arises in trying to adapt social aspirations to an economic device or vice versa. Each of the major systems has a role to play and a function to perform and neither system should be measured or judged in terms of the purposes of the other. Thus, we find that the private system is criticized for its failure to adhere to the social values of a public system and the public system is criticized for its failure to produce benefits of an "adequate" amount.

Three somewhat obvious conclusions can be drawn from the experience of the past 90 years. First, changing economic and social conditions of the past century have led to general acceptance of the desirability of organized systems for old age income maintenance. Second, the private movement of business and industry to provide income assistance for aging workers was a logical outgrowth of the employment of large numbers of workers in a single business enterprise which made earlier forms of providing for older workers impractical and obsolete. The same reason may be cited for initiation of retirement systems for employees of governmental units. Third, government has assumed the dominant role in the creation and maintenance of old age income systems. The original role of Government was limited to that of employer, then expanded via tax legislation to encourage other employers to establish programs, and finally, to the enactment of compulsory legislation requiring workers and employers alike to contribute to the financing of old age. A fourth related point, which may not be obvious, is that the effectiveness of permissive tax legislation as an incentive to the accumulation of retirement income is directly related to the impact of taxation on the income of individuals rather than on the income of business.

Old-age income flows from a number of organized sources: first, veterans' pensions; second, Old-Age Assistance; third, Old Age and Survivors' Insurance; fourth, public employee retirement systems; fifth, private retirement plans. There are a number of variants of private retirement plans: first, the corporate pension plan; second, the joint labor-management pension plan; third, association plans; fourth, self-employed plans; fifth, bond purchase plans; sixth, tax sheltered annuities; and other arrangements. It is readily apparent that most of the methods in use are for the primary purpose of simplifying the complicated tangle of rules and regulations covering the operation of qualified private retirement plans to the point they can be made economically attractive to small groups.

For society the most desirable arrangement, of course, would be for every older citizen to continue his preretirement standard of living out of his own resources accumulated during a working career of full and adequately compensated employment. The minimum that most Americans are willing to settle for is assurance that no one in our society is without the basic necessities of life, but fixing responsibilities for this minimum is another matter, as is identifying the need by classification or by individuals. In the absence of adequate and clear-cut private channels for satisfying minimum income needs of older citizens, Government has assumed the responsibility first at the local community level, later at the State level, and now largely through Federal sponsorship of programs in cooperation with State and local government.