government—and should actually do so—in return for the resulting social values within the territory of Cleveland?

Do you ask what I mean by social values? I don't mean those conveniences that everybody would have at will—the convenience of driving through the streets or of passing one way or another on the sidewalks or of going into the parks, nor any such intangible privileges. The social values I mean are those that are measurable financially. The contractor who should take these as his pay for giving you good city government would get inordinately rich out of his contract. The better the government he gave you the richer he himself would be; for the better the government the larger the measurable social values.

What do I mean by measurable social values? Everybody would understand if I were talking about private investments instead of public revenues. By measurable social values I mean those social values that are measured by the selling price of building lots. The values of building lots rise and fall according to the size and prosperity of a city and the kind of government it has. If you should turn your city affairs over to a contractor requiring him on the one hand to give you the best possible government, and giving him in return the annual ground rent value of the site of your city, his pay would be the earnings of —well, of whom? of what? Of the manufacturers? of the storekeepers? of the printers? of the wage workers? of any of the workers of Cleveland whether employer or employe? Not at all —not as workers, not as individuals. Would your contractor's pay, then, be the earnings of the men of Cleveland and New York and Europe who own the city of Cleveland? By no means. These do not even help to give value to the site of Cleveland—not by owning it at any rate. It is Cleveland herself that makes the site of Cleveland valuable. If, then, you gave your civic contractor the values of the city of Cleveland by yearly amounts you would be giving him the annual earnings of Cleveland, wouldn't you? Well, why give those earnings to a contractor? Why not make Cleveland her own contractor? Why not let Cleveland govern herself and live upon her own earnings?

That would be scientific. It would be on the "quid pro quo" principle. Every man that paid Cleveland for a location would pay in proportion to the business and other social advantages which that location gave him. He would pay in proportion to the value that Cleveland is giving—not has given but gives now—to that location. If public revenues were got in this way there would no longer be enforced contributions for public revenues. Everybody would pay in proportion to the financial benefits the government gave him. It could not be any longer said that taxes are levied or collected regardless of the special benefits which their expenditure confers. Public revenues would be collected and paid in proportion to benefits.

In addition to all the rest, the "ground hog" would be dispossessed. This is where the question of public revenues links arms with social health. If the "ground hogs" were driven out, ground users would take their places. Think what that would mean. It would mean abundant business and abundant employment. And this is only another way of saying that the ghost of bankruptcy would no longer haunt business men and the wolf would stop howling at the door of the worker.

HIS TROPHY.

H. J. Dawtrey in Magazine of The Free Religious Movement, Dundee, Scotland.

Scene—An English Hospital: A Highlander with a German Helmet.

"So you've brought back his helmet, Sandie, my man;
And you killed him, I guess? It's a trophy you've won?"

* * * * * * *

"Na-a, na-a!" replied Sandie, "that wasna the plan;
The man was a freend, gin ye'll wait till I'm done.
I dressed his wound an' he sorted mine.
No' a word could we speak, the ane tae the ither;
But I lookit at him, an' I kent him a brither;
An' I gid him my bonnet, in token, ye ken.
He lauched, an' he grippit my han'—an' then
He gied me his helmet; an' it cam' tae my mind,
Here's a trophy, thocht I, of a newfangled kind.
I dressed his wound, an' he dressit mine;
No' a word could we speak, the ane tae the ither;
But tho' he was German, I kent him a brither."

BOOKS

OUR DAUGHTER REPUBLIC.

Liberia. By Frederick Starr. Published by the Author, University of Chicago, Chicago. 1913. Price, $1.00 net.

The little nations of the earth suffer through the big people's war. Just a note now and then in the world news tells their plight: How no merchant ships have put into port for many weeks either to fetch or carry; how all the accustomed comforts are gone; and how longer isolation threatens ruin and death.

The Republic of Liberia is one of these sufferers, too far away and too weak-voiced to be heard above Europe's battle-din. But this should not prevent Americans from remembering the kinship and extending practical sympathy. Professor Starr's handbook of the country,—its topography, climate and population, its political story and financial struggles and present needs—and his ap-

preciation of the nation's worth to Africa and the rest of the world, are both a revelation and an appeal to the true chivalry that is part of American democracy.

The only fault to be found with the book by most readers is that—in spite of its having been written by a traveler thither—it creates out of the unlonged-for unknown a new land desirable to see and impossible to visit.

A. L. G.

PAMPHLETS

In the Service of Peace.

The American School Peace League, organized in 1908, to promote "through the schools and the educational public of America the interests of international justice and fraternity," has published a little essay by its secretary, Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, 405 Marlborough St., Boston, on "The War: What Should be Said About It in the Schools?" Mrs. Andrews believes that those superintendents who, at the beginning of the school year and at the first ghastly tidings of the war, requested that it be not discussed in the school-room should now, "when the significance of this world object-lesson comes more and more into light," not lose this "supreme moment for teaching history and examining into the causes of the catastrophe, the meaning of militarism, and the principles that should govern the terms of peace.

The report for 1914 of the work of the World Peace Foundation (40 Mt. Vernon St., Boston)—whose creator and endower, Edwin Ginn, died a year ago—is an inspiring record of international labor for permanent peace. So inconspicuously and quietly does it co-operate with all the great agencies for peace that even the regular recipients of its scholarly and invaluable pamphlets, will be amazed at the scope of the Foundation's influence as shown in these reports of its chief workers. To take one of many instances: How many of David Starr Jordan's enthusiastic auditors know that for their much appreciated opportunity to hear him, they are partly indebted to the Foundation? That the Foundation is alive to the European war's greatest danger for the United States, Mr. Edwin D. Mead shows in closing his annual address as chief director: "The militarist's argument that great armaments are peace preservers, has absolutely broken down. These have proved, as we have so solemnly warned the nations, the great menace and not the true defense; and sobered men everywhere now see that the only possible solution is that which we have steadily urged. There are those who will not see it; and we deceive ourselves if we do not prepare for a stiff and long campaign against a powerful party which still strives to make the country draw the false lesson and push it, by demand for great armaments, into intensifying here the very evil which has wrought the ruin in Europe. . . . . It would not be less than a crime against humanity if we, at such an hour, safest of nations and never so safe as in the long exhaustion of all the European nations which must follow the war, should be betrayed into leading or supporting the forces of reaction, instead of leading bravely in the policy of progress."

A. L. G.

PERIODICALS

Toward Permanent Peace.

The Woman's Peace Party, headquarters of which are Hull House, Chicago, is prominent in The (New York) Independent of January 25. All women readers are urged to join, and the remarkable leaflet sent out by the party just after its organization on January 10 is printed in full. For the same Independent, one of the Peace Party's four vice-chairmen, Anna Carlin Spencer, writes a fine article entitled "Women and War," illustrated by portraits of Jane Addams, the Peace Party's Chairman, and a group of its other officers, including Carrie Chapman Catt and Alice Thacher Post. "All enlightened and free women," writes Mrs. Spencer, "especially those of neutral countries, should make a protest, compelling in its solemn appeal, against war as the supreme outrage on the moral nature of humanity. On a sure sense of ethical values rests all the permanent progress of the race; war, and the things that make for war, give a dual and self-contradictory direction to the idealism of youth, and to the ethical judgment of maturity. . . . The dependence upon "the judgment of battle," among nations as among individuals, has long been the supreme atheism; it denies the sovereignty of truth and justice."*

There has been formed in Holland, as reported in the January Advocate of Peace (Boston), the Dutch Anti-War Council (Nederlandsche Anti-Oorlog Raad, 31 Theresiastraat, The Hague) composed of representatives of all organizations in Holland which are interested in a lasting peace at the end of this war. The Council states its objects in a manifesto to the Dutch people: "(1) A study of the causes which have led to the present war and which might lead to new wars in the future. (2) An examination of the means by which a conclusion of the present war might be promoted and a peace concluded which would not carry the seeds of new wars in it. (3) A study of the consequences of the present war on economic, moral, and intellectual aspects of life. (4) A consideration of the reforms which will have to be made in national and international relations so as to prevent wars in the future. (5) The formation of a strong national and international organization of all pacifists."

A. L. G.

A Triumph of Pacificism.

In "The last phase of the great war, the German invasion of America," Ray Stannard Baker, in a fanciful sketch in the American Magazine for January, gives a clever account of the practical workings of pacificism. After Germany had triumphed over the Allies she realized that her victory would not be complete until she had subdued the United States,

*See Public of January 29 at page 110.