

the only recipe that I know of to attain wealth in the United States."

You are waiting on the street corner for a car. There are 19 others waiting for the same car. It has but 30 seats, and when it arrives, 20 of them are preempted. The successful man is he who gets a seat. The millionaire is he who gets the end seat.

Therefore, pay strict attention to business. You will need unusual brain power and energy and application. Look sharp! There's your chance! Rush in ahead of that woman! Bravo! Now get out your paper and bury your face in it so that you will not appear to see that decrepit old man who, with difficulty, is clinging to a strap in front of you.

Then when you hear a man insisting that the company ought to furnish enough seats to go round, denounce him for trying to inflame the masses against the classes. Tell him that he is envious or lazy, and that any man can get a seat in this car of success if he pays strict attention to business, and has unusual brain power and energy and application. Then if the man asks you how 40 men can sit in 30 seats, call him a pestilent fellow, and tell him that the postal department ought to deprive his paper of the second class mailing privilege.

The young man returning from the Civil war could go to Iowa, and for \$10 an acre could buy the opportunity to toil on as rich soil as Nature ever made. But the young man back from the Spanish war would have to pay \$75 an acre before he would have any right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness on that soil.

There is much truth in that recipe, Mr. Morton. But it is not the whole truth. There is also some truth in Mr. Kipling's lines:

The toad beneath the harrow knows  
Exactly where each tooth point goes;  
The butterfly upon the road  
Preaches contentment to that toad.

#### A CALIFORNIA "SPELLBINDER."

From "The Campaign Spellbinder," by Lindsay Denison, in Everybody's Magazine for September.

The last gubernatorial campaign in California discovered Franklin K. Lane. He was a candidate, of course, but he did things which had never been done before by a Democratic candidate. California is normally 20,000 Republican. Mr. Lane came within 1,500 votes of election, notwithstanding the most energetic efforts of the powerful Hearst influence to beat him by aiding the Republican candidate. Lane sets off no fireworks in the

course of his speech-making. But he shows every single fact which is concerned in his campaign, and sets it forth as he sees it, in such a manner that the voter must see it his way. Without making any apparent effort for effect, the man gets at the feelings and the reasonableness of every man within reach of his voice as though that man were all alone with him on the other side of a dining-room table. Lane's voice is big and powerful, and, moreover, flexible. His own campaign discovered him, and sooner or later he will be drafted over into the great spell-binding army this side of the Rocky mountains.

#### ENFORCED PEACE.

The report for Thursday, October 6, of the Thirteenth International Peace Congress, held in Boston, was headed in the leading daily: "Would Force Peace." It was a clever comment by the reporter on Andrew Carnegie's proposition for stopping war immediately. Carnegie's letter to the Congress proposes the most extreme war measure possible for the obtaining of peace, that of slavery. He says:

Suppose, for instance, that Great Britain, France, Germany and America, with such other minor states as would certainly join them, were to take that position [binding themselves to settlement of all disputes by arbitration], prepared, if defied, to enforce peaceful settlement, the first offender, if there ever were one, being rigorously dealt with, war would at one fell swoop be banished from the earth.

This has an exact parallel in the proposition of the father who took his son to enter Sunday school, and thus directed the teacher: "If he don't get his lesson, you just tell me. I'll lick it into him!"

How that boy must have loved the Bible, "licked into him" by his zealous father! And how those lesser states will love the bonds of "peace" in which they writhe in the iron grasp of the Great Powers!

But let us not ourselves make war upon Mr. Carnegie while we are testifying to the need of a peace interior to the external form of it. Therefore, let us realize how he came to make such a singular proposition. He probably gave way to that extremely human tendency to be carried off one's balance by enthusiasm for some longed-for condition, forgetting that the mere external has absolutely no power for good without the presence of corresponding underlying causes.

Such enforced peace would result in the bondage and consequent inevitable oppression of the weak nations by the strong. War, in freedom, horrible as it is, is a mild hell compared with

bondage made peaceable by force. Every person or people has a divine right to self defense, and no abuse of that right can make slavery a virtue. The word "peace" is desecrated by giving it as a name to such a condition. The picture arises involuntarily in one's mind of the horrors of the situation of a little nation, oppressed by the united powers, unconsciously often, because those powers will be absorbed in arranging their own affairs to their best possible advantage, and the little nation will not be able to lift a hand in self-defense. Have we not seen enough of such oppression to warn us against its systematic perpetuation throughout the earth?

Much more to the point are the words of the British workingman, Pete Curran, to the congress: "War is caused by greed of territory." Every single taxpayer knows the truth of that, and it gives us a new impetus for work. Much more has been written and said of national and individual benefits of the single tax than of the international. Now the time is ripe to press that aspect of it, and it will further the knowledge of the lesser ones. Arbitration is in the air. Ten treaties in ten months have been made. More are about to be concluded. This kind of peace may come much sooner than we have anticipated. It will be a step onward, but it will soon result in enormous injustice, unless it can go further. International peace, with special privileges to the few, will soon cease to appear even as peace, and will become a new form of slavery. Internationally, the world must establish itself on the rights of all men to use the earth, before international peace can be anything but a new name for larger special privileges. Now is the time for single taxpayers to spread abroad this truth.—Jane Dearborn Mills, in The Single Tax Review for October, 1904.

#### BRYAN TO THE POPULISTS.

From The Commoner of Nov. 4, 1904.

Some of the Populists criticize Mr. Bryan because he advocates the election of Judge Parker. They point to the fact that the Populists supported Mr. Bryan in 1896. The case is not parallel, as everyone must admit who has stopped for a moment to consider the circumstances. In 1896, the Populists indorsed Mr. Bryan's candidacy because they thought by so doing they might be able to elect him and thus secure those reforms upon which the Populists and Democrats were agreed. With the aid of the Populists, Mr.

Bryan came so near election that a change of 20,000 votes, properly distributed through the close States, would have changed the result. The Populists, therefore, acted wisely, in doing the best they could under the circumstances. If at this time the race was between Mr. Watson and Mr. Roosevelt, and Mr. Bryan could help defeat Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Watson, he would be in the position that the Populists occupied eight years ago, and would be open to criticism if he refused to assist. But that is not the situation to-day. If Mr. Bryan supported Mr. Watson, he would simply help elect Mr. Roosevelt, and thus become responsible for what Mr. Roosevelt might do; whereas, by supporting Judge Parker, he hopes to elect Judge Parker, and thus secure such reforms as are within reach at this time. Four years ago Mr. Bryan declared imperialism to be more important than any economic question. His sincerity would be open to criticism if to-day, on account of differences on the money question, he refused to support a man who stands squarely against imperialism, and who has a chance to win. In like manner, he would also be open to criticism if he refused to help reduce the army, which Judge Parker promises to do; or refused to assist in ridding this country of the warlike spirit which President Roosevelt has inaugurated. In 1894 Mr. Bryan, after having received a unanimous nomination for Senator, urged the Democratic convention to nominate Judge Holcomb, the Populist candidate for Governor, and he gave as his reason that the nomination of a Democratic candidate at that time would not result in the election of a Democrat, but would assist the Republicans; and that the Democrats, desiring the defeat of the Republican candidate, could best accomplish that defeat by the support of the Populist candidate. The convention took this view of the subject and Judge Holcomb was indorsed and elected. This was the beginning of fusion in Nebraska. In supporting Judge Parker to-day, Mr. Bryan is acting upon exactly the same principle. To support Mr. Watson would be to help Mr. Roosevelt and to deny to the people the good that can be accomplished through the election of Parker and Davis. It is argued that Judge Parker's defeat might hasten the reorganization of the Democratic party; but no one can afford to put the interest of his party, or of his faction of the party, above the interests of his country. No one can afford to become

responsible for four years more of Rooseveltism in order to help his element of the party obtain control of the party organization.

In other words, no one can afford to do evil in the hope that good may come out of it. The only safe plan is to do at all times that which seems best for the country; and at this time, the reduction of the army, the overthrow of imperialism, the removal of the race issue, and the substitution of a spirit of peace for a spirit of war, are the best things within reach, and these things the election of Parker and Davis would help to bring about. And since Mr. Bryan has declared, and still believes, imperialism to be a graver issue than any economic question, he could not with honesty or honor fail to render such assistance as he can to the reestablishment of the Declaration of Independence and constitutional government.

#### A GENUINE REPUBLIC.

From an article on "The Use of Wood in Switzerland," by Wendell C. Corthall, in *The Craftsman* for October, 1903.

Let us remember that the life in Switzerland is distinctively that of the village. Here is the only true republic in Europe, a republic of far more freedom, dignity and real democracy than that of France, or even than that of our own. A land is here without a "Boss," where every member is free to cast his ballot and have his full share in the general corporation. The forests are among his assets, and all are interested to have them kept at their full value. . . .

The cost of the government is only three dollars per capita per annum. In England it is \$12, and in France \$15. . . .

Switzerland has no castles, no walled towns. She has been governed for 500 years by her own people, and without the help of kings. She is a land of villages, of homes. Of 600,000 householders, 500,000 own a bit of land. The Swiss are the freest people in the world, the Athenians of modern times. They are the most universally educated of any country, it being their boast that everyone who is not mentally incapacitated, is able to read and write. They have all the virtues and none of the vices of our own political life.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR OF THE CRAFTSMAN.

An editorial which appeared in the *Boston Transcript* some time during the month of August last, com-

pletely justifies the statements made by Mr. Corthall regarding the prosperity of Switzerland and the causes for the same.

The editorial opens with a quotation from Mr. Peck, a former United States minister to the mountain republic, who lately said: "There is no country, no nation on the globe, which can compare in quality and number of educational institutions with those of Switzerland, according to the number of inhabitants." The writer of the article then develops a comparison between Switzerland and Massachusetts, in both of which commonwealths it has been discovered that the intelligence of the people is a prime cause of all other prosperity, material as well as moral.

In the course of his observations the writer states that, long ago, emigration from Switzerland ceased, and immigration into that country began; since Germans, French, Italians and Slavs were and are still attracted by the excellent economic conditions there prevailing.

The democracy of the European state, the writer maintains, is much more essential and powerful than that of Massachusetts; popular control being now almost absolute, and preventing the use of the public resources for the selfish advantage of the few. These conditions are maintained by means of an article of the constitution, the referendum, which provides that all measures of vital import, in order to become laws, must be referred to the whole body of the citizens.

The editorial closes with a second quotation from Mr. Peck, who says that the 3,000,000 of Swiss consume more commodities to-day than the 15,000,000 of Italians, although the natural productiveness of the two countries cannot be compared.

In these and many other favorable facts to be noted in the present condition of Switzerland we may discern the effects of good government, pure and simple; but before instituting a parallel between that country and Italy in the matter of commercial consumption, the geography of the two countries should first be considered. Switzerland is protected from the greed of the continental powers by a natural barrier. Her children are thus left free to cultivate the soil, to develop manufactures, and to elevate themselves. On the contrary, Italy is now, of necessity, an armed camp, forced to nourish its defenders, who