

is expanding alarmingly under the encouragement of a subsidised guaranteed price.

Then there is the worry about international trade and overseas markets. Here we have the fascinating situation in which, on the one hand, the U.S. is threatening the E.E.C. with reprisals in the shape of withholding "Foreign Aid" against the market's exclusion of U.S. agricultural products, and on the other Australia being caustic to the U.S. about American quotas and prohibitions against Australian exports — while both maintain their own tariffs and indulge in pious talk about "improving world trade".

Occupying large areas of the Sydney daily press has been the N.S.W. Labour Government's rent restriction legislation, the Landlord and Tenant Act. Certain clauses of the highly contentious Act expired at the end of the year and the Government took the opportunity, not only to try to renew the life of the clauses but to add some new provisions, making a few minor concessions as "pill sweeteners". The Government's majority in the Lower House assured the passage of the new Bill, but the story in the Legislative Council was another matter. There, the Opposition, with the assistance of several so-called

"rebel" members of the Labour Party, threw the Bill out, to which the redfaced Government, led by its Minister of Justice (sic) threatened Orders-in-Council to "correct" the position. It has not yet dared to do this in the face of strong criticism from all sections of the community and warnings from members of the legal profession. The Bill has been withdrawn while the Government sucks its burnt fingers and thinks up the next move. Meanwhile, the two lapsed clauses make it no longer necessary for (1) a landlord to have owned "controlled" premises for two years before taking eviction proceedings; or (2) to provide other "suitable" accommodation for an evicted tenant of "controlled" premises. Meanwhile, too, the Home and Property Owners Rights Association is preparing to challenge the validity of the Landlord and Tenant Act in the courts, and letters pour into the newspapers from the victims of the invidious and inept legislation, including recently-arrived migrants, whose views of Australia are being sadly modified by their experience in seeking homes. Meanwhile, also, the *Sydney Morning Herald* could report "£A42,506,000 Building Boom in Small Sydney Area"; the area being part of the business heart of the city. Banks and insurance companies have no worries about where to lay their heads.

Letter to the Editor

SIR,—May I say how much I always enjoy the Personally Speaking articles in your journal, perhaps because they show so clearly the wide appeal of Henry George's ideas. I particularly enjoyed the January contribution (*The Road to Realisation*), and before proceeding further would mention that I have recently used this article as an introduction to Georgeist philosophy to one or two enquirers.

As, however, the writer says that he accepts the idea of a "just war," I feel prompted to answer.

And yet it is not so much the idea of a just war that I question, as what are the "just" weapons that should be used to fight it. The conventional weapons of war are material, but—to make a gross understatement—these are too clumsy ever to come to grips on the real stage, where it is ideas that are at war with ideas.

There is no need to cite extreme instances, such as Hiroshima, because any occasion of resorting to material weapons is a mistake—unless you are simply trying to find out which sword is the stronger.

None of us, of course, is able to

say how he would act in any sudden situation. But of this we may be sure: that it will depend largely on how we have thought and acted in the quite ordinary moments of our life, when we had the time consciously to direct our thoughts and actions.

We become adept at the war of ideas in proportion as we are disenchanted with material weapons. But this is not all; for we find that if we go in this direction, other changes come about in our lives. For instance, it is impossible to continue thinking for long in this way without being attracted, sooner or later, to vegetarianism (to which Mr. Carter was sympathetic but did not embrace). This leads one in turn to appreciate the value of whole-foods, and our need to consume the greater part of our food uncooked. Further by doing this, one avoids a great deal of unnecessary illness; and should the need arise, the healing power of nature, tried and tested, makes one ever more sceptical of orthodox medical ways.

In case you should think that I am straying wide of Henry George's philosophy, may I say with all due

humility that in my view I am sticking very much to the point. There is a passage in *The Condition of Labour* that has always stood out in my mind. Henry George says that of the two sides to his reform — the ethical and the economic — the ethical is the more important, and that in his opinion it will need "nothing less than the religious conscience" to bring it about.

But the "religious conscience" cannot be sought in any one sphere of life, it must encompass the whole of life—it cannot do less. And for me the attraction of Henry George's ideas, and the attraction of pacifism, of vegetarianism and of nature cure is one and the same—the attraction of non-violence. Schweitzer has very well called it "reverence for life," and any treatment other than nature's is violence to the body—the thalidomide tragedy being, like Hiroshima, only an extreme instance of its kind.

All of these ideas are at war with their opposites, not because of any "just" cause, but by reason of their very nature, as is the way with ideas. They do not bear any material weapons, but instead a universal message of "peace, goodwill toward men."

Yours faithfully,

SHIRLEY-ANNE HARDY.

London W.11.