

ileges and special franchises offer for public use an abundant common fund which now goes into private pockets.

Johnson makes no secret of his ultimate aim. It is to so arouse the conscience and awaken the good sense of the people of Ohio, by exposures of the iniquitous system of taxation from which they now suffer, that they will concede to every locality the right to raise its own taxes in its own way. Nor would he consider this accomplishment the goal. Having secured that right of home rule, he would push the issue until the localities raised their taxes not only in their own way, but in the right way. And that way would be by taxing nobody but the owners of valuable rights of way, valuable building lots, valuable sites generally; and taxing them only in proportion to the value of their sites respectively. The following article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, containing an interview with Mayor Johnson on the subject, explains his purpose:

The fact that leading politicians throughout the state seem to have business in Cleveland at this particular time may be regarded as a coincidence by some folks, but the wise ones do not see it that way. They view it as a prearranged condition which tends to confirm what Mr. Johnson's friends hope and believe, viz., that he is becoming "It" in the Buckeye state.

One thing about which there is no dispute is that Mayor Johnson wants to get control of the legislature in the sense that he wants, so he says, to see fair-minded and unpurchasable men elected to it. "Any unprejudiced and unpurchased body of men may be easily and quickly convinced that the present laws relating to taxes and franchises work an outrageous injustice on the state and the people of Ohio," according to the mayor. "I intend to use all my influence to assist in electing a legislature composed of honest men," he said. By honest men, it is taken for granted the mayor meant honest democrats.

It is not believed that Johnson has in mind a law that will make the adoption of single tax imperative on the state. It is more likely that a bill will be framed providing that any county, on the vote of its people, may adopt the system. Having adopted it, the county, if it

does not find it satisfactory, by a majority vote can return to the old system. As Mr. Johnson sees it, the possibility of any community, having once adopted the plan, wishing to return to the old one, does not exist.

"A majority of the people of this country," remarked the mayor to a friend, the other day, "are single taxers, but they don't know it. But they're coming to a knowledge of the fact, and it's for us who have studied the matter and are a little in advance of them, to point out the way. Some well meaning people who don't know what they're talking about, say that a single tax on land values means placing a heavy burden on the poor man who owns a little home. If you ask these same people who bears the largest proportion of the tax burden now, they'll say the poor man; not alone the poor man who owns a little house and lot, but the poor man who has some personal property. He has so little that he can't conceal it, and the assessor gets it. If a farmer has two buggies, three horses, a piano, 50 head of cattle, etc., everybody knows it, and that includes the tax assessor. If the rich man has a million dollars in securities and says he has \$1,000, the assessor takes his word for it. We can't reach the rich man's personal property, and we don't, but we can the poor man's. Now, that is manifestly unjust. If we can't regulate the system, why not abolish it and adopt one that we can regulate? The rich man can't conceal his real estate any more than the farmer can."

#### SUCCESS IN LIFE.

If we were about to preach a sermon on success, we should pointedly distinguish different kinds. We should show how success may consist on the one hand in building up character with reference to moral principle, or, on the other, in gaining more or less of the whole world and losing your own soul; and we should urge acceptance of the lesson of the high mountain in the Holy Land, where the most successful personality in all history signalized his greatest triumph with the exclamation, "Get thee behind me, Satan!"

But this is not to be a sermon; at any rate, not that kind of sermon. It is to be an unreserved, and we trust a sensible, inquiry into the possibilities of achieving that species of success, now so generally applauded and so heartily coveted, whose treasures

are subject to the ravages of moths, thieves and corruption.

The prime condition of selfish success now most generally approved is somewhat different from that which prevailed two or three generations ago. In their youth, men now of middle age were persistently taught that their success depended upon their piety. This idea was inculcated in the church, in the home, in the school; and in debating societies arguments were fattened with it. It was the lesson of the marbled-back literature that constituted the literary staple of Sunday school libraries, and the burden of all other respectable vehicles of advice to the young. In the pietized imagination of that day, the good boy was destined, if he escaped an early and joyous death, to become a rich and exemplary man.

Usually the illustrative examples were mythical. Yet living ones were not wanting. The theory did suffer serious strain when the millionaire Girard was mentioned; but all infidels had not committed themselves, as he had, to hostility to churches in their wills, and even John Jacob Astor could be referred to, though with some reserve, as a poor and pious boy grown wealthy. Spectacular success, however, was not common then. The types were the little rich men of the neighborhood. With but few exceptions they were invariably pious; they had in almost all instances been poor boys; and as uniformly as circumstances would permit, their success was attributed to their piety from youth up. Incidental advantages were often known to have contributed, but these fortuitous circumstances were not considered important enough to count.

When the piety of that period is analyzed, its utility as a promoter of selfish success is less dubious than at first blush it appears. Its nature was not unfairly exemplified by the little negro of the wharves, who pushed and shoved and trampled upon his smaller companions to get the pennies that a stranger threw over a ship's side to see the youngsters scramble for them. After he had filled his pockets with the coin, of which he had prevented the others from getting a

share, this ebony Rockefeller in embryo refused to dance, even for good pay, because he had joined the church! Piety consisted, that is, chiefly in getting into church and keeping out of jail. Beyond those two points few questions were asked. And so the pious were supposed to succeed and the successful were supposed to be pious.

But few sensible men of to-day would attribute selfish success to piety. Too many pious men have failed. Too many pious men are hopelessly poor. Too many of the wicked have been crowned with success. Even professional pietists no longer recommend piety for business reasons. Almost universally it is now recognized that genuine piety is a positive bar to success; and as for the other kind, however valuable hypocrisy may once have been as a commercial asset, it is so no longer. While ambitious business men are as careful as ever to keep out of jail, they are not so anxious to get into church. Piety as a specific for selfish success has been displaced by individual industry. The successful are now assumed to have been industrious, and the industrious are assured of success.

This theory is adopted and fondled and propagated not only by those who are ambitious to gain as much of the world as possible though they lose their own souls in the process; it is also approved and applauded and assiduously impressed upon the minds of youth by our professional teachers of moral and spiritual philosophies. It is the latter day substitute for piety. But will it work any better than the theory it has displaced? That is the question.

The best expression, perhaps, of this modern theory of success, was written by a notorious pretender. It is known as "The Message to Garcia," a tract that has evoked very general applause. One railroad man, who had himself been successful, distributed copies broadcast among his unsuccessful subordinates to teach them how to rise.

The tract is the story of a young military officer who, early in the war with Spain, was given a message by

the war department to carry to the Cuban general, Garcia. The difficulties in the way of the messenger seemed insurmountable. But he made no protest, he asked no questions. He had been told to carry a message to Garcia, and he did it. The tract might gain force as a guide to success, if its author could write a sequel describing the promotion of the plucky young officer to the grade, say of brigadier general. But that reward did not go to the officer who carried a message to Garcia; it was reserved for one who delivered a forgery to Aguinaldo.

Despite this suggestive anti-climax, however, the story of the message to Garcia has been widely accepted as a true exposition of the secret of business success. When you are told by your superiors to do something, don't hesitate, don't question, but do it, and business success is yours. That is the moral.

President McKinley spoke to the same effect at a colored school in Louisiana, upon his continental tour. He told his youthful negro hearers that if they would get an education, build up a good character, and be unfalteringly industrious, they would have "success anywhere and everywhere," and that this is true of blacks and whites alike. A survival of the pietistic theory was introduced there, in the allusion to building up a good character. There was also a reference to another theory of success, which once had temporary vogue but is now almost monopolized by poor and ambitious school boys and college students—the theory that book education is the open sesame. But Mr. McKinley, like the author of "The Message to Garcia," laid his emphasis upon "unfaltering industry."

Most impressive, however, of all the teachers along this line is Mr. Charles M. Schwab, the man who, from an impoverished boyhood, is reported to have risen by Garcia-message-carrying methods to a salaried position of a million dollars a year. His stupendous success is the guarantee of his competency to advise.

In a recent address to the graduates of a technical school in New York, Mr. Schwab summed up the now dominant philosophy of success in one pregnant sentence. It is not

enough to do your duty. "Everybody," said he, "is expected to do his duty; but the boy who does his duty, and a little more than his duty, is the boy who is going to succeed in this world."

In one respect the theory of success thus indicated is like that which it has displaced. It embodies a measure of truth. Just as the idea was true that the good boy would succeed, other things being the same, so is it true that the industrious and persevering boy will succeed, other things being the same. But there is the difficulty. "Other things being the same," implies that a large proportion of boys shall not be good, in order that the good one may succeed, and that a large proportion shall remain inferior in industry, in order that the industrious one may succeed. In other words, this much belauded industry theory of success can be true only so long as most people don't act upon it.

If all were equally industrious, all would not succeed; and if all tried to succeed by exceptional industry, the great mass, who must necessarily fall short of such a standard, would come into a condition of virtual servitude to the successful,—a servitude that would be all the more profitable to its beneficiaries on account of the high standard of industry the struggle to avert it had established.

If, for illustration, the clerk who willingly works nine hours in an office when the rule is eight is the man for promotion, and all in the office are ambitious, the rivalry for success will result, if the employer also is ambitious, in extending the office day to nine hours. After that the clerk who would distinguish himself must work ten hours. When in the course of time a new rivalry shall have raised office hours to his standard, willingness to work 11 hours will be the test of industrial worthiness. And so on until the standard of office hours has been raised so high as to abolish leisure, and an exceptional few have become masters of the rest.

Returning from this illustration to the more general considerations which it roughly explains, if all workers were to do more than their duty in some degree, only the exceptional

ones who did it in greater degree could win; and if all rose to that standard, the winners would be those who raised the standard still higher. Should the process go on, none could succeed finally but those who so far overleap the limits of their duty as to go the full length of human endurance; and then, even if all were endowed with equal endurance, success could no longer depend upon excessive industry. None could excel when all had reached the limit.

The time would never come, of course, when all workers would reach the highest standard of human endurance. Some would be physically too weak and others morally too sane. But there would be some point at which the great mass would give up in despair; and when that point had been reached, the social problem would be just where it is now, just where it would have remained if no universal desire to succeed by excessive industry had taken possession of the people. Then, as now, only the few could succeed. The difference would be that with the rest the strain for a bare living would be more tense, while the successful few would have to be stronger than ever and more insanely ambitious. Those who fell below the highest standard would still be crowded to the wall, still be denounced as indolent, still be robbed of the lion's share of what they did produce; those who rose above the standard would still thrive upon the unrequited toil of their brethren.

Industry is truly a virtue, and one which is too much neglected by all classes. The work of even laborious toilers is drudgery rather than industry, and a vast amount of upper class labor is hardly more useful or honest than "the process known as four of a kind." Whoever, therefore, writes anything or says anything calculated to stimulate wholesome industry renders a public service. But he who stimulates it by raising false hopes of business success as the reward of industry, commits a social crime.

It is not true, what is often asserted, that the success of our rich men is attributable to doing more than their duty. While excessive devotion to their employers' interests may have given to their business career its orig-

inal impulse, other factors have entered in to produce the successful result. Good or bad, these factors may have been; just or unjust; sordid or not; mean or manly—but they, and not alone fidelity to an employer's interests, not alone excessive devotion to duty, not alone excessive industry, have helped turn the scale for success or failure.

And in the present as in the past, many factors are necessary to success. Most important of all is some advantage whereby the industry of the unsuccessful may be forced to contribute to the success of those who succeed. Not until a man can live in fabulous luxury upon the labor of others is he accounted successful. For that reason industry is no guarantee of success in life. The industrious as a class can not succeed so long as success consists in the possession of power to levy tribute upon industry.

By natural law success does depend upon industry; and the degree and intelligence of the industry does naturally determine the measure of the success. This would be true also in actual experience, if industry were confined to rendering service. Then success would not be a prize for the extraordinary feats of the few. It would be the reward of all to the extent of their earnings. But industry is not so limited. In a slave country it may be devoted to buying slaves; and there the successful man is he who has acquired enough slaves to relieve him of all necessity of working. In more highly civilized countries it may be devoted to the purchase of financial interests that are nourished by veiled systems of slavery. The principle is the same; only the method differs. And just as it would be cruel mockery in a slave country to tell slaves that excessive industry would assure them business success, when in fact not they but their masters would profit by their greater usefulness, so is it in the country of higher civilization even more cruel, because more deceptive, to teach that success depends upon industry. It would be only the truth to teach that it depends upon monopoly.

Does not every intelligent man

know, will not every genuinely honest man admit, that the industrial power of the present time centers in monopoly? It is true that you may get your monopoly by excessive industry, so long as the standard of work leaves a margin for extraordinary labor feats; but it is the monopoly all the same, and not your industry, that finally makes you successful.

Monopoly is a process of levying tribute upon the industrious for the benefit of the monopolists. When it exists, increased industry among non-monopolists can not benefit them as a class; for as soon as this greater industry becomes general, its profits go to fatten monopolists.

Hence incentives to general industry are popular with monopolists and their agents and organs of opinion. If the people of this country could be induced to work harder in the vain hope that all may thereby win success, the value of monopolies would rise, but industry in general would be no better paid, and if not in excess of the higher standard would win no prizes.

When, therefore, the agents and beneficiaries of monopoly interests preach excessive industry as the solution of the social problem, yet "lie low" on the subject of monopoly, they expose either their intelligence or their motives to suspicion. The whole thing is suggestive of the primitive method of inducing the mule to turn the mill by hanging a bundle of hay where it continually dangles just before his nose, but always eludes his reach.

Yet there is hope in the new theory of business success. It does something in pushing aside the old idea that success is the reward of piety. It will do more presently in demonstrating its own deceptiveness.

Not more than one generation is likely to be fooled by it. After that experience, the people may be trusted to recognize that under existing conditions success does not depend upon industry—not as a rule of general application. Yet the logic of the rule will lose none of its force. The conviction will still remain that industry,

even though not the measure of success, certainly ought to be.

Let the people once look at the matter in that way, and the solution of the social problem will be at hand. They cannot look upon it so without being put upon inquiry. They cannot feel that industry ought to be the measure of success, and at the same time realize that it is not, without searching earnestly for the cause of this conflict between what ought to be and what is. And if they once set about searching for the cause they will find it in the institution of monopoly, an institution so obtrusive, so bold, so comprehensively explanatory, as to make them wonder they never thought of it before. When the theory that industry is the true measure of success once receives full consideration, the doom of monopoly will sound.

Meanwhile, however, the theory that industry is a guarantee of success as now exploited, is both vicious and dangerous. It is dangerous because it will bitterly disappoint most of the young men who adopt it; in their blind anger they may, if occasion for violence occurs, neither weigh its wisdom nor count its cost. Nothing could be better calculated to produce reckless revolutionaries. It is vicious because it gives the youth of the country a fundamentally false idea of life. Though embodying a substantial truth, the truth that success is the natural reward of industry, this theory of success deceptively inculcates the idea that social conditions permit the rewards of industry to find their natural objects. It conceals the monopolistic influences which now disturb the natural distribution of the proceeds of industry. By doing that, it falsifies the very truth it embodies, and realizes Tennyson's conception that "a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies."

## NEWS

Hardly had our last week's account of the darkening of the speculative outlook in Wall street got upon the press when the gathering storm culminated. Northern Pacific railway stock, which had closed on the 8th at

\$156 per share, of the par value of \$100, rose on the 9th, immediately upon the opening of the New York stock exchange, to \$170. From that point it went up to \$180, fell again to \$170, jumped with successive bounds to \$300, receded to \$230, soared to \$400, and then, with an initial falling sweep which touched \$320, shot up to \$660, fluttered back to \$550, and at one bound leaping up to \$700, sprang with another to \$1,000. This was its highest point, and it quickly fell to \$600. Simultaneously with the fabulous rise of Northern Pacific, other leading stocks enormously fell. Fortunes seemed to melt like ice on a griddle, and fears of a business crash were general.

It subsequently transpired that the fabulous prices offered for Northern Pacific stock had been caused by an unintentional corner in it. The Morgan interests on one side, and the Vanderbilt interests on the other, had been buying the stock in order to get a majority and so control the property. As their purchases were for future delivery, each succeeded in buying a majority of the stock, thus imposing an obligation upon sellers to produce some 200,000 more shares than actually exist. The manipulators of these purchases were therefore able to check the panic by a mutual agreement to let "short" sellers out of the corner, and they did so. Consenting to accept \$150 a share in lieu of Northern Pacific stock deliveries, they released the strain and restored the market. This soothing result was promoted by the banks, which extended special facilities to the Wall street fraternity. On the 10th, consequently, Northern Pacific fluctuated between \$150 and \$160, and the other stocks rose again. A similar effect was produced on the London stock exchange by similar means. The effects of the Northern Pacific corner were felt there also, and at the solicitation of Mr. Morgan the London stock exchange committee suspended obligations to deliver until the crisis had passed.

Nevertheless, the Wall street storm has left an irregular market behind it. After congratulating themselves for a day or two upon the return of promising speculative conditions, Wall street operators began to notice on the 13th that transactions were falling off; and on the 14th there was another fall in prices all along the line. This debility of speculation is ac-

counted for in two ways. The personal losses in the storm turn out to have been much more crippling than was at first supposed; and the scare is believed to have driven outside speculation into less dangerous financial waters.

President McKinley was reported as greatly disturbed by the Wall street panic, but a telephonic conversation with the east put him at his ease. He was at the time in Los Angeles, where he had arrived on the 8th, as reported last week. At this city on the 9th he rode at the head of the floral parade of the carnival, and on the 10th he and his party reached San Luis Obispo. At every stopping place along the route he was welcomed with floral displays, and at Santa Barbara he made his principal speech of the day, in which he said:

What a splendid civilization comes out of the old states and from the old nationalities that are represented here to-day, the best civilization in the world; a civilization based upon liberty, upon equality, upon self-government, and civilization that leads wherever it goes, whether here or in the distant seas, and wherever this civilization goes it carries the ark of freedom. Our liberty, our freedom, our sense of justice are not extinguished in any climate on the globe, and here, facing the Pacific, I am reminded that this ark of liberty has moved out into this great ocean.

Referring then to the Spanish war, he led up to the Philippine question, saying:

As the result of that war we are in the Philippines, and we do not mean to come away, and we mean to give to these distant peoples what we gave to California more than 50 years ago, the blessings of security and liberty.

The 11th was spent by the presidential party at Del Monte; and on the 12th they arrived in San Francisco, two days ahead of time. This departure from the schedule was necessitated by a sudden illness which attacked Mrs. McKinley, requiring special medical attention. The president ran down from San Francisco to San Jose on the 13th, where in his address he spoke flatteringly of the place and the people, and with reference to subjects of general interest said:

We live, my fellow citizens, under a constitution that was made for 4,000,000 people, and yet it has proved quite adequate for 75,000,000 people. It has embraced within it every national duty and purpose, and has never