

the unjust usurpation of power which kingship everywhere means. We did nothing of the kind. We could do nothing of the kind. We may say that the poor French King was innocent of any purpose to do harm, and that is no doubt true. And we may think that it was an exhibition of nothing but brutality which led the people of France to take the life of Louis XVI. But we shall make a mistake. Where there is power there is responsibility. He who dares to exercise the one must accept the full measure of the other. There is no escaping the conclusion. That power which presumes to rule a people must be held responsible for the welfare of that people. It is right that it should be so.

Now, when we set up a government on these shores, though we got rid of a King, we did not get rid of one smallest fraction of the power and responsibility vested in a King. Wherever there is a government, no matter what its form, there is all the power and all the responsibility that inheres in any other government. Government in the United States does not incur less responsibility than government in Russia or Germany or China. The attempt was made here to distribute responsibility. But he would be exceedingly rash who would say that that attempt had been very successful. In theory, the responsibility of government is distributed among our seventy or eighty millions of people, or our fifteen or sixteen millions of voters. But in practice that is not altogether true.

The sum and substance of the matter is that this nation is not half so much a democracy as it is a plutocracy. I cannot imagine any sane man denying the statement that for the most part it is money rather than men that carries elections and determines government here. I say I cannot conceive a sane man doubting that proposition. It is true, whether we know it or not. That is to say, money has arrogated to itself in this country the precise function which was vested in a King in France.

You may say that the people submit to it, and are therefore responsible for it, that they decree it. That is not true. Under existing conditions the people cannot help themselves. It would be just as true to say that in the days of slavery in this country the slaves were responsible for the power exercised by their masters. That was not true. Conditions over which the slave had no control had made him a slave and the other man was his master. The condition of mastership was a usurpation. Upon the master rested all the responsibility which his power implied.

#### MUNICIPAL IDEALS.

Extracts from an address delivered in Chicago, Monday noon, February 20, under the auspices of the National Christian Citizenship league, by Prof. George D. Herron, of Iowa college, as reported by the Chicago Record.

The individual life of man is more and more made up of relations of fellowship. More and more it is becoming true that the quality of the individual depends upon the quality of his relations to his community and to his fellow-men. In nothing can a man be any longer separate unto himself. He is the most truly individualistic who makes the widest possible contribution to his fellow-men. The city is best governed and is the best home for man in which all citizens rejoice or suffer at the same thing. That city in which something works to make some happy and others sad, or causes some to prosper and others to be injured, is the habitation and culmination of all misery. The city is to-day the nerve center of human life. The association which city congestion produces is better in its worst phases than the highest form of separation and loneliness. "Fellowship is heaven; the lack of fellowship is hell," has been said. I feel like adding that fellowship in hell is better than separation and individualism in heaven, if any sort of a heaven is a subjective condition that comes from the harmony of man in right relation. It is in the city, therefore, that ideals in the common life can be realized, and only in the city. The city is the communal unity, the communal soul, in modern life. The citizens of a city working together for the common good can make a communal heaven even out of Chicago—and that is a great stretch of spiritual imagination. . . .

Every child born into this city is entitled to be surrounded by all the resources of the common life, the best that is possible, the highest that is conceivable, in opportunity for living out all possibilities of his life. Every man is entitled to life, liberty, land, air, art, education, the opportunity to do what he can best do. To all these men are equally entitled. To give them the city is really created. . . .

A city which permits its resources to be centralized in the hands of the few, so that the few have power and luxury, is a hideous caricature. It is irrational, unnatural, profane, irreligious, that the common resources should be given away as a field of exploitation for the few. If you can picture a condition that would permit corporations to control the air and sunshine, consider the matter of public franchises. If a few men can own the

city, they doubtless own the citizens. Is it not true in this city that the few men who own your public resources and franchises own its moral being and its citizenship, whose souls become at last but grist for the capitalist mill? I am not interested in your discussions whether street car companies should have 25 or 50-year franchises. The granting away of franchises of any sort for any time whatever is public immorality. Private ownership of public resources is inherently and elementarily immoral. It reduces the municipality to a sort of splendid slavery. It is a violation of nature. I do not blame Mr. Yerkes for owning the city. I blame Chicago for allowing him to do it.

The conservative and respectable reformer, from which the Lord deliver us, asserts that citizenship for the city's good may be practical a generation from now; that we are not ready for it yet. No ideal was ever born into the world out of its time. The moment that ideal comes into the vision of the common life, then and only then is the safe moment to realize it.

#### TOM JOHNSON'S DECLARATIONS.

The single tax proposes to abolish all taxes placed on consumption, all taxes that fall on men measured by what they consume.

Sugar does not pay taxes. Steel rails do not pay taxes. Men and women pay taxes.

When you measure how much they pay by what they consume you have adopted a scheme of taxation that falls on weak and strong alike, rich and poor alike, that taxes the head of a family alone more than an old bachelor, though he might be many times a millionaire.

That is the kind of a tax that you collect at a custom house. Single tax proposes to abolish that. It proposes to take away from the statute books every scheme of license tax. Living would be doubly easy.

The next step would be to abolish the tax that falls upon personal property, the tax that falls on bonds and stocks, the tax that the widows and orphans pay.

A tax on stocks and bonds is a tax on mere evidence of ownership, and it is as absurd as to tax a man on his house and lot and also on the deed for his house and lot.

The single tax would abolish the tax on improvements and leave the tax on the land values from which we now raise a part of the revenue. We say, raise it all from that source.

The single tax proposes to raise every