

account the nature of man, just as foolishly as for a foundry superintendent to ignore the quality of his iron. Efficiency is not, as some suppose, a means of enlarging your output to give you greater profits taken out of greater exertion on the part of your workmen. That is merely a selfish and one-sided strenuousness that will not last. A friend has recently declined three good offers to take charge of developing efficiency in as many factories, because the purpose was to get more out of the men and for the owners to keep it all. Efficiency, indeed, should mean industrial success, but will not unless it means industrial equity too. Part of the conquest of himself that the efficient manager must make is to get rid of distorted views, such as looking at the rate of wages rather than at the result of wages, or regarding wages as an expense instead of being an investment, or the fear of paying too much lest perhaps the workman earn liberally, or the spirit of antagonism against him who seeks that relief from physical strain and from narrow circumstances that we all think normal to ourselves. A man in a neighboring state increased after study the output of one article from 24 to 200 daily without extra labor. Does one wonder that another manufacturer was willing to give him double the salary he was receiving?

Some days ago I met a maker of machinery who told me that one of his men was earning \$12 a day, and that by reason of his skill in handling a large tool he had brought the piece-work cost of certain finishing work to a very low point; and this enlightened employer spoke of his great satisfaction in the earning power of the man, and was too wise to think he would gain aught by cutting the piece-work rate. The output of a shop depends for the highest efficiency more on the human factor in it than upon its equipment, its methods or its supervision. Good machines, good methods, good direction, good management are all themselves partly efficient, but only the working in accord with the laws on which men and women are created is fully sufficient.

We face, as a business proposition, in the factories in which we are interested, a certain reduction of the rates in our tariff schedules. What shall we do about it? Many of our efficient shops have nothing to fear, for they are already meeting European competition on its own ground. Those who produce the eleven hundred millions of manufactured goods we annually sell abroad have little about which to worry. But some among us have been educated to believe in their own inability to stand alone, and some there are whose inefficiency is such as to make this possible. Cries of woe and wails of dread ascend from certain backward industries; but if you will examine the list of the silent, you will find it contains our choicest and best. It seems indicated clearly to us all that during the coming six or eight months we should search our own ways to learn if they be wise or no; that every wasteful and inefficient process should be stopped; that every needless burden habit or neglect has left-be thrown off; that we cast away every weight, including the pernicious falsehood that low-priced labor is the cheapest producer. Then with keen, accurate insight into our own plants, well equipped, well manned, well led, we may face the world of commerce not only unafraid, but with a strength and a serene self-confidence to which we have thus far been strangers.

#### THE PEACE PLAN

Houston (Tex.) Post: In the matter of stating a proposition so as to bring out its strongest features, Mr. Bryan has few peers in this or any other country. The logic of any statement he submits is strengthened in the impression it makes by a ready flow of euphonious words that with irresistible force concentrate the attention upon the very features he has chosen to emphasize.

In his discussion recently at a dinner given in New York in honor of the foreign members of the international conference that is arranging the celebration of 100 years of peace among English speaking peoples, he urged in behalf of the peace plan offered by President Wilson to all nations that "it contemplates time for investigation and deliberation, and this," he said, "makes the possibility of war remote."

In further extension of his remarks on the subject, he said: "It is the purpose of this plan to close up the gap and to leave no question to become a cause of war. It is the belief of the president that when the treaties have been made between this nation and other nations, severally, by which there will be investi-

gations before hostilities begin, that war will become practically impossible. The time that will be allowed gives a chance for the separation of questions of fact from questions of honor, and it gives a chance also for the operation of public opinion, which is increasingly for peace. It is the hope of those who believe in the plan that when it is adopted between this nation and other nations, it will then be adopted by other nations between themselves until all nations of the earth will be knit together by these agreements and the people will know war no more."

The force and plausibility of this argument is not to be lightly considered. In theory it works out beautifully. It is an easy matter to arouse the popular passions of a people to a white heat under charges of invasion of their national rights by a foreign country; hence any plan which has for its object the prevention of undue haste in resorting to hostilities while the subjects in controversy are being investigated to eliminate misunderstandings, will, as Mr. Bryan says, give public opinion time for reflection, and when reason asserts it sway passion loses its force.

But, as a rule, wars are not so much the result of misunderstandings as between nations, but rather of conditions arising out of misunderstandings on their part of those economic laws which make for true national progress. It is because of a failure to observe these that national animosities are engendered, and upon slight provocation are easily fanned into flame, which being renewed from time to time by the addition of fresh fuel, become so inveterate that diplomacy finds itself powerless to avert a recourse to arms to give vent to the "war spirit" so strongly implanted in the human breast.

While agreements among nations, not compromising of their respective interests, for the maintenance of peace are properly to be encouraged, it may be affirmatively stated that the surest basis for permanent world-wide peace is for the nations to stop exploiting their subjects by oppressive taxation and the support of policies which "robs the mouth of labor of the bread which it has justly earned," thus breaking down those indefensible systems for whose maintenance there is the constant incentive to aggress upon the rights of other nations in the struggle for territorial and commercial aggrandizement.

#### GOOD SIGNS

There are many good signs these days and among them is the proof that men are growing more considerate of one another, more tolerant of one another's opinions and more appreciative of one another's efforts. Senator Kenyon of Iowa, is a republican, but he does not hesitate to recognize the good work of President Wilson. A dispatch to the Sioux City (Ia.) Journal says:

Senator Kenyon has arrived at home on his way back to Washington from the Jefferson memorial dedication, full of praise for President Wilson, and enthusiastic over federal aid for good roads which is now consuming much of his attention. "Good roads are more important than the tariff," he declared. Of President Wilson he said: "President Wilson is determined that the party pledge of a reduction in the tariff be carried out. While one may not be in accord with his opinions, yet one can not help but see that he is sincere and conscientious in his effort to serve his country. He is not allowing any political influence to thwart him in his selection of men for public office whom he believes to be the best for the place."

#### MR. BRYAN IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Bryan visited the capital of Pennsylvania May 13. A Harrisburg dispatch gives this account of his visit: Secretary of State William J. Bryan addressed the Pennsylvania legislature this afternoon on the distinction between democratic democracy and aristocracy.

He predicted that before another general election, the presidential primary would be so general that there would be no need to hold national conventions and that presidential nominees would be named not by party leaders or bosses but by the people.

Secretary Bryan came here to speak at the Jefferson anniversary dinner of the Central Democratic club of Harrisburg and was invited to address the legislature.

"Jefferson, a century ago, spoke of two parties," he said, "one was the democratic party and the other the aristocratic party. The democratic party is that party which tries to bring the government near the people and the aristo-

cratic party is that which desires to restrain and obstruct popular government.

"It is important to know whether the legislative representative is holding to the democratic idea or to the aristocratic idea. It is a settled principle of this country that a platform is binding upon every man that runs on that platform. Some men violate platforms because they say they can not violate their conscience.

"No man should violate his conscience, but that does not mean that he should violate his party platform. It means that his conscience should begin to work before he is elected and not afterward. A man who violates a party platform and betrays his party and the people, is a worse criminal than the man who embezzles money.

"The day of the boss is gone. The people will write their own platforms hereafter and send their own representatives to the legislative halls."

#### A TIMELY QUESTION

The Commoner invites special attention to the following letter, written by a well known Nebraska newspaper man. The writer of this article states the theory correctly when he says that the idea of the homestead law is to make it easy to secure a farm. The case cited by Mr. Kennedy is so plainly unjust to individuals as well as to public welfare that the policy should be so changed as to meet cases like this:

Omaha, Neb., May 11.—Editor Commoner: Why does Uncle Sam make it hard for citizens to get a homestead when the idea and theory of the law is to make it easy to secure a farm?

Not that it will be of any personal assistance in the case I call attention to, but in the hope that those who follow may have it made easier, is this letter written.

The writer is the father of a boy twenty-two years old. He is a city-bred boy whose life ambition is to be a farmer. To prepare him for his chosen avocation, Allen Kennedy was sent to the agricultural school at Lincoln, Neb. This last winter was his third year in school.

In October, 1911, this boy drew a number in the Rosebud land drawing in Millette county, South Dakota, and filed on a quarter section of land in September, 1912. The regulations required that he establish residence on the land in six months from date of filing, or March 2, 1913.

While at school this last winter he wrote the land office, reciting the fact that he was an agricultural school student in his third year; that he wished to finish the term, which ended about April 20, 1913; and asked that a 60-day extension of time be given him in which to establish residence, or until May 2, 1913, in order that he might finish his school term. With this request was proper certification by school authorities that the boy was a student in his third year, etc.

The request was denied.

He either had to give up the farm or give up the school. So he gave up the school at the end of the first semester, in January, and wasted his time waiting till the middle of February to go up to his homestead to establish residence March 2.

Instead of finishing his agricultural schooling in four years the ruling of the land office people at Washington makes it necessary for him to consume five years.

And yet I read over and over again in innumerable publications the cry of "back to nature," "back to the farm," "Uncle Sam gives every man a chance," etc., while the red tape brigade at Washington works overtime looking for petty larceny obstructions to put in the way of those who do try to get a farm.

Instead of permitting this boy to stay in school and finish his studies the land office red tapers forced him to go out on the prairie and sit sucking his thumbs.

Father will have to dig five instead of four years for the money to pay for this boy's education; the boy has lost faith in his Uncle Sam; and the red tape department at Washington has preserved its dignity. But, just the same, I know that in this instance Uncle Sam has made it hard, instead of easy, for this Omaha boy to get a farm. Why? F. A. KENNEDY.

#### GOOD COMPANY

The Hartford (Conn.) Courant has some unkind references to Senator Kern of Indiana, but in the same issue in which the Courant criticizes the Indiana democrat, it condemns President Wilson, Senator La Follette and L. D. Brandeis. Senator Kern has at least the satisfaction of knowing that the Connecticut newspaper put him in distinguished company.