APPENDIX

A. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

SOCIETY: All people, taken generally.

ECONOMIC SOCIETY: If it can be considered separately from Society, means all people engaged in the production of wealth or the rendering of services. Practically all people working do so in a realm of "specialization and exchange." Each person tends to do one kind of work, becoming relatively expert in it; he exchanges the results of his efforts for those of others, thus supplying all his own needs indirectly. Expressed in another way: All men put the products of their labor into a great pool of economic values, the market; then each draws out from the market just what he needs to supply his own wants. Obviously, justice demands that in the long run each shall draw out not more than he has put in. This is kept track of by the use of money and by the constant accounting of credits and indebtednesses of all people.

POLITICAL ECONOMY: The science of the nature, production and distribution of wealth in a society practicing specialization and exchange. It is not supposed to be any part of politics.

Having to do with people and their varying natures, it is not one of the exact sciences, like mathematics or physics, but deals with general tendencies. We cannot say that under certain circumstances such and such will always take place; practically always we are limited, in truth, to saying that there will be a tendency for such and such to take place. Yet economic tendencies are powerful and of vast total effect. Millions of people, twenty-four hours a day, are acted upon by the same forces, the same desire to get all they can in the easiest way.

Even lying awake nights, people "figure all the angles" of every situation and opportunity. So what we can style only as rules or tendencies are of very great and usually predictable force and direction, making the "laws" of political economy worthy of the same respect as those in other sciences.

This "total effect" of general tendencies is the basis of one of the great sayings of Franklin: "Little leaks sink great ships".

ECONOMICS: The science of the conservation of scarce means, of the avoidance of waste, of attaining the greatest effect from the least exertion or expenditure. (Perhaps the "political economy" of a one-man society!)

WEALTH: All material things produced by human labor for the satisfaction of human wants. It is not a class of people. It does not include money or credits, which are merely evidences of claims, on the part of their possessors, to the products of the

labor of others; it is the actual, tangible goods themselves. It includes "consumers goods" -- food, clothing, shelter, and all other direct, material needs. It includes "producers goods" -- capital, hereinafter defined.

LAND: All the material universe available to man, exclusive of his own products. Practically speaking, it is the surface of the earth and all materials upon it. It is the gifts of Nature to Man just as we find them. It includes every class of land from city to wilderness, and considered separately from any improvements made by Man. It is not to be confused with any part of wealth or capital, no matter how "wealthy" a man may be by its possession, and no matter how logically a capitalist might count his land as part of his business assets.

LABOR: All human exertion, mental or physical, managerial or otherwise effective or useful, in the production of wealth. It is the entire human and active factor in production.

(Land and labor are the two fundamental factors.)

CAPITAL: That part of wealth used in the production of more wealth. It is "producers' goods" -- not money, but actual, tangible, material things themselves, typically the tools, machinery, buildings, stocks of goods, etc., used by industry and commerce.

Capital does not employ labor. Labor produces and employs capital.

Land, labor, and capital are the FACTORS OF PRODUCTION.

Rent, wages, and interest are the AVENUES OF DISTRIBUTION.

RENT: Payment for the use of land. It can be made in periodic payments, perpetually, which are usually paid in money but which, in the case of agricultural lands, are often paid in a share of the crop. Rent can also be paid, once and for all, in the shape of a purchase price whose amount is likely to approximate the capitalization of the total periodic payments for a year but possibly modified by speculative considerations. In economics generally, and in this essay exclusively, "rent" means payment for land only.

WAGES: Payment for labor. Since most men work for employers, they are usually paid in money; such payments include not only wages for common, physical effort, but also salaries, commissions, store owners profits, etc. -- any payment at all for services rendered by people in the production of wealth or services.

Wages also include the products of a man working for himself, producing goods for his own use, in his own shop, in his

own garden, in his own woods. The importance of this is commonly overlooked in social philosophy.

INTEREST: Payment for the use of capital.

The last seven terms defined can well be grouped as follows:

Factors of Production	The Product	Avenues of Distribution
LAND		RENT
LABOR	WEALTH	WAGES
CAPITAL		INTEREST

MISCELLANEOUS

PRODUCTION: This includes all work or services required to extract raw materials from the earth, to transport, refine, manufacture, package, warehouse, store, retail, display, or otherwise deliver goods to ultimate consumers.

IMPROVEMENTS: Include buildings, grading, fertilizing, fencing, or other products of labor put on land to facilitate its use.

PATH OF PROGRESS: Lands lying in the immediate vicinity and direction of expansion of populous places; lands bearing natural resources for which society has growing uses; talents of people for which there is a certain and growing demand. This is a term devised for use in this essay.

REAL ESTATE: Land and Buildings taken together.

(CAPITALISM is a term used by most people in referring to our philosophy of free enterprise and private ownership and management of capital, presumably in competition with others and for profit. I do not consider it a properly descriptive term and so do not use it, any more than we would, except in humor, use O'Henry's designation of Manhattan: "An island off the coast of New Jersey.")

EXPEDIENT: This word is herein used with its favorable connotation, meaning simple, practical, and workable.

B. BASIC LAWS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY

1. MAN SEEKS TO SATISFY HIS DESIRES WITH THE LEAST EXERTION.

2. MAN'S DESIRES INCREASE WITH THE POWER TO SATISFY THEM.

3. THE LAW OF RENT.

Rent has been defined as payment for the use of land. It is of value to understand what facts tend to determine the amount of rent, or, economic rent.

Within any interdependent, economic, trading area, it can be imagined that certain total amounts of land would be required for each of the many different lines of productive work to meet the total demands for the respective products. In agriculture can be found a good example. Consider a country like ours, in which there is much more land of every kind than is yet needed.

The total amount of land that must be cultivated to meet the demand for, say, wheat, would include lands of differing degrees of productivity. Soil fertility, workable terrain, and convenience of location would all contribute to overall, productive advantage.

All men, in competition with one another, seeking to obtain good lands, will, in the long run, tend to offer to pay rents -- in periodic payments or in purchase prices -- roughly corresponding to the overall advantages, as these are measured by productive results of equal expenditures of effort.

Suppose that, on the poorest class of land resorted to -- at the MARGIN so-called -- for which no rent could be demanded because of the superfluity of that quality of land, a given application of labor and capital could produce 10 bushels per acre. Suppose, too, that on the very best land the same application could produce 100 bushels; also, that on all intermediate qualities, correspondingly intermediate yields would be produced.

No rent could be asked for marginal land, as any producer could take up such land for himself free. For land producing 20 bushels per acre, or 10 bushels more than is produced on the poorest land in use, a rent measured by the value of this excess produce could be asked by the owner, and paid, as an economic proposition, by the user. In the same way, rents could be asked and economically paid, as follows: the value of 30 bushels for land producing 40; 50 bushels for 60 bushel land; 90 bushels for 100 bushel land -- the best in this example.

Rents and productivities may not correspond exactly to this rule everywhere and always, because of many factors; but, due to the tendency of all men to offer to pay whatever the special advantages of different lands are worth, we can make the following general statement:

> THE RENT OF LAND IS DETERMINED BY THE EXCESS OF ITS PRODUCE OVER THAT WHICH THE SAME APPLICATION OF LABOR AND CAPITAL CAN SECURE FROM THE LEAST PRODUCTIVE LAND IN USE.

This general rule is accepted by all economists whether in favor of the general philosophy of this essay or not. The general idea of what rent in any case depends upon, as expressed above, applies to all lands, whether used for farming, storing, banking, mining or even residential purposes.

C. COMPETING PHILOSOPHERS AND THE LAND QUESTION

1. KARL MARX (1818-1883) is certainly the principal, historic oracle of socialism and/or communism.

In 1847, Marx, with Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) wrote and published The Communist Manifesto, which laid down elements of doctrine which seem still to be adhered to in the literature and practices of those socialists and/or communists with a Marxist emphasis. For the sake of whatever enlightenment it may give regarding those philosophies, the following extract, which seems to be the core of its doctrine, is taken from the Manifesto:

> "The proletariat will use its political supremacy, to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.
>
> Of course, in the beginning this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production, by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which, in the course of the movement, outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order, and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionizing the mode of production.
>
> These measures will of course be different in different countries.
>
> Nevertheless in the most advanced countries the following will be pretty generally applicable:
>
> 1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
> 2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
> 3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
> 4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
> 5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
> 6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
> 7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State, the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
> 8. Equal liability of all to labor. Estab-

lishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolution of the distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of population over the country.

10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc., etc.

When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character.

Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for supressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of the class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

In 1867, Marx brought out his main work, Capital. His final chapter, number Twenty-Five, should be of special interest to readers of this work of mine. In it, Marx revealed, using a striking example from Australian economic history, that he saw, at least fleetingly, that readily available land made it possible for men to be free, immune to exploitation. But having no faith in the possibility of attaining a good society directly through human liberty, he seems to have shown no interest in how land might be made available. I suspect he thought men's attainment of freedom and independence would, as a halfway measure, delay or forestall the institution of the right and ultimate organization of society -- in his eyes, socialism. A controlled, centrally directed economy and social order was at least his immediate objective. If he ever gave any inkling of his conception of a proper life for the individual -- other than what you can infer from his recommendation of "industrial armies, espe-

cially for agriculture" -- I must have missed it, along with whatever he meant by "the free development of each," in spite of studious efforts on my part.

2. HENRY GEORGE (1839-1897) made a more thorough study of the land question than anyone else I know of.

George was not the first to recognize the importance of rights in land and of the taking of rent for public revenue; but he did most, for those of us living in this century, in clarifying fundamental relationships between the factors of production and distribution of wealth, and the requirements of justice and expediency in public policy.

George never claimed his doctrine was a cure for all ills -- as some of his followers have been ridiculed for doing. He did believe his doctrine to be essential to the life of free men, and he trusted free men to sensibly govern themselves and institute just laws and a good society.

His philosophy is an integral part of my own, and I regard it -- in combination with an enlightened individualism and a strengthened personal fortitude -- as the ultimate hope, if there is any, for the preservation of American ideals.

A few, who have studied economics previously, will recognize in Chapter VIII, the outline of The Single Tax doctrine as proposed by George.

George was born September 2nd, 1839 at Philadelphia, into a loving, close-knit, and essentially religious family. As a boy he "sailed before the mast" to India and Australia, and later, after learning the printers' trade, went to California where he rose in the field of newspaper work.

A compassionate man, cognizant of the industrial revolution -- rapid even then -- he was struck by the association of progress in the production and accumulation of wealth with the poverty, degradation, and crime seemingly always generated simultaneously within the same society. During a short stay in New York City on business, while yet a young man, he found this strange phenomenon in its greatest intensity. Walking the streets to observe and wonder at the disparate conditions, he became so moved by such injustice and evil that then and there he "made a vow that he would never rest until he had found the cause of, and, if he could, the remedy for, this deepening poverty amid advancing wealth".*

The basis of the cause of this paradox came to him, so he wrote, when he was back in California.

In 1869 the transcontinental railroad was completed, all the way from the east coast, out through Utah (where, at Promontory on the 10th of May, as you read in history, they drove the last, The Golden, spike), terminating at Sacramento. In anticipation of the growth of population, commerce, industry, and wealth certain to be brought by the inevitable extension of the route of the "steam cars" to the west coast at Oakland, there was, all

* Henry George, Jr., January 1905, in his "Life of Henry George".

about that place for miles, a great boom in land; whoever could do so had acquired all possible acres for the rise in value soon to come.

In those days, George had the habit of frequently riding out into the country, "for mental change". Writing of what occurred on one of these rides when he had stopped to rest his horse, he said: "I asked a passing teamster, for want of something better to say, what land was worth there. He pointed to some cows grazing off so far that they looked like mice, and said, 'I don't know exactly, but there is a man over there who will sell some land for a thousand dollars an acre.' Like a flash it came upon me that there was the reason of advancing poverty with advancing wealth. With the growth of population, land grows in value, and the men who work it must pay more for the privilege. I turned back, amidst quiet thought, to the perception that then came to me and has been with me ever since."

The problem gained clarity in his mind in the ensuing two years; the natural "remedy" emerged, and in 1871 he wrote it all out in a short essay, Our Land and Land Policy. But soon (probably feeling much the same as I do constantly!) he realized that a more thorough treatise was needed. In 1877 he began such a work, to be entitled Progress and Poverty, calling it "An inquiry into the cause of industrial depressions and of increase of want with increase of wealth", and dedicating it, on its completion in March, 1879,

To those who,
Seeing the vice and misery that spring from
The unequal distribution
Of wealth and privilege,
Feel the possibility of a higher social state
And would strive for its attainment.

He further stated the problem specifically, thus: "Why, in spite of increase of productive power, do wages tend to a minimum which will give but a bare living?".

Finding a publisher was difficult. The manuscript was sent to New York. "Some publishers there thought it visionary; some, revolutionary. Most of them thought it unsafe, and all thought that it would not sell, or at least sufficiently to repay the outlay".* But one was finally found, who, sharing the risk with the author, published it in 1880. It proved to be (and let this be a lesson to publishers!) an immediate success; was printed in hard covers and soft, run as a serial in magazines, translated into many foreign languages and sold abroad, becoming one of the most famous works in the world on the subject of political economy.

George's philosophy is the basis of much of mine. His work should be read by everyone wishing to go deeper into social problems.

Although I did not see America's problems just as George did in his day, yet all ours now are closely related to those he

* Henry George, Jr. 1905

described. Most of his predictions have been proving true; the "land question" is just as basic as ever, and it is, in view of the "population explosion" and rapid industrial expansion, being seen more clearly both here and in all foreign countries as the increasingly intense problem that it is.

George's analysis of the problems in political economy and the reform he urged for laying the foundation for their solution by the assertion of equal rights in natural opportunity, are exactly as described in this work of mine, but carried out in complete detail in their many ramifications.

Finally, going further into a more comprehensive consideration of social questions, George undertook to test his main proposition from yet another viewpoint. He said that every great truth, if correctly apprehended, is eventually seen to be part of some larger generalization. If his proposition regarding the cause and cure of the inequitable distribution of wealth and power were true, then it could be shown to be consistent with a general law of human progress. But such a law would have to be so formulated as to account, not only for the rise and progress of all civilizations in existence today, but also for the decline and disappearance of those which we know of only through written history or their buried ruins. He undertook to formulate that law.

The chapters he devoted to The Law of Human Progress should be of profound interest to every serious student of today's conditions here and throughout the world, and should be read in the original. But it is given here in brief outline, as follows:

Human progress, or progress of civilization, continuous over many generations, depends upon or is made possible by people coming together and forming a society which gradually develops a "web", "fabric", or body of knowledge, laws, habits, customs, manners, traditions, tastes, and language -- and the institutions implementing and preserving these -- in which all the individuals in society are born, raised, and conditioned, and in which they live out their lives and from which their characters take their stamp. The progress made by each generation is brought about by the constructive study, work, and maturing of the people -- individually, in groups, and collectively -- but that of successive generations is reflected mainly in the development and improvement of this body of knowledge, laws, and so on, improving with it the education, determining-influences, and lives of the individuals.

Progress does not consist of the inate, hereditary, irreversible improvement of individuals. Very true, individuals make personal progress during their lifetimes; they may make great contributions to the development of society and its accumulation of good qualities. But as generations succeed one another, their members are endowed with no permanently greater potentialities. If I may illustrate this concept in my own way, I would say we realize that a 20-year-old high school graduate today may know more of science

than did Archimedes (287-212 B.C.) at 75. This is possible, not because he is brighter -- he is probably far less bright! -- but because he grew up surrounded by teachers, schools and libraries full of the accumulated knowledge of 22 centuries and amid the daily application of hundreds of scientific principles now commonplace. Later he may join the staff of some great research laboratory, and, with others, using the principles of mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology, astound the world with some long-awaited, epoch-making, scientific "breakthrough". He and his associates may feel some justifiable pride in their accomplishment, but actually for none of them will it be any greater personal triumph than was the simple "bathtub breakthrough" for Archimedes running naked through the streets of Syracuse shouting "Eureka!" None of them had inherited the talents of their parents, or become brighter than past generations. They had simply had access to the knowledge collected and preserved by society and had worked in the scientifically sophisticated and stimulating atmosphere of the times created by all past and present social forces.

As George wrote, "...though each generation may do but little yet generations, succeeding to the gain of their predecessors may gradually elevate the status of mankind, just as coral polyps, building one generation upon the work of the other, gradually elevate themselves from the bottom of the sea".

Mental power is the "motor of progress". But mental power is not unlimited; therefore the power that is available for progressive pursuits is the amount of it that is left over after the needs for non-progressive pursuits are met. The non-progressive uses are first, the maintenance of society in its present condition at any given time, and second, any wasteful uses, mainly conflict of all kinds -- theft, violence, and war, and the resistance to such aggression.

In a separated state, the whole powers of men are required merely to maintain existence, and mental power is set free for higher uses only by association of men in communities, which permits the division of labor and all the economies which come with the co-operation and reduction of conflict among increased numbers.

Therefore, association is the first essential of progress. Improvement becomes possible as men come together in peaceable association, and the wider and closer the association, the greater the possibilities for improvement.

As the wasteful expenditure of mental power in conflict becomes greater or less as the moral law which accords to each an equality of rights is ignored or is recognized, equality (or justice) is therefore seen as the second essential of progress.

Thus, association in equality is the law of human progress.

Recognition of the moral law prevents the dissipation of men's powers in fruitless struggles.

The growth of specialization and exchange, characteristic of every advanced society, though making possible a far greater aggregate production of wealth, tends to make each man more and more dependent upon unavoidable participation in a society over which he has less and less control. (I would have added that it also makes necessary a division of wealth among the factors of production -- land, labor, and capital -- which, as society advances, come to be represented by separate men or owners who naturally use any advantages they may have to augment their respective shares in the products of industry.)

The great cause of inequality is the natural monopoly which is given by the possession of land.

"The first perceptions of (primitive) men seem always to be that land is common property; but the rude devices by which this is at first recognized -- such as annual partitions or cultivation in common -- are consistent with only a low stage of development. The idea of property, which naturally arises with reference to <u>things of human production</u> is easily transferred to <u>land</u>, and an institution which, when population is sparce, merely secures the improver and user the due reward of his labor, finally, as population becomes dense and rent arises, operates to strip the producer of his wages".

In this way, inequality in wealth and power are augmented, and society increasingly consists of the very rich who tend to rule, and of the very poor who are ruled. Every inequality begets more. And monopoly of land is more and more clearly seen -- by those capable of learning from the history of great fortunes -- as the principal basis of all others.

With extreme inequality in wealth and power, the masses are compelled to expend their powers in merely maintaining existence, and any excess power in society, instead of easing the lot of those who need it most, is, under the direction of those with wealth and influence, expended in intensifying the system of inequality, the building of temples, palaces, and pyramids, and in ostentation, luxury, and warfare.

George's answer to his own question as to why the wages of labor -- along with the returns to capital, which are the returns to stored up labor in tangible form -- did not rise in accordance with the great increases in economic society's wealth-producing power was that the rising rent of land always tended to absorb the productive gains (in the manner described in Chapter VIII).

The reason that George's "Law of Human Progress" is so important a consideration today is that we now realize that American society certainly can decline, as we can see unmistakable elements of decline already -- even as I have tried to point them out.

George saw decline even in the 1870's!

The belief in his day, that human progress, onward and upward,

was good, inevitable, and irreversible, was just as strong as our belief is today that science will solve our problems, leading us to better things. But I could point out that the great airplanes of today -- among the epitomes of our scientific progress -- while they have carried my daughters to foreign lands in the great spiritual and cultural exchanges now going on, and have aided business men in knitting the economic world together in internationally-unifying trade arrangements, they have also whisked spies, land speculators, and saboteurs about the world bent on their nefarious schemes, and have carried bombs, death and destruction to many innocent people, spreading the seeds of fear and hate, just as George, in his day, wrote: "Invention has given us, not merely the steam engine and the printing press, but petroleum, nitro-glycerine, and dynamite", going on to say "It is startling to think how slight the traces that would be left of our civilization did it pass through the throes which have accompanied the decline of every previous civilization". (And he had not heard of atomic energy!)

Recalling that many past societies had decayed internally and were then overwhelmed by more vigorous barbarians from without, George anticipated a question naturally asked by those who thought our society had long outdistanced any such catastrophe, which was: "Whence shall come the new barbarians?" He supplied the answer (whose validity we can see now!): "Go through the squalid quarters of great cities, and you may see, even now, their gathering hoards!" "How shall learning perish?", it would have been asked, and he had the answer: "Men will cease to read, and books will kindle fires and be turned into cartridges."

But George was not a prophet of doom.

"Political economy", he wrote, "has been called the dismal science, and, as currently taught, is hopeless and despairing. But this...is solely because she has been degraded and shackled; her truths dislocated; her harmonies ignored; her protest against wrong turned into an endorsement of injustice. Freed -- as I have tried to free her -- in her own proper symmetry, political economy is radiant with hope".

In his day, economic thought was dominated by two, mutually-supporting doctrines, the "Malthusian Doctrine", and the "Wages Fund Theory".

The first asserted that increasing population naturally tends to outrun subsistence, so that by running its course it tends to create a sort of "balance of nature" in human society in which is generated and maintained that degree of sickness, starvation, and death necessary to restrain further increase. (This is correct as regards the world of plants and animals, but if thought of as applying to Mankind it disregards the infinite difference between him and all the non-mentally directed forms of life.)

The second theory asserted that wages depended upon the ratio of the amount of capital, devoted to the payment of wages, to the number of workers seeking employment.

Both these doctrines seemed, to most authorities, like the inexorable laws of Nature, ordained by the Creator. If true, they would absolve the successful members of society and the leaders of thought from responsibility for the sad condition of the poor and shiftless, and would also seem to obviate the need for a further, truer analysis of the causes of poverty.

But George had already (in the main body of his work) proven the fallacy of both these doctrines!

As for the first, human life and success did not depend on the mere brute survival of only the fittest in a society tending always to grow while feeding only on the static offerings of Nature; instead, by intelligent attention to health, popular access to land, and a progressive agriculture, Man could and would always increase the supply of food and other needs in proportion to the growth of population.

As for the second, wages were actually not paid out of capital at all; instead, they were paid out of the product of labor itself. (Practical men manufacturers, farmers, whaling-ship captains, etc. have always seen that "Production is the Mother of Wages".) Though wages varied according to the skill, training, and personal qualities of men of various classes, their general level was always a reflection of the productivity of men working on marginal land (land of the poorest quality to which men were forced to resort). Though that general level might superficially appear to be subject to the whims, plans, or vicissitudes of the affairs of an employing, or "capitalistic", "class", yet looked at after the most careful study of all the fundamental factors in political economy, the level of wages was not significantly so determined at all.

Whether those factors were treated in the best interests of all society was seen as depending on man-made institutions, not on a niggardly field of nature or an oblivious, jealous God.

Thus George saw the destiny of Man as being in Man's own hands.

Human progress did not, he saw, rest secure or depend on the growth and improvement of the units of society, but depended upon improved qualities of society itself, whose status would, with the loss of justice and equality, sink or succumb to barbarism, but which, on the other hand, could, with the the revival of those qualities, rise to great heights! There-

fore Man, far from being a victim of blind predestination, was seen as simply confronted by the threat of barbarism if the justice of his institutions failed, but, on the other hand, by the promise of peace and satisfaction if the great challenge of the situation were met -- again, with his destiny in his own hands!

George had even seen the possibility of realizing the idealistic parts of the "dream of socialism" without its hazards and sacrifices of human liberty.

All these considerations freed him from the hopeless fatalism widely felt in his day. Man's troubles sprang from ignorance and greed implemented by bad institutions of human construction which would in due time -- not in his, perhaps, but that did not matter -- be made a thing of the past.

And all this gave him an abiding hope.

It does me, too. No day passes that I do not see evidence that Man's troubles are self-imposed, either by his individual or his collective stupidity.

My father felt the same. "I can die happier," he once said, "knowing that there is a way that will some day be recognized!"