

Here we are at the turn of the year—hope strong in our hearts that the months to come may bring peace to a war-torn world. It is no time to brood on the sad past, for face our part in the bitter present and shape a better future we must! Ours to defend the democratic way of life, to fight to hold what political freedom man has thus far won—as a means to the economic freedom we dream of.

So, united we must stand, pool our strength and putting aside differences as to ways and means, seek in each other only the great purpose that is our common dedication. For never were the foes of freedom so clearly defined; never were the inten-

tions of the "robbers and murderers" so sharply marked as in this most terrible and most widespread of all wars. Could Henry George express himself as of today, I am convinced his opinion would be that the physical aggression of totalitarian nations must be physically stopped since, until that be done, there is no chance for economic justice.

For those who have not realized that Henry George's love for freedom was greater even than his abhorrence of war, it might be wise to quote from "A Perplexed Philosopher" (page 81).

"The application of ethics, like the applications of mechanics, or chemistry, or any other science or body of laws, must always be relative, in the sense that one principle or law is to be taken in consideration with other principles or laws: so that conduct that would have the sanction of ethics where one is beset by robbers or murderers might be very different from the conduct that ethics would sanction under normal peaceful conditions."

Ibid, page 203: "Since the ethical commands, 'Thou shalt do no murder' and 'Thou shalt not steal' mean also, thou shalt not permit thyself to be murdered or stolen from, the justification of defensive war needs no invention of relative ethics. Nor is this needed to justify under extraordinary circumstances what under ordinary circumstances would be violations of the right of property."

Ibid, page 178: "In case of necessity, such as war, the power of taking anything is habitually exercised, and ships, horses, railways, provisions, and even men are taken for public uses. The power to do this is a power incident to the supreme authority and at times necessary to society."

"When, in 1889, Johnstown, Pa., was cut off from the rest of the world by the flood that destroyed preexisting organization, a British subject, Arthur J. Moxham, was placed in charge by what a Quaker would call 'the sense of the meeting.' His first acts were to seize all food, to destroy all liquor, and to put every able-bodied man to work, leaving the matter of compensation to be determined afterwards. He voiced the will of the society, driven by crushing disaster into a supreme effort for self-preservation, and the man who had resisted his orders would, if need be, have been shot."

Ibid, page 203: "Was not Arthur Moxham acting, in the name of the reason and the conscience of the community, on the same eternal principles of right and wrong that in ordinary conditions would have forbidden these things? What in form was a denial of the rights of property and person was in its essence respect for life and property."

"But while changing conditions may change the application of ethical principles, it is only as the change in a ship's course turns the compass-card in her binnacle. The change is in the conditions, not in the principles."

And so, facing conditions that will test men's souls, we, followers of Henry George, because we do know the cause and the cure for war, have the responsibility of helping shape the conditions that will follow the cessation of war. Time, being of the essence, we dare not waste in personal disagreements—but if, keeping ever conscious of the "long view" taken by the Wise and Understanding Ones, we shoulder our tremendous obligation and "fight the good fight"—the year 1942 may possibly be a happy one.

Anna George de Mille
New York City