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 candidate 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-

pounding industrial phenomena from their most complex and confusing aspects, as if one were to teach the laws of the mechanical powers from the operation of an elaborate and complicated modern machine, working—to complete the analogy—under great stress of difficulty. Thus, while the seed of transcendently important economic truth has been long and faithfully scattered abroad, the impression still prevails, among not only the masses but men of great attainments and undoubted devotion to ideals of justice, that nature has made no provision for industrial peace and harmony in the civilized state, and that this oversight must be corrected through the labored lucubrations and contrivances of men.

We need not wonder then that the present widespread awakening of the public conscience, to say nothing of the public prudence, regarding the wrongs and sufferings of the disinherited should be largely wasting itself on inadequate, impracticable and inconsistent "demands." Through the hopeless impossibility of doing more than a small fraction of the multitude of things which we are authoritatively assured must be done, the forces of industrial regeneration are divided into rival squads on questions of policy. Their leaders dispute in vain over the relative importance of numberless schemes of partial relief pending the revolution or catastrophe which all agree in forseeing, and spend much of their effort in mutual bickering and vituperation; while the rank and file see small opportunity or prospect of ever accomplishing by political action anything more than a demonstration of their abiding and rapidly growing discontent.

In view of this general confusion and uncertainty it would seem that the urgent need of the hour is to emphasize and insist upon the plain natural principles of industrial activity as shown in the simple beginnings of surplus production and exchange of commodities. The harried and anxious multitude will now hear gladly that there are such principles, ordained from the beginning, eternal and immutable, to be not altered or improved but only recognized and obeyed. Most gratefully will they learn that there is in the nature of man an automatic and equitable regulator of prices and wages, incredible as it may seem to the perplexed and worried gentlemen of the boards of industrial arbitration and the public service commissions. Many of our best and brightest will recoil at its name, which is that of the most maligned and least understood of all the principles involved in economic or other human activity, competition. But let them boldly advance and challenge its further acquaintance, for their theory of its practical obsolescence is an utter delusion. It is as if an observer of a cyclonic disturbance should infer that it was abolishing the law of gravitation. The economic principle of competition deserves our earnest study, by way of reparation if nothing else; but it must be studied in respect of its free and natural action, like the orderly exit of an audience from a crowded theatre at the close of the performance. Its ill repute has arisen from unfairly judging it as we see it hemmed in by privilege and pursued by the devouring fiends of poverty, like the fierce scramble for the doors of that same audience when the stage is on fire.

ELIZABETH P. ROUNSEVELL.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE MEXICAN SITUATION.

Puebla, Mexico, March 15.

It is only within the last few days that the nature of the recent increase in Mexican disorder has become clearly manifest. As a residence in several parts of the country since the fall of Diaz last June has given me a favorable opportunity to observe post-revolutionary events, my impressions of the present situation may prove of interest.

During the five-month incumbency of provisional De La Barra, and up to the inauguration of President Francisco Madero in early November, the country was for the most part in a quiet and orderly condition and trade was active and prosperous except in those industries, like mining promotion, dependent upon the constant introduction of new foreign capital. Outside investors have been shy of Mexico since the anti-re-election agitation became active in 1910, and gave the lawless elements in the back districts an opportunity to ply the trade of bandit under the guise of revolutionist. Though the bandits did not disband on the exile of Diaz, they were obliged to retreat to the more remote districts, where their depredations did not seriously affect the mass of the people, and would have, normally, been more and more difficult to continue.

In the struggle against Diaz, one of the Madero chiefs in the South had been Emiliano Zapata, an outlaw of no formal education, but of considerable natural force and shrewdness. After the triumph of Madero, Zapata did not disband his troops, but allowed them to pursue their depredations, giving as an excuse that his men had not been paid their wages as soldiers of the revolutionary army. But when Zapata's troops were paid, and even their firearms purchased by President De La Barra, the brigandage still continued. Francisco Madero, the controlling voice of the De La Barra regime, had several conferences with Zapata in September, in which he tried to quiet him by kindness rather than force, but without success; for Zapata, a wild man of the hills, proved amenable to neither reason nor patriotism.

General Bernardo Reyes had been politically prominent under Diaz, having been successively