

we pat ourselves on the back and congratulate ourselves that we are not like the uncivilized people of the early ages. . . . Imagine the people of a few centuries hence reading how we overworked our publicity department telling folks how highly civilized we were, meanwhile spending one penny for public education against 25 for perfecting machinery to kill each other with. Or, fancy the hearty "ha-ha" that will some day greet the account of the Southern cotton planters of 1908, who were forced to cheat nature and turn under a portion of her bountiful cotton crop in order to keep up the price of cotton; or the fruit jobbers of California, for instance, who dumped a shipload of bananas into the sea to maintain market prices, while ragged men sneaked along the gutters picking up banana peelings and eating them with relish. Verily, our vaunted civilization needs a brisk currying, for it "sho' is" shaggy in spots.

+ +

The Land Value Question in Great Britain.

Manchester Guardian (Lib.), Aug. 19.—What are the things to be attained by land valuation and rating reform? They are four: (1) The price at which a public body can purchase a site must bear a fixed relation to the value at which it is assessed for rating; (2) in valuing land for rating purposes its value as a site must be estimated separately from the value of buildings and other improvements upon it; (3) the site value (thus arrived at) of all land, whether occupied or not, should be rated (excepting any desirable exceptions such as parks; (4) the value of buildings and other improvements on land should as far as possible be exempted from rating. These are the four essential points, the second, which looks abstract and uninviting in itself, being the indispensable key to the three others, whose urgency forces itself on our attention from every side. * *

* The Government deserve credit for their Scottish land values bill, but it is difficult to see any reason, except the sheer pressure of other eagerly desired measures, why an English bill has not yet been introduced to keep it company. The House of Lords finds it much easier to slaughter such bills singly, and provokes a far less powerful agitation by doing so. The question of land valuation touches them very intimately, and may well provide, as Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman seems to have thought, the best ground to fight them upon; but if so, the fight must be early and seriously taken in hand. There is a close parallelism between the two questions, for while the House of Lords may be the greatest obstacle to immediate legislative reform, the greatest obstacles to administrative reform—to the bringing of legislative benefits home to the people—are the land monopoly and the rating injustice.

+ +

The "Iowa Idea."

The (Johnstown, Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), August 7.—What is this "Iowa idea" that is now sweeping the country and seems certain to hold it in its grasp until Nov. 3 next? Is it an "Iowa idea" which has for its ultimate aim the accomplishment of something for Iowa alone? That is very far from the truth. . . . The "Iowa idea" is not exclusively an

"Iowa idea." The idea is the conviction of great masses of voters in every State of the union that the Republican policy of tariff protection is maintained exclusively for the benefit of special privilege; that it is maintained for the purpose of affording monopoly the power to rob the farmer, the laboring man and the consumer generally; that it is maintained for the benefit of the vicious trusts; that it is maintained for the purpose of stifling competition, forcing the farmer to sell in an open market at the market prices of the world and compelling him to buy in a closed market at abnormally high prices; that it is maintained for the purpose of forcing labor to compete for employment in a market which invites the cheapest labor of Europe and compels it to buy the necessities of life at prices which reduce it to want. The "Iowa idea" is that the tariff is a conscienceless humbug, that it is destructive of the national welfare, that it is the means by which a few are amassing tremendous fortunes at the expense of the rest of the 80,000,000 people, and that it is a vicious form of special privilege which affords the hateful trusts the power to control the law-making bodies of the country and subvert the will of the people. The history of 1892, it signs may be accepted as indicating anything, is going to be repeated in 1908. It was the manufacturing and agricultural States that registered their will against the tariff in 1892. It is inevitable that the manufacturing and agricultural States will join hands again this year. Their interests are identical. The tariff is as much of a blight to labor in the cities as it is to industry on the farms. Its victims are in every precinct of the Union. It sits in a high place with poisoned tentacles that reach out in every conceivable direction and viciously assault humanity, beginning at the cradle of the infant and not stopping until the clods have sealed the coffin in the earth. The "Iowa idea" is that this unspeakable crime shall cease. The "Iowa idea," which is an idea not confined to Iowa, is that this shall be a government of the people, by the people, for the people—"special privileges to none, equal rights to all."

+ +

The Minor Parties.

The (New York) Nation (ind.), August 20.—Hearst, Debs (whose followers see visions of a million votes), Watson, and the Prohibitionists will probably poll between a million and a million and a half of votes. What effect will that number of neutralized ballots have on the fortunes of Mr. Bryan? We say Mr. Bryan, because we assume that the minor parties, embodying as they do various degrees and shades of radicalism, have been mainly recruited from Mr. Bryan's radical Democracy; and that any large gains of Debs or Watson will be made at the expense of the Democratic party. Mr. Hearst, indeed, is in the campaign with the unconcealed purpose of hurting Mr. Bryan. . . . Were the campaign at the outset not restricted to a comparatively narrow fighting ground, the Hearst influence might count for more. But in spite of iridescent visions of Democratic victory on the Pacific coast, it is obvious that Bryan's hopes abide chiefly in the Mississippi valley. California is practically conceded to the Republicans; New York is likely to go Republican unless the local leaders are