

50. Giving Back

If you decide to do good it's because you feel compelled to give back. Someone was kind enough to let you survive to date. The more you take the more you can afford to be generous. Yet one must be wisely charitable. Many run around with crazy ideas to make World a better place based on affluence acquired and good treatment they've received. This objective is way too lofty. All need to focus on their own spheres of influence. Don't need a mission to Third World. Things aren't right right here at home. Are you nice to your family or fellow workers? Why bring up banal references to business and human resources books? They're all about what you personally do, not what some amorphous abstract society does. Is society in which you live fair to all its constituents? Does that successful nation to which you belong share fairly with other nations? Instead of affirmative action aimed at divvying up limited resources, will resources expand to serve all equally? More importantly, what are *you* going to do about it?

Palms down at work give; palms up receive. Any hand reaching out, sharing, is a gift. You can begrudgingly or gratefully take it, toss it out, trade for a merchandise credit, or try passing it along. The only thing you can't do is expect more. Other people decide what they'll send. You can only decide what you'll give to whom. Whether entitled or not, if you ask for help, it may or may not come, or it may show up in forms you don't recognize. Customary giving, as done on birthdays and holidays, is a marketing ploy, nothing more. Some people only give when they feel obligated. The best gifts come unexpectedly when you need them the most: an opportunity, shot in the arm, sudden inspiration. Minor miracles do happen every day; you have to be looking for them to notice.

But what if you've never received much? Did it all on your own? Grabbers are often people who've had to struggle. Those with sweet deals aren't going to question anything. They aren't brilliant, just average intellects who never thought things through to murky conclusions. It's so easy to grab from those without a tight grip; seems easier than gradually earning. Everybody snatches what they can when survival depends on it. Why not cut the to chase, start by grabbing? If you're sneaky about it, would probably work. Those who acquire or require little are assailed by those who'd take even that away. Worse, greedy, impatient opportunists take away one's serenity. Nothing ever gets better. Grabbers become bitter and twisted, if they survive, or infect others.

Utopias never survive because men have only seen a small glimpse of what society could be. H. G. Wells envisioned, "Cycle tracks will abound in Utopia." More to the point, how damned difficult is it to help some people? Having been treated cruelly, people only know how to be cruel to others and themselves. Those who've been kicked in the teeth act to annoy whenever they can, block entryways, cut lines, stand in middle of street. When you lie with dogs you get fleas. You don't feel much like helping them after suffering their rudeness. But it makes no difference, since you're simply compelled no matter what. You feel you must seek out those with grace, those well behaved. Yet a peaceful World of fiscal fairness and gentle commerce cannot be attained if greed isn't abolished. Individual, separate utopias only exclude, not a place, but a state of mind. Places need not exist if positive ideals can be mustered from within. If public cared and fairly shared, you wouldn't need special accommodations for bicycling. Easier to cull out bad actors, cut their privileges.

There were many ideal societies that failed or never got beyond planning: Communism, Erewhon, Facism, Greek Polis, lip service democracies, murderous Mafia tribes, mythical city states, Nazism, religions, reputed republics, Swiftean Laputa. Dudbubba's distopia is the latest installment. Few can define, never mind encompass, them in their mind. Anything other than fairly sharing is essentially beating someone else for profit, "Give me what you have." Disrespect is a form of violence. To those who leap directly into copouts, "The problems are so complex they'll never be solved," Al could only shake his head, aware that all those stuck in a mindset not of their own conception, impossible for them to get beyond, weren't worth correcting on the spot. Problems may not be resolvable in the current paradigm. Your only solution may be to change paradigm. Copouts and do-nothings invariably counter argue, "Revolution results in equivalent replacements back in power." Historically, there *have* been precedents. French overthrew their monarchy only to wind up with an even worse emperor, but, ultimately, this led to democracy not only in France but America. Almost all of society's ills are a direct result of market economy policies so staunchly defended as to betray their treason. So, do away with them. There are alternatives, systems of fair exchange where people don't slug each other to get what they need.

Cooperation, giving with no expectation of profit, has been called the most mystifying aspect of human behavior. Political scientists as Fowler at U-Cal-Davis identify *altruistic punishment*, an urge to correct injustice and rudeness among strangers, as the glue

that holds society together. They claim it's a species survival instinct. "Our tendency to sanction breaches of social norms is the key to human cooperation." He met many punishers but not so many forgivers. Although fear of punishment helps keep chaos in check, people do what's right most of the time anyway. Sharing is a hard-wired circuit where some deprivation is expected, even welcome. It's no sacrifice to never have enjoyed fleshy pleasures and remain celibate nor become so jaded as to give it up. The sacrifice is in unrequited longing, tantalized but seldom satisfied. Natural curiosity bridled by inexorable restraints puts everyone in that middle ground. Conservative, criminal, extremist, frugal, liberal, pious, sinful and uptight are all wavelengths on the same spectrum. People around the middle, fair traders, give and take, offer and reciprocate, are the easiest to get along with.

They say, "You can't have it both ways," as if you must choose among extremes. More precise to say, "You can't have it either way," because, 1st, whatever you want will be denied or put beyond your reach, and, 2nd, anything too extreme falls apart without its opposite. A coin cannot exist without both sides, day without night, yang without yin. The so-called Law of Unintended Consequences, more an observation than principle, states that all human actions imply some unforeseen effects. No decision is perfect, each denies and grants privileges to certain individuals, whether buddies or countrymen or foreigners or the World's poorest. Trespass will never disappear, can only be reduced to tolerable levels. To forgive unknown transgressions is thoughtless. Don't you want to know why you're being forgiven? If people point out your flaws and pains they've endured because of you, forgiveness becomes meaningful. So many have endured so much for his sake, it left him worshipfully awed. It can't be repaid.

The problem with the phrase, "In the end, only kindness matters," is it disregards how this truth was derived, before destination is reached. It minimizes trouble to find truth and what effort it took to get there, as important as a conclusion. Why think of *the end* when rewards occur throughout? There are satisfactions of reaching intermediate goals and relishing good will of people you've helped. You can't just be careful or kind, you have to understand why you must be. By analogy, solving mathematical equations requires both the appropriate axiom and effort; punching keys on a calculator doesn't test your knowledge. You have to know how and practice. There are many methods: following rules of etiquette, obeying just laws, possessing courage to act on your convictions, speaking against what's wrong even when it's an unpleasant subject

or may result in retaliation, and spurning *brutalitarian*, totalitarian minds who never recognize kindness because that would destroy their basis of power. You can be eccentric as long as you are fuzzy and kind and don't ask for anything. Displays of threatening behavior aren't tolerated. Animal and human sacrifice, dangerous negligence, and property destruction aren't allowed.

Bits of logic get lost afterward. Any person who looks at a result after it was accomplished and complains it didn't meet his/her expectations should have made it a point to be there during design phase. Activists are often conceptually far ahead of perceived needs. Expectations are judgmental. Big doesn't always equal strong. Smart doesn't guarantee productive. When they don't get what they want, culpability is quickly assessed and penalty applied. At least 10 million of these transactions occur every minute: domestic violence, petty theft, workplace harassment. People with needs sit in judgement of another's character. He was greeted with that same annoying carping and hollow criticism, having been excluded from planning to begin with then rebuked for results. After improvements, original state is gone; so how bad it once was can't be compared with how unsuitable it is now. Take bike routes and bikeways. They can be very poorly done, it's true, but do they get used? Encourage participation? Flow traffic better? Since nothing is perfect, something is better than nothing. Can't stagnate in analysis paralysis. You have to try based on your best input. Problems of flowing intense bike and motor traffic are so new, few transportation engineers yet grasp there are even issues.

You don't know much. What you think you know, someone immediately stifles. Congress is fixated on athletes who use steroids. Newscasters spend a month chasing a demented story of one Olympian maiming another to get ahead. Are sports now about physically incapacitating an opponent off-court or shooting up drugs to gain advantages? Pelaton cyclists are not above flicking off one another. If that's tack being taken, there's probably too much money or prestige involved in winning. Why else would media be obsessed with this? Celebrities who get slightly banged up get far more press than poor villagers who are murdered daily for *ethnic cleansing*. That's what's sad; that's why it goes on. If you kill those who are obscure, nobody chases you. A few say, "Shame... tsk, tsk." No investigative report digs into it. If it did, bystanders would tell reporters, "Oh, yeah, that guy... Didn't he do drugs? Hang with a bad element? Live in a slum?" Media acts as if any of these things, if true, damned victim to an early grave. They'll discredit victims to dispel stench of their own guilt.

Reporters were to Jimmy Hoffa like ants at a picnic, nothing to worry about, when they could have been an ally had Hoffa made good on a threat to call them. Biologist Wilson warned against comparing people with ants, which communicate by smell and taste, keep themselves fastidiously clean, live in alien social organizations, and wage war perpetually, perhaps not so different after all. Globally, number of ant colonies surpass humans. When neither government nor organized crime is protecting you, you can only appeal to the masses, a desperate measure at best, because they're so easily fooled or swayed, never have much interest unless it affects them personally. Their inattention assures they'll be lied to with impunity, ripped off, and taken advantage of. Those who emphatically oppose or even question their policies quietly disappear. Organized groups, no matter what their size, are extremely powerful compared to disorganized individuals. People can be left to themselves, huddle together, rough hew out a life in some form, as long as they generate a critical mass or keep a low profile. After all, doesn't this describe most nations around globe?

Media disappoints, time after time, by not performing a vital task, namely, exposing stories that guilty would rather remain unknown. If the *hue and cry*, as it was once known, demanded justice at each killing, theft, or trespass, murderers and thieves would be dealt with swiftly. Not caring for each other spreads societal malaise. Citizens fear speaking out, let miscreants have their way. They're worse cowards by letting lawless mobs do their worst. Newscasters, producers, reporters and station owners top cowardly list by steering clear of: a) Bankers, insurers, and utilities, who bribe commissioners and regulators with impunity; b) Candidates who pay millions for a seat that pays tens of thousands; c) City and state workers whose sole duty is to show up for a check on payday; d) Crooked judges who gladly dispense the best justice money can buy; and e) Dictators who wage war for monetary and political gain. Television reporters who show up to be interviewed, talk over unfolding events, or transform into personalities have to go. They are supposed to be neutral, fade into furniture, profess no individual viewpoints. It's called *objectivity*. The fact that Baba Wawizz, then Kathy Cantread were paid more than other anchors is a good reason to get rid of them. They aren't really reporters but actors allegedly delivering accurate reports. Human suffering is so secondary to their charms, news is minimized. No wonder he got his news anonymously from BBC, Internet, National Geographic or PBS. There actually are some who'd work for the honor and pleasure of doing what they do, given enough to subsist on.

Cable television has inspired a whole new subspecies, *Homo mordax*, the biting, caustic, raging news junkie, who absorbs all that crap and cackles back at radio and television. If reporters were honest, stories would be balanced: both sides of important issues, chance to introduce informed viewpoints, concise debates. But none of it is honest, more geared to mislead and provoke ineffectual action than inform and gain audience support. Either don't watch or suavely do something about what bothers you. Be a boot spur that drives jackasses forward. Just don't sit there and stew about issues that don't affect you like a Huckabee protagonist driven into doubt, emotional paralysis, and self loathing.

How can you justify giving advice to just, "Go do something," when that might cause damage, death, pain or ruination? There's no such thing as *doing nothing*; alive and breathing means glomping food and wasting resources while you contribute nothing in return and deprive yourself of what's most important, positive interaction. Yet no sooner than you think, "Get out there and make contact," than people you meet cruelly use you. Worse, you can't even enter nation's hospitals because of rampant staph infections, which lately have leaked into communities and started killing otherwise healthy, unsuspecting neighbors. If you want to stay alive, you must alertly assess every new threat, never let down your guard. It's exhausting. To do things right you have to absorb way too much input; you're still not ready when you've turned 50, and by then you're just too flabby and spent.

Funny how fans marvel at, swoon over, dead artists who made pretty paintings, poetry, songs, even actors, dancers and filmmakers. They produce a paltry thing and people rave. Films urge you into action, which you'd think might drive people away from passive movie viewing, but moviegoers think of a night out at a film as doing something. It was hype of artwork that bugged him. Basic artistic principle: Do anything, then successfully sell it as some important departure. Ask outrageous amounts to prove its worth. Giving something away for free is to condemn it to oblivion. How many superlatives can you toss around? Renoir was nice, but a nameless Samaritan slopping soup to homeless bums is greater. What about workers who build cities, fix roads, keep the juices—food, fuel, power—flowing? Aren't they the real artists? It's impractical to justify a balance sheet with things that help homeless children or lepers. Doing for dilettantes, making rich richer, didn't do it for him. Volunteering time should only be for those in need. People prepped for early painful death from diseases of inactivity are in need, whether they realize it's coming or not.

Society supports those who produce new products by letting them make lots of money. That's what people hold dear, profits, although they vilify those who actually succeed. Working toward common good only gets noticed by its peculiar strangeness. Selfless, unprofitable acts are laughable and draw jeers and taunts. No selfless act will go unpunished. There'll be no awards for perfection. They don't give any to whoever treads lightest across earth, though aboriginal people did revere her life-giving goodness, didn't defile, harnessed rivers with weirs, but possessed no mechanized means to defoliate and reshape land on a massive scale. These days they're making up for lost time by building casinos. Society rewards the biggest son of a bitch, anyone who grabs as much as possible for personal gain. Recognition is for suckers. He was in this game for years. Rulers toss around gold watches, jewelry and trophies just to get more out of those who follow. He never wanted "Volunteer of the Year", although others speculated he might. Recognition didn't work in club. No sooner rewarded, volunteers stop doing anything. It's just a carrot for dopes with hopes they'll be noticed. If he won, he had a speech ready: "That I'm being awarded this honor is a sad testament to fact hardly any of you did anything to make this club serve any value. I'm ashamed by your negligence. Get off your fat asses." Whose was he supposed to kiss to get a goofy plaque? Please! It's like Groucho Marx said, "Don't want to be part of any club that would take me as a member." There are a few people who *do* work diligently, but they're exempt. Some members appreciated him, but miscalculated his worth; insiders hated him, because he made them look bad. As it should be.

How do you describe chains? End plates and pins form a link, and links connect to work in unison. Brands as Shimano, Shram, and Whipperman provide choice, as hollow pins do decrease weight, and solid increase wear. Chains can be connections in an effective network or constituents in a set of shackles. A hapless husband refers to wearisome wife as a *ball and chain*. What was lost meeting her needs? You have to produce like hell while you can since later you'll spend all your time caring for a sickly parent or spouse. What experiences will you miss? Having occasionally given in to allure of road he mostly found pavement in disrepair, plenty of pain, and superficiality among strangers. Some might prefer this to strong bonds that tie one down. Having a child is a way to fill your life with all manner of chains. You can't choose to dissent, do nothing, drop out, revert to hermit. No, you have to work to feed and raise your child as best you can, something becoming increasingly difficult. Lusting to harness everyone's effort there's no

provision anymore for caretakers, homemakers, housewives. They've raised the cost of living to a point where entire families have to be gainfully employed, but they forgot to provide good pays. Emotionally, men, like lizards, are genetically wired to find new partners, impregnate them, and move on. It's only by sheer will that they remain faithful. Women, like birds, are wired to adopt a single locale, feather nest, and wait for Mr. Right. With this paradox of monogamy, infidelity was practically assured. Yet males jealously guard conquests, harem, prey or turf. Fight first, then f***! Biological imperatives suppress any logical discussion or societal evolution, despite a society plagued by STDs. Sorting it all out is like steering through a hormonal swamp dotted with alligators and pools of quicksand. As Freud revealed, understanding sex drives between interacting pairs unlocks all behaviors.

Those who don't believe that things can't get worse forget it *truly was* not long ago. Any current equilibrium is being shored up by land and resource grabbing elsewhere. Places like Afghanistan, Balkans, Colombia, Darfur, Indonesia, Iraq, and Somalia are just widely dispersed flash points in a global class war, where insurrection would be unthinkable at home. As long as a middle class survives in America, there will be relative peace. Meanwhile wealthy create buffer zones around their gated properties under guise of natural resource trusts, thereby putting environmentalism to work for themselves. Puts aside at least a portion of rapidly disappearing nature; so what if it happened to fall right next to a enclave of mansions? Was such a clever ruse, who could argue? Would rather see historic mills turned into public parks. Before something like that could occur, all surrounding land would be bought for a pittance by rich speculators who'd build mansions afterwards. Old money goes out of its way to ensure long range, low risk planning. All bases are covered; riff-rafs are excluded. With nowhere to build modest homes, middle class is fast disappearing. National policies are trump cards in every fiscal game. Some might discredit this as a jealous rant. He truly had no interest in acquiring bulletproof layers, living in a palace, or shutting everyone else out. But neither can you open your gates to criminals and lunatics.

Everywhere—mail-order, market delis, retail stores—little bait-and-switch scams go on—especially tourist traps where it's more likely they won't get your repeat business. They stock side by side 2 similar products with widely varying prices. No matter which item you order by description, you get whichever's the most expensive. Usually nobody notices until they get home. Complaining is covered with glib excuses, "You ordered *imported*." This is practi-

cally tolerable compared to escalating fees and premiums for items depreciating in value or diminishing in quality (especially cars), 5 quarters of water bills each year, multiple taxes on the same thing, overestimated utility bills, unchallenged increases in real estate valuations every year, and unearned privileges someone else gets but not you. Big stealing and steady chiseling beget small and successive, in turn. It all becomes a circus for which consumers pay whether engaged or oblivious.

Everything was a game. He saw through real estate success stories to banks lining up suckers for loans. Speculators believe they can take on a mortgage with no money down, hold onto property for a few months, then turn it over for big profit. They're often stuck with white elephants that didn't move to begin with: bad location, high cost to be made livable, localized recession, no redeeming qualities. The only parties who make money are bankers and real estate agents, who profit twice on every turnaround, and insurers and tax collectors, who churn up revenue out of otherwise stagnant assets. Buyers and sellers are just suckers. They say, "A watched pot never boils." Makes no sense. Of course it does, well, at least, liquid inside, which does boil quicker to if you leave cover on. But they extrapolate on this phrase to mean, "A rolling stone gathers no moss," or inertia pays. Again, nonsense. Bankers want you to focus elsewhere while they loan your money and pay you next to nothing for the privilege, a nice sleight-of-hand trick if you can get away with it. It cost more to be pleased for 20 minutes than what bankers pay you for 365 days use of, say, \$100,000. This way they can triple its value in 20 years, \$15,000/year, or \$2 an hour. You get 1/200th part, a penny an hour. A more equal partnership would be fair, 50:50 or 60:40. Having money doesn't seem to do you any good: accrues no interest, costs you money to keep it, gathers no moss. Money managers are hired based on their sphere of influence, who they know, not what they know about finance. People ought to get back to self sufficiency rather than pay to be gypped, purchase tools rather than T-bills, put their money to work for themselves rather than lend to institutions. But It's safer to default on a loan than risk your own cash.

Big issues never get discussed. Or, perhaps, there's no way to calculate effects of taking a stance. Gun control would disarm a lot of would-be killers but not all, and would make those disarmed more vulnerable both from malevolent individuals and rogue officials. Parties on both sides of women's choice argument have no answer for who would've provided for the thirty million children that would've been born. Poverty isn't an effective gun or

population control, only starvation. Before it comes to that, people will take up whatever arms they can to fight back, you can be sure. A reasonable distribution of wealth is essential to national security. Lately this goes under the politically correct pseudonym, *distributive justice*, as if someone is honest enough to fairly distribute, or spreading wealth would result in fairness. Giving back a dollar to tax payers had already been tried unsuccessfully. Many bought a lottery ticket, hoping to parlay their *windfall* into something meaningful. Time wasted gambling was paid by suffering of the dispossessed; gambling was a major factor toward more becoming so. Lotteries sanctify the false ideal of a lucky few prospering at the expense of everyone else. Religions that don't denounce gambling from their pulpits are false; many are busy organizing bingos.

He said aloud, "I am no number on a balance sheet." Such a pronouncement was once enough to inspire activism. But now its urge was gone. His mind paralleled attitudes of commercial businesses. They didn't want him either because he didn't add to bottom line according to principle by which they profited, root out all waste. Generalists aren't even a "nice to have" in a world focused on making cash fast. Commercial industry, despite all contrary propaganda, doesn't strive for a greater good in which everyone's doing, earning, sharing, spending and swelling economy. Instead, it offers best and brightest small chances to hack off tiny slivers and pick crumbs, while CEOs, major stockholders, and other self-serving monstrosities consolidate power and hide from press scrutiny. Publicists are paid to key into successes and shroud any *ghost in the machine* among club of billionaires who run World on autopilot.

To champion capitalism is to endorse hostility, manipulation, and terrorism. When Americans should be showing what they can do without nations powerful enough to threaten, they sink to the lowest common denominator. An administration mired in fear overburdens middle class, runs up a huge deficit, shrinks economy, and wastes trillions to subjugate poor unfortunates. Dudbubba spoke incessantly of a "threat to civilization", just ring leaders and tribal warlords with an inflated view of their potency. Why not announce peaceful plans for humanitarian aid to Moslem and other needy countries instead of occupying them? By advancing ethics, creating opportunities for all, and inspiring greatness, America could again be a model for rest of world. You can only assume America doesn't want mantle of World leadership. He felt helpless. All his worst nightmares, from which he'd wake sweating, were about being powerless to help someone when they needed it most, letting them die because he was too weak. Contorted dying faces

haunt you forever. Fear of the unknown is called anxiety and cowardice, which come from having too much to lose.

Bono tried to give to those in need, but found it impossible. Too many greedy hands in the way. Many who'd like to do their part complain of champagne parties for patrons biting too much into funds raised. Junkets are taken, while scholarships aren't given. So, instead, Bono underwrote an effort to lobby for debt amnesty, passive aggression, sleight of hand, workarounds. To date 36 nations have benefited. Like Alvin Lee, he'd love to change the World, but he didn't know what to do, and so left it up to entertainers like Bono, until now. The answer seemed simple. Ice pick frozen assets and scatter slivers. A bunch of targets came to mind: SEC complaints against securities issuers, sexual perversity lawsuits against organized religions, whistle blowing. Send some people to jail. One pharmacist was giving cheap placebos in place of expensive but needed cancer drugs. Easy to cheat those who might die anyway. After killing hundreds of victims and pocketing >\$20 million, they finally caught him; must've paid a hefty fine. Jail time is seldom enough. Penalties should equal offenses. Legal process must be just and swift, not prolonged and uncertain. Public accepts capital sentences for serial crimes. But what about work details to at least partially undo losses thefts and vandalism cause? Prisoners who assault guards or inmates do need behavior modification not more time. Charities could spot check that institutions critical to general health or wellbeing are doing what they are supposed to do. Instead they incarcerate those who promote improvement. Reformers resort to illegal activity, like assassinations, kidnapping, unbombing; all that's counterproductive, makes rich look like victims, plays into their hands. Robin Hood was a romantic fantasy.

Since laws don't work, just put money into hands of lawyers, who already have too much, the only thing left was to get everyone to boycott products of offenders. You'd need a scorecard separating companies with vested interests from those conglomerately liberated and cooperatively owned. If corporations shift employment out of country, stop blindly buying their foreign imports. Executive compensation is a good indicator. Why give anything to individuals who won't distribute it equitably? If they don't report perks and salaries, as don't most Japanese firms, buy from competitors. Why do you think so many corporations are eager to merge? It's to dodge your boycotts and protect their executives. Without majority acting in unison out of conscience, government through laws is impossible. For example, police can't protect unless citizens report suspicious activity or testify in court.

Food, fuel, and pleasures they bring are worse than heroin, not something easily kicked. Businesses dangle carrots so consumers do as they are told, empty their wallets, endure lines for ordinary things, never consider whether they need them or not, take on debt. Merchant sang, "Have I been blind? ...lost? ...wrong? ...wise? ...strong? Have I been lost inside my myself and my own mind, hypnotized, mesmerized, by what my eyes have seen." He also faced down what she implied, *cavernous greed* that fosters all fear and injustice. Capitalism makes gray haired matrons mask themselves in bike advocacy and turn it into a cottage industry. Who will gently shake up sleeping majority, get them to rouse themselves to selfless public service? Recycle and reuse. Become small, escape daily routine, ride a bike, speak at town meetings. How can you convince those you care about to deprive themselves? Almost easier to become rich than pry loose their grip.

Middle class majority ought to arise, organize, wrest control. They are paying for everything—bureaucracy, food stamps, welfare, warfare—from which none of them benefit. Why not demand rich pay instead? Oh yeah, rich are in Congress, enacting repressive laws instead of representing their constituency, middleclass voters. He was already boycotting almost everything. Effective boycotts require an enormous amount of expensive communication: book publishing, distribution, television time. Anyone can post a web page for little, which competes for attention with billions of other pages. With Internet you get what you pay for, virtual anonymity. But you can say whatever you like, if you aren't afraid of repercussions, which, of course, you should expect.

Since he didn't owe anyone, he had no compulsion to give anything back. Seemed like society owed him. In many ways, that's as it should be. Better to spend it all than hoard, whether it's talent or wealth. Charity is giving your own effort and time to achieve a demonstrable result, something you see in front of you after having achieved it yourself. You don't achieve your goal of grace by simply going along unaware; it comes when you stifle vengeance despite betrayals, mistreatment, witness to heinous sins. To shoulder this horrible burden and still forge forward for the common good, that's grace. If only he could spread this message among those who could do something about suffering, endow a foundation, truly give back. He'd have to win a lottery to do that. Didn't play games. Unexpectedly, a plan emerged.

