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"Economic democracy" is a relatively new phrase. Traditionally we have been accustomed to take our democracy straight; the term, properly used, is so all inclusive in its implications that it covers the whole range of life — political, economic, and social. In recent years a new set of emphases has broken up the word and set one phase of democracy above others. "Economic democracy" has acquired a special meaning. Before inquiring into the sources and significance of the phrase we should look to our basic concept.

What does democracy mean? Even definitions from antiquity have relevance today. Plato said: "Democracy . . . is a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, . . . dispensing a sort of equality to equals and unequals alike." His description is both enlivening and illuminating. It emphasizes the egalitarian element so noticeable in historic American democracy, epitomized in the life and thought of Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln, among statesmen, and of a whole host of industrialists and professional men who similarly rose from social obscurity and poverty to exercise great influence.

Aristotle also described democracy: "If liberty and equality . . . are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best
attained when all persons alike share in the
government to the utmost.” That statement
carries strong overtones which are plainly
discernible in universal suffrage, acceptance
of the decision of the ballot, and free speech
and action. Thus both antique definitions
have a singularly modern ring; they should
remind us that our basic ideas have a his-
torical continuity much longer than we some-
times realize. They have been tested by time
— they are not extemporized.

As a practical matter, by democracy we
mean government by public opinion; it
functions where public opinion is free from
censorship, where the Bill of Rights protects
the individual in the formation and expres-
sion of his opinion, and where public action
responds to that expression of opinion.

This ought to be clear enough; if we are
confused, it is because we live in an age of
double talk. Thus “liberalism” on many
tongues has ceased to connote freedom; the
term has been virtually captured by men who
set other values — chiefly material — far
higher in the scale. By a mad inversion of
meanings re-emphasis upon freedom is insis-
tently described as “reaction.” “Democ-
rracy” has also been kidnapped. Perhaps the
theft occurred because not very good use
had been made of the term since the days
of Woodrow Wilson; neglected things are
easily pilfered; our attention has been ab-
sorbed with immediate solutions rather than
with underlying ideology. The British also
employ the word “democracy” less than
formerly, since they are more enamored of
the phrases characteristic of their modified
Marxism.

Meanwhile the Russians have embraced
the word and “democracy” appears in their
speeches more and more frequently and
vigorously. Indeed in debates in the United
Nations Assembly they have almost monopolized it. They and the admirers of Russia now employ "democracy" to describe ideas and processes which have no tincture of what we were wont to regard as democratic. It was early in this process of pouring new wine into old bottles that the term "economic democracy" received fresh emphasis. On November 9, 1942, Vice-President Wallace made the connection crystal clear when he said: “Russia, perceiving some of the abuses of excessive political democracy, has placed strong emphasis on economic democracy.”

We had definite indications of Russia's most modern line a year ago and we had specific proof early this October that the line was being maintained. The weekly issue of the "Information Bulletin" published by the Soviet Embassy in Washington on November 6, 1946, set it out clearly; the recent statement announcing the "Cominform" corroborated it. The former provided a detailed explanation; the latter made a public declaration.

There is not a word about the "dictatorship of the proletariat," so long the watchword of the Soviets, either in the "Information Bulletin" or the proclamation of the revived Comintern. As the Cominform's proclamation calls Sovietism the "new" democracy, so the earlier publication insists that "Soviet democracy is a higher type of democracy." N. Matyushkin presents the thesis that "under true democracy, the people should be sovereign; they should exercise government authority, and dispose of the resources of the state." He declares that "in the Soviet Union, government authority is actually wielded by the working people." "The people of the USSR enjoy wide liberties — freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience, freedom of
assembly, freedom to hold street processions and demonstrations."

In another article in the same "Bulletin," Professor N. Kareva points out that the Soviet system is one of true "popular government." He writes: "The principle of the sovereignty of the people is the cardinal principle of democracy, its alpha and omega."

"In the Soviet Union the principle of the sovereignty of the people operates most consistently and to the fullest possible extent. Here the action of the Government, in domestic matters as well as in international affairs, fully conforms with the wishes of the people. Here the people are the real sovereign, undivided masters determining the destinies of the country, shaping the trend and content of the State's domestic and foreign policies." "All citizens, irrespective of race, nationality, sex, religion, and social status and origin, enjoy not only all the rights and liberties which form part of any democratic constitution, but also such great rights as the right to work, to rest and leisure, to an education and to material maintenance in old age and also in case of sickness or incapacitation." "Popular government and the full sovereignty of the people is an everyday reality."

One could hardly ask for anything more sweeping or more explicit. Did those glowing commitments to a democratic society prepare the way for that long-desired fusion of the ideologies of the East and West? Could we have found in those pronouncements that common basis upon which we could have resolved our painful differences? Or was this merely another instance of international second story work whereby the jewels of our ideology were stolen from the top of the bureau while we slept?

An unequivocal answer is provided in the
statement of the Cominform which describes the "two camps" which have come into being as "the imperialistic anti-democratic camp with the basic aim of establishing world domination of American imperialism and routing Democracy, and the anti-imperialist democratic camp with the basic aim of disrupting imperialism, strengthening Democracy and eliminating the remnants of Fascism." "The imperialistic camp and its leading force, the U.S.A., is displaying a particularly aggressive activity. This activity is being unfolded simultaneously in all directions — in the direction of military-strategic measures on the level of economic expansion and ideologic struggle. The Truman-Marshall plan constitutes a European section of the general plan of the world expansionist policy carried out by the U.S.A. in all parts of the world." Vishinsky calls it "war-mongering."

The revived Comintern warns that "the chief danger for the working class consists in underestimation of its own forces." "Communist parties must head resistance to plans of imperialist expansion and aggression in all respects — state, political, economic and ideological. They must rally and unite their efforts on a basis of a common anti-imperialist democratic program and gather around them all democratic and patriotic forces of people." It is a call to action — and we are seeing it put to the test in France.

Matyushkin had pointed out a year ago that "one of the major features that make the Soviet system a true democracy is the fact that no one can use private property to exploit others. That is also the main distinction between Soviet democracy and bourgeois democracy. For it is obvious that there can be no real equality between an employer, an owner of the means of production, and the worker who is at his economic mercy." One may pause a moment to reflect upon
the sardonic humor implicit in that phrase about the worker being at the economic mercy of his employer in times such as our recurrent coal crises, when the employer, the public, and the government itself have been at the mercy of the workers' representative. Who then is exploited? Only last December the unchecked power of a workers' spokesman reversed the national policy of a free economy, and in the twinkling of an eye sent us back toward a "managed economy" — to government controls. That does not look like ownership supplying dominance — nor does Petrillo's edict that record making must stop on December 31!

We must not let our minds be seriously deflected, however, by the ironies or transparent inaccuracies of Soviet assertions. Instead, we should recognize that Russia's "democratic" propaganda embodies a subtle and powerful appeal on behalf of "economic democracy" as opposed to "Bill of Rights" democracy. Implicit in the new line of argument are inferences designed to keep the American system on the defensive.

I say the appeal is subtle and powerful. It is subtle because it stresses two values and sets them in opposition — life on the one hand and property on the other. It is powerful because it aligns the Marxist system behind life and the American system behind property. The Soviets are made to appear to emphasize the supreme value of the worker, whereas American free enterprise is accused of being undemocratic because it is charged with putting profits rather than human values at the heart of the system. That supplies the key to another statement by Mr. Wallace: "Men and women cannot be really free until they have plenty to eat."

When I called this an age of double talk it was no exaggeration. The whole Marxian
system is built about material values. It carries economic determinism to the extreme. There is something logically fantastic about claiming that Communism puts life at the center, as there is something incredibly absurd in a great political figure in well-fed America making "plenty to eat" a test of freedom while extolling Russian "economic democracy." There people stand in line for hours for bare necessities. But life is more than logic, and in an age of double talk we must not be surprised if politics transcends reason.

If only the Soviets and their satellites stressed such statements about democracy and made such inferences regarding the American system, the entire propaganda could be disregarded as merely another case of misrepresentation. That, however, is not the case. Instead, the free enterprise system is more often carelessly betrayed in the house of its friends. Devotees of a free economy constantly use phrases which imply that man's sense of values is dominated by the profit motive. Equally with the Marxists they speak in terms of economic determinism, and continuously underemphasize the human values inherent in our form of economy. Their lack of emphasis upon the democratic structure of our economy is so serious that it allows enemies of the American system to raise doubts concerning the existence of any democracy at all. It also invites the Soviets to say they are "more" democratic.

The phrase "free enterprise," even when used by its professed adherents, has all too often been described as though its primary characteristic were the guarantee of freedom to entrepreneurs to engage in speculative endeavors for their own profit. It has not been adequately interpreted as a system of economic organization which provides freedom for the worker. By this extraordinary
limitation in the meaning of the word "free" in the term "free enterprise," ammunition has been given to the Marxists. That sort of thing makes the folly of selling scrap to the Japanese pale by comparison.

The devil can quote Scripture; the Soviets do, as we know. If the exponents of free enterprise do not recognize and emphasize its dual function — its synthesis of human rights and property rights, the mutual interest between employer and employee, its democracy not only at the level of the entrepreneur but also at the level of the worker — then genuine economic democracy is betrayed in the house of its friends.

This schism between personal rights and property rights, this sharp antithesis of values, is transparently inaccurate and untenable. Failure to recognize that there can be a synthesis which includes both values, the characteristic error of setting the two values in opposition made it possible for Mr. Wallace and those for whom he speaks to sneer at Bill of Rights democracy and to urge "economic democracy." Whenever economic factors are overstressed, it is possible to discount the true supreme values, namely, those of the Bill of Rights, on the ground that they are nullified by the absence of economic democracy. Under those assumptions the Soviet makes its claim to be the most democratic of all nations. That is the meaning of the passages quoted from the "Bulletin" of the Soviet Embassy. That is the core of the Cominform's proclamation.

There is no valid reason for accepting such a false estimate. Substitution of genuine analysis for superficial and careless expression makes the falseness transparent. Is it true, for example, that profits are non-existent under the Soviets? Does Communism really achieve "production for use and not for profit"? Does the Russian worker escape exploitation
and thus attain a new dimension of freedom which must be lacking as long as the profit motive is one of the motives of production in free enterprise?

To all those questions the answer is "No." Monopolistic communism — and communism is really monopoly — has built up the industrial resources of the Soviets by insisting upon a higher margin of profit than is available under the competitive capitalism of free enterprise.

The successive “five year plans” have often been pursued with ruthless disregard of the comfort and welfare — not to speak of the freedom — of the worker.

Take as an illustration the construction of the vast industrial empire beyond the Urals, described in these terms by a sympathetic participant and observer: “This was the Magnitogorsk of 1933. A quarter of a million souls — Communists, kulaks, foreigners, Tartars, convicted saboteurs and a mass of blue-eyed Russian peasants — making the biggest steel combinat in Europe in the middle of the barren Ural steppe. Money was spent like water, men froze, hungered, and suffered, but the construction work went on with a disregard for individuals and a mass heroism seldom paralleled in history.”

Men were driven to that construction; when a laborer froze to death his body was rolled off and another man took his place. Workers were purged for falling below fixed levels of production. That was not merely a program of guns before butter; that was industrialization before life itself. The foreign exchange necessary to purchase critical items abroad was obtained by the export of food; it continued to be exported even during a famine period while millions died of starvation.

Let us make no pretense that we have
been wholly pure in this matter. There was
gross exploitation, for example, in the build-
ing of the railroads to the Pacific. Grim and
deadly passages in the history of coal min-
ing laid the foundations for the extraordinary
discipline which makes coal strikes so ter-
riyng.
We know, too, that the black curse of
slavery was not regarded as inconsistent with
either the Bill of Rights or free enterprise
by many who considered themselves high-
minded. From time to time we need to
review Lincoln's words which ring like the
denunciations of Jeremiah: "If God wills
that [the war] continue until all the wealth
piled by the bondman's two-hundred and
fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk,
and until every drop of blood drawn with
the lash shall be paid by another drawn with
the sword, as was said three thousand years
ago, so still it must be said, that the judg-
ments of the Lord are true and righteous
altogether."
We know that even now segregation, dis-
 crimination, and bitter injustice still exist
within our democratic structure. One has
only to recall the program of Huey Long and
the sayings of "The Man" Bilbo to feel a
surge of shame. The rancor of our industrial
strife proves that the Lord visits "the iniquity
of the fathers upon the children unto the
third and fourth generation." There has been
reform, sweeping reform, rapid reform, but
neither rapid enough nor sweeping enough
wholly to expunge the heritage of wrath.
It should be clear that I am not seeking
to discount the crudeness, the harshness, the
needless pain, and the stupidity which have
from time to time existed — and still exist —
beneath the banner of freedom. These
shortcomings must be solemnly taken into
account; the sins that so easily beset us must
be expiated. Nevertheless it is safe to assert
that Communism has been more ruthless of human life, has more mercilessly exploited personality for financial and political profit, and has ground the faces of the poor for the benefit of the state to a degree which would put any modern capitalist behind bars where he belonged.

When someone mouths the phrase about “production for use and not for profit,” remind yourself that the expression is compounded of a double error. Production does not continue without profits; Communism makes profits. There is no production without use; free enterprise cannot exist without production for use. Use is a vital purpose of production in our economy for only the utility of the product makes it marketable.

Profit is only one of the motives of free enterprise, unless the term “profit” is broadened to mean profit in use, not merely profit in cash. Public opinion certainly will not let one man alone enjoy the fruits of other men’s labor; they must be shared in use. The matter runs even deeper than the compulsions of public opinion, however powerful. There is no profit without a market, there is no wide market without mass purchasing; consequently the miracles of mass production are utterly dependent upon mass purchasing power — and will. That forces production for use.

A SIMPLE ILLUSTRATION underlines that truth. However rich Mr. Ford became, the relevant fact was never the amount of his personal wealth. That was trimmed with taxation and could be all but confiscated by inheritance duties. The essential fact is that the laborer in America rides to work in a car, while the working man of Russia plods, and in the rest of Europe he has, at best, a bicycle. In America the working man’s wife has at her disposal slaves of the lamp, while her sister
in Russia has none. Here electrical appliances, machines of every kind have become a necessity. Because of them Americans harvest an acre of cotton in less than a third the working time required in Russia. Nine hours of labor bring a greater yield from an acre of wheat in America than forty-seven hours in Russia. An acre of American potatoes requires only sixty-eight hours against two hundred and sixty-five in Russia. Illustrations could be multiplied indefinitely to show that the American worker produces more with less time and effort than his Russian brother.

In his new book, *The Calculated Risk*, Hamilton Fish Armstrong states: "The Soviet Government's inability to supply its own population with everyday necessities and conveniences is so great that anywhere else the Communists would present it as a reason for revolution." Our productive superiority is not due to superior natural resources because Russia has equal potentialities. It is the product of genuine economic democracy — democracy in use of goods and services.

In summary, the margin of profit is smaller in the United States than it is under Communism; we should remember that item when "swollen," "greedy" corporate profits are being denounced — sometimes with justice! The distribution of goods and services here is broader than under Communism. The standard of living is higher than under Communism. Even our inflation has not altered that basic reality. Failure to keep those points clear makes it appear that the Russians have achieved economic democracy, and that we have not. The opposite lies infinitely nearer the truth.

Other careless expressions likewise cast doubt upon the reality of our economic democracy. It is common, for example, to speak of the "automatic" adjustments of our
economy, and of the "price mechanism." These are metaphors, but after long use they come to be taken literally. Calling the process a mechanism naturally persuades people that it is mechanical. It is easy then to suggest that the mechanism is manipulated by an oligarchy — "the sixty families," "big business," or some other wicked or self-serving group. The consequence is a demand that the machine be "democratically" controlled by the government in the public interest instead of being manipulated privately for private interests. That involves managing our economy from the center. Prices offer a good illustration. Why should not the government operate the price mechanism? Certainly the use of power can distort anything; the immediate impact may appear desirable (as in low prices) while the collateral results may be concealed for the moment but be utterly disastrous (as in the disappearance of goods from the markets, nor all the power of government can avail to produce goods — as England is learning).

Talk about economic mechanism gives people who urge centralized planning and a managed economy the opportunity to say that a managed economy is more "rational," since mind should be dominant over a mechanism. Their conclusion is that a managed economy, being more "rational," is more "democratic."

Metaphors aside, the adjustments in our economy are not automatic and the price system is not a mechanism at all. The adjustments of a free economy are the effective consensus of widely distributed personal judgments. True economic democracy is the natural outcome when each person makes up his mind on a course of action in view of circumstances that come within his observation and his responsibilities. His consideration need not be limited to his immediate
surroundings; the miracles of communication and transport give him a perspective upon his problem and an opportunity to relate his own decisions to the larger picture. Each individual contributes to the consensus of opinion by the most real of all votes — a commitment by which he must stand, accepting gain or loss in proportion as his judgment is right or wrong. The spontaneous collaboration of an infinite number of individuals who bear a responsible relation to the task in hand is the very core of the democratic process. It is public opinion in the economic field. In the most rigorous sense of the term, it constitutes economic democracy.

A managed economy is not democratic in its processes even when conducted by selfless experts entirely in the public interest. Their “reasoned judgments” are, inevitably, the decisions of one man or a compromise among the opinions of a relatively small group. The democratic process is absent.

The most influential single economic journal in Britain is The Economist of London. In a recent number it said: “The Economist has long ago committed itself to the view that it is both desirable and possible to have, not indeed a detailed control over all economic processes, but a certain measure of purposive direction of the general economic climate. It must be confessed, however, that the experience of the last two years has considerably dimmed that faith. Here was a situation that should have been easy to diagnose, and a set of controls already in existence more far-reaching than any socialist planner had ever dreamed of. Yet if ‘planning’ is defined not merely as the efforts of the small group of self-confessed planners at the centre, but as the net cumulative effect upon the economic system of all the actions and policies of the state, there can hardly be any room for doubt that it has been
bad. If ever a community has been more planned against than planning, it has been Britain in the last two years. There has been quite a singular unwillingness to face facts, to adjust ambitions to resources, or to reduce the policies of the various Government departments to a coherent pattern."

**Under the system of free enterprise** — as opposed to centralized planning, direction, or control — a vast number of separate people reach business judgments; individual minds react in innumerable ways and the resulting decisions are expressed in action. Such distributive judgments develop a focal point or area which establishes a major economic impact. How else would you define democratic action?

This distinction between managed economy and free enterprise has a peculiar importance in the United States. Our nation is not a tight, compact area, uniform in population, alike in economic interests and activity. On the contrary, variability is infinite. Very different judgments are equally valid in different places because the circumstances are not everywhere uniform. Numberless factors are considered from many different legitimate points of view. There are delicate balances in our economy which determine, for example, whether corn shall be fed or sold. Such business decisions are countless. The managed economy can never have the flexibility our continental dimensions demand; only free democratic economic process can achieve the infinite adaptations to varied circumstances.

In another sense free enterprise is both rational and democratic to a degree which national planning cannot even approximate. The flow of circumstance is continuous, requiring constant modifications of judgment. Those adaptations can be made individually
long before they can be made by any group; the man who buys today can sell tomorrow, take his profit or cut his loss by shifting his commitment. The judgments of individuals are always more plastic and more fluid than the decisions of a bureaucracy.

Under a managed economy, on the contrary, the flow of circumstance must be artificially halted for analysis and decision. Of course the economy is not really halted. The halt is merely statistical; that makes it unreal. It must be stylized and formalized, deprived of its dominant quality of variety, which makes it doubly unreal. By the time the bureaucracy has made up its mind, circumstances have changed and the judgment is already obsolescent; it may soon be so obsolete as to be irrational. Centralized judgment, moreover, has a quality of rigidity; it is not adapted to continuous flow or to great diversity. Being less well adapted, it is therefore less rational, and, of necessity, less democratic.

A free economy is vastly more democratic on yet another basis. Society is made up of individuals, and the so-called social values of the centralized planner must inevitably be composites — unless arbitrarily imposed by a totalitarian dictatorship. In either event they do not represent individual tastes. When individuals make their own judgments, economic considerations are not uniform, nor are the minds of men governed by the same scale of values. Even Sir Stafford Cripps with all his newly conferred power cannot make them uniform. Some men ardently desire wealth, while others do not care much for money (or we would have no teachers at all); some people are energetic and some lethargic; some are adventurous and others timid; some are young and some old. Under the free enterprise system, each individual follows his own bent. He does not have
forced upon him either a system of values or a level of values that is not meaningful in his own life. It is the business of democratic government to keep the environment favorable to individual taste, interest, initiative, imagination.

The managed economy does not supply such an environment; indeed, centralized direction blights the growth of the individual. Democracy is dependent upon the capacity of the common man to make reasoned decisions. The democratic system inculcates the habit of forming judgments and stimulates increase of their competence. In a managed economy the major determinations of policy are made by official supermen at a distance; the area of individual judgment is correspondingly reduced. The "experts" frustrate democratic essentials — energy, imagination, skill, and self-confidence. The habit of individual judgment tends to atrophy. Centralized management is a blow at the very foundations of democracy, since it penalizes independence of mind. The result is to lower the capacity of public opinion to check and criticize the remote decisions of the supermen.

My text was drawn from the Russians; so also the conclusion. In his notable speech before the United Nations Assembly in October, 1946, Molotov, the Soviet Foreign Minister, repeatedly taunted the United States with its want of self-confidence. Clearly referring to the United States, he said: "There is no lack of faith among our [Soviet] people in the peaceful means of progress and there is no feeling of incertitude which is created in countries with unstable economic and political prospects." He spoke of "profound distrust in the peaceful methods of further development of one's own country and of some pessimistic lack of confidence in one's own strength in so far as the prospect of
peaceful competition between states and social systems is concerned.”

He continued the attack in his speech early last month on the thirtieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution. “Uneasiness and alarm are growing in the imperialist ranks, since everybody sees that the ground is shaking under the feet of imperialism, while the forces of democracy and socialism are daily growing and consolidating.” “If the ruling circles of the U.S.A. had no cause for anxiety concerning domestic affairs, especially in connection with an approaching economic crisis, there would not be such a superfluity of economic projects of U.S.A. expansion.” “A new, peculiar sort of illusion is widespread — while having no faith in their internal strength — faith is placed in the secret of the atom bomb.”

VISHINSKY HAS PERSISTENTLY followed the same strategy but altered the tactics. Like Molotov, he has sought to put us on the defensive. Accusing us of “war mongering” and “aggression,” he has given the usual psychological explanation — we are overcompensating an inferiority complex.

The same emphasis appears in the proclamation of the Cominform: “The struggle between the two opposing camps . . . is taking place in circumstances of further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, the weakening of the capitalist forces and the strengthening of the forces of Socialism and Democracy.”

Do we have that sense of inferiority? Do such doubts corrode our national life? We have just mastered Germany and Japan. With a small percentage of the earth’s surface and population, we produce half the goods of the world.

In a human and fallible world what more could one ask to stimulate and strengthen
self-confidence? Yet we came to the close of fighting and the opening of a new era with a government terrified alternately of inflation and deflation — and sometimes of both simultaneously! The youth who fought to victory have too little faith in the strength or stability of our economy; they fear depression and unemployment; they feverishly study technical subjects as a kind of reinsurance of their subsistence.

Only recently by the action of Secretary Marshall last June, and still more recently at the opening of the United Nations General Assembly, did we put Russia on the defensive. The shrillness of Vishinsky is all the evidence we need. We no longer hear the subtle taunts of Molotov but the fervid denunciations of a politician who is on the defensive. The reassembling of the Comintern is further proof that we have gained the initiative. We must not lose it — either by failing to hold the line abroad, or by selling America short at home.

We need not halt reform. Katharine Lee Bates's "America the Beautiful" has a phrase: "God mend thine every flaw." We ought to cooperate in that process. We should not let the word "reform" be captured by those whose only mathematical concepts are subtraction and division and who know nothing of addition and multiplication. But we ought to see the defects of our system as flaws, not as basic weaknesses. There ought to be a resurgence of faith in the idea of democracy, and a new appreciation of its reality in our life — political, social, and economic.

The first "Federalist" paper, written by Alexander Hamilton in 1787, states the challenge for 1947. After one hundred and sixty years we come again to the point where we make — or break — a new order for the world. Alexander Hamilton said: "It seems
to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force. If there be any truth in the remark, the crisis at which we are arrived may with propriety be regarded as the era in which that decision is to be made; and a wrong election of the part we shall act may, in this view, deserve to be considered as the general misfortune of mankind."

In 1865, eighty-two years ago, Lincoln set the pattern for today: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, . . . to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."