

terms with the community by payment of rent into the common purse, *he earns the right to exclusive use of the common inheritance and to full private property in what remains of the product after rent to the community is paid.* Thus did George reconcile the right of the individual to undisturbed exclusive occupation of land, with the right of the community to the rent of land, the communal fund.

It still remains to be determined how this share of the product due to individual producers as a whole ought to be apportioned among them. George had unbounded faith in the beneficent workings of the natural order, *provided it be allowed to operate free from obstruction or interference*, and here, true to his principles, he held that if once we remove from the body politic those privileges and monopolies (of which private appropriation of land rent is the chief) whereby some gain wealth

without equivalent rendering of service, the working of the market under the influence of free supply and free demand will automatically apportion reward to individuals according to the service rendered by each. This is the natural function of the free market which the market of to-day fails to perform because it is not free. It fails because it is distorted by privileges and monopolies, enabling some to take out more than they put in, thus leaving others to put in more than they take out. Because of monopoly and privilege, the market of to-day does not perform its natural function of apportioning reward according to service rendered. Rid it of these distorting factors; let it function in liberty, and George was firmly convinced it would automatically act so as to apportion to every producer, high and low, reward according to the useful service he renders his fellow man.

## WHAT IS MORAL REARMAMENT ?

WHAT, we may ask, is the inner meaning of that rather cryptic expression "Moral Rearmament," which forms the text of some recent pamphlets, magazine articles and platform speeches? It is obvious that the words carry a mysteriously soothing message to the ears of many war-weary souls, suggesting as they do that our fears and terrors and the difficulties of international diplomacy may all be allayed and settled by purely spiritual means. They also call to mind the beautiful imagery of St Paul: "The whole armour of God," "The sword of the spirit," "The helmet of Salvation," "The breastplate of righteousness," and "Feet shod with a preparation of the Gospel of Peace." But, pragmatists as we all are, more or less, we are moved to ask the surely pertinent question as to what difference it will make in our actions or attitudes if on the one hand we accept this motto or war-cry, or if on the other hand we disregard it. In plain words what does it mean? Dr Frank Buchman or Mr H. W. Austin could probably enlighten us.

Meanwhile reflection seems to reveal a fundamental incongruity between the terms of the expression, and this is perhaps the reason why its sponsors do not wed them by the use of a hyphen. "How can two walk together unless they be agreed?" asked the wise man of old and left his question unanswered. If he lived to-day and asked himself how to make morality and armament keep step with each other, he would probably be baffled as we are. For the Moral Imperative, though it may begin its education of the Spirit on the lowly ground of a mere recognition of honesty as the best policy, tends always to rise to successively higher levels: trustfulness, kindly feelings, generosity and unselfishness; and reaches its highest manifestation in good-will to all mankind. Armament, on the other hand, follows a downward path. It begins in suspicion, it begets envy and jealousy, it vitiates the power of the judgment, it gravitates to the lower levels of uncharitableness and ill-will, and ultimately to hatred. How can it be possible to find any point at which two such disparate sentiments can be brought into touch? Like oil and water, they may be enclosed within the same container, but can never coalesce. To find a moral approach to the question of our attitude to armaments, we must look in a different direction.

That most lovable of philosophers, William James of Harvard, wrote an essay on "A moral equivalent of war," contending that all the alleged benefits of military training can be secured by recruiting our young men to take part in the necessary though arduous and disagreeable vocations that our social life involves, such as road-making, navvying, and even chimney-sweeping

and the cleaning of sewers. If our friends had woven their arguments and written their theses around the idea of "a moral substitute for armaments," even such friendly criticism as is offered above would have been avoided, and a more direct appeal made to the hearts and consciences of all who believe as Christians and rationalists that such a substitute is discoverable.

Whether this substitute when found can be expected to take definite form as an organization or to use material means in giving effect to its principles, it is difficult to imagine. If we ask with what weapons or moral substitutes for weapons we are to attack the embattled forces of unreason, ill-will and suspicion, we ought to be told plainly that there are none—other than their opposites and natural antidotes—sweet reasonableness, goodwill and trustfulness. While hesitating to trust ourselves in such a seemingly precarious and hitherto untried position we may make the discovery that there is an *antecedent condition* which is absolutely necessary to the efficient functioning of these immaterial weapons. That condition is that we shall be in a position to face the enemy not only with pure hearts but with clean hands. We must have expunged from our record all the injustices and offences against our fellow men that still stand to our charge. We must have earned for ourselves that most invaluable of credentials, a collective conscience void of offence. and then, we may perhaps hear from far across the centuries a not unfamiliar voice, saying: "And if thou bringest thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, go and be reconciled to thy brother, then come and offer thy gift."

This, then, is the searching question. Have our brothers ought against us? Have we established economic justice within our own borders? Can the finger of scorn no longer be pointed at us and our army of unemployed men and hungry families? Must we still blush in confessing that we have built up our economic system on a principle that condemns the majority of our people to perpetual poverty and insecurity? Are we prepared now to do what this paper has been urging month by month for over forty years—to restore to our disinherited brethren their rightful share in the bounty of the earth? Until we have done this we cannot expect the spiritual weapons we have been offered to do their work effectively. When, however, we *have* expiated our past injustices in the way we know of, we shall, in the words of Rabbi Ben Ezra, be

"Fearless and unperplexed when we wage battle next  
What weapons to select, what armour to indue."

ALEX MACKENDRICK.