

to prove the wisdom of great armaments, how can it be logically held that preparedness has been justified by the fact that the victors were possessed of great armaments? Can the means to a certain end be justified by both success and failure?

Is Force in the field of morals a corrective principle? If so, then whatever the outcome of the war shall be, it must be admitted that the victors were justified in their ante-bellum contentions. When we consider that before the breaking out of hostilities the differences between the nations were, in actuality, conflicting mental attitudes toward certain questions; and when we stop to realize that mental and physical attitudes are wholly unrelated to each other—the maximum of might being possible where there exists a minimum of mentality, how can it be held that might can be a just solution of a principle which involves mentality alone? In the event that war could have been averted by “reasoning together,” and that war followed BECAUSE certain nations were unwilling to accept the reasoning of others, how can beings of intelligence consent to dispense with reason, and invoke might instead, when it needs no argument to prove that might, as an arbiter, is wholly unrelated to mind? What position will a citizen of culture and mental equipment take in respect to an infringement of his rights by an opponent? Will he consent to submit his contention to the arbitrament of brawn as exhibited by his neighbor? No, indeed. But because he is a man of culture and mental equipment he will willingly submit his case to disinterested arbiters, of culture and mental equipment, and abide by the result. A nation that will not do likewise stands for those of its components who are equipped with a maximum of brawn and a minimum of mentality.

J. A. DEMUTH.



NATURAL LAW.

Fairhope, Ala., Jan. 20, 1915.

I believe that too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the importance of making all public functions and policies conform to the natural order inherent in the laws of the universe and that those laws permeate all creation, not only in the physical world, but the mental and moral as well, because while it is in a general way admitted, by all, it is in our practical considerations of public questions almost entirely ignored, and such questions are quite commonly considered in the light of expediency and selfish interests. Or else, as in politics, they are discussed from a partisan standpoint or class hatred. Thus we follow by-paths that lead into the wilderness of uncertainty and bitter contention.

There is no more wisdom or safety in considering public questions from any but the scientific standpoint than there is in our investigating questions of electrical problems, and the records of governments and political parties are full of the evidences of unwitting contact with live wires of revolutions and carnage as the result. Success full and satisfactory is never achieved in any line of human effort except that effort is put forth along the scientific lines of natural law. The more we emphasize that idea the sooner we will acquire the habit of right living for life is little more than habit anyway.

It has long seemed to me that an aid to the development of the proper discrimination and the scientific spirit in public affairs would be established if our editors and lexicographers and especially our newspapers, would discard the use of the term law, except when applied to the natural order. The indiscriminate use of the term law, for human enactments and the divine order, has unduly magnified the sanctity of the former, and degraded the importance of the latter. Let us recognize no law but the natural order and consider all human enactments as simply statutes temporarily employed as experimental human interpretations of the natural order, to be revised or repealed as soon as it becomes evident that they do not fully reflect that law.

J. BELLANGEE.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, March 23, 1915.

Commission on Industrial Relations.

Investigation of the rural land problem was begun at Dallas, Texas, on March 16 by the Commission on Industrial Relations. Governor James E. Ferguson was the first witness. He told about hardships and privations suffered by tenants which had come under his own personal observations. Asked by Chairman Walsh what chance a tenant in his own home county had to become a home owner the Governor answered: “Not one in fifty.” He had no other suggestion to offer than that some way be devised of securing the aid of capital to improve uncultivated land. Arthur Leseur, a banker of Minot, North Dakota, declared the sources of the farmers’ troubles to be an unjust credit system and laws which prevent co-operation among farmers to raise money on their business. On March 17 W. S. Noble of Rockdale, Secretary of the Land League of Texas, a tenant farmers’ organization, testified that two-thirds of the tenant farmers are economically submerged. That very week he had found two tenants in such distress that they were offering to give their children away. The next witness was L. T. Stewart of Savoy, a tenant farmer, who told the story of his struggles. He had come to Texas in 1903. Before that he had lived in Arkansas where he said he had raised from four to eight bales of cotton a year on thirty acres of rented land and ended the season with nothing. Since that time he has lived in many places, has produced at least 450 bales of cotton, several thousand bushels of corn, tried twice to buy a home and is now \$700 in debt and without means of making a living. His personal property had all been seized under foreclosure. His wife and six of his eight children