
*Konrad Gizbert-Studnicki*¹

MY THOUGHTS ON FUTURE POLITICAL NEEDS AND DIFFICULTIES

Keywords: historical examples, journalism, political views, cities, intelligent politics, education, health, democracy, international conditions

ABSTRACT: When I was a young father, my children believed that my sayings were a true wisdom worthy repetition; today things have changed – it was my turn is to repeat wisdom of my children, believing that they usually are right. A few months ago, my son, Daviken, said that those who were writing frequently *cannot* easily survive without writing. Daviken was right. I loved to write, especially when something I wrote and which was contrary to what people believe was correct. I believe I inherited the dislike *to* generally accepted *truth* from my father, who was described by a Polish weekly that he was “the man who always goes against the general flow”. My father thought that this was an excellent statement of his character. He loved saying: “I am indeed a man who will think and act against prevailing flow, because only shit floats always with main current, and people who try to float in the main flow are those who repeat, without understanding, everything what they had heard”.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most intelligent sayings about politics which I know was the division of politics between an important social science and politics as the knowledge of how to lead people to accept a desirable solution. My father was a politician who understood the most of existing problems of

¹ Konrad Gizbert-Studnicki, economist, graduate of London School of Economics and McGill University in Montreal, former professor of economics at Mt. Allison and York Universities and visiting professor at Dalhousie University in Halifax and Carleton University in Ottawa.

his country, but who had no talent to move his nation in a proper direction². He explained his lack of “political successes” as due to his belief that it was due to his *uncompromising rule of always telling what were his ideas and how they serve his nation*. Indeed he always said and did what he considered correct and good for Poland and indeed in most cases people would not accept his proposed policies. The *reason of refusal* of my father’s proposals were due not his beliefs (it was a politician’s duty to explain his ideas), but the difference between his understanding of difficulties faced by the poor and war-destroyed country with much stronger neighbors and the majority of Poles, believing that the country should always maintain its honor and faith in helping its ally, France. Unfortunately, my father’s warnings proved correct and Poland had to survive tragic years of first German occupation and then years of Soviet domination.

FEW GENERAL WORDS ABOUT MY POLITICAL VIEWS

I was interested in politics, but after few unsuccessful achievements I decided that political problems are interesting yet fighting in order to realize the most sensible policy is something against my nature. I admit – totally without pride – that in my life I preferred to think about difficult aspects of policies and most likely effects of governments achieving different results from similar adopted policies.

In my life many times I have changed many important views. This is nothing rare and many people consider it as *normal* as for young people social justice always is more necessary than our societies are willing to assure, especially for poor persons. The one should work and vote for socialists, because for socialists the fundamental principles are justice and help for the poor. However, elderly people are better informed about numerous, mostly needed materials. Of course, people who had the best chances to observe the world also know that in our world changes and

² “He was a natural arid real politician and really only political, although he was not a tactician” told about my father Józef Mickiewicz (see article by P. Kimla, *Antyrosyjskość myśli politycznej Władysława Studnickiego*, “Potiteja” 2005, No. 2).

progress are necessary for improvement of people's lives, however only if they take place after serious considerations. Young people are allegedly thinking "what is important should be done fast" while old citizens would answer "forward, but after thorough consideration of what, how and when".

When he was young, my father was a socialist and paid for this by being sent to Siberia by Czar's government and, later he was active both in Poland and Western Europe in socialism. However, as a young man I was a nationalist and contrary to the myth that most of young people are socialists, I disliked socialism and particularly socialist internationalism. Most of his life my father was a true nationalist, although he had not used that term. Regardless of which party he was a member and how that party was called, his political position was the same: he fought about the independence of Poland and during the inter-war period he was trying to persuade Polish politicians to do everything possible to preserve independence of that country. My father was devoted to Poland and its eastern provinces. He combined his love to the country with a strong political realism, although this combination of love and realism was unusual. Similarly, he also made another strange combination, namely mingled indifference of making money and being a good practical economist.

My and my father's lives were different. He was born and spent fifty one years of his life when Poland was partitioned by Russia (the biggest part), Germany (initially, 'Kingdom of Prussia') and Austria-Hungary; my father was born in the Russian part of Poland which made him enemy of that country. My life was totally different. I was born in independent Poland and from my child's years I believed that Poland was and should be an independent country, because so decided the Polish nation. Indeed, after tragic times of war and post-war years Poles were fighting for their independence, regardless of high costs of the fight for independence. In his young years my father was a socialist, but he was a 'Polish socialist' who believed that social justice is necessary for fighting and preserving Poland's independence, while during my youth I believed that social justice is important to the country, but it is less important than good government working for independent and prosperous country, thus I decided against being a socialist.

I owe more realistic view on political parties to coming to post-war British Labor Party. One could have looked at the Great Britain as a country which only just survived a very difficult war with significant losses, dirty cities, badly dressed people and not yet repaired houses damaged by German air attacks. At the same time, British people were *marvelous*, they were mutually helpful, friendly and, most importantly, people who learned thinking during the war and previous very difficult economic depression. During my seven and a half years in post-war in the Great Britain I learned a lot, not only at the university but also from observing Labor Party government of Clement Attlee.

During my stay in the Great Britain I hated Soviet communism, even if many young English people were rather friendly to Stalin's empire. At first, I felt uneasy about it and I also felt rather bitter about what I considered allied betrayal of Poland to become a part of Soviet sphere of rule. Then, even if I could not accept the existing situation, I learned that if one is to understand the world, needs to understand the interests of foreign countries. A good lesson of the world was granting of independence by Britain to India, Pakistan, Burma, Malaysia and in 1984 Sri Lanka (Ceylon). Attlee was British prime minister between 1945 and 1951. Almost immediately after he became a prime minister he had to deal with pressures related to India. In 1947 British India was divided by India and Pakistan. In 1948 Burma became independent, in 1957 Malaya became "federal of Malaya", a part of British Commonwealth of Nations. In between 1948 and 1960 Burma had a communist revolution of Chinese inhabitants, known as "Malaysian Emergency". For the British giving up colonies was a bitter decision, but a decision which was necessary, which was proven by defeat of *France* in Indochina (Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam), Algeria and other African colonies, the Netherlands in Indonesia and Portugal in Angola and Mozambique.

The Attlee's government had many problems to deal with. Demobilization of troops brought many of them to achieve interrupted education, many wanted to get married and to create families, which in turn required places to live and many houses were destroyed or needed repairs; the industry and mining required workers, but mainly

employees who knew their jobs. Britain was not the only country which needed to resolve similar problems – in fact most Europe was a continent of many problems to which one should add political problems. Those disliking for lasting existing problems were not waiting for solutions and needed were new, more advanced solutions. Furthermore, the Great Britain needed to maintain its currency more or less stable, something which was particularly difficult during the period where so many expenditures were needed. Attlee's government was not avoiding all errors, but it was acting reasonably in a very difficult situation and tried to achieve more than expected modernization of the country. Among many myths and simplifications is quite frequent to hear that left wing governments tend to be devoted mostly to preconceived policies. This myth does not correspond to Attlee's government. His modernization of Great Britain's industry required *strong* government interventions, including the nationalization of certain key industries. This may be considered as a preconceived left wing policy, but considering problems faced by Attlee's government it was necessary. Successful long-term modernization quite often indicates that it very rarely needs serious leadership and not the belief that "free market, left to itself, will resolve all problems" – this silly belief has been proven not true by experiences of many countries.

Polish senior socialists whom I met in London, were pleasant and decent but not equal to leading the leading British politicians in the *post-war* times, both in the *Conservative* and Labor parties, thus I did not join either the PPS or the Polish Nationalist Party. In London I joined the Polish Workers Party [Polska Partia Pracy], that is "Christian Democracy", a centrist party. From those times I acquired sympathy to socialist parties, provided that they were honestly trying to raise social justice in the manner which would also positively affect long-term economy of their *country*.

In my old age, I am tending to become supporter of a systems of political parties in the Western countries, because I consider that they can be useful, as long as they produce mutual understanding between the government and the citizens and, of course, if they behave honestly.

THE THREE HUNDRED YEARS

People live together, better or worse. There are some societies famous of cooperation of their members, assuring common help, protecting their common safety and understanding rather well of what they should do. Good mutual cooperation is largely a product of experience, but also of accepting certain customs of behavior. As the life is becoming easier *because* of technological progress it also tends to become more complex and the existing legal system becomes more less easy to understand and use. We are proud of the progress of our world, but we donot understand growing complexities, we are proud of the achievements of great scholars and increase in understanding what they say, or write. Particularly, we find with dislike specialists of governmental complexities forgetting the basic fact that without understanding of what is needed and how difficult it is obtained, particularly in the long time.

Most social scientists tended to be more than academic scientists. Many wanted to study not only how societies function, but also how they should operate. Indeed, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were not only the periods of great scientific progress and great inventions but also taught our forefathers how to look both at physical world as well as the changes of our society. That period was the time of birth of sociology as science. Today, Auguste Comte (1798–1857) is only almost forgotten, and in his times a leading philosopher of positivism and one of the first sociologists. Similar role played by James Mill and his son John Stuart Mill. These outstanding British classics claimed that in the “enlightened world” all problems could be resolved. Joseph Schumpeter, one of the modern leading economists and author of an ‘almost finished’ excellent history of economic science. In this highly *valued* book Schumpeter writes with deep respect to British economists and social philosophers from the times of “classical economics” of nineteenth *century*. However, respect does not mean not noting serious errors which the great scholars committed. Because of the admiration which I am sharing with most economists of Schumpeter’s great book I am quoting his negative judgement on the mistake made by English classical economists, an error that still appears by today’s social scientists and politicians. He wrote about their error: “The English classic economists did not

see any other *reasons of working* than increasing welfare” (Schumpeter, 1954, p. 536). Undoubtedly, this idea of ‘rational behavior’ has survived to the present day in spite of the majority of observations which clearly indicate that modern economic system based *entirely on achieving maximum profit* cannot exist and that selling and buying prices based on profit *are* very rare in today’s market transactions. The nineteenth century was a period of great political, social and economic changes as well as great achievements in science and technology, thus accepting “rules of rational behavior” appeared reasonable, it might appear reasonable but human beings not always think “rational”, according to some rules, but according to their feelings, personal, family and social ‘rules’, ambitions and many other reasons. We know that during the wars and national fights many people were willing to risk their lives for their ideals and many prefer things and employment to pay more because they consider it ‘better’ or ‘nicer’.

One can give hundreds of examples of people of doing, or judging something more important than money. I don’t want to give hundreds, or, at least dozens of examples, but only, as one example, an attitude of many people who would prefer a product which they believe was more useful in the past than products manufactured by modern system even if a current project was cheaper, faster and easier to produce because of progress of production – this example comes from history of journalism.

This example from history is journalism. One of the best known “grandfathers of journalism” were *Acta diurna* (a daily public chronicle published in ancient Rome for the order of Julius Caesar). However, newspapers and periodicals required more than an emperor’s order, but invention of printing and subsequent innovations lowering costs of printing.

First, or one of the oldest ‘newspapers’ was a paper produced by government of Venice under title *Notizie scritte* in 1556 (this newspaper was known as *gazetta* [“petty money”], which became adopted by many languages). In Poland the first weekly was *Merkuryz Polski Ordynaryiny*, (“Polish general runner”) started in 1661. In the Western Europe high quality weeklies started appearing in the middle eighteen and nineteenth centuries.

In the second half of the nineteenth, inventions appeared which reduced printing costs which permitted large publications of newspapers and massive production of publicity. Newspapers started changing their

character and arrived the so-called “popular press” also, slowly high quality daily newspapers and, a bit slowly, good periodicals started disappearing. After popular press came popular radio, then popular theatre, and popular movies. Some good theatre and good, or even, very good movies survived, but ‘popular staff, gained and also ‘popular history’ started replacing ‘difficult history’.

During my life I was reading, with great pleasure and advantage, first class papers, most of which do not exist any more, and some, also first class, programmes in radio, TV and cinema which largely met similar life as good newspapers – well, the fact was that very good programmes not necessarily bring money.

Immediately after the end of war years, which were mostly a time of first class programmes, I heard many statements forecasting that, with time, “future excellent improvements will come and thanks to them people learn, through radio, cinema and TV much about the world and better known world will be a betted world” – a marvelous forecast, unfortunately totally wrong one.

Many people, worked much time producing new inventions and new, different ways of presenting different people and different cultures. One can say that many humans think, many humans want and try to make people to understand other people. Nobody, I know, can predict how different inventions can effect other people. Some *human* beings think, some human beings work and produce new things, but nobody knows what happened to things invented – it is needed long time to found and understand what new findings can produce.

CITIES, A MAJOR INSTRUMENT OF CHANGES

Large cities and towns changed and still change our world. Cities existed over centuries not only as places for buying and selling goods, but also as places for getting to know things or learning about new products and new ways of doing things. In order to change goods and meet new people we need transport. Inventing and using transport changed a lot

and every change would affect whom we get to know and what we can exchange. Thus, the mankind needed lot of time to learn how to improve transport and learn things which people 'here' learned about people and products from 'there'.

In the old past the most important means of exchange was water transport. Thus, the Eastern part of Mediterranean Sea which connected shores of Western Asia, North Eastern Africa and South Eastern Europe made ancient Greece, Egypt, Phoenicia and Ethiopia via Nile river (also water transport!) and Mesopotamia (today Iraq) and Persia (Iran). An example of transport connections between Africa (via Nile) and Near East was the old story of Queen Sheba of Ethiopia and King Salomon of Palestine (or Israel). Queen Sheba visited King Salomon, who immediately wanted to make love with her. He was refused, but after using one of his tricks he was successful and had a son with Queen Sheba, whose decedents were Ethiopian "kings of kings". Regardless of truths of that story it illustrates the memory of very early connections between countries of Africa, Europe and South-West Asia. Later came navigation of other seas and oceans and land transport, starting from use of animals and later railway, road transport and aviation. The progress needed centuries, but with every improvement improved transport permitted longer and faster movement of people and cargo.

Fast development of cities, which helped to bring the development of progress of trade and international spread of knowledge, started in the eighteenth century and created a real new world in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The development of cities was the great instrument of progress, but not charitable instrument. People were coming and working in cities to increase their wealth and indeed most people who moved to the cities became better off, but the successes of the cities created increasing costs and the multiplication of difficulties.

The truth is that we need great and smaller cities and dealing with their growing problems increases. Large cities demand concentration of people and concentration of people leads to increase of prices, which leads to speculation of land, buildings and facilities in which a key role plays *indirect gains or losses*. Because of the importance of this concept I shall briefly explain this concept of economics.

The first observations of ‘indirect gains and losses’ were observations of bees. Bees produce honey, but the production of honey requires flowers. People who like honey pay for it to beekeepers, who, in turn, do not pay to the owners of flowers, yet, no flowers, no honey. In the world of bees and flowers the owners of flowers and bees may be good friends and nobody thinks about how and how much the gardener would get from beekeeper. Was it a strange forgetting economics and commerce? Different appears to *be* a situation of a transport company delivering good to city destinations. Although a transport company does not pay directly to a city for producing *exhaust* from his vehicle, which may appear something like beekeeper not paying for his bees, the public reaction is different. After all, bees and flowers represent the world of nature and beauty, while nobody would consider that a delivery truck producing stinking exhausts, harmful for health. We have different reasons for treating a beekeeper and a transport company differently probably because if we wanted to increase taxes paid by the transporter this would affect the costs of products bought by urban consumers. Examples of bees and trucks may appear unimportant, but it was the first example of indirect gains and losses, which *later* brought other, more or less different examples that payment depends or value depends on something not directly related to money paid as a part of transaction.

There does not necessarily exists a relationship between making money on certain speculations and buying or selling in order to obtain direct value. A simple example of speculation of urban real-estate is helpful here. For example, let us think that I have a house for sale on a particular street. Normally, for selling this house I would show it to a potential buyer who may be interested in buying a particular house, similar to mine. However, the situation would dramatically change if on my *street* someone constructed a very expensive and impressive house. This building, produced by someone I do not know is likely to make my house, become more expensive, because it would become a “house with a distinguished owner on that street”. Exactly different would be the situation of the price of my house if someone established on my street a high noise making use of his house. In neither situation, the price of my house would depend on someone who neither sells, nor buys a house on a particular street or in par-

ticular city district. That would also be effect of indirect gain or loss in the city property.

Large cities produce many examples of indirect gains and losses, which in the “old economic theory” could not exist in a rational world in “large cities practicing free and well functioning market”. However, in our existing world not only “indirect results” exist, but their effects may appear after a fairly long period of time. For example, in a new district being created the only practical transport medium are *motor car* and, for the first few years, the *number* of existing automobiles of owners of new houses are not extensive, thus ‘traffic jams’ were not a problem. However, few years later, someone else constructed another, similar district and the owners of new houses also were users of their automobile. This new number of automobiles, due to construction of new district, affected traffic between the previously built district. New ‘traffic jam was born. Situations of that type is quite common in large, growing cities. Logically, those situations make major changes in large cities necessary; but such ‘major changes’ would be impossible for maintaining a system of free market in the urban expansion. This example illustrates inherent impossibility of an efficient functioning of competitive market in a situation which creates major indirect effects.

What I have written here would be obvious for many people, as it was also obvious for many people what I have written about the role of large cities in trade or exchange of civilization gains between different countries and the role of large cities in this interchange. Understanding these mutually contrary phenomena should be quite obvious if we observe what is happening in front of our eyes.

WHICH, IN MY OPINION, IS MOST NEEDED TO CREATE THROUGH INTELLIGENT POLICIES

It feels difficult to answer questions about what the existing governments should do. I feel attached both to Poland and Canada, thus I feel to be *attached* to both countries and, theoretically, I believe that *both countries* need similar investments and policy changes, yet, thinking in terms of realistic policies could not do the same major, long-term changes.

Therefore, I shall write about general changes which should be made in the future in all countries somewhat differently, at different time and in different manner. For years I have observed people – including intelligent and good will people – try to bring to all countries similar, idealized democratic changes, quite often with negative results. Writing this paper, I received *The Guardian Weekly*. The first article in this the issue of *Guardian Weekly* of July 7–13, 2017 is entitled “Hong Kong’s freedom fades”. There was not a sentence in this article that Hong Kong’s population is Chinese and mostly proud of doing things the “Chinese way”, while many countries in the world were forced to become “Western type democratic” with extremely bad results.

Our nations have organized themselves by common national, religious and economic or social groups. These unwritten groups develop normally in an informal manner, even if nations, states or religions define human duties and limitations of doing or preaching something. These rules appear important and even they may be as important as they look, but as a wise British lawyer said: “the truly important laws are not written laws but laws unwritten but generally accepted in a given country”. I have lost his name, but he obviously was a wise man and a great lawyer.

Whether plates which were allegedly given to Moses by God to save Jews and later also Christians were a real gift from God or in any case not requiring a proof to the believer. None God’s orders to humans by evangelists, prophets, or to Mahomet or other wise men need “objective proof” because they suffice to know that such orders were given, largely followed up by believers and essentially very much similar, telling one’s *people* that their duty is to defend Jews of their people.

One often ignores an important rule of “good behavior”. Good behavior means to be nice and smile to a worried child, including an unknown child and helping an unknown person who looks being in trouble. Catholic Church prescribed confession and penance. My father, who was not a believer, very much respected these prescriptions. He used to say that critical review of one own behavior should be the beginning of improvement of behavior to other humans and confession and penance are commitments of better behavior. I have no doubt that my father was totally right in this matter. Unfortunately, in my life I have seen truly unpleasant

situations, and an *absence* of apologies after careless, or simply stupid behavior. I found most unpleasant to observe somebody to apologize for something trivial was to a “person who counts” and ignore another person who “does not count” (I have been seen usually in a large store, where a client was insulting to a clerk and very polite to a manager).

Offending people usually is not unpleasant to see, but essentially it is just stupidity and lack of manners. However, for a government to play with budgets *creates* serious long-term problems. Contemporary governments tend to spend money both for important reasons and for trivia which real purpose is to gain the support of certain groups. The serious consequence of using state money for potential support of different groups are the lack of adequate funds for important purposes.

SHORT AND LONG-TERM PLANNING

One of the difficult and rarely not noticed problems are the differences between long and short-term thinking and planning. Strangely enough, majority of economists considers the long-term a sum of short-terms and ignore the effects and problems between short and long-terms. Thinking of the long-term as a combination of short-terms would make obvious sense if future were known, but not when prices and interest rates change and such future changes are unknown and usually different. For example, known and unknown expected value let us think about someone buying a house under conditions of perfect knowledge of the next year. Let us assume that next year taking care of the house, taxes and costs of money are known, thus the cost of next year is known and if at the same time costs of the person renting an apartment are known, she can exactly know what will be the costs of the house. But let us assume that the costs of having the house are higher (say from 6% to 10%), a question arises does buying it makes sense. However, if the value of that house increases significantly, it would be worth to buy it today and sell a year from now. A good, or happy speculator will guess it, or predict correctly, but this also means that the owner of the house who sold that house for less than it became worth lost on selling. Another example is about savings. If I save

10% annually for 10 years, my savings will equal one year of my earnings. But if interest rates were changed, my savings may be more or less. In the era of the fast years (I am thinking about the last quarter of the 20th and the first quarter of 21st centuries) became in the “West” greater demand for short-term investments even if there are still people, companies and governments which believe that long-term planning makes good sense.

COMMENTS ABOUT WHAT IN MY OPINION RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENTS SHOULD DO

Upbringing of next generation. One of the most important changes in our world is taking control of human fertilization and in the same, more or less, time higher employment of women. The effect of these changes was a decline of a number of children in majority of families and ability of majority of *parents* to bring up themselves children adequately. Of course, there are many families with one or two children who are doing excellent bringing up of their children, however, one should not close eyes on problems of small families. Unfortunately, many children of small families become egoists, or have difficulties later in their lives of dealing with people.

These important problems do not need deploring but finding and establishing necessary way of helping parents to bring up children, especially if proper solutions exist. These solutions are establishing properly planned and well-staffed sport and play center. Such center would allow children and young adults to *learn* how to work and play together, enjoy and get physically better through sports and physical exercises, and, with luck, learn interesting and useful things. Already there exist good sport and education center, often not too large to be useful and ran by good and properly trained instructors. Of course, these center are cheap to establish and run, but long-term effects of children playing in the streets, often learning unwanted ways, including learning crime and/or getting and using narcotics. From short-term, kids on the street are cheaply to keep, but from the long run much more expensive than good center.

Education. Education means combination of knowledge and understanding how to intelligently use what one knows. Therefore, education should start from childhood and become expanding and understanding all human life. Schools, from kindergarten to university, are instruments of education and not tools of learning possibly useful things. Today one often talks about computers as instruments of education. This leads to errors. Computers are instruments for obtaining and handling obtained information and communicating with other people or institutions. Computers, as also libraries and prints were great advantages as instruments of education, but *cannot* become “machines for finding education” – such machines are human brains. In order to get education, one needs teachers, who not only teach new things, but also (and mainly) the understanding of new things, as well as possible errors and uncertainties of what one learns. The proper learning of new things is full of difficulties, because different people have different abilities of learning and understanding new things, thus one of the major advantage of a good teacher is to teach the way which brings understanding of things he tries to teach.

Good teaching system as the key to education. I was lucky in getting good teachers. When I was young I had a luck of having good teachers and good schools with sizes of classes possible for teachers to get to know individual pupils. As it happened when I was at the university I also had a good access to teaching staff and even its distinguished visitors. I was studying in England, when the country was tired and impoverished, yet wise enough not to have too many *students* per professor and had adequate scholarships to study full time. Students attended lectures, spent time in the library and had informal conversations with people from whom they could learn. Thus, were we too expensive for taxpayers? I believe that good education is almost never “too expensive”, while bad one quite often is. Furthermore, it was not as expensive as it appeared. In afterwar Britain because students had scholarships they did not need to work and therefore they could learn more and took their time for getting the first diploma in three years, while in Canada, where most of students need to work, at least from time – to – time, the duration of similar diploma course was one year longer. Good education is not necessarily

not much more expensive, but it requires intelligent people to organize and run an education system.

Good education should last one's entire life, especially in the era in which changes of life and knowledge of everything increase very fast. This general increase of the speed of the world brings dangers for individual humans becoming obsolete with age and have difficult to combine experience and knowledge about current situation. The only *reasonable* way of trying to resolve this problem are systems of updating. These systems start appearing in many countries, even in some *cases* the updating becomes mandatory. Unfortunately, if the necessary updating systems could become mandatory more working people could have time to attend enriching their knowledge and preventing to forget things they have learned. As intelligent solutions usually tend to prove more economic, well-organized and run system of making people to keep and increase their knowledge is necessary and is worth money needed to invest, but modern societies should learn that modern world needs the application of brains.

Health. Maintaining citizens in decent physical condition, like developing and maintaining them well-educated mean maintaining social capital intact. Fortunately, modern medicine is becoming such better and better capital, but, unfortunately, training and updating of health personnel is becoming increasingly costly. Also, increasingly costly are medications and equipment of modern medicine. "Social capital" of health services is costly, but inadequate provision of health services is also, directly and indirectly, costly and, furthermore, the system of quality of health services depends on private welfare of patients which is also dangerous as leading the society to social class fight. Therefore, a sane society will not try to *organize* health services in a commercial manner but should manage the costs of keeping society in a good condition. There is one element in planning health services which tends to be forgotten by governments and tax-paying people, namely the fact that planning of health services requires, by their very nature, a long-term planning. Training of medical doctor, from the beginning to final full qualities of practitioner is almost ten years. Proper establishment data regarding preventing and/or treating many health problems or disease takes usually long time of both field and laboratory research.

Adjustments to present international conditions. Over hundreds, or thousands of years, wars or armed interventions were one of main instruments of international policy. Carl von Clausewitz, a great and unforgettable author of the book on war as “international policy conducted by different ways”. Von Clausewitz was correct up to inventions and use of atomic bombs destroying Japanese cities. From that time wars between major powers ceased to be possible and instead became “interventions” of powers to *minor* countries. These interventions, advocated by great powers as noble actions, are not always successful but practically always very destructive. The consequence of the *current* consequence of avoiding war between great powers and not at all rare interventions by great powers into smaller countries is a major change of international policies and a way of *smaller* countries preserving their position are federations of smaller countries, of which a good example is the European Union.

Today does not exist “European power”, although there exist “almost European powers”, however the European Union is an economic power and individual members of the Union have serious opportunities of protecting their interests, although as the prime minister of Denmark wittily observed *that* European countries can be divided into those which understand *that* they are not only real powers, but even can not be fully independent and those European countries which cannot understand their own real situations. When I read pronouncements of some Polish politicians that “Poland is and must be an independent country” I cannot think that our country had lost so many great losses because of the lack of adequate strength, that today we should not repeat the same disastrous nonsense but should carry loyally its membership in the society of most civilized countries which makes possible to retain our ability to preserve our freedom.

The situation of Canada is different from the situation of Poland. Canadians depend on the United States of America, and have to be loyal to that power, regardless whether USA for whatever reason has good or bad government. In order to gain more freedom Canadians should try to establish new commercial and cultural relations with more countries, but not to do that in order to be disloyal to the United States. I would prefer, as any reasonable person, that USA would get less involved in too many

countries, especially in Africa or Asia. Neither USA, nor most of their friends know much or too little about countries on these continents to do something good for them and tend to do more harm than good, in spite of their trying to be helpful. I hope *that* Canada will become a better partner to countries which need help.

CAN OUR DEMOCRACY SURVIVE?

For many years I had a Hungarian friend. Unfortunately, he does not live, but he left me his favorite saying “*pessimism is optimism of wise people*”. For him it was more like a joke but also a warning that while everything, or even almost everything, appears to be a good future, one should not avoid considering possibilities of difficult situations because avoiding thinking of wrong situations may lead from difficult to bad situations. I think that it makes sense to think possibilities of problems in Western democracy in order to avoid possible bad situations.

I consider that a human duty is to look into the future. By its very nature, looking into the future is different than studying something which already exists and almost always our expectations of future can rarely be totally correct. This means that we have a difficult situation: we are doing something, for improving our future, because it is impossible to change the past, but cannot know what future will bring which means that we should use the best methods to forecast the unknown future. The more difficult are the forecasts of the possible situations, the more difficult necessary work on trying to predict the future and more likely are committing errors.

“To err is human” tells an old proverb, but depending on who will suffer and how much makes some errors important. History teaches that important errors of leaders from a *country* may be very dangerous for the nation and lead otherwise law obedient citizens to revolutions or apparently “peaceful” destruction of existing political system. One should not forget that in the inter-war Italy and Germany, many democratic citizens brought to power dictators and similar situations almost existed in Great Britain (Mosley Black Shirts) and France (Colonel de la Roque’s Croix de

Feu) and fortunately did not happened because of remarkable lack of intelligence and political ability by Mosley and de la Roque. Thinking about the future of democracy, I fear that the current relative decline of welfare by poorer classes, high unemployment and growing racism may bring to a sad political situation, let us hope that intelligence and good will of people in democratic countries will bring common sense to politics and mutual understanding to resolve existing problems and save freedom.

THE END

I wrote what I wanted and the only thing left for me to add is: “*may long live common sense and critical look at the world!*”

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Schumpeter, J. (1954). *History of Economic Analysis*, New York: Oxford University Press.