

office; they might recall his dexterity in raising campaign funds and his lack of dexterity in enforcing the anti-trust law against friends, and they would be pretty sure to scoff at his intimate association with such "progressives" as Mr. Perkins. All this, and much more, could easily operate against a candidate with as extensive a "past" as Mr. Roosevelt.



Then there is the technical problem of the Republican party as a party. How can the party turn Mr. Taft down without at the same time virtually condemning the present Republican administration? And if it condemns Taft by "damning him with faint praise," how can it have the face to claim supreme wisdom as the savior of the nation? A political party must at least have an appearance of consistency. If the Republican party in 1908, aided by Mr. Roosevelt himself, couldn't pick out a candidate that it dare renominate in 1912, is the party going to face the country with a virtual acknowledgement of its own bankruptcy? If it is going to play the game, it has to be "game."



The situation, then, is not so simple as it seemed at first sight. In considering the availability of Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate, the practical politician will inevitably ask whether the popularity of Roosevelt (which has revealed a tendency to "wobble" a bit since his return from Africa) will be strong enough, between June 6th and November 4th, to surmount the disadvantages entailed by repudiating Taft and renominating a man with a record as extensive and vulnerable as that of the Strenuous One. Mr. Roosevelt himself seems to be dimly conscious of this. For while his recent declaration on the Initiative and the Referendum is marked by the absence of his usual "weasel" words, his personal attitude is very "weasely." His practical instincts, like those of the machine politician, restrain him from condemning Mr. Taft; and, like the machine politician, he gives clear evidence that he will support the regular candidate of the "G. O. P.," whoever is nominated. In other words, he does not make a straight-out fight for the nomination regardless of consequences. So it appears that while Mr. Roosevelt's words at Columbus reflect public "sentiment," his personal attitude reflects the existing machine situation in politics. This attitude may be worldly-wise. No doubt it is. But the thing that spells wisdom to some observers is the very thing that suggests uncertainty in the matter

of renominating and re-electing Theodore Roosevelt.



### Traffic Monopolies.

The Interstate Commerce Committee of the lower house of Congress is reported to have adopted a recommendation with reference to the Panama Canal which would apply to all relations of railroads to water shipments and destroy the connection between the two. This proposal would prohibit railroads from owning, leasing, operating, controlling or having any interest whatever, by stock ownership or otherwise, directly or indirectly, through any holding company or in any other manner, in any common carrier by water with which the railroad or other common carrier does or may compete. This is a laudable effort to regulate traffic by setting competition free; but like most efforts of the kind it utterly ignores the key to the problem. If shipping combines own dockage locations, or railroad lines own terminal sites, or a third interest owns one or both, what difference can it make whether or not any of them owns or controls stock in the other?



### Patent Monopolies.

By 4 to 3 the Supreme Court of the United States holds that a patent for an invention gives the patentee absolute control over its use—control so absolute that he can prescribe to lessees and purchasers the very terms in every respect upon which they may use it while the patent lasts. Apparently the majority of the Court have decided this case in strict conformity to the patent law. That is, they have decided the rights of litigants under the law as Congress has made the law, instead of making law to suit the circumstances. But in so deciding they give astounding power to patent owners; and for that reason Chief Justice White and two other judges vigorously dissent.



In his dissenting opinion the Chief Justice points out that under this decision the patentee of a sewing machine might require the lessee or purchaser to buy all the thread, needles or oil used with the machine from the patentee. Doubtless this would be so; but it is no answer to the decision of the other judges that such is the law of Congress—is, not necessarily *ought to be*. Apparently the Chief Justice and his dissenting associates would like to decide that this is not what Congress intended. But they would thereby make

the patent law according to their own notions of what a patent law ought to be. If this view prevailed, the design of the patent law would depend upon the courts and not upon Congress; and that is precisely a power which it is objectionable for courts to have. If Congress has made a bad patent law, let Congress and not the courts amend it.



That Congress has made a bad patent law is no secret. Instead of providing some reasonable method for compensating inventors, it has created in inventions an absolute monopoly which almost always obstructs the public in enjoying the benefit of inventions and seldom rewards inventors. What the majority of the Supreme Court have decided that this law is, is precisely what Congress intended it to be—a law giving monopolies. Congress did not indeed tend it to have the effects that the Chief Justice shrinks from; but Congress did intend to create an absolute monopoly in patented inventions. If a monopoly produces those effects it is not for the Court to correct the improvidence of Congress. But it is for Congress to do so, and let us hope that Congress will do it and do it thoroughly. A system of royalties instead of monopolization, would meet the case and not be difficult of adjustment.



### School Teachers and the Steel Trust.

The attempt of the steel trust, lately represented in the Chicago school board and still not without influence there, to displace a faithful principal to reward a serviceable friend, has culminated in disaster to the steel trust's plans and a good lesson for all concerned. The principal in question, Charles I. Parker, had become an institution in South Chicago. He had piloted generations of children through their school life, and won a place among them which sent a thrill of indignation through the whole community when the steel trust labeled him for its scrapheap. His is an instance of the right kind of service in school-teaching. School-teaching calls for leadership. It affords opportunities for the truest kind; and when a whole community springs spontaneously as in this case to the support of its school principal, like children to a father; there is little room for any other inference than that he is a school principal worth keeping.



### Warren Worth Bailey for Congress.

In naming Warren Worth Bailey, editor of the Johnstown Democrat, as their only primary candi-

date for Congress, the Democrats of the Nineteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania have shown good judgment. Perhaps they were influenced by the fact that this district is, upon the surface, a hopeless one for any Democratic candidate; but none the less for that they are entitled to the credit of putting their best man forward. Mr. Bailey is a democratic Democrat. Are there not by this time enough democratic Republicans in his district willing to cross party lines to elect a Democrat provided he be such a one as Warren Worth Bailey is? These times are like those of the 50's, when the real Democrats of both parties came together to form the Republican party. The same conflict between democracy and privilege rages now, though the issues are different in detail. The men who believe in privilege are getting together without regard to party lines; why can not those who believe in democracy follow their example? No party issue is now at stake in Congress. The issues are between progressives and reactionaries. Every democratic Democrat in Bailey's district will vote for him. If every democratic Republican does the same, he will be elected in spite of the enormous Republican majority there. By the way, why should that great majority waste itself on a mere party machine? Why not give the machine a needed lesson by voting for a Representative who will represent the progressive instead of the reactionary elements of the Republican as of the Democratic party?



## THERE IS A LAW.

The pitifully small area of good ground in the field of human opinion is constantly forced on the consciousness of the thoughtful lover of truth. Sowers in this field who have failed to take account in advance of its stony ground, and its thorns, have found little in their harvest but grief and disappointment and have usually retired early from this branch of agriculture. Only a great love sustained by the Eternal Strength could persevere therein to the end.

It is more than a quarter of a century since there was placed at the service of political economists a clear exposition of the natural laws which underlie and govern the association of men in the production and exchange of wealth. These laws, up to that time but rarely and vaguely apprehended, were shown to be fixed, uniform and nearly as obvious when once pointed out as the laws of physics and mechanics. Still these laws have not ceased to be studiously overlooked by the acknowledged authorities, and the old practice yet prevails of ex-