akbar & Fazeli Nezhad, Javad (1397). Conceptual Distortion of Supervision in the Legal System of Iran, Administrative Law, 6(16), 70. [In Persian].

30. Serdült, Uwe (2015). The History of a Dormant Institution: Legal Norms and The Practice of Recall In Switzerland, Ritsumeikan University, 51(2), 3. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00344893.2015.1056219.

31. Twomey, Anne (2011). The Recall of Members of Parliament and Citizen`s Initiated Elections, UNSW Law Journal, 34(1), 43.

32. Velayi, Ali & Nobahaar, Rahim (1402). The Position of the Principle of Validity in Assessing the Eligibility of Election Candidates in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Contemporary Comparative Legal Studies, 30(14), 277. Doi: 10.22034/LAW.2022.49902.3067. [In Persian].

33. We The People, Thoughts On The Preamble of The U.S. Constitution (2014). Center For The Study of The American Constitution.

34. Welp, Yanina & Castellanos, Ana Sofia (2020). Understanding the Use of Recall Referendum; Evidence From Ecuador, International Political Science Review, 41(3), 335-348. Doi: 10.1177/0192512119830373.

35. Weinstein, Rachel (2005). You`re Fired!, The Voter's Version of the Apprentice: An Analysis of Local Recall Elections In California, Southern California Interdisciplinary Law Journal, 15(1), 139.

Judicial Decisions

36. Burton v. United States, 202 U.S. 344 (1906)

37. Cole v. Webster, 103 Wn.2d 280, 285, 692 P.2d 799 (1984)

38. Cook v. Gralike, 531 U.S. 510 (2001).38

39. Gordon v. Leatherman 450 F.2d 562 (5th Cir. 1972)

40. Kotar v. Zupan, Kotar v. Zupan 658 P.2d 1095 (Mont. 1983)

41. Palmer v. Hart, 201 Mont. 526, 530, 655 P.2d 965, 967 (1982)

42. Powell v. McCormack, 395 U.S. 486 (1969)

43. The Coalition for Economic Equity v. Wilson 110 F.3d 1431, (9th Cir. 1997)

44. U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton, 514 U.S. 779 (1995)

45. Westpy v. Burnett, 82 N.J. Super. 239, 197 A.2d 400 (N.J. Super. 1964)

Websites

46. Cowen, Jill (2021). How much was spent on the recall? One estimate: Nearly half a billion dollars. <https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.nytimes.com/2021/09/15/us/calfornia-recall-election-cost-money.amp.html>

47. Chemerinsky, Erwin & Paulsen, Michael Stokes, Interpretation: The Preamble, <https://constitutioncenter.org/the-constitution/preamble/interpretations/37>

48. Kelly, Martin (2020). Why The Articles of Confederation Failed, <thoughtco.com/why-articles-of-confederation-failed-104674.>

49. Spivak, Joshua, What Is The History of Recall Elections?, The George Washington University, <https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/1660.>