

where for making clear the menace of Sullivanism.

S. D.

Political Ethics.

Just where the line of demarkation lies between legitimate aid and pernicious interference of national administrations in State politics has not as yet been clearly defined, beyond the popular notion that the side assisted welcomes it as an aid to good government, while the opposition considers it an act of inexcusable tyranny. But so long as we maintain a strict party form of government, with party responsibility, it is inevitable that the President, as the titular head of the party, should interest himself in its membership, in so far as it bears on national affairs. With the appointment of Federal officials in his hands he cannot but have a direct and potent influence in State politics. It must remain a matter of discretion on his part as to what extent he shall interfere. Party responsibility excuses, indeed demands, the same accord between the President and his party that exists between the English Prime Minister and his party; for neither the President nor the party, acting in opposition to each other, can carry out a successful policy. Since the same reasoning applies in a lesser degree to the actions of the President's official family, Mr. Bryan's objection to Mr. Sullivan's Senatorial candidacy should be considered on these lines.

The issue raised by Mr. Sullivan's candidacy should not be misunderstood. It is not that he is an unfit man personally, either in point of ability or integrity, nor yet that he is a political boss, that he would be objectionable as a Senator from Illinois. He would make an admirable Senator for such as hold to his ideas of government. The objection to Mr. Sullivan is that he is not a Democrat. A Democrat he may be in the loose party sense that includes Ransdal of Louisiana—who serves the sugar ring of that State, and Bryan of Florida, who defied the citrus interests of his own state in voting his convictions—but he is not a Democrat in the only sense in which Democrats are to be considered, if their party is to receive the support of the country. The Democratic party is composed of progressives and reactionaries, just as was the Republican party before the split. And from the beginning of the present administration the party has maintained a semblance of progressiveness only through the exercise of the utmost firmness on the part of the

President. Had a reactionary like the Speaker of the House been President, there would not have been even the semblance of progress. It is now a question of whether or not the men to be sent to the House and Senate next fall shall be progressive democrats or reactionaries. This is a matter of vital interest to the Administration.

If other evidence of Mr. Sullivan's reactionary politics than his long service in behalf of privileged interests were desired, it can be found in the treatment of his candidacy by the Chicago press, and the Republican press throughout the State. The "boiler plate" matter that his organization is sending to the country newspapers is made up largely from editorials in the Chicago papers. When a politician wins the support of the opposition press, it is neither because he is transcendently great, or is a valuable political asset to the kinds of privileged business that controls the papers supporting him. Critics who object to Mr. Bryan's throwing his influence into Illinois politics in opposition to Mr. Sullivan should remember that it was just such an act of his in the Baltimore convention that saved us from a reactionary President; and his present action will displease the same people that were displeased then. It is not now a question of splitting hairs over political proprieties, but of making the Democratic party democratic.

Dangers Overlooked in Pending Legislation.

While pending anti-trust legislation in its present form brings us no nearer to a solution of the trust problem, it may be used, as the Sherman law has been, to hurt interests that should not be hurt. It will not interfere with any predatory privilege, but may seriously interfere with unprivileged labor. Since the framers of the pending bills have deliberately ignored the relation of privilege to the trust evil they have failed to remove the Sherman law's menace to labor organizations and other unprivileged combinations. They have also neglected to remedy the effect of the Supreme Court decision which unreasonably confuses price fixing on unmonopolized articles, with price fixing on patented articles. They have ignored the fact—as also did the Supreme Court—that when the government grants a privilege in the form of a patent it becomes its duty to do what it can to minimize the harm done. This justifies the assumption of authority in deciding the terms on which the patented article shall be

marketed. But where no privilege has been granted such assumption of authority is clearly not justified.



For instance: If John Doe manufactures a shoe bearing his trade mark, the trade mark merely assures those who want to buy Doe's shoes that they are getting what they want. It does not, like the patent, prevent anyone else from manufacturing and selling a shoe equal in every respect to John Doe's. It only prevents him from passing it off as John Doe's—something he ought not to do, anyway. If John Doe refuses to furnish shoes to a retailer who cuts prices he is within his moral rights, and ought to be within his legal rights. There is nothing oppressive in that. If the price fixed by John Doe should be unreasonable, other manufacturers will be glad to furnish shoes just as good for a lower price. The consumer can then decide for himself whether it is worth the difference to wear a shoe bearing John Doe's trade mark when he can get the same thing, minus the trade mark, for less money. If no one else will manufacture a shoe equal to John Doe's for a lower price then it will be evident that the price fixed by him is not unreasonable. No Supreme Court or trade commission can decide such a matter as fairly as a free market.



Here it seems is common ground on which all unprivileged business may meet with organized labor, and demand that anti-trust legislation recognize the difference between combinations and businesses resting upon privilege and those that do not. Otherwise the new legislation will be like the old, a menace and means of oppression as far as unprivileged interests are concerned, and a red herring across the trail for privileged ones.

S. D.



Railroad Corporation Strike Threatened.

A freight car shortage in Chicago is explained by a writer in the Chicago Evening Post of February 12 with the statement that the big roads can not order more cars until they know whether the five per cent increase in freight rates will be granted. The inference is that with no increase the car famine will be allowed to continue. So it seems that a strike is threatened—not of laborers but of railroad corporations against the public. The railroads will refuse to give adequate service if denied the demanded increase. If such is their intention then it is clearly useless to persist in the policy of regulation. If the roads can reg-

ulate the regulators once by strike methods, they can do it again. The necessity of government ownership of all highways is clear.

S. D.



Interest of Railroad Not Paramount.

The Pennsylvania railroad publicly complains that it made \$11,000,000 less in 1913 than in 1912. Some papers seem to assume that the general public should feel deeply concerned over this. Just why the public should is not evident. Others engaged in business have troubles too, but they try to settle such matters themselves. It may be well to recommend that course to the directors of the Pennsylvania railroad with the further suggestion that the Interstate Commerce Commission has shown how by, abolishing "allowances," the railroads can save considerable money. The decrease in the Pennsylvania's profits during the past year is nothing, at all compared with what its monopolistic privileges, and similar privileges held by others, have cost the wealth producers of the United States for very many years. There is no occasion for public worry over the needs of the Pennsylvania until the more pressing problem of what Labor needs has been solved.

S. D.



Personal Efficiency and Monopoly.

"Monopoly, as we all understand and fear it, is the result of the personal efficiency of the monopolists," says the Chicago Inter. Ocean of February 9. Then why do monopolistic interests object so strenuously to removal of their underlying privileges? If monopoly is the result of personal efficiency only, then the magnates of the tariff-protected trusts can continue maintaining their monopolies under absolute free trade. Why then do they fight so hard against tariff abolition? If monopolies that get rebates and other railroad favors could keep on being monopolies with franchise privileges revoked, why do they object to revocation? If the steel trust, coal trust and similar monopolies do not need to control natural resources to monopolize the markets, then they must have no objection to removal of such control. Somehow these monopolists do not seem to have much confidence in their personal efficiency when progressive legislation becomes an issue.

S. D.



A Brand New Objection.

In the stir of great times great minds are brought to the front. It is a part of the wonderful protective workings of Providence—per-