

# NewOptions

July 25, 1988

Issue No. Fifty

## Shifting the Framework from "Growth" to "Health"

So far, NEW OPTIONS has focused upon changing the *forms* of the world—shrinking the big corporations, empowering the U.N., promoting sustainable agriculture. . . . But as management consultant Harrison Owen told us last week from his Potomac, Md. offices, "To observe the forms is to be one step away from what is really going on."

According to Owen, whose self-published book, *Spirit* (1987), has become an underground best-seller among executives and administrators, behind the forms is culture, myth, "spirit" — in organizations, the "spirit of the organization"; in politics, the "spirit of the age."

If Owen is right, then the incessant battles over forms are also and most fundamentally battles over spirit. But how to report on spirit in a political newsletter?

### Growth story

It *can* be done.

As Owen points out, "spirit" is often packaged in the external world in the form of "guiding stories." And it's not difficult to discern the "guiding story" behind traditional politics and economics. It's the oft-told tale of the value and necessity of endless economic growth. Both presidential candidates are telling the tale, and so is the political left (see NEW OPTIONS #44).

For years, decentralist/globally responsible thinkers and activists have poked holes in the growth story. They've even offered competing stories (#33). But they've lacked a credible organization promoting a competing story. Until now.

For the last two years or so, the World Health Organization (WHO), one of the agencies of the United Nations, has been promoting a notion of health—a health "story" — that can stand as a full-blown alternative to the growth story.

Through declarations and conferences, "action" projects and "healthy cities" programs, WHO has been saying that the measure of societal success should be, not the growth of

the economy, but the inner and outer health of the people.

### Breakthrough

When WHO was founded 40 years ago, it was already defining health as "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being." But as Leonard Duhl, public health professor at UC-Berkeley and U.S. consultant to WHO, points out, "The reality is that for the first couple of decades, the medical model remained the focus. Doctors, hospitals and the health care system were assumed to be synonymous with health."

In 1977, the 30th WHO Assembly resolved that the "main social target of governments" should be "Health for All by the Year 2000." And the following year WHO's Declaration of Alma Ata called on governments to adopt a "primary health care strategy." But there was still little movement away from the medical definition of health.

The big conceptual breakthrough came in 1984, at a conference in Toronto called "Beyond Health Care." Public health experts from around the world decided it was time for them to shift from thinking about "public health policy" to thinking about "healthy public policy."

"[We concluded] that public health policy based on health care organization alone is a totally inadequate means of improving health," says Trevor Hancock, public health official from the City of Toronto who helped organize the conference and is Canadian consultant to WHO. "If we are to enhance [people's] health we must move our policy discussions into sectors that have little or nothing to do with the delivery of sick care services."

The following year WHO did something controversial and brave. It decided to sponsor the proceedings on "health and economics" at the annual TOES conference (the *alternative* economic summit; see p. 3 below). The TOES/WHO collaboration gave birth to a stirring 28-page pamphlet, "Health, Wealth and the New

Economics," summing up the findings of the conference.

Among the "healthy public policies" TOES participants urged WHO to promote: healthier work, healthier food, healthier housing, a healthier built and natural environment, healthier transport policies, healthier technologies—and a healthier definition of "wealth"!

### "Ottawa Charter"

Many of the key insights at the "Beyond Health Care" and TOES conferences were formally adopted by WHO in a remarkable document known as the "Ottawa Charter," drafted

#### Note from the Editor

We skip our August issue, as we do every year, and resume publication in September. But don't worry, we won't miss a beat. We've just gotten press credentials for the Democratic National Convention in Atlanta, and we'll be spending part of our vacation on the Convention floor!

and passed at WHO's "First International Conference on Health Promotion," held in Ottawa, Canada, in 1986. According to Duhl, six million copies of the document are in circulation worldwide (disproportionately few in the U.S.). Its five key recommendations:

- Build healthy public policy.
- Create supportive environments.
- Strengthen community action.
- Develop personal skills.
- Reorient health services.

### Adelaide & after

This spring, 240 health professionals from 43 countries flew to Adelaide, Australia, for WHO's *second* "International Conference on Health Promotion." Its charge: to flesh out the first of the five recommendations of the Ottawa Charter.

"The definition of 'healthy public policy' that

emerged from Adelaide is a very interesting one," Hancock told NEW OPTIONS. "It says that healthy public policy is characterized by an explicit concern for health and equity in all aspects of public policy. See the [breakthrough] there? Equity is equated with health.

"It also says that public and private policymakers are to be held accountable for the health impacts of their policies."

In 1991, in Sweden, WHO will be sponsoring its third "International Conference on Health Promotion," on the links between health and the environment. "One of the things I'm doing in preparation for that conference is bringing together the notions of sustainable development and sustainable health policy," Hancock says. "The things that tend to be damaging to the environment tend to be damaging to human health, too—and that includes many aspects of economic growth. . . ."

### "Action research"

If all WHO did was hold conferences and issue declarations, even that would have an effect. "In every place but the U.S. and some parts of Western Europe, WHO is an [inspirer and] enabler," Duhl told NEW OPTIONS. But WHO is seeking to implement its vision, not just publicize it. In the Third World, one thing it's doing is launching "action-oriented research projects."

To find out more, we visited Marilyn Rice at WHO's Regional Office for the Americas, which occupies an enormous circular building on the outskirts of downtown Washington, D.C. "What we do," Rice told NEW OPTIONS, "is go into a community [or small country in Central or South America] and say, 'What are your priority health needs?' We won't just talk to medical personnel, we'll talk to community leaders and organized community groups.

"Some of the [small countries] have already picked their priorities. One thing some of them have picked is traffic accidents. Now that's the kind of issue that would *never* get identified as a priority in a medical care setting, okay? But looking at it from a more global, multi-sectoral perspective, the country has said, 'This problem is really affecting the health conditions of our country, and we need to look at it.'"

### "Healthy cities"

In Europe and North America, WHO has launched a "Healthy Cities Project" aimed at "moving health high on the agenda of city policy." Twenty-three cities, from 16 countries, are already participating in the project.

None of the cities are from the U.S., which is ironic, because the originator of the "Healthy Cities" concept is Berkeley's own Leonard Duhl. His book *The Urban Condition* (1963) was one of the first to present a socio-ecological view of health.

Duhl spent 20 years speaking and writing about his ideas in a public policy vacuum. Then, in 1984, Hancock brought him up to Toronto to speak at the "Beyond Health Care" conference. "WHO people were there," Duhl told NEW OPTIONS, "they had me fly to Copenhagen to see the WHO-Europe staff, and the next thing I knew 'Healthy Cities' was a prime program in Europe! It really just took off like a bat out of hell.

"Part of it had to do with language; the term 'healthy cities' rang true. [Also,] medical care was getting so expensive that they *had* to find other ways of dealing with the [health] problem. Finally, mayors all over the world were saying that cities are ungovernable. [The time was right for an approach] that says, 'Hey, let's get the cast of characters out of their private professional domains and have them come around a common game board—and instead of playing separate games, *create a new game* that integrates all [their] concerns. A game called 'Healthy Cities'. . . ."

Although no U.S. city is part of the Healthy Cities project, "there are a lot of [individual programs] in the States that fit the model," Duhl says. "Do you know about KidsPlace? It's a [kids' lobby in Seattle actually drawing on kids' ideas and meant to place children and their families high on the city's economic and cultural agenda]. There's a superb food project in Knoxville, Tenn., working with restaurants, working with stores, [to] feed kids and old people. . . . If you look at a lot of the programs that Harry Boyte mentioned [in *Community Is Powerful*, #10], you'll see they're all *pieces* of what could be a Healthy Cities program."

### "Hannover Project"

Two months ago, at the "Mind and Nature" conference in Hannover, West Germany, England's Peter Russell and Norway's Sven Bjork launched the Hannover Project, an international initiative aimed at encouraging governments and people to put "as much time, energy and money into exploring the psychological, cultural and spiritual dimensions to the problems facing us as we currently put into resolving the problems themselves."

The Project has already been endorsed by over 100 key thinkers and activists worldwide. Russell and Bjork are meeting this month to decide on the next steps.

Hazel Henderson, the economics writer and futurist (#43), is U.S. representative on the core group of the Hannover Project. "Up till now WHO hasn't been interested in the the inner states of human beings, because that was so culturally explosive," Henderson told NEW OPTIONS. "Every country has a different definition of what's mentally ill and mentally well. What Sven is hoping to do is get a research directive out of WHO saying that this area of

research is [now] a high priority."

### A new spirit?

On one level, WHO has launched an innovative new kind of public health movement. On a deeper level, it's trying to change the "spirit of the age" from a focus on economic growth to a focus on physical, social, emotional and—hopefully!—spiritual health.

And many of the key WHO players know it.

"In the old days you could integrate [society] by motherhood and god," Duhl told NEW OPTIONS. "You can't do that any more. But health [can become] a real integrating phenomenon. When you define health very broadly, it becomes a clarion call for people [from all countries and from every station in life]."

For Hancock, health is a more effective unifying story than ecology or economics. "People in general are more concerned about human health than they are about the health of fish or trees or whatever. One way of addressing environmental issues is as a health concern. . . . You can also address social justice issues in health terms. People seem to have a willingness to accept economic injustice. They seem to say, well, that's life, some are rich and some are poor. I think they have a lot less tolerance for accepting things like a gap in life expectancy between the upper and lower income quintiles."

*Action Research Project: Marilyn Rice, WHO-Americas, 525 23rd Ave. N.W., #804, Washington DC 20037. Healthy Cities Project (and general info. on WHO): Ilona Kickbusch, WHO-Europe, Health Promotion Unit, 8 Scherfigsvej, DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark. Hannover Project: Sven Bjork, P.O. Box 5140 Majorsua, 0301 Oslo 3, Norway. Owen: clo Abbott Publishing, 7808 Falls River Dr., Potomac MD 20854; Spirit, \$23 pbk. "Health, Wealth and the New Economics": \$5 from Intermediate Technology Development Group, P.O. Box 337, Croton-on-Hudson NY 10520.*

## NewOptions

NEW OPTIONS (ISSN 0890-1619) is published every month except August by New Options Inc., 2005 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., lower level, Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 822-0929.

Please address ALL correspondence to Post Office Box 19324, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Subscriptions: \$25 a year in the U.S., \$32 first-class and Canada, \$39 elsewhere. Back issues \$2 each.

Editor: Mark Satin

Manager, New Options Inc.: Sylvia Tognetti

Assistants: Judith Leckrone, Mary-Coleman Ragsdale

Business Consultants: Richard Perl, Roger Pritchard

Designer/Typesetter: Baker Johnson Graphic Design, Inc.

Printer/Mailer: Newsletter Services, Inc.

Mailing List Manager: Montgomery Data Systems, Inc.

Board of Advisors (partial listing): Lester Brown, Ernest Callenbach, Fritjof Capra, Herman Daly, James Fallows, Marilyn Ferguson, Elizabeth Dodson Gray, Joan Gussow, Vincent Harding, Willis Harman, Hazel Henderson, Jane Jacobs, Petra Kelly, Winona LaDuke, Hunter & Amory Lovins, Joanna Macy, Jane Mansbridge, Patricia Mische, Robin Morgan, Magaly Rodriguez Mossman, John Naisbitt, Jeremy Rifkin, Robert Rodale, Theodore Roszak, Mark Rudd, Kirkpatrick Sale, Charlene Spretnak, Robert Theobald, Nancy Jack Todd



## Is the "New Economics" ready to roll?

"I'm 76 years old," cries Johan Galtung, bloodshot eyes blazing out at the audience from beneath a shock of jet-white hair. "I'm getting a little impatient waiting for the New Economics!"

"You've *abdicated!*" Susan Hunt cries out to a panel of much too secular-sounding religious liberals. "And [New Age rhetoric] is what we're coming up with instead!"

"Z-z-z-z-whop! Z-z-z-z-whop!" In the midst of Kevin Danaher's very traditional Marxist analysis of the global food system, one member of the audience falls asleep and voices a loud unconscious protest.

We're at The Other Economic Summit (TOES), fifth annual meeting of economists and economic thinkers and dreamers the vast majority of whom are committed to articulating a "third way" in economics—a "New Economics"—and creating a human-scale, sustainable society.

We're at the TOES meeting because no other organization in North America comes close to including as many decentralist/globally responsible economists and economic thinkers (63 on the Advisory Board alone). If there's ever going to be a "new," sustainable economics, it will be in no small part because of TOES.

### Different worlds

Every year the seven richest industrialized nations get together for an "official" economic summit. And every year TOES gets together in the same city at the same time for a citizens' summit (see NEW OPTIONS #10 and #17).

This year the official summit was held in Toronto in mid-June, and on the morning of June 17 TOES set up shop at Toronto's Ryerson Tech, archetype of the inner-city university, just a mile or so from the real summit.

Many TOES registrants had checked into a 22-story student residence the night before. They stood out from the students dramatically with their "message" T-shirts, 60s-casual manner and graying hair. It was as if they lived in a different world.

The restaurants nearby served pizza and beer and stayed open till well after midnight. Sleep-starved TOES-goers, crowded around pizza-stained tables, talked about their lives and gossiped about Green politics and laughed uproariously at quotes like this one, from the British Chancellor of the Exchequer on the eve of the official summit: "The world economy is in such good shape. There is no crisis that needs attention." Prostitutes cruised the streets outside. So many different worlds.

### Three concerns

En route to the TOES conference we had three main concerns. First, we wanted to see if TOES's participants would be self-consciously articulating a *new economics* and not just a jumble of good "new ideas" that could be thrown into the old progressive pot. Second, we wanted to see if TOES's people would welcome *debate and passion* or if they were still caught up in the old New Age soft-shoe (Gee-aren't-all-these-ideas-wonderful). Finally, we wanted to see if TOES/North America—the North American branch of TOES, now one year old—would get its organizational act together.

Only about 60 people showed up for the opening session, and no more than 120 for any session. That was no big surprise: TOES had no advertising budget to speak of and no full-time staff. What did surprise is that the economics the participants were espousing was as innovative and exciting as we'd hoped.

### Pinning it down

*All through the first day they tried to define it, give it shape, pin it down. . . .*

Our purpose is to design an economic system that's more "just, humane and sustainable" than the present one, Alan Gussow, president of Friends of the Earth/USA, tells the opening session.

The new economics must be enabling (to people) and conserving (of the Earth), says James Robertson, author of "Health, Wealth and the New Economics" (p. 1 above).

Our primary concern should be with human well-being, not with growth and employment, says Paul Ekins, author of *The Living Economy* (#35).

Economics is supposed to be about dealing with "scarcity," says Susan Hunt, who coordinates TOES from the economics department at the University of Maine. But most peoples over the centuries have never experienced "scarcity"! Most of them choose to limit their needs rather than increase the number of their products and services.

We've got to improve economics by bringing "externalities" back in, says Johan Galtung, Norwegian economist and world order theorist (*The True Worlds*, 1980). Specifically, we need an economics that encompasses five "spaces": nature, human, social, work and cultural.

C'mon, says a white-bearded man from the audience (voice trembling with emotion, sleeves of his creased yellow shirt rolled up). The New Economics has got to reflect what's

happening *now* among people in the *real world*. It should *not* reflect the abstract constructs of economists.

What we really want is a "familial economy," says Terry Mollner, president of The Trusteeship Institute (#23). The whole *point* of the New Economics is to increase the number of members of our affinity groups or "families."

### Signs

There were other signs that TOES is serious about creating a "new" economics:

- *The emphasis was on the practical.* Farmer's markets, economic conversion, re-working the definition of the GNP. . . . Larry Martin from the Institute for Local Self-Reliance put together a workshop describing an "integrated approach to waste management."

- *Even the visionaries talked common sense.* Michael Linton was ever-present at the conference with his long hair and boundless energy, proclaiming at one point that "money is entirely imaginary!" But if you went to his workshop you'd have heard, not more proclamations, but a very cogent critique of "conventional money" (e.g., it makes us feel that *wealth* is in short supply), along with a blow-by-blow account of some of the experiments with computer-based local barter systems that are taking place in communities across North America.

- *People paid tribute to their predecessors.* You can't have a distinct new economics without a distinct lineage, and several speakers helped provide that lineage. For example, in the midst of her talk on regional self-sufficiency in food, Joan Gussow (#43) gave credit to two underappreciated food pioneers from the early 20th century: Henry Sherman and Ralph Borsodi.

### "South Commission"

Another positive sign: Quite a few people came to the TOES conference from abroad.

One of them was Frank Bracho, wiry, articulate Venezuelan who described himself as the "unofficial representative" to the TOES conference from the South Commission.

The Commission is an "independent body of outstanding individuals from the Third World," Bracho told NEW OPTIONS. "Julius Nyerere is honorary chairman. . . . [We hope] to provide solutions to the present crisis from a Third World perspective." Kind of like the old Brandt Commission, but with a much greater commitment to "restoring the confidence that the Third World has in its own capacity for development. . . . We're [especially interested in] fostering national and collective self-reliance."

The third official meeting of the South Commission was coming up, so during one lunch break Paul Ekins, Joan Gussow, Hazel Henderson, James Robertson and others got together and drafted a message to the Commission. Here's the passage that seemed to matter most

to them: "We are aware that we have much to learn *from you* and look forward to hearing of your conclusions" [emphasis added].

### "Seikatsu Club"

The most visible foreign presence was the contingent of 10-12 Japanese consumer activists. They appeared to pay close attention to everything, even the most inane exchanges. They all had transmitters with long wavy antennas and someone was always translating for them.

Many participants looked forward to hearing the Japanese, and after their presentation—on the "Seikatsu Club Consumers' Cooperative"—curiosity had turned to admiration and even envy. Just as America's 19th-century farmers' co-ops laid the groundwork for the populist movement, so Japan's new-style consumers' co-ops appear to be laying the groundwork for a mainstream decentralist/globally responsible political movement.

"Seikatsu Club was established in 1965," Takashi Iwami and other representatives of Seikatsu told the conference. "Over 200,000 households are now involved. . . .

"Seikatsu worries that by having large supermarkets in which members shop, the co-op system has become just like commercial enterprises. Seikatsu is calling on the public to create a self-managed lifestyle in order to change the present wasteful lifestyle. . . .

"Unlike most Japanese co-ops which distribute merchandise through their stores, Seikatsu delivers goods directly to its members. This system ensures freshness—which means that preservatives are not necessary in our original-brand food. . . .

"Although most co-ops offer a wide range of merchandise, Seikatsu [produces and distributes] only 400 products in total. We believe that limiting quantity insures quality; as a result we offer only one version of any given product. Also, through limiting variety the Club is able to streamline production and distribution. . . .

"Seikatsu's members are grouped into 25,000 'hans' which meet in 100 or so branches in 10 prefectures throughout Japan. Composed of roughly 500-1,000 members, each branch develops its own agenda and activities. . . .

"The Tokyo Seikatsusha Network is a political movement emerging from within the Seikatsu Club. This year we're concentrating on consolidating the organization and firmly establishing its policies. Among them:

- Ban unsafe food;
- Create a 'central/local system' that can stimulate local autonomy;
- Promote and encourage international cooperation at the citizen level with the Third world.

"Our organization is willing to assume significant responsibility in the Tokyo area. However, our goals cannot be reached without link-

ing internationally with other people. [That's why we came to the TOES conference.]"

### Building community

Not only were the TOES participants committed to articulating a genuinely new economics. They also loved to argue.

The big Saturday night event was a panel on Stuart Speiser's Universal Stock Ownership Plan (USOP). The USOP was designed to get \$100,000 worth of corporate stock into the hands of every American family (see NEW OPTIONS #29 and #31), but it might as well have been designed to get economists and economic thinkers arguing with each other.

David Burress, economics teacher at the University of Kansas, said he liked Speiser's scheme because it allowed him to put "left-wing ideas in right-wing language" and get both sides talking to each other.

Jon Wisman (#48), economics teacher at American University in Washington, D.C., said Speiser's scheme would "give a large bureaucracy enormous potential power over the economy." Why not launch *Employee Stock Ownership Plans* instead?

Robert Hamrin, author of *America's New Economy* (below): Wisman's idea is even more utopian than Speiser's! Full employment is totally unfeasible any more.

Libby Lyon, activist from New York City: After this afternoon's session on waste management, I think we should pay people to *not* work for a while!

Kevin Danaher, Institute for Food and Development Policy: Speiser's scheme would give each of us a piece of Wendy's and MacDonald's—each of us a vested interest in rain-forest destruction for cheap Brazilian beef! It would give each of us an economic reason to *want* to exploit the Third World!

Jeff Smith, colorfully-clad Henry-Georgist from San Diego: Let's tax the land instead.

Bernie Levy, wearing a "First National Green Gathering" T-shirt: This session is a parlor game! We're assuming that each person has the same amount of power. The power structure wouldn't sit still for these schemes for a minute.

Unidentified woman: I'd like to see communities and groups get control of capital—rather than individuals. Speiser's plan would only perpetuate our individualistic way of life!

Speiser himself (distinguished-looking New York City lawyer type): Well that's our culture. And if you want to change our culture, wouldn't it be easier if you were getting \$10-15,000 a year in income from USOP?

Andre Joyal, economics teacher at the University of Quebec: No!—because your plan is enrichment without empowerment.

Tony Guglielmi, wearing a "Center for Popu-  
*Continued on page seven, column one . . .*

## Surprise . . .

### Sweet 10,000

I was invited to "Sunday brunch" last month in Larry Martin's back yard. It sounded pleasant, and I knew I'd have finished with my deadline, so I said sure.

I was shocked to see so many people I knew in one place. There was television journalist Joanna Johnson, arm-in-arm with Calvert Social Investment Fund's D. Wayne Silby (#43). There were Paul Freundlich and Denise Hamler of Co-op America (#9). There were my two part-time co-workers, Judith Leckrone and Mary-Coleman Ragsdale, sitting "demurely" at a card table.

I didn't know Larry knew any of these people. It took me a couple of seconds to realize what was going on. I'd walked in to my own surprise party. A party to honor NEW OPTIONS for attaining its 10,000th subscriber. Even harder to "get": a party to honor me.

I could vaguely remember my parents pulling something like that when I turned five. I hid under the table till everybody left. I was tempted to do that this time, too, except I knew I'd have never been able to live it down.

So I tried to smile and enjoy it—and eventually I did. And more and more people arrived. Some came from hundreds of miles away; some I hadn't seen for years; some knew me from strange and secret past lives.

But it wasn't their intention to just let me hang out and enjoy. By and by, they gathered together and took turns telling the "truth" about me. Since I'd said truthful things about many of them and their works in the pages of NEW OPTIONS, I suppose they had the right.

Kirk Sale (#21) and Bob Olson (#45) told horror stories about me in the New World Alliance—the political group I'd helped found.

Belden Paulson (#49) told homey anecdotes about my two years on the road before founding the Alliance.

A high-powered Washington lawyer told about the time I tried to pick her up in a grocery store.

Elaine Zablocki, who moved out from a communal farm in Oregon to start NEW OPTIONS with me, and who's now one of the best direct-mail consultants in Washington, took great delight in describing how hellish that first year was.

Running a newsletter is difficult, and lonely. You've got to be good at staying up till two in the morning. You've got to be so Responsible, you've got to be so mean. The surprise party reminded me that it's not so lonely as it sometimes feels.

Thanks, everybody.



# Letters . . .

## Wimpy

It seems to me that your [innate conservatism] has gotten the better of you in your cover story, "To Balance the Budget, Build a Sustainable Society" (NEW OPTIONS #48).

A sustainable society has to be fair. What makes your grossly watered down version of Lon Smith's \$100,000-limit inheritance tax fair? Why follow Lester Brown's squeamish 50-cents-higher gas tax when it doesn't even begin to be fair to future generations or the environment?

Why is a 2% rise in the top income tax bracket fair? I've been reading Daniel Patrick Moynihan's account of the guaranteed income (*The Politics of a Guaranteed Income*, 1973), which was actually proposed by President Nixon in 1969, and passed the House by a vote of 255 to 147, only to die in the Senate. The level of justice, fairness and compassion in that era makes your suggested 2% rise in the top tax bracket look wimpy.

Your gingerly 10% reduction of military spending over five years is ridiculous from the standpoint of fiscal and environmental sustainability, waste management, and even defense. Ten percent a year would be more like it, and would gladly be matched by the Soviet Union.

There is no question that a sustainable society can balance its budget. But minimal measures won't sustain us.

—Robert Schutz, Ph.D.  
Santa Rosa, Calif.

## Wrongheaded

Your headline in issue #48 reads, "To Balance the Budget, Build a Sustainable Society." Well, it's not clear to me how a sustainable society can be built with more than 100,000 people.

Even that's pretty big! But a country 3,000 x 1,000 miles with 250 million people? It's a dumb idea from the start.

Let's get things down to a human scale.  
—R. Mock-Frye  
Seattle, Wash.

In issue #48 you print a potpourri of the oldest ideas around, then have the gall to label it "new options." Hogwash! A few examples:

- The federal deficit is trivial, historically speaking. Deficits at 4-5% of GNP in the 1930s did nothing to end the Depression. Deficits of 30% brought prosperity in the 1940s. Today's deficits are comparable to those in the 1930s.

- Farm subsidies prevent food shortages that follow from the inevitable collapse of agricultural free markets. Yes, "regenerative farming" is needed, but let's not kid ourselves about the lack of need for subsidies.

- Your "worker democracy" is a cruel hoax in a world of huge industrial overcapacity. The individual examples of "success" you cite mean nothing, and there is absolutely no reason to assume—as you do—that workers who do not "own" their plants do not give a "full day's work."

—Prof. Frederick C. Thayer  
Author, *Rebuilding America* (1984)  
Pittsburgh, Penna.

## Superficial

Gad Zooks! I can hardly believe what I'm reading in NEW OPTIONS. "To Balance the Budget, Build a Sustainable Society" is a nice slogan and a worthy objective, but your article by that title doesn't even ask the right questions, much less offer useful answers.

To hold that this sort of thinking is the product emergent from the "New Paradigm" is to grossly misrepresent the depth of change required and to trivialize transformation into titillation. At best, it reflects a lapse into the old left-liberal, statist, end-justifies-the-means mindset. Has another valiant warrior succumbed to the toxic mists of Foggy Bottom?

How can you speak of "decentralist/globally responsible" proposals as the desiderata, and then offer us coercive, centrally controlled, Big Government legislative programs? My mind reels at the contradiction. The use of tax law as a social policy tool is a creature of elitist philosophy and its implementation requires centralization of power.

OK, so we alternative types all seem to agree on this at least, that "an economic strategy of high growth" is neither possible nor desirable. And, yes, there is no avoiding the issue of huge government debt and deficits. However, the obvious strategy of raise revenues/cut spending will just not fly, neither politically nor economically.

It should be clear to all who read NEW OPTIONS that the prevailing order is one which is rife with special privilege and monopoly control and is supported largely by statute and government bureaucracy—"socialism for the rich"—while the rest are made to compete for whatever trickles down. These inequities are embodied in a wide range of economic institutions and social contracts, including the land tenure system, the monetary and financial system, and the legal statutes, particularly those applicable to business organization (corporate law) and taxes. *If these were properly addressed*, there would be no need to consider coercive measures like the appropriation of wages, mili-

tary conscription, or setting maximum limits on wealth and income.

We must not make the error of accepting the "mass society" and centralized state control as constants in the socio-political-economic equation. The "New Paradigm" must recognize that the budget deficit is just a minor symptom of a most serious disease, and that the establishment of a sustainable society will require *fundamental* restructuring.

—Thomas H. Greco, Jr.  
Management consultant  
Rochester, N.Y.

## So, shall we begin?

"To Balance the Budget, Build a Sustainable Society" suggests reasonable increases in revenue (though I do take exception to Lester Brown's 50 cent rise in the gasoline tax. It would heavily burden working people and the poor outside cities where cars are the only means of transport, and would be inflationary since higher trucking costs would be passed on to the consumer).

But my favorite revenue increase is for a 3% tax on the real property and income of all non-profit corporations and tax-deductible institutions. I'm sure it would amount to billions. Why should the public be supporting religious institutions, private schools, etc.?

Also, why not reduce military spending by 50%, and go back to a [genuine] defense force [as mandated by the Constitution], rather than continue trying to maintain a world-wide, aggressive, first-strike-oriented war department and military establishment that is a major corrupting influence on our society?

—Lucille Salitan  
Peace Resource Center  
Canaan, N.Y.

I very much enjoyed your article on cutting the federal budget deficit. Your agricultural policy suggestions are right on (I grew up in western Wisconsin).

I do have some refinements to make on some of your interviewees' comments on military spending. I take exception to Susan Meeker-Lowry's citing of military expenditures as 55% of the budget. It is more like 25% plus the relatively small amount in the Department of Energy for strategic programs. Lumping the State Department and other foreign relations programs in with the Department of Defense is misleading at best. These costs are simply the costs of nationhood!

I also take exception to suggestions by Lloyd Lill that we can arbitrarily hack at the Department of Defense without a corresponding reassessment of U.S. strategic commitments.

Some suggestions in this regard: Pull all U.S. forces out of Europe, Korea and Japan—ground

forces over a three-year period and air forces over a five-year period. This pullback would not only save us considerable sums (\$150 billion?), but would actually increase security as Japan and the European Economic Community fill the gap.

—**Scott A. Zingler**  
*Cost analyst, U.S. Air Force  
Alexandria, Va.*

### Conspicuous absence

While reading through back issues of NEW OPTIONS, I noticed a conspicuous absence. There is no mention of the university. Yet I would guess that the university has played a critical role in leading many of the people discussed in NEW OPTIONS toward their work.

I speculate that this omission comes from two causes, which are interrelated. First, the university has become nearly lifeless in the U.S. over the past decade, a fact which is not pleasant to consider. Second, the American tendency to forget history and to forget one's own roots has led many activists to forget about the university once they leave it.

Based on what I've seen of Stanford, Duke, N.C. State and U.N.C., nearly none of the ideas found in NEW OPTIONS are being discussed by students today—they simply have no ready pointers to them. And many of the new options in university education that students of the 60s and 70s brought to the university—"Free Universities," ethnic studies, alternative lifestyles, student-controlled or experimental course programs—have languished, conformed to the mainstream, or been extinguished in recent years.

My prescription is that [those of us] who are involved in creating new options work toward maintaining a continuing involvement in a university community—that is, talk with students, in whatever forum works. A great way to divert students from the yuppie track is to just share your own careers with them, to show that a whole other world of work exists out there, where they can engage their moral sentiments instead of having to suppress them.

—**Dr. Lee Altenberg**  
*Dept. of Zoology, Duke University  
Durham, No. Car.*

### It is fear

I just finished re-reading your report on the Green gathering (#40). It takes me back to the 60s and something important I had to learn in the civil rights struggle.

Some of us genuinely cared for the oppressed; others hated the oppressors. What a difference in the creative energies that flowed from these two poles of feeling!

Many of us were mixtures of both polarities,

as I was. But until we were willing to recognize and work with our deeper motivations, we remained shackled to our fears.

I use the word "fear" advisedly for this is always what's behind our hatreds and resentments. Ultimately, it is fear that keeps our groups from working.

—**Alice S. Kavanagh**  
*Willingboro, N.J.*

### The old programming

I read with great interest your critical review of Willis Harman's *Global Mind Change* (NEW OPTIONS #45) as well as Willis's response (#47). Throughout these readings I could feel the difficulties we all face in our efforts to develop a new way of thinking and deal with new options.

The old programs introduced in our subconscious minds during our formative years are very persistent. When we think we have ejected them, they still grip to our memory and surreptitiously influence our conscious thoughts and behavior.

Many of the gambits used by you and Willis are the result of the powerful grip that the old either/or attitude has on us. Two examples:

- You imply that we can *either* understand change *or* promote change *or* create the forces of change. You miss the fact that, when we help a society understand the nature and necessity of the forces of historical change, we are *also* fomenting change and *also* creating forces for change.

- Willis says that "throughout history the really fundamental changes in societies have come about not from dictates of governments and the results of battles but through vast numbers of people changing their minds." He might rather have said that those changes have come about from dictates of governments *and* the results of battles *and also* through vast numbers of people changing their minds.

I agree with Willis that, for those who begin to apprehend the reality of cosmic consciousness, it becomes increasingly painful to behave abominably toward fellow humans, the planet and its creatures. From my own experience I can say that every time there's been an attempt to expand consciousness within a given social group, the behavior of the population did become more humane, ecologically sound and socially responsible. Witness the following:

- the integration of diverse and antagonistic systems of belief in the Sarvodaya villages of Sri Lanka;

- the success in adjusting the stock of population to the possibilities of renewal of the soil and the mothers' bodies in thousands of Thai communities under the leadership of [indigenous grassroots groups]; and

- the low rate of default on loans provided

to poor communities by the Fundacion Salvadorena de la Vivienda Minima in El Salvador and the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh.

I am not in a position to discuss whether we are in the middle or at the beginning of a global mind shift. But why do you consider Willis' affirmation that it is happening as a thesis that should be almost mathematically proved? Willis has perceived signals of a shift in that direction and is sharing his perception with all of us. Should we believe this only if we can translate the arguments into equations?

The development of capabilities among large numbers of people for acquiring relevant information, for using it in a socially and ecologically responsible way, and for listening to the inner voice is a long process. That is why the global mind change is proceeding so slowly. But I fully agree with Willis that it is happening and that it is slowly giving a human face to both capitalism and socialism.

—**Mario Kamenetzky**  
*The World Bank (retired)  
Falls Church, Va.*

### Tell me why

Years ago when I faced the Sixties after growing up in small town Ohio I bounced around a lot. I dropped out of Harvard twice, found my way to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, helped launch *Mother Jones* as circulation director, and started a direct-mail fundraising agency for Left-Liberal causes. Finally I began a west coast office for another [fundraising agency] that concentrates on environmental issues, public television and the like.

Somewhere along the way I lost touch with the intellectual-activist core of what was happening in this society and the world. And given that all of my important decisions about how I live my life were and are based on that sense of mission formed back in the Sixties I end up with a hollow feeling.

I get the feeling that what I lost is an important reason that you started the newsletter. At least that's what is important about it to me.

Every issue invigorates me. And helps me get in touch with the reasons why I am doing what I'm doing.

—**William M. Dodd**  
*San Anselmo, Calif.*

### Blue roses

Congratulations on reaching 10,000 subscribers! Now that you have arrived at your goal, is it what you hoped it would be? Are you resting now, integrating the achievement of this phase of your work? Or have you already set another goal? What is it? On what plane?

—**Meta Hough**  
*Eugene, Ore.*



Continued from page two:

lar Economics" T-shirt (TOES's left-wing counterpart): You'd just be reinforcing the old paradigm! You'd be getting people to buy into a system that is *not functioning*.

It went on for two hours like this, but there was less anger than met the eye. When Al Andersen, gentle author of the book *Liberating the Early American Dream* (#27), said he thought things were getting out of hand, Terry Mollner laughed and said, "I think the group is *feeding* on itself," and Guglielmi said, "There's a difference between anger and excitement. I'm not angry, but I *am excited*—because I care deeply about what we're talking about here."

What they were actually doing, of course, was building community—without which TOES/North America will never get beyond the conference-holding stage.

### God & man at TOES

The only really destructive exchange came at the panel where Catholic and Protestant theologians spoke on "building more constructive relationships with the Third World." The theologians used concepts like "interdependence," "participation," "supporting women in development," and, above all, "solidarity."

Susan Hunt spoke for a large number of people in the audience when she stood up and said, Why aren't you people using spiritual language—discussing the "soul," for example? People are hungry for it.

Too often, people have used spiritual language to legitimate domination, replied Gregory Baum, the noted Catholic theologian.

The white Western male theologians are in a "listening phase," added Don Conroy, director of the National Institute for the Family.

An unidentified man then gets up and cries, There's a new spiritual metaphor arising whether you theologians like it or not! We are each of us cells within the body of Gaia!

But a very similar metaphor is *in the Bible*, says Baum—the Body of Christ. And we've misused that metaphor constantly. For example, men are often described as being the "head" of the Body.

Unidentified voice rings out: Thomas Berry uses the metaphor in a responsible way!

Another voice: But he's not within the Christian tradition!

Another: That's not true!

An older woman activist harrumphs and says, Back where I come from, in Alabama, *not a one of you* would be seen as being in the Christian tradition.

### Differences

Many differences of opinion that surfaced at TOES were not thoroughly discussed—and are not of the kind that will quickly go away. If

TOES wants to become the organization that it can be, then it's going to have to live with—and learn from—these differences:

● **Alternative economics—or alternatives to economics?** Paul Ekins, Johan Galtung, Alan Gussow and Mark Lutz all argued in favor of a *revised* economics, a coherent and sophisticated alternative to neoclassical, Keynesian and Marxist economics. Lutz provocatively stated that the New Economics would become credible as soon as people started studying it at Harvard and Yale. By contrast, James Robertson wanted the New Economics to become less academically-oriented. And Hazel Henderson spoke of the "end of economics" as the dominant lens through which we see the world. She'd relegate "economics" to a minor blip in a new holistic lens consisting of many disciplines and approaches.

● **Jobs economy—or informal economy?** At a session called "Creating the Peace Economy," Michael Closson, director of the Center for Economic Conversion (#38), said that one of the main advantages of a peace economy is it would create "millions of [more] jobs." At a workshop on "The Informal Economy," scheduled at the same time, Bill Dyson, co-author of *The Informal Economy* (1983), said that full employment as traditionally defined has got to go. He pointed out that the link between work and wages is breaking down (many of us are doing essential but unpaid "work" that can't or shouldn't be structured into "jobs" — volunteer work, raising our kids, etc.). He hinted at a "universal guaranteed income."

● **Look to the state—or to private enterprise?** Lutz spoke out strongly against the wage system, the stock market, and absentee ownership. Galtung worried that Lutz's views would require much greater reliance on the state. Economic health is ultimately dependent on "risk-willing capital," he said—and when all is said and done, private enterprise channels capital better than "Gosplan bureaucrats."

● **Is (community-based) capitalism OK—or not OK?** Jeff Hollender, representing New York's Bank for Social Responsibility (#46), described lending money to large, for-profit developers. Andrea Imredy, representing Massachusetts's Institute for Community Development, pointedly stated, "We only lend to non-profits that involve low-income people," and spoke of stock dividends as "the return on somebody else's labor that they didn't get themselves!"

● **Should we address consciousness directly—or indirectly?** A woman in the audience urged that we bring "anti-sexism" and "anti-racism" into the New Economics. Dyson responded that "preaching won't get us there," that what we should focus on instead is changing social *structures* so the "economy is more personalized [and] people treat each other respon-

sibly. [We have to] decentralize the economy so people will treat each other differently."

### Empowerment

The TOES conference wasn't always as lively as the debates above suggest; sometimes it was painfully dull. So we spent some time with the booksellers and other exhibitors, and took away three books by TOES economists that had just hit the stands. Each of them exemplifies one of TOES's key commitments:

Robert Hamrin, *America's New Economy* (Franklin Watts, \$27.50), exemplifies TOES's commitment to *empowering* the public. It is, quite simply, the best introduction to the economy we've ever read—the clearest, the savviest and the least pretentious. If you read this book from cover to cover, you'll never be intimidated by economists again.

Hamrin has done a bit of everything—worked for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, written a report on industrial policy for half a dozen environmental groups (#7), advised the AFL-CIO and the People's Republic of China—and his book is nothing if not comprehensive. There are chapters on virtually every economic topic (growth, inflation, the deficit, taxes, poverty, big business, small business, unions . . .); each begins by setting forth the "big" issues and questions, then lists the basic "facts," then discusses the various interpretations of the facts.

The only real drawback to the book is that the interpretations never, but never, include the kinds of analyses and ideas put forward by Hamrin's friends and allies at the TOES conference! We suppose Hamrin would say that his purpose was to provide the "major" (liberal, conservative, mildly leftist) interpretations, and that the book is already nearly 500 pages long; but we still think Hamrin might have taken *one or two* risks for sustainability.

### Equity

Kenneth Taylor's anthology *Capitalism and the "Evil Empire"* (New Horizons Press, Council on International and Public Affairs, 777 U.N. Plaza, New York NY 10017, \$19 pbk) exemplifies TOES's commitment to *equity*. It consists of excerpts from some of the best entries in the Universal Stock Ownership Plan essay contest (described in #29), and the papers turn out to be just as varied, just as passionate, and just as thought-provoking as was the panel on USOP described above. (In fact, the winning essay, reprinted in full, is by Jon Wisman, who took part in the panel—as did two other essayists.)

The editor, who teaches economics at Villanova, is convinced there can be no "lasting peace" between the superpowers until the U.S. attains more "economic justice" for its citizens; hence the book's rather misleading title. It

should also be pointed out that, for all their passion, some of the essays can be pretty heavy going.

### Holistic thinking

Mark Lutz and Kenneth Lux's *Humanistic Economics* (Bootstrap Press, Intermediate Technology Development Group, 777 U.N. Plaza, New York NY 10017, \$18 pbk) exemplifies TOES's commitment to *holistic thinking*. Rather than beginning with employment, income, "scarcity," etc., as Hamrin and all mainstream economists do, Lutz and Lux begin with the deepest assumption of economics: that there's such a thing as a wholly self-aggrandizing "economic man."

They heap as much scorn on the assumption as it deserves, but they don't just scorn it—and they don't just boost its opposite, Abraham Maslow's concept of the "self-actualizing person" (as they tended to do in an earlier book). Instead, they show that each of us are "dual" or "divided" selves—each of us has a "higher self" and a "lower self." And the purpose of economics, they go on to say (in so many words), should be to help create a society that activates our higher selves.

They suggest how such a truly "humanistic" economics would address certain key issues: welfare, worker self-management, "economic imperialism," government regulation, international trade. Their suggestions are always stimulating, and always very thoroughly argued—mathematics, political science, psychology, sociology, even classical philosophy, are all grist for their mill.

*Humanistic Economics* is suitable for use in classrooms (maybe even at Harvard and Yale, as per Lutz's vision above), but it's clearly written and full of good examples and shouldn't intimidate the general reader. Major quibbles: the authors don't square their full-employment policy with the economic "steady-state" that they elsewhere favor; and where oh where is the environment in all this? Does it not merit a place right *beside* the dual-self?

### Self-denial?

On the last day, all TOES participants came together to discuss what they'd learned—and where TOES should go from here. "I've never seen so much hope!" "Our biggest weakness was not hearing more about what other *cultures* are doing—not bringing other cultures here." "It *doesn't matter* if we reach the ["official" economic summitteers]. *We* are together in what we do!"

(Nobody asked why so few people were there. Nobody had the gumption to ask why potential cross-over figures like Harvard's Robert Reich, #39, and Calif. Assembly Ways and Means Chairman John Vasconcellos, #27, weren't there.)

In a discussion about what TOES's representatives should say at a press conference, many TOES participants chose not to define themselves as economists or economic thinkers with a valuable expertise, but rather as "people"—as part of "the" people. "An important element in the press release [should be that] people are speaking out here." "We should tell the politicians that The People are full of good ideas."

Among the suggestions participants made for the future of TOES: "Let's get our meetings away from the academy." "Where are the native people of Canada and the U.S.?" "Let's have families—children—be more a part [of our meeting] next time."

It was uncanny. Here were 40-50 economists and economic thinkers who'd just spent two incredibly full days developing some of the richest, most innovative—and most badly-needed—insights into the North American economy, that you could find anywhere. Few of them had ever had much of an audience. Each of them individually—not to mention the New Economics as a whole—merited much greater access to the national economic dialogue.

And yet, instead of discussing how TOES might serve as a transmission mechanism to get their ideas into the hands of Congressional aides and local officials and young economics journalists at newspapers and magazines, TOES participants were beating themselves over the head for not having created a fully representative social-club-like organization!

We wanted to collectively spank the participants. We did go so far as to wonder if they'd ever *been* punished as kids, or if we were witnessing the paroxysms of self-denial and guilt that are said to come from overly-permissive (withdrawal-of-love-oriented) child rearing.

Fortunately, TOES/North America is not letting things stand as they were left. The 30-person Organizing Committee has scheduled a "retreat" for the end of July to further discuss

TOES's "future goals and how best to achieve them."

### Circle

Just as we were feeling most discouraged about the proceedings, the facilitators called on us all to stand in a circle and hold hands and complete the meeting by saying anything we had left to say.

Nobody said much; we were all spent. Then a couple of people began to sing, and Guy Dauncey, from Britain—author of *Nice Work If You Can Get It* (1983)—asked if he could lead us in a song he'd written. It was to the tune of "This Land Is Your Land," and it went:

This Earth is my Earth,

This Earth is your Earth. . . .

I can't sing well; I hate my singing voice. But I caught my breath, waited till they came around a second time, and joined in:

This Earth is my Earth,

This Earth is your Earth,

From the tigers' jungles,

To the dolphins' oceans,

From the eagles' skyways,

To the human heartlands,

This Earth was made for you and me.

We went around a third time, and a fourth. And I knew, while singing that song, that in some sense my fears and concerns for TOES were beside the point. In a world where intellectual activity is often cold and unfeeling and "economics" is something politicians and businessmen use to keep people tied to the growth machine, TOES is already something life-givingly different.

---

*TOES/North America: c/o Susan Hunt, Economics Dept, Univ. of Maine, Orono ME 04469. South Commission Secretariat: C.P. 228, CH-1211 Geneva 19, Switzerland. Seikatsu Club Co-op: 26-17, 2 Cho-me, Miyasaka, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo 156, Japan.*

---

## New Options

---

---

New Options, Inc.  
Post Office Box 19324  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Issue No. Fifty

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Washington, D.C.  
Permit No. 4999