

become a serious problem in the near future. It says:

Possibly in one generation the same problem is likely to be presented in the Mississippi valley that Denmark wrestled with 100 years ago. And Iowa and all States situated like Iowa, may have as much difficulty in shifting from non-resident landed estates to peasant proprietorship as Denmark had; in fact, they may find it as impossible to shift without a revolution, as England is finding it, either in Ireland or at home. There is a much more important lesson for the new West in Prof. Kennedy's letter in yesterday's Register and Leader than appears at a glance. No land, however fertile, will ever be successfully and profitably cultivated by tenants. The land must be owned by the men who till it, and in the end will be owned by them if national prosperity endures. While the country is yet new and the fertility of the soil seemingly inexhaustible, the problem of land ownership is not pressing. But the benefit that may be derived from the experience of others is the ability that is acquired to foresee unfavorable conditions before they are pressing and to ward them off. Prof. Kennedy's letters will contain no more valuable hint to the farmers of Iowa than the hint given to them in the experience of Denmark, to make it their main business in life to own their own farms.

This tendency is likely to become more marked as the field for investments is limited through the centralization of wealth. So far, the men of great wealth have found outlet for investment in industrial enterprises, but it is only a question of time when the Rockefellers, Morgans, Goulds and their associates will turn their attention to the soil. They must find a place to invest their rapidly accumulating incomes and the creating of great estates is certain to result. As a rule, the tenant farmers of to-day rent from retired farmers, but it is only a question of time when the landlord will become distinct and entirely separate from the farmers as a class.—Milwaukee Daily News.

BURMAH BEFORE THE BRITISH OCCUPATION.

The most successful of the world's great visionaries seems to have been Buddha. In Burmah, where the faith in his doctrine has been kept comparatively unceiled, something like an ideal state of society has been realized for centuries past. With the British occupation of the country I fear the sorrows of the Burmese have already begun. Until we invaded their land and stole it from them they managed to exist without a military system, without a state church, without an aristocracy, without stock exchanges, or gambling halls, without land monopolists,

and without poverty. Mr. Fielding, in his inspiring book, "The Soul of a People," which has never been refuted, states that before the British occupation there was no man, woman or child in Burmah who had not enough to eat and wherewithal to be decently housed and clothed. Though there were degrees of wealth there was no pauperism, and if one man became more fortunate than his neighbor by reason of his superior ability or business capacity he devoted his surplus wealth to public purposes without a murmur, and as a matter of course. If he brought out a new invention he published the fact to all the world, that the whole community and not himself exclusively might profit by it. Moreover, the system of the administration of justice was based upon the principle not of revenge, but of reformation. Offenders against the laws of the community were not subjected to cruel punishments, but taught to be better men and women. To take life, whether of man or beast, on any pretense, was a crime; licentiousness did not exist, and the fear of death was unknown. These were the people whom we marched against with horse, foot and artillery.

Our excuse for this high-handed procedure, which inspired Mr. Kipling to sing "On the Road to Mandalay," was simply a lie. The people at home were assured that the king of Burmah was a drunken despot, who wasted the substance of his people in riotous living. Yet Mr. Fielding who, I understand, has held a high official position in Burmah, declares that King Theebau strictly adhered to the Buddhist teaching on temperance, and allowed no intoxicants to enter either his kingdom or his palace.

For Mr. Kipling to glorify a military expedition such as the invasion of Burmah only proves that even an alleged poet can sometimes be destitute of the moral sense. Nothing can be more cowardly than to invade a country whose people are prohibited by their religion to fight.

There are, however, ruby mines in Burmah, and that explains the whole disgraceful business.—A. E. Fletcher, in the New Age, of London.

THE PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE MOSAIC LAND LAWS.

It is plain that the method adopted in the commonwealth of Israel for the practical assertion of equal right to the use of the earth, however good for the time and place, could not be followed in a modern nation, with its complicated social organization and

its varied agricultural, mining, manufacturing and commercial interests. But "God fulfills Himself in many ways," and it is quite possible to believe that the Mosaic land laws were absolutely right in principle, and also right in method for their own time, without thinking it either desirable or possible to graft the details of early Hebrew legislation on a later and alien western civilization.

Although the actual division of the land in equal shares among a people is one of the possible ways of asserting the doctrine of equal rights, it ceases to be a convenient or a just way as soon as civilization passes beyond the pastoral and agricultural stage. The special position of the tribe of Levi in the Hebrew State led to the introduction of modifications which directly suggest the methods of modern land reform. Fortunately it is quite possible to assert an equal and common right without resorting to equal physical division. If a father gives his children a cake, they naturally assert their equal rights by cutting it up into equal pieces. If he gives them a pony, they divide, not the pony, but the use of it. If he leaves them a house in equal shares, they may either divide the occupancy of the house equally, or divide it unequally according to the need of each for accommodation, paying the rental value into a common fund, from which each takes equal shares; or they may let it altogether to some one else and divide the rent. A proposal to divide a railway—permanent way, buildings and rolling stock—equally among the shareholders, would meet with scant favor at a shareholders' meeting; they know well that they divide the railway best by dividing its earnings in the shape of dividend. So with the land. It is still true that all men have equal rights to the use of land. It is no longer true that men all require to use land in equal portions, or that equal portions of land are even approximately of equal value. We can now assert our equal rights in land by having the rent of land paid into a common fund, and either divided equally or spent for the common benefit. The modern method of removing our neighbor's landmark is to put the rental value of land into private pockets instead of into the public exchequer, and the first step, in modern times, towards reasserting the ancient and eternal principles which underlay Mosaic land laws is the taxation of land values.—The London Echo.