

let us enjoy her brigands, forgers, horse thieves and assassins in undisturbed peace, until their ranks began to be swelled by members of a new criminal class who call themselves revolutionists. Only then did the Czar's government recollect that a treaty of extradition gave it the right to demand the surrender of runaway "criminals." . . . If the world at large has been led to think that several hundred executions a week were enough to keep Russian justice reasonably employed, it was mistaken. Appetite notoriously grows by feeding, and the Russian government, having established the reign of law within its borders, by means of drumhead courts, military courts, states of major siege, states of minor siege, states of extraordinary security, and states of merely reinforced security, is evidently sighing for new worlds to conquer. The true object of the present campaign of extradition is not hard to guess. The Russian authorities wish to create the impression that America can no longer be looked to as asylum for enemies of the established order.

* * *

The New Jersey Labor Riot.

The Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat (ind. Dem.), Nov. 27.—Those foreigners at Perth Amboy, Keasbey and other New Jersey towns who have gone on strike because pre-election promises of a wage advance in the event of Taft's success have not been kept are too literal. . . . They expect too much. They "vote for their jobs" as a matter of course. They understand that this is always the thing to do. They also understand that it is the Republican party which is the special providence that furnishes the jobs. Hence they vote with great enthusiasm and in credulous faith for the party of great moral ideas. But why should they insist on like good faith from their employers? Why should they insist on getting promised increases in wages? Can't they let well enough alone? Haven't they reward enough in that they have jobs at all at any old wages? Do they forget their employers have soldiers at their beck and call to shoot them down if they get funny and insist on getting more pay according to ante-election pledges? The Taft majority in New Jersey was a glorious one. It revealed the power of the manufacturers in handling their men and inducing them to vote right. But it is somewhat disturbing to find the men so undisciplined and so unreasonable as to insist on the delivery of the goods that bought their support. The event is calculated to arouse derisive comments among the unregenerate and it is bound in a certain degree to embarrass Mr. Taft and the eminent statesmen who are engaged in the praiseworthy task of appeasing the ravenous appetite of the tariff grafter. Men have no right to kick up a row about 15 cents a day in pay when in doing so they bring reproach upon the elect.

* * *

Bryan and the Labor Vote.

The Commoner (Dem.), Nov. 20.—While an adverse vote in a city containing a large labor element might be accepted as prima facie evidence that the laboring men did not support the ticket, a closer inspection of the returns might show that the labor

vote was actually cast for the ticket, but that losses in other parts of the city overcame the gain. Mr. Gompers and those closely associated with him as labor leaders must be credited with sincere, earnest and effective support of the Democratic ticket. Their arguments may not have convinced as large a percentage of the vote of organized labor as was expected—upon this subject the statistics are not yet obtainable—but it must be remembered that under present conditions it is necessary to do more than convince. A great many people were convinced that the Democratic position was the correct one, and yet were afraid to follow their convictions. The Republican leaders confessed this themselves when they began to appeal to the fears of the employes. Many cases have been brought to our attention where employers warned their employes not to vote the Democratic ticket under threat of reduction in wages. At Newark, Ohio, Mr. Bryan called attention to such speeches made by representatives of the New York Central railroad. There were cases where the support of the ticket in labor precincts perceptibly diminished when these threats were applied. It is easy enough to say that a laboring man ought to stand by his convictions and vote as he believes, regardless of threats, and yet human nature must always be considered in passing judgment upon human beings. After forty-eight years of almost continuous Republican rule, the wage earners are living so near to the hunger-line that a few weeks' loss of employment brings the family face to face with want. The election comes in November—just at the beginning of winter, with fuel to buy, house rent to pay and warmer clothes to provide for the children. The laboring man is under a constant duress. A laboring man who has but little, if anything, laid up for the future, must have a strong heart to defy the expressed wish of his employer and cast his ballot for something which he believes to be permanently good, at the risk of passing through a period of idleness before that good can be secured. Four months elapse between the election and the inauguration—four cold months. Be not too harsh in judging the man who bends to the lash and surrenders his citizenship when his conscience tells him that he should resist injustice and vote for better conditions. Be not too harsh in judgment—even in the holiest wars there are deserters; even when free government is at stake, many have turned back rather than endure the hardships and privations called for by the struggle. Let us rather be thankful that there were as many heroes among the laboring men as there were—even if there were not enough.

It must be remembered, too, that not all labor is organized, and the leaders of organized labor are not in touch with unorganized labor. . . . It is also true—let it be admitted with a blush—that there are those so prejudiced against the laboring men as to be alienated from the Democratic party by the very fact that our platform contained labor planks. . . . Then, too, it must not be overlooked that a large percentage of the population seems to be entirely indifferent to the laboring man's condition and to his demand for remedial legislation. The merchants, while they may not sympathize with the hostile attitude of some of the large employers, are not brought into sympathetic connection with the employes engaged in wealth production. The clerks in the

stores do not count themselves in the same class with the laboring men; they do not regard their interests as identified with those of the toilers. The farm laborers also regard themselves as in a different class and they labor under conditions quite dissimilar from those which surround the factory worker or the miner. The farm laborer is employed by an individual rather than by a corporation. His personal acquaintance with his employer protects him from the injustice to which the employe of the corporation is subjected. The farmers do not as a rule understand the labor situation. Their business does not bring them into contact with the industrial life of the city, and the relation between themselves and their employes, instead of informing them on industrial conditions, is apt to give them a wrong impression as to the city laborer..

+ +

The Explanation of Poverty.

Pittsburg (Pa.) Leader (ind.), Nov. 22.—Improvidence of the individual is the cause of much poverty, but surely this is not such an improvident people that 80 per cent lead a hand to mouth existence continuously? There are among them those who would save if they could. The truth is that they are victims of social conditions under which they must work for the enrichment of others and are denied the opportunity to do for themselves. The land whose farm products alone reaches the value of eight billions a year produces more than enough for all. It is intended that it should sustain all, but as it is in the possession of the few, the many who must live off its products are under tribute to those few.

+ +

Abuse of the Principle of Patents.

Machinery (trade), Nov.—Some time ago an infringement suit was brought by an Eastern company against another firm manufacturing a like product, in which the court had to decide the question: Can a manufacturer buy a patent, never make use of it, and still sue for infringement? The decision, as rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States, was to the effect that the owner of a patent, after having bought it, has an absolute property right in it whether he uses it or not, and has a right to withhold from the public the benefits derived from the invention. This decision, no doubt, conforms with our present patent laws, but it is safe to say that laws so enacted and interpreted do not carry out the original purpose of patent protection, which was simply to insure to the inventor the right of deriving full benefit from the invention, by exclusive privilege to use or manufacture for a certain number of years, and by no means included the right to prevent others from deriving a benefit from something which he did not care to use himself. The present patent law appears to operate merely to restrain others from making and using for a limited period a certain device covered by a patent, whereas it is clear that patent laws were originally framed with an entirely different conception of the rights of the inventor. The question of patent right has an entirely different aspect whether we examine it from the point of view of exclusive right to make or use for a number of years, or of a right not to use it but at the same

time prevent the whole world from using and deriving benefits from the invention as well. The inventor is given a monopoly by patent with the idea of encouraging him to expend energy and capital in its perfection, and to benefit the public by his invention, he himself being assured a reasonable profit for a reasonable number of years. The idea of permitting an absolute monopoly of a patent, even when the patentee or owner of the patent refuses to make any use of it whatsoever, is very similar to our harmful and vicious policy of legalizing monopolies in natural resources with the result of benefiting a few who render no service to the community at the expense of the community itself. From a moral point of view there can be no exclusive right to a patent, except it be used, any more than there can be exclusive right to the bounties of nature, except they be put to their best use, so that they benefit the community at large.

RELATED THINGS CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

SONNET ON HIS BLINDNESS.

By John Milton.

+

John Milton Having Been Born on December 9, 1608,
the Tercentenary of His Birth Will be Celebrated
Next Week. He Was Born in London, and Died in the Same
City, November 8, 1674.

+

When I consider how my light is spent,
Ere half my days in this dark world and wide;
And that one talent which is death to hide
Lodged with me useless, though my soul more bent
To serve therewith my Maker, and present
My true account, lest he, returning, chide;
"Doth God exact day-labor, light denied?"
I fondly ask: but Patience, to prevent
That murmur, soon replies, "God doth not need
Either man's work, or his own gift; who best
Bear his mild yoke, they serve him best; his state
Is kingly; thousands at his bidding speed,
And post o'er land and ocean without rest;
They also serve who only stand and wait."

+ + +

MILTON ON THE NEED OF A FREE PRESS.

From the "Areopagitica"—A Speech for the Liberty
of Unlicensed Printing to the Parliament
of England, 1644.

This is not the liberty which we can hope, that no grievance ever should arise in the commonwealth; that let no man in this world expect; but when complaints are freely heard, deeply considered, and speedily reformed, then is the utmost