

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

single cent of revenue required for the nation, for the state, or for the municipality by a tax upon land values and upon land values only. That is single tax.

We propose leaving land in the private possession of individuals, with full liberty on their part to give, sell it or bequeath it; simply to levy on it for public uses a tax that shall equal the annual value of the land itself irrespective of the use made of it or the improvements on it.

We do not propose to assert equal rights to land by keeping land common, letting anyone use any part of it at any time. We do not propose the task, impossible in the present state of society, of dividing land in equal shares; still less the more impossible task of keeping it so divided.

We would accompany this tax on land values with the repeal of all taxes levied now on the products and processes of industry, which taxes, since they take from the earnings of labor, we hold to be infringements of the rights of property.

God cannot contradict Himself nor impose on His creatures laws that clash. If it be God's command to men that they should not steal—that is to say, that they should respect the right of property which each one has in fruits of his labor—all these taxes violate the moral law. They take by force what belongs to the individual alone; they give to the unscrupulous advantage over the scrupulous; they have the effect—nay, are largely intended—to increase the price of what some have to sell and others must buy.

They corrupt government; they make oaths a mockery; they shackle commerce; they fine industry and thrift; they lessen the wealth that men might enjoy and enrich some by impoverishing others.

I am convinced that single tax is the only remedy for existing evils and am willing to dedicate the balance of my life to advocating the cause.—Chicago Times-Herald.

WHAT THE NEWSPAPERS HAVE TO TELL US ABOUT TOM L. JOHNSON.

Tom Johnson is 45 years old. He was born in Kentucky, but his blood and parentage is of Virginia origin. The Johnsons of Virginia are as famous in their way as the Robinsons. One of Tom Johnson's grandfathers was a distinguished soldier under the first Harrison. Robert Johnson was a pioneer still honored by Kentuckians. Tom's father was a military man of great force of character.

Like innumerable other poor boys of

the world's history the young Johnson received his education in the common schools and then became a messenger boy for the Louisville Street Railway company. His marked characteristic at that time was—all ears and no mouth. He was a prodigious listener, but a very poor talker. The Louisville company was having a struggle to convince the general public that street cars ought to be patronized. On its own part the public was apparently convinced that street cars would never supplant omnibuses.

Johnson, first messenger, then clerk and finally an assistant in the one office of the Louisville company, had knowledge of all the obstacles which the corporation was forced to overcome. He mastered the details of a street railway business before he reached his majority. He listened and listened and said little until he began to feel the strength of his own will, and then he acted. His family was poor and he was one of its financial stays.

The Louisville road and certain other struggling western street roads were in great need of a new style of switches and certain improvements in the car machinery. No inventor had yet supplied these wants. Johnson tried his own hand at designing what was needed, and as rapidly as he believed that he had succeeded, patented his discoveries. He went to bed one night to awake in the morning to find himself famous and on the way to wealth. His nickel-in-the-slot box for collecting fares was a success. His automatic switch was adopted by all the street roads at once.

At 22 his patents had brought Tom Johnson sufficient money with which to place his parents in comfortable circumstances and to enable him to buy the only street railway that Indianapolis possessed at that time. The Indianapolis cars were then pulled by mules and the service was wretched. Johnson supplanted the mules with horses, painted the cars, introduced comfortable seats, uniformed his employes and by the attractive appearances of all his property brought the public to rapid and profitable patronage of his investment. With the money he made from this line he purchased a bankrupt horse line in Cleveland. . . .

Strange as it may seem, Tom Johnson carried on this fortune-making without making bitter enemies. He was shrewd, calculating, a hard worker and a hard hitter, but no one was to be found at that time nor now who cherishes against him the memory of one treacherous action or the doing of a thing that could be called unmanly.

He fought his battles in the open. He kept his temper when he was the hardest pressed. He always paid close attention to his digestion. He never hurried as nervous men hurry. If there was seeming occasion for worry he laughed. If business cares should have kept him wakeful at night he slept. His equipoise was and is marvelous. . . .

The patent steel rail used in the automatic switches invented by Johnson was not approved of by the big rolling mills of those days. They did not believe the rail could be made a success, and were not inclined to make them. Johnson desired the rail for use on his lines, but it was with difficulty that he persuaded the mills to turn them out. Once though that any considerable number were on the market the demand for them became great, and the mills could not produce them fast enough. The price charged for them was high. Johnson objected to this. His objections were of no avail.

Then it was that he organized the Johnson steel works at Lorain, O., and Johnstown, Pa. After that he manufactured his own rails at prices that met his own views. The previously greedy rolling mill owners were forced to bring their prices down to his or quit the market.

From owning the street railway lines of Indianapolis and Cleveland Johnson became the chief of the system of trolley lines which now center at Allentown, Pa., and which gridiron all of that section of Pennsylvania. Later with a brother he purchased a controlling interest in the Nassau Electric company, of Brooklyn. On this line he established a five-cent fare to Coney Island. In time he owned nearly all of the Brooklyn lines, with extensive holdings in the street railway systems of Detroit, Chicago and Boston.

The determined character of the man is shown in the story told of his sale of his Brooklyn lines to the Whitney-Flower syndicate. At that time he was the master mind of the 17 street railway systems of Brooklyn. He was asked by representatives of the syndicate desiring to purchase what he considered the upset price to be. He named the sum—a total represented by millions of dollars. An afternoon was agreed upon when the syndicate and he should meet and reach a final settlement. The time came and \$200,000,000 of traction capital intimated to Mr. Johnson that his price was too high. He was affable, but unyielding.

"It is my price, gentlemen," he said. "Not a dollar less can I take for the property."