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In response to Dr. Posada's invitation to participate in this congress, with his suggestions that I comment on such aspects of agricultural development as agrarian reform, government policy and administration, and the role of agriculture within the framework of the new international economic order, it seems more appropriate to present these remarks under a title of the political economy of agricultural development rather than the economics of agricultural development. The distinction is simple but significant. Economics of agriculture has in common practice, at least in the U.S., come to refer to analyses of the operations of an economy of agriculture and to the processes of transforming resources into useful commodities. This is the domain of technology, input and output, costs and returns, etc. In this conceptualization, the basic theoretical propositions formulate the implications of freedom of choice in a market context. The term political economy, as used here, is intended to refer to the structure of an economy and to the social and political matrix within which economizing activities occur. In short, while the theory of economics refers to the consequences and outcomes of freedom of choice, a theory of political economy refers to the conditions of freedom which make significant choices possible.

The acceptance of the concept of political economy as the basic theoretical terms of reference has some advantages for the consideration of the aspects of agricultural development emphasized in Dr. Posada's letter of invitation. In principle, at least, the emphasis in political economy upon the structure, or political matrix, of an economy enables us to analyze economic organization as systems

of working rules, making possible the identification of basic similarities and differences between economic systems which result from differing ideologies. Within such a formulation consideration of the problems of agrarian reform and land tenure systems becomes possible as integral parts of the system, not simply as interferences in production organization. Of even greater importance, in my view, a political economy approach enables us to accept as a criterion for the validity of the analysis, the reconstruction and control of economic systems pursuant to the analysis. By contrast, the more conventional operational analysis of interrelation within a universe of commodities, basically by imitation of the physical sciences, is deemed to have been validated by successful prediction of outcomes. The two criteria of validity are complementary, not contradictory; I would argue however that systematic inquiry, which is instrumental to the reconstruction and control of economic systems, is a more fundamental achievement than successful prediction, particularly for agricultural development policies, basically because the social function of intelligence is the continual reconstruction of human situations with the central task in free societies being the assurance to participants of a sufficiently wide arena for responsible conduct so that they may live as self-willed persons.

I.

Professional Recognition of the Significance of Agricultural Development.

The development of agriculture is now recognized to present major issues in international economic policy consequent to several major happenings. World populations are growing at higher rates than anticipated, particularly in what we call the less-developed countries. Sheer numbers raise the spectre of impending shortages of food on a global scale. After one or two proclaimed decades of world economic development, there are now wide apprehensions regarding the limits
to growth. Deep poverty persists especially in the rural areas where most of the poorest of the world's poor live. The seemingly endless migration of the rural poor threatens to engulf the cities in which they take refuge. All of this and more has brought a new awareness to the members of the economic professions of the importance of agriculture in national economic life.

In the first years of "development planning" after World War II, development was virtually equated to industrialization. Why this should have been is an intriguing question, but one we shall not long dwell upon here. Some of the urban industrial bias in economic thinking can be attributed to the fact that, taking the world as a whole, most of the people who entered graduate schools were city boys with little sympathetic understanding of the problems of agriculture, let alone of the peasant people. In fact, a vast majority of professional economists are from the industrialized countries. Also, systematic thinking about development problems and the theoretical matrix of development analysis was initially in macro-economics, as evidenced by the Harrod-Domar growth equations or the theories of international trade and finance. Marxian analysis placed great faith in development by industrial technology and organization and assumed that agriculture was just another industry not different in kind from any other. Agricultural economics as a field of professional specialization has developed as a part of the process of modernization of commercial agriculture in the U.S. and other industrialized countries. This bequeathed to the craft parochial views of their fields of professional responsibility. Given all this, the current recognition of agricultural development as a worldwide problem for economic policy is testimony to the significance of the revolution of rising expectations of the human family and the political influence of the poorer nations in the United Nations organizations and elsewhere.
The Drift into Rural Poverty.

The mitigation of rural poverty is undoubtedly the most arresting challenge to agricultural development. Although the redress of poverty is and must be the primary responsibility of national governments, in a regime of nation-states, the world community has some obligation to be concerned about and assist in this endeavor. As a first step in understanding the nature of the problems of rural poverty we may consider how it came about that so many rural people are the "excluded" poor--persons not effectively included in any productive economy. One key to this understanding seems to be that of how agricultural development has impinged upon the antecedent system of subsistence agriculture. As a benchmark of analysis I find it helpful to recognize the fact, and I believe it to be a fact, that our ancestors everywhere devised subsistence-survival systems of agriculture which were remarkably similar. They were essentially land-labor forms of economy where labor was implemented by only the crudest of tools under guidance of the conventional wisdom of a people. Over centuries these subsistence agricultural economies were gradually modified, although there are still hundreds of millions of people who depend on them for survival.

In much of the "Old World" of Europe and Asia, these subsistence economies were gradually improved through hard work, foresight and the practices of husbandry to become productive peasant farms. Under the impact of the colonial policy in Africa, the western hemisphere and Australasia, these traditional systems of agriculture were pushed aside, mostly to wither away. Under the Marxian-inspired revolutions of this century, from Eastern Europe to the China Sea, agricultural development programs set out to destroy traditional agriculture through land reform, but with only partial success. By these revolutions private economic power was eliminated but remnants of the traditional agriculture persist as small
satellite holdings around collective farms in Russia and Eastern Europe. In China the system of private homes and gardens seems to have survived largely intact with only the land and labor surplus to the household economies being utilized in the communes.

Perhaps the most general lesson to be learned from this vast experience is that the public or social purposes of agriculture change with successive stages of agricultural development. As cities developed it became necessary that the use of land serve purposes of providing food and fiber to urban people as well as export crops for foreign exchange. The need to extract a surplus from agriculture for export easily becomes the dominant purpose in the public policy for agricultural development, to the utter neglect of the survival needs of the people on the land. The production of an exportable surplus was quite obviously the dominant public purpose in the development of colonial agriculture. Ironically, in country after country it is no less so in an era of independent states, and the food economy has been left to the traditional ways of farming. Thus one lesson to be learned from this experience is that the economy of agriculture becomes affected with wider public purposes in an interdependent economy than in more self-sufficient modes of survival.

The system of land tenure for agricultural land has a parallel history. The rules for the use occupancy of land in primitive systems were designed to serve the purpose of group survival, of those who use and occupy the land. To such ends those who cleared, occupied and used the land characteristically acquired usufructuary rights only (i.e., hereditary rights to use the land) which ran as long as the land was used. Such rights are not salable; in fact the very thought of alienation does a dishonor to one's ancestors. The sovereign or root right of ownership of the land was held by the authoritative head of the group with the power for the authoritative allocation of land use rights to members of the group. The
use of the land was reserved exclusively for the members of the land holding
group-family, clan or community, although strangers may have been accommodated
temporarily. These two kinds of ownership rights in land reflected the two gener-
al principles by which property in the rightful use and occupancy of land was es-
tablished. The acquisition of usufructuary rights by cultivating persons
followed the principles of property enunciated by John Locke: a person makes
property in land his own by "mixing his labor with the soil" and appropriating it
from "a state of nature." The sovereign ownership rights in land held by the
authoritative head derive from a different principle: ownership by right of con-
quest. Where these two principles function in an indigenous society, the Lockean
principle of acquisition of right of use and occupancy operate within the prin-
ciple of sovereign ownership by right of conquest. Both kinds of rights are made
secure by the sanctions imposed by the authoritative head of the group.

In areas ruled by the external authority of colonial rule, as was character-
istic of much of Asia and most of Africa at the beginning of this century, a dual
system of ownership usually developed. Especially when agricultural land was
suitable for European settlement and was so used, a modern type of fee-simple own-
ership was created by which the immigrant settlers held land under European type
of property arrangements. These legally sanctioned forms of land holding were in
effect islands of state-sanctioned property rights surrounded by a sea of custom-
ary tenures, with which the state may have had no connection whatever. Come na-
tional independence in our time and these alien systems of ownership simply vanish-
ed and land reverted to use and occupancy under customary rules, unless the newly
created independent state moved fast enough to acquire the area as public domain.

When the modernization of agriculture was undertaken, as with the introduction
of cocoa as a cash crop in western Africa, the trees were planted in areas inter-
stitial to the land used by the community for subsistence crops. This meant, in

1. This system of farming is referred to by H.L. Myint as a "peasant-export
economy", The Economics of the Developing Countries; and by Manning Nash as an
"adjunct export economy", Primitive and Peasant Economic Systems, p.82.
effect, that it was the members of the stronger families, the historically dominant families in the community with claims to the larger areas of unused land, who had the opportunity to plant cocoa, frequently arranging with "strangers" to establish cocoa plantings on some sort of shared basis.

Since land in these areas is held under customary (tribal) tenure arrangements and is neither salable nor subject to mortgage, legally sanctioned property rights have developed in the trees, which can serve as collateral for a bailor-bailee type of loan. Neither the form of the legally sanctioned tenure system nor the appropriate kind of system of modern farming, communal or individualistic, has yet been worked out for this region. But the holdings of land by many of the families are being cut down by inheritance to such small sizes that it contributes to the inducements for out-migration.

Where the territory was not only conquered but also settled, or partially settled as was the case generally in North America, Australasia, and in parts of Latin America, the same set of principles of property worked out a bit differently. Where the native people were few enough, or weak enough, and could be pushed aside, a predominating European system of ownership was installed, with the traditional tenure systems reduced to mere remnants. Where the native peoples were too numerous or too strong, as in the mountainous regions of several Latin American countries, dual systems of tenure resulted (part European and part traditional) usually with some provision for the conversion of customary property rights into legally, or state, sanctioned property rights in land. In this dual system those persons who held land within the orbit of European institutions had legally sanctioned titles to landed property. Their claims to ownership had the sanction of law, were registerable, negotiable and could be used as collateral for credit. Customary tenure rights were recognized and secure only within the memories of the elders of the community and usually lack legal titles. Dissatisfaction with
the inferior status of the poor within these dualistic systems has been the driving force behind much of the land reform undertaken in this century.

Another lesson which the experience with agricultural development teaches us is that a modernizing transformation of agriculture is more easily achieved when markets are developed through urbanization for the indigenous customary crops, as happened in Japan and Western Europe. This contrasts with the experience of tropical Africa for example, and the "hot" countries in general, where agricultural modernization has centered on the production of exotic crops for export.

Where feudalism developed, as in Europe, it was swept away by revolutions like those of the 17th and 18th centuries in Europe, epitomized by the French Revolution, or by the Marxian-inspired revolutions of this century in those parts of Europe which staved off the earlier revolutions.

III


The experience of England stands out as a distinct and different achievement in the way institutional innovations were used to support economic development. Although there was much blood-shed in revolutions on this isle, they achieved something of a unique transition to a modernization which honored willing participation through a gradualism achieved by institutional innovations which induced and rewarded such participation. This is an outstanding example of how pervasive inequality and a heavy concentration of power within an authoritarian regime were gradually modified to create a situation where people come to have effective citizenship and significant degrees of freedom in a market economy within a constitutional monarchy. The English experience deserves special comment since it shows the possibilities of gradualism through institutional innovation in support of national economic development. The lesson seems even more significant now than a few decades ago. Much of the world is now governed by authoritarian regimes, in
which both citizenship and ownership of property are at best a matter of privilege rather than of right. A truly satisfactory national development must somehow overcome the demeaning effects of authoritarianism.

In the England of the 16th century, the monarchy ruled by absolute power. But the seeds had already been planted for the growth of procedures which eventually led to the differentiation of power in ways which stimulated a surge of creative economic growth. The breakthrough, as we say today, came when the King conceded to the lords who were his tenants that their domains were inheritable (not mere concessionable privileges) and that taxes and miscellaneous feudal dues would be levied through parliament rather than arbitrarily at the pleasure of the crown. This had the effect of placing strict limits on the use of arbitrary power. The acceptance by the crown of rules which placed limits upon the arbitrary exercise of power and authority converted the tenants into de facto owners and eventually changed England into a constitutional monarchy. This followed the acceptance by the crown of the rules of parliament as being superior to the will of the monarch. These limitations were accepted by the crown out of a struggle between the crown and the lords which lasted over centuries, from the Magna Carta of 1215 to the Act of Settlement of 1700. The crown accepted the limitations because the support and willing participation of the lords was required, initially to provide troops which were necessary to preserve the throne.

The procedures by which this was achieved became generalized as due process through the rules evolved for the functioning of parliament and the common law method of rule-making through the courts. By this latter process, customary rules for resolving disputes between landlords and tenants and later of commerce

2. This epoch has been analyzed profoundly by John R. Commons in Legal Foundations of Capitalism, esp. Chap. VI, "The Rent Bargain: Feudalism and Use Value." Here we attempt only a brief interpretative sketch.
became respectively the common law of real property and of commerce.

Substantively, the working rules which effectively limited the arbitrary exercise of power by the crown, created in John R. Commons dramatic phrases, "an indefinite residuum", "an orbit where the will is free." This indefinite residuum eventually provided wide zones for discretionary conduct by land owners and other entrepreneurs acting on their own volition.

Through a long process by which the obligations of lesser tenants and yeoman farmers were also protected against arbitrary exactions by those with superior power, the entrepreneurs in agricultural were able to occupy and exploit, and to some degree reap the benefits of, the opportunities created in farming in England by the new technology, improved transportation, worldwide systems navigation, the growth of populations and urbanization. This creation of zones of secure opportunity on the land became the basis for private property in land, just as the correlative achievements of civil rights created an effective citizenship by assuring to persons an effective sharing in the powers of sovereignty.

Every detail of this picture was not pretty. But this process of limiting arbitrary exactions by the crown, thereby creating an orbit where the will was free to occupy opportunities, led to the differentiation of the rent of land, from taxes on the land. The retained powers of taxation of land, along with the powers of eminent domain, and what we in the U.S. call the police power, provided procedures whereby, in the Anglo-American tradition, the public interest in privately owned land can be asserted and protected.

It is one of the hallmarks of our time, as authoritarian regimes have replaced the feeble starts in democracy over much of the world, that the distinction between rent and taxes is erased and both citizenship and ownership of property in land are reduced to privileges rather than rights. The experience of England here sketched conceivably may provide clues for the expansion of freedom in many lands.
It is, I would argue, one of the fundamental principles of development that willing participation is more productive than commanded or coerced participation.

There are hundreds of millions of people in the world who lack secure economic opportunities of any kind. They are referred to here as excluded because of a lack of effective inclusion in functioning economic systems. Their exclusion is not a consequence of deliberate policies to shut them out; rather they are excluded because long-standing procedures for including them in an economy have broken down. In more elementary systems of agricultural economy, as in tropical Africa, everyone born into a land-holding family has as a birth-right the privileges of returning to his ancestral village and claiming a rightful share of the village lands, sufficient to provide him and his family with a site for a home and a subsistence plot. With the growth in population and urbanization, this privilege becomes less and less valuable. Yet no substitute forms of minimum employment and subsistence survival have been devised. Also, with the withering away the handicrafts in competition with factory-made goods (as in Indian villages), tens of millions of people have been left without secure economic opportunities; they have fallen back upon whatever kind of agricultural employments they can obtain to keep body and soul together.

IV

Including the Excluded: Expanding Opportunities for the Rural Poor.

If one were to try to summarize in a single phrase, the essence of the most urgent development problems which we now confront, it might well be the general task of "including the excluded" peoples of the world into national systems of economy more adequately. This, it seems to me, is the deeper meaning of the current agitation for a new world economic order. This is also the essence, at least in conception, of the agrarian reform programs attempted in this century as a means to agricultural development.

The number of the "excluded" people is very high in many if not most of
the countries of the western world, to speak only of this hemisphere. In the U.S. they are found by the millions in our cities, lacking both the abilities and the opportunities for full employment. Here, as in most of the industrialized countries, the excluded poor congregate in cities because the modernization of agriculture has been achieved by labor-saving devices which make unskilled labor redundant. In this way the problems of rural poverty were shifted to the cities.

In the less-developed countries, which are predominantly agricultural by occupation, the number of the "excluded" people is largely a consequence of the withering away of traditional subsistence agriculture, with the numbers augmented no doubt by the mechanization of agriculture. How all these people can be "included" basically in remunerative employment, and as self-respecting members of the community, is a problem to which there can be no simple solution.

As one tries to achieve perspective on such great problems and issues, a reasonable inference is that we live in one of these turning points of history where the future will differ significantly from the past. For at least five centuries a growing world population has been able to enjoy rising levels of living by combining the exploitation of natural resources accumulated over aeons of time, within a growth matrix of science and technology. Many of the key resources are not only scarce but wholly inadequate to continue to support rising levels of material living for the ever-greater numbers of people. Thus, in the future we shall be forced to depend more on the creative ingenuity and efforts of man, through the enhancement of human abilities and the design of forms of association which elicit and reward willing participation, and through the more effective use of the creative powers of government. It is in this context, as I see it, that the achievements of a world economic order are to be understood.
The recent report of the Leontief committee to the United Nations on the Future of the World Economy summarized in a single paragraph the reconstruction necessary to achieve worldwide economic growth and thereby suggested the major dimensions of the problem of including the excluded:

"To ensure accelerated development, two general conditions are necessary: first, far-reaching internal changes of a social, political, and institutional character in the developing countries; and second, significant changes in the world economic order. Accelerated development leading to a substantial reduction of the income gap between the developing and the developed countries can only be achieved through a combination of these conditions." 3

Although this formulation provides criteria for the achievement of world economic growth, it falls short in the provision of criteria for an equitable sharing of the fruits of growth. The sharing need not be equal for all people, but what is essential is that there should be opportunities for all able-bodied persons to achieve at least a minimum level of real income by their own will and efforts. The problem of including the excluded is different for the industrialized countries of the west from that needed by the developing countries. Even so, any attempt to estimate the prospective significance of agrarian reform for agricultural development in developing countries in the next few decades must take into account, somehow, the meaning of the requirements stated by this committee. This follows partly because the emerging world economic order will go far to determine the degree to which developing countries must rely upon agricultural development as the central engine of growth.

The first major agrarian reform effort of this century was the land reform program of Mexico. At the close of the first World War, land reform programs which expanded the class of owner-cultivators followed the breaking up of both the Austro-Hungarian and the Ottoman Empires in Eastern Europe. Concurrently, the newly installed communist-inspired revolution swept over Russia, soon to be followed by the confiscation of privately owned land and the eventual collectivization

---

of agriculture. At the end of World War II, major land distribution programs were carried out under authority of the armies of occupation in both the defeated countries--Germany and Japan--largely as intended means for the strengthening of democratic regimes. With the dissolution of European empires in Asia and Africa, land reform programs were undertaken in scores of countries with some continuing to this day. The revolution of rising expectations in Latin America also led to attempts at land reform in several countries, some of which are still active.

Although these agrarian reforms occurred largely as integral parts of major political changes, virtually all of them were undertaken in the name of redressing inequality and stimulating agricultural development. The achievements of these great waves of agrarian reform are not easily assessed and can not be attempted here. We may note however that one of the central purposes of most reforms has been the reduction or elimination of private economic and political power based upon ownership of land. In Japan, Taiwan, and Korea where reforms were comprehensive, the resulting system of small-scale owner-cultivator agriculture has been both highly productive and technologically progressive. In Japan it gave strong support to democratic political processes. Where land reforms were carried out under communist regimes the private economic and political power of land ownership was also eliminated, but in accordance with the tenets of ideology, all power was gathered to an authoritarian center, including the power of economic decision-making; the latter is widely diffused in a democratic private enterprise system of political economy.

Thus the system of state and economy under Marxian inspiration is constructed basically of working rules sanctioned by the state which define specific performances for participants. By contrast the state-sanctioned working rules which contribute to basic structure of systems of state and economy within the liberal tradition of the western world, give central emphasis to rules for individual performance which specify avoidance. This primary emphasis upon specific
avoidances rather than specific performance by participants is the procedural basis for freedom, objective opportunities, and zones of private discretion. Any country which uses land reform programs to strengthen an owner-cultivator system of farming has this long history of development in the liberal tradition to draw upon as a resource.

Most of the land reform programs of this century have had less definitive outcomes, partly because they were only partial reforms to begin with; partly because of the overwhelming resistance that was encountered; and partly, no doubt, because the reform impulse was weak to begin with, lacking a clear sense of direction. Even so, the fact remains that these agrarian reforms, mostly land reform efforts of this century, have been the major effort to achieve far-reaching internal "changes of a social, political and institutional character in the developing countries." But whatever may be judged to be the achievements of agrarian reform in this century, they have provided an unprecedented social laboratory to try out different kinds of institutional innovations. For one thing, a wide variety of kinds of cooperative farming and group farming has been undertaken. Even if these group farming efforts do not succeed well, such arrangements may turn out to be a good vehicle for expanding industrial employments in rural areas.

However, the greater significance of these land reform efforts is to be found in the fact that they were generally intended to distribute land to individual farm families as their own. As I have tried to visualize the prospective role of agricultural development, including agrarian reform programs, in the reconstruction of the world economic order, it is this aspect of land reform programs that I would expect to be of greatest significance. I do not see how changes in the international structure of the world economic order will or can modify very much the basic national responsibility for the welfare of the citizens of each country.
I would acknowledge, to begin with, that my understanding of and perspectives upon the world economic order are limited. I expect, furthermore, that there will be major alterations in the terms of trade through commodity agreements of various kinds. I presume that this struggle to restructure the world economic order will lead to much more nationalization of the ownership of basic physical resources. Also, there will no doubt be substantial adjustments in outstanding debts, as temporary measures.

But when one takes the longer view, the ultimate reconstruction of the world economic order will surely depend more upon the effectiveness with which the economy of a country is organized than on anything else. Thus, it would seem reasonable that most developing countries should strive to provide their own basic food supply. If agricultural production is enhanced, this can support an internal market for some manufactures. But for the foreseeable future, recognizing the impact that the Japanese have made on world trade in manufactured goods, and anticipating ever stronger competition from other East Asian countries as their economies become organized to better release the energy of a people, it would seem that agriculture, supplemented by manufacturing mostly for internal consumption, must remain the predominant form of employment over much of the developing world. The thought here is that time may be bought, and utter chaos avoided, by programs which provide some minimum self-subsisting opportunities on the land. The world economic order probably cannot endure endless generations of absolute poverty. Perhaps this will turn out to be too conservative a view, but it would seem the part of wisdom for any country not to expect too much of the reconstruction of international economic relations.

The central idea of agrarian reform is that there is some equalizing redistribution of opportunities on the land. Any mention of land reform programs is likely to conjure up visions of massive confiscations of land. In the long run, I consider complete confiscation to be counter-productive. Neither do I think
it advisable to simply give developed land to farm people through reforms. Some kind of a middle course of paying a reasonable price for land taken and of charging recipients enough so that the payments can be met only by productive effort is likely to do more to give support to both investment and entrepreneurship.

One of the great shortcomings of land reform programs in this century, in my judgement, has been an excessive and even hateful determination to "right old wrongs." Far better, it would seem, would be to concentrate on the tasks of reconstruction, on the design of an economic system of agriculture which holds promise of providing a basis for future development. Considering the appalling dimensions of the poverty of the rural poor, now excluded from any meaningful participation in national economies, I am driven to the conclusion that the longer future can be made more secure and promising by national programs which provide minimum, if only partially adequate, opportunities for decent survival on the land. Furthermore, we in the Western Hemisphere have not given sufficient attention to the possibilities of intensive cultivation of limited areas of land. We simply do not know the possibilities or opportunity costs of modernizing our presently subsistence forms of agriculture.

The greatest gains for a country which are possible from a distribution of opportunities on the land which would assure some basis for an economic survival are almost surely intangible. Even a small holding of land provides a domain, however limited, in which a cultivating family can act upon their own volition. Once a family has some land of their own, they are somebody. Just being a self-respecting somebody, in itself, supports the development of abilities, for there is a reciprocal interrelation between abilities and opportunities. Opportunities can be occupied by persons who have the requisite abilities. Thus a career is a set or succession of opportunities occupied over a lifetime. If the opportunities disappear through shifts in technology or markets, the career is ended; if the abilities are lacking, an opportunity can never be occupied in the first place.
In fact, a person cannot develop abilities in farming, or in anything else, except as there are opportunities which evoke and nurture the exercise and growth of abilities. Stated differently, if persons are to make their maximum contribution to a society or an economy, they need to be in a position to make their own life better or worse by acts of their own, as John Stuart Mill observed more than a century ago: The Irish cottier was very poor because "almost alone amongst mankind [the cottier was] in this condition, that he can scarcely be either any better or worse off by any act of his own."\(^4\)

If I have seemed to labor this point, it is only because of a conviction which I have developed through some years of concern for agricultural development that, as a profession, agricultural scientists, including economists, have become overly committed to a belief that it is possible to develop the agriculture of a country by increasing man's control over physical nature. This is essential and important, but scarcely half the story. Agricultural development is achieved by the wills and persistent efforts and the energies of men. Freedom and willing participation are in themselves productive.

If I were to summarize or generalize the points I have tried to make in a sentence or two, it would be this: That the nation which can devise ways to include the excluded poor as rightful participants in both state and economy will be the stronger for it. Somehow everyone should have both economic citizenship and political citizenship. The great tragedy of the rural poor over much of the world is that they have neither.
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