proved acceptable there, adopt them throughout the American industry simultaneously.

**[556]** Contrariwise the least inventive industries have usually been those with the most competition, like clothing, foods, furniture, lumbering, construction, as we said (¶ 546). In short, the test of experience refutes rather than supports the idea that inventive progress depends on interfirm rivalry anent invention. Furthermore, in our historic parallels the monopoly was almost always incomplete, and therefore the funds for invention were limited. Were that weakness eliminated, the inventive program would certainly have been greater.

**[557]** Again to summarize the monopoly question, competition between individuals, industries, and countries is inevitable, or unaffected. Only competition between firms is concerned, and that would be reduced in field but sharpened. Farms, ships, and most means of production are old inventions open to all, yet that does not eliminate but heightens competition amongst them.

**[558]** 3. THAT THE PROPOSAL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL, because the Constitution (¶ 31) authorizes only patents to inventors. *Answer:* If this interpretation were accepted, then no sale or assignment of a patent could preserve its validity, and our present system would fall. Under our proposal patents could be granted to inventors as before, but subject to assignment as before.

**[559]** 4. THAT OFFERING UNLIMITED FUNDS IS UNHEARD OF AND UNECONOMIC. This is a serious charge, that the power of the associations to support unlimited research and buying of patents, by simply raising their dues and passing on the cost to the consumers, is a new kind of institution, has no economic laws to guide it, and might lead to excessive spending on research, for the profit, glory, or creative satisfaction of the men running it.

*Answers:*

**[560]** (*a*) The Government is to be always represented in the associations with power to control abuses; and the profuse trade and scientific press, and rival companies and associations, are there to report facts and bring pressures. Care might be taken that the directors of the association, while drawn from companies, probably the larger ones, should be protected against further continuing domination by the same.

**[561]** (*b*) The rivalry *between industries* (¶ 552), and with foreign countries in industries having international trade, would deter industries from burdening themselves with excessive charges of R&D.

**[562]** (*c*) While the pacesetting for invention would be thus only partly controlled by known economic laws, a situation, as little understood or still less, is familiar, working, and accepted, in about 30% of our economy, viz., its 30% support by Government and by philanthropy. Their budgets are so regular from year to year that they are evidently controlled by socioeconomic laws, though our social sciences may not yet be advanced enough to explain these. Our classical economics is based on markets, where numerous buyers and sellers freely compete, a different situation from Government or philanthropy. Since these nonetheless work regularly and acceptably, why not trust Government a little more, to exercise sense, and trust our new institution in between Government, philanthropy, and business?