

themselves: How shall the black and shameful chapter of our history, which we are now writing, be blotted out? How shall our flag, polluted by being made the standard of piracy and rapine, be cleansed? Is there any atonement for national sin?

These questions can have but one answer, the atonement for national sin is through repentance, confession, reparation and amendment. Our moral leadership, so wilfully abandoned, can be regained by our standing before the world as a penitent nation. Let us confess our fault to those whom we have wronged (the Filipinos); make such reparation as is possible by offering our aid in helping them to establish a government of their own, absolutely free from any foreign domination; and then, taking to heart the bitter lesson learned, resolve never again to be false to the principles of liberty and self-government.

J. T. RIPLEY.

#### A DREAM OF EMPIRE.

I dream of an Empire vast, sublimer than Rome of old,  
A giant to make the past seem petty and poor and cold.  
I see in the lengthening years the nation's shadow grow  
O'spreading the hemispheres, as Freedom's sun sinks low.  
The pulse of pride is thrilled at the thought of the things to be,  
And Caesar's soul is filled with a vision of Destiny.  
The fetters are broken made for us by the Fathers gone,  
And Jefferson's ghost is laid with the spectre of Washington.  
Now welcome the Empire grand cemented in blood and might!  
At last shall our country stand, emancipate from Right!  
Farewell, the sun, now setting, that rose on the nation's birth;  
His pitiful race is run—our heritage is the earth.

I dream of an Empire vast, divided by robbers twain;  
Yet oft I awake aghast with a sting of shame and pain,  
For, what if a Judge there be of nations as well as men,  
And a real eternity with laws beyond our ken?  
And what if He fall to see in the scales His fingers hold  
An ounce of supremacy for Color or Caste or Gold?  
'Tis sweeter to dream or drink, as the joyous feast goes on;  
For, should we awake and think, we might think of Babylon.  
—James Jeffrey Roche, in *The Criterion*.

#### THE COOPERATIVE KITCHEN.

Now that so large a number of advanced and farseeing men and women are awakening to the scope of domestic science and studying combinations of food material with reference to hygiene, they will not long continue to

relegate such important interests to a body of ignorant office-holders. For the abundantly rich the problem presents but few difficulties. Wealthy families will always be able to secure a satisfactory resident cook who has been trained in the best European or American schools, but for families of moderate means it looks as if the cooperative kitchen would be the ultimate way out of the difficulty. At present there is a waste of fuel, of cooks, of kitchens in household economics, and in order to make a cook worth her keep and her wages she is often obliged to act as laundress. Thoroughly skilled labor in all departments of living is becoming more and more specialized. A cooperative kitchen would have to be convenient to a number of houses; perhaps later an architect will build houses around a block and a kitchen for the use of all in a central courtyard. Such a kitchen could well be conducted by a representative of the refined and educated class who would understand "moral cooking," and would also have a cultivated taste for edibles and seasoning. She or he, as might be, would want to do away with the hot ranges of the past and their clumsy adjuncts and to substitute gas stoves, spirit lamps and electricity. An improvement in the personnel of cooks and their environments, a demonstration of the worthiness of the profession, would present it in a different light to all wage-earners, and the American sovereign would no longer affix a stamp of odium to cooking as a business, and further adaptations and changes would take place which cannot be foreseen from this distance. The trend of the times toward having less food prepared in home kitchens is plainly visible in the quantity of bread, meats, and salads, pies, cakes and desserts purchased not only from bakers, caterers and confectioners, but from industrial exchanges in which private housekeepers of the most honorable grade have made an entering wedge as cooks for the public market.—F. A. Doughty, in *January Chautauquan*, as condensed for *Public Opinion*.

#### WHO PAYS THE TAXES?

The intimation is being quietly made that the wage-workers and laboring classes of the city have not quite the right to vote on the question of bonding the county for \$100,000 to buy a new court house site possessed by those who are property owners and direct tax payers. The assumption on which this intimation rests, that the man whose

name does not appear on the assessment rolls does not pay taxes, is entirely erroneous. On the contrary, the fact is that the average man whose name does not appear on the assessment rolls pays more in proportion to his means than those whose names do so appear.

Business is so organized that the property owner, unless he uses his own property, is able to transfer the tax levied upon him to the person to whom he sells. Speaking generally, the renter, not the landlord, pays the tax on the house he occupies and the customer, when he buys an article at the store, pays all the charges that have accumulated against that article, including taxes. The wage-worker generally purchases for consumption, and as such consumer the accumulated weight of the public burden falls upon him. It would be possible to have a tax system in which this condition did not prevail—for example, an income tax is not capable of being transferred—but under the system we now have taxation rests upon consumption, and in proportion as a man buys shelter or necessities of life, he contributes to the city, county, state and national governments. Moreover, inasmuch as the average wage-worker comes more nearly to expending his entire income than does the well-to-do or rich person, the wage-worker proportionately is more burdened by public taxes.

It would be well if all classes, especially the wage-workers themselves, more clearly perceived this simple and primary fact of taxation incidence. It would save us from many a foolish public act. As it is now many wage-workers really think it to their interest to have large public expenditures by moneys raised through tax levies. Forgetting that sooner or later the tax will come around to them as consumers to pay, they permit themselves to be deceived into thinking that the tax will rest only upon the citizens whose names appear on the assessment rolls. At a low estimate, nine-tenths of the tax which it is proposed to levy for the purchase of a new courthouse site will in the end be paid by those who have never been visited by an assessor.—*The Des Moines (Iowa) Leader*.

#### HAVE YOU PRESERVED YOUR RESPONSIBILITY?

An extract from a sermon on "An Inhuman Civilization," delivered by the Rev. Wm. T. Brown in Plymouth Congregational church, Rochester, N. Y., Jan. 22, 1899, as reported in *The Rochester Herald*.

I suppose most of us think that when in this republic we dispensed with a King altogether, we freed ourselves of the social danger which is involved in

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