Unravelling The Myth of “The Free Market”

by Richard Lowenthal

The following article appeared in the Spring 1991, issue of Katuah Journal, Leicester, NC. It is reprinted with permission.

The refrain has become all too familiar: environmental protection means loss of jobs, we are told, and if we would only let the corporate “free market” function without interference, then everything would magically work out for the best. The “invisible hand” of the market “automatically” maintains economic balance, we are assured, and competition keeps prices low and standards high, as well as providing much-needed “jobs.” Our economic difficulties are therefore the result of too much regulation, not too little; we are simply not letting the system function properly...

Of course, there is some truth to these assertions—but not very much. If “market forces” are really that benevolent, then why are they (we) creating many technologies and consumption patterns which are both socially and ecologically destructive. Why is energy conservation seen as somehow beneath us? Why is our society falling apart at the seams? (Wasn’t it largely the DE-regulation of the 80’s that led to outrageous financial excesses of every description—the “greed is good” mentality which, we’re now learning, we’re going to be paying for over several decades?) Why do most people’s “jobs” consist of boring, unfulfilling work which, more often than not, has a detrimental effect on our world and our lives? We need only think of all the people working in the nuclear industry, or all those working within the “military-industrial complex” and its offshoots, or all the common household products—solvents, paints, detergents, aerosols, polishes, etc.—whose creation simultaneously creates a multitude of toxic industrial by-products, and which are often hazardous or toxic themselves.

Clearly, there is something very wrong with a socio-economic system which rapidly undermines social cohesiveness and destroys the very resources upon which our supposed “prosperity” depends! The manic—or maniacal—functioning of our present economy reminds me of those old cartoons in which the “hero” is sitting on a high tree branch and is vigorously sawing through it—on the side closer to the tree! Or there’s the classic comedy routine in which the “hero” is sawing a circle around himself in the floor and soon completes it—only to fall through to the floor below. In both cases, the end result of all that hard work is an unforeseen disaster—though anyone even remotely aware of reality could have foreseen it.
These comedy routines are funny precisely because the coming disaster is so completely obvious—yet when we promote an economy that is leading to imminent social and ecological disaster, we seem oblivious to the danger. Laughably, not only is it not obvious to us, but most of us mightily defend our “right” to continue on the same “profitable” path! But here we should learn something from the cartoons—or we will continue sawing away until we and our environment are destroyed.

All around our nation and the world, the struggle to save our environment and our societies is moving into high gear—and the issue of “jobs” and “productivity” occupies a central place in this struggle. In the Pacific Northwest, environmentalists are desperately trying to save the spotted owl and its habitat, the remnants of once-huge old-growth forests, while angry loggers claim that they are now “an endangered species,” and logging companies claim to be patriotically serving vital socioeconomic needs. And in North Carolina and many other states, obsessive road-building and development are fervently supported by businessmen, economists and politicians (and, of course, the developers), on the assumption that economic prosperity and job availability depend on more roads and more rapid growth. This trend continues unabated despite evidence that the prosperity thus gained is very short-lived, if indeed the “standard of living” for the locals ever does rise appreciably.

The reality behind the dreams of quick, lasting prosperity is this: once the prosperity boom accompanying the initial development and construction is over, the local inhabitants usually end up getting shafted. Most of the big money from manufacturing, rentals, chain department stores and supermarkets, and the glut of fast-food restaurants is funneled out of the local area and into the bank accounts of distant corporations and developers, while “the locals” are left to face the long-term prospect of menial “service jobs” and socially and ecologically disrupted lives.

Despite intensive “development” and an influx of new technologies and industries over the past 15 years, the “standard of living” of the average American has fallen during that time period, and real income has been steadily falling. Why is this occurring?

During this same period the richest and smallest segment of the American populace has gotten much richer, while the middle class and the poor have gotten poorer. It is well-known that the reign of “Free-market Reaganomics” (and its sequel, “Bushonomics”) has created more millionaires than any previous “growth decade.” The trouble is, it also created mountains of debt, a horrendous banking crisis, many more families and children living in poverty, and legions of homeless and hopeless people...the grim “dark side” of the supposedly unbiased, accessible, and socially-responsive “free market.”

Is the market really “value-free,” as its proponents claim, and does it really encourage democratic participation and healthy socio-economic diversity—or does it implicit value-preference for profit at any price drive the market (particularly industry) to be free of ethical considerations and compassion, free to abuse the public trust, and free to ignore as many social and ecological consequences as possible?

Is it possible that the truth underlying the “free market” is that it supports a very small, self-appointed elite in ransacking our environment, exploiting other people, and raking in vastly disproportionate monetary rewards? Does our society actually reward those who can most convincingly con the public into believing that all this exploitation and “development” is for their own good and the good of the country?

The question of environmental preservation vs. “development” and jobs is without doubt a thorny one—and it is made even thornier by a multitude of dangerous and unquestioned assumptions about the nature of our economic/ecological reality. Such assumptions include:

1. the belief that environmental protection is the primary factor behind job loss in industries such as the wood products industry, despite the fact that the true culprits in most job loss are managerial greed and callousness, industrial automation, corporate “streamlining,” and poor “resource management.”

2. the belief that endless extraction and consumption of resources is good for jobs and the local
3. the belief that work and productivity must be measured solely by amounts of materials extracted, processed, and sold, and never in terms of conservation or restoration of vital habitats. Due to this belief, we are still reluctant to commit ourselves—and our money—to ecologically-sound economic practices, and we stubbornly refuse to factor into our economic accounting the true social and ecological costs of our vaunted “free market” system.

4. the belief that people are dependent on the “generosity” of industry for their jobs, and not on themselves, the value of their own labor, or personal involvement in their communities.

5. the belief that despite meaningless and mechanical work, workers’ “productivity” can be increased solely by increasing wages without any increase in workers’ interest, involvement, or satisfaction.

The deeper problem that we are just beginning to confront is that we have created a “culture” based on mass consumption and “the consumer mentality.” When maximum profit and consumption are our highest goals, we of course seek only short-term “efficiency” in our extraction, production, and distribution processes. Under the prime directive of maximum profit and consumption, “efficient productivity” must mean producing the greatest amount of goods in the least possible time at the least possible cost—and then selling them at the greatest price the market will bear. This kind of “productivity” would more appropriately be called “destructivity”; it ignores long-term consequences, creates “needs” where there were none, and treats both nature and human beings as objects to be exploited, used up, and then forgotten. For most workers, this overt exploitation is then “compensated” via insultingly low monetary rewards, which nevertheless enable us to consume more goods—which requires that we produce more, of course. The end result—our real “gross national product”—is a vicious downward spiral of produce-sell-consume-throw away, produce-sell-consume-throw away...and a never-ending “need” to exploit and “develop” new areas once the old ones are exhausted or become “unprofitable” in the eyes of our Glorious God, the marketplace.

But now we have nowhere to move on to, and our habitual “frontier” mentality no longer makes even economic sense (it never made sense ecologically). The biosphere we live in is suddenly changing—in our human awareness—from a limitless collection of exploitable “resources” to a fragile and endangered ecosystem with limited “resource availability.” So now something has to give, something has to change in our way of relating to the Earth and all her diverse life-forms.

Our response to this need for change has been slow, but we are starting to redefine productivity to include the preservation/restoration of ecological systems and “resources,” since such preservation alone can guarantee a continuing supply of valuable “products” (as well as a functioning planet!). Eventually, we will have to recognize that protecting and restoring natural ecosystems is “productive work” worthy of great financial “compensation.” This essential mind-shift can already be seen in action in programs such as the Federal Conservation Reserve Program, which pays farmers to not plant crops on eroded fields, and to plant trees and grow a forest instead. These farmers “are paid to take the land out of production for 10 years,” and though the trees can be “harvested” after that time, “90% of the acres planted in trees under the soil bank programs of the 50’s and 60’s have remained forested.” Similar incentive programs are being utilized in the struggle to save the rain forests: for example, the so-called “debt-for-nature swaps,” in which conservation groups or governmental agencies “buy” part of a tropical nation’s debt load in exchange for the preservation of a section of rain forests.

These programs, and others like them, certainly deserve to be viewed as “productive.” Indeed, the work they provide could be called the most productive work, for it creates ecological health and economic sustainability, and is not based on the economics of profit through exploitation and destruction.
In 1977, on the day before his death, E. F. Schumacher had this to say about Western industrial society: "Nature cannot stand it, the resource endowment of the world cannot stand it, and the human being cannot stand it.... It is a kind of fraud. And so it is necessary for us to step back and have a new look."

It is now 1991, and Schumacher's words ring even truer today. We do indeed need—desperately—to "step back and have a new look" at the world we are so busily creating—and the world we are destroying. But here's the rub: In order to see environmental/social preservation as "productive work," we must stop relating productivity only to short-term profits and maximal consumption. The idea of "production for sale and consumption" must be augmented by the vision of "productive preservation for a sustainable future."

What will such a shift in emphasis mean? In practical terms, it means that we must create new criteria for productivity, and will have to pay people to preserve our environment even though their work does not create a "product" for imminent sale, and thus brings in no money in the short term. On this most practical level, it's obvious that the money needed to pay these people will have to be justified by an entirely different rationale than that usually subscribed to by industry and by economists. This type of work will have to be evaluated and valued differently than work producing immediate results and profits, and the workers' pay will have to come from other public or private sources, since their work involves an outlay of funds rather than producing immediate income.

The logical source of such funds is the corporations and businesses which have been profiting the most from the exploitation and/or destruction of our environment—especially such corporate giants as the transnational oil, banking, chemical, plastics, beef, and wood products industries. They should be the ones to pay for environmental protection, not the beleaguered taxpayers, since most of these corporations have been allowed to "get away with (ecological) murder" for decades—in return for the many "benefits" they supposedly bring us. As Schumacher put it, we've bought into "a kind of fraud," and have been conned into supporting a fraudulent and disastrous economic system. This has got to stop; we simply have to redesign our economy if we wish to survive.

Yet our economic system is structured to protect big business more than individuals, so it's quite likely that taxpayers will soon be asked—or rather, told—to foot the bill, as is already occurring with the mushrooming S & L scandal and other looming socio-economic disasters. If we, the workers, taxpayers, and citizens wish to avoid this fate, we must recognize that a strong environmental surtax for these and similar industries is both necessary and just. This recognition must in turn be followed by social action, if it is to have any effect—and then we'll face the long and arduous task of bringing industry into line with ecological and economic reality. After all, the money to pay for long-term productivity and preservation has to come from somewhere—and it should come from those who profit the most from the rape of the Earth. Equally important, our concept of "work" simply has to shift into a more future-oriented and truly productive mode, a mode in which our financial survival no longer depends on personally, socially, and planetarily deadening "jobs," or on incomes deriving directly or indirectly from ecological and social destruction.

We now have the opportunity to refocus our economy and our society so that they can be a source of pride and fulfillment instead of shame and despair...so that we can regain a sense of identity beyond our roles as exploitive "consumers" and profiteers. There is so much more to the "American Dream" than we've been seeing, so much we've apparently forgotten. The time has come to revitalize that dream, to renew the vision of a truly just and humane society...and to create a livable, sustainable future. Let's "seize the day"!
The Efficiency of Community and the Inefficiency of Hierarchy

by William Alexander

Kerala, a small state (30 million Malayalam speakers) on the southwestern tip of the Indian subcontinent, first attracted the attention of demographers about 20 years ago. Without any significant increase in incomes, birth rates in Kerala began a sharp decline. In addition to the unprecedented fertility decline, other characteristics of the good life were noted—high literacy, vigorous democracy, equal female status, low infant mortality, and long life. Explaining this anomaly has become the task of amateur researchers in an ongoing series of Earth-watch Expeditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USA &amp; Canada</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Kerala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (millions):</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fertility Rate:</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of Life Indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infant Mortality Rate</th>
<th>Life Expectancy, Male</th>
<th>Life Expectancy, Female</th>
<th>Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Consumption indicator:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNP per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researchers faced two urgent questions. (1) Why was the basic quality of life in Kerala so much higher than the rest of India, given the similar amount of the Earth's resources consumed? (2) Why was the consumption of the Earth's resources so much higher in the First World, given the similarity of the basic life quality in Kerala and the First World? The current western social sciences and economics do not answer these questions, and the Earthwatch research teams have had to innovate. The best hypotheses to date answer the first question with the efficiency of community and the second question with the inefficiency of hierarchy. If we wish to speak of efficiency we must define some terms—efficiency for what and efficiency of what. We seek efficiency for high life quality. Further in India it is the Earth resources which are in short supply and the efficiency of resource use is sought. In USA, human time is seen in short supply, accordingly labor use is the basic for efficiency measures. Valuing labor use over resource use has led USA and most of the First World to utilize the most expedient method of decision making in our productive process, hierarchy.

In order to call the decision-making system of the First World inefficient, we must stop denying that the condition of the whole Earth is changing from a condition of resource abundance in the past to resource shortage in the present. Given the current rates of resource depletion and the current increases in human population, the basis for a world-wide formula for efficiency changes automatically from labor use to resource use. That is to say, the peoples of India in earlier times did not grasp the fact (accepted in the west) that there were more Earth resources to be exploited beyond the next mountain or across the seas. And conversely, the peoples of the west have not yet (in our time) grasped the fundamental Earth fact—total resources are limited.

The continued focus on labor use efficiency is a significant explanation for the current failure of western nations to achieve efficiency in the use of resources to produce human quality of life. Unfortunately for our research this hypothesis does little to explain the low quality of life found in the rest of India when compared to Kerala. To the unsophisticated visitor, the traditions and culture of Kerala and India seem similar. In addition to important historical differences (quite beyond this research note), a striking difference is found in the speed with which the caste divisions have been abolished in Kerala. Rapid repeal of the economic rules of caste has transformed Kerala into an enormous community with a decision-making system we call a "net," a system very different from hierarchical decision making.

Castes are fixed groupings of ancient family lines, each with a particular work role in relation to other castes. These castes have been arranged in a rigid hierarchical order, Brahmans at the top, outcastes at the bottom, and other castes in hierarchical order in between. Those in the lower castes suffered endless social and economic disabilities while the higher castes were endowed with extensive social and economic privileges. Organization within castes followed family customs (care and compassion) with honored patriarchs and matrarchs exercising traditional familial authority.
Castes were held together by religious tradition and the authority of blood relations. Internal to the castes no clear hierarchy for decision making existed. External to the castes an absolute hierarchy of castes governed day-to-day production processes. The highest caste made rules for the larger human system, the next caste enforced these rules over the lower castes and outcastes who carried out the whole range of work within the Indian culture. The current inefficiency of production of life quality (found in the larger India as contrasted to Kerala) can be explained by the hierarchical decision systems based on residual caste practices in India at large.

Caste in Kerala was more rigid and more repressive in 1800 than in any other place in India. There were significant moves against caste in the 19th century in the areas which later became the state of Kerala, but it was the 20th century which saw a concerted attack on caste in Kerala from every direction: caste improvement associations, Christian missionaries, and Gandhian nationalists. At the height of this struggle against the discriminatory practices of caste, indigenous Communists organized and won the election of the first Kerala government of independent India in 1957. Although members of many caste groups provided leadership, the votes of the numerous outcastes and lowest caste groups united in the winning majority against caste restrictions and disabilities.

The empowering effect of that first election on the outcastes and lowest caste people was a transforming revolution, a real paradigm shift. The lowest castes and outcastes learned that they were important, that they had power. The writer knows of no other case where the promise of democracy, equality for humans, has been so fully realized. The election of the Communist government in 1957 was symbolic of the fundamental change in the structure of society, the destruction of caste boundaries in all except strictly religious institutions, i.e., marriage. All subsequent governments in Kerala regardless of party labels, as a condition of their election, have stood against caste disabilities, particularly economic handicaps.

The destruction of caste lines was also the destruction of hierarchy among caste groups. The decision-making nets within each caste group were joined with the nets of every caste group, forming a body politic, a net system without hierarchy within Kerala. Decisions within this huge community took on the consensual characteristic known within caste, that is, essentially every person from the highest to lowest must find agreement before action may be taken. In terms of resource use, this means that each allocation of a scarce good will be delayed pending an understanding that such allocation will serve the interest of all.

It is precisely this careful allocation process which produces the high life quality at modest consumption levels. Consensual does not mean free of controversy; some decisions proceed amid contention. From the point of view of a citizen from a high consumption society (valuing the use of human time over the use of resources), this slow, tedious process of decision making seems exasperating. Those who have lived in intentional communities will have experienced the frustration of consensual, non-hierarchical, "net" decisions. The cost of efficient resource use to produce life quality has been paid with human time.

Those living in high consumption societies may wish to achieve the resource use efficiency of Kerala. What should be done? Those looking for complex economic and technological solutions will find the answer too simple. The emperor has no clothes. Seek the full potential of democracy—seek a society of the people, by the people, and for the people. Rethink the promise of democracy. In every society there are more people who see themselves as poor in relation to the wealthy than there are people who see themselves as wealthy.

Book Reviews


Community Service has just received copies of the 1992 revised edition of Preserving Family Lands, one of the most important land conservation books of the past decade. It has been revised and updated and is now available around the country.
This second edition can be enormously helpful to landowners who care about their land as it covers the problems, especially the tax problems, confronting families and landowners who care about their land, and it outlines in clear terms possible solutions to those problems.

Preserving Family Lands gives the reader simple, easy-to-read, basic literature about protecting the family’s land. It offers information in layman’s language about the serious and sometimes expensive estate tax problems that lie ahead for many landowners.

Every year, traditional family lands are lost simply because they must be sold to pay estate taxes. These lands are often valuable (wildlife, agricultural, scenic, etc.) areas and if the landowners had their choice, they would prefer to keep these lands in the family or in a conservation land trust or easement for all to enjoy.

If landowners were more familiar with land saving options and the tax consequences of these options, perhaps we could turn the tide in preserving the family farm or ranch for conservation. This book is intended to encourage landowners to plan their way through potential tax and land saving problems.

Without any advertising, more than 50,000 copies of the first edition of Preserving Family Lands were sold to landowners, lawyers, government agencies, and conservation and resource protection groups in all fifty states.

Hundreds of thousands of additional readers need the information in the book. For the first time in the history of the United States, the family that just wants to leave the land to the children may no longer be able to do that without planning ahead. Countless families across the country are now finding that the land they loved has to be sold to pay estate taxes.

Preserving Family Lands shows the reader how to protect, and how to keep in the family, farmland, forestland, ranchland, country property, large suburban estates, river-front and lakefront property, and wildlife habitats. More than 90% of the wildlife habitat in the United States is on privately-owned lands. As we enter the era of a new presidential administration that will be looking carefully at both the environment and raising revenue through estate taxes, there could not be a more timely book than Preserving Family Lands.

Stephen J. Small is an attorney with the Boston law firm of Powers & Hall P.C. Before joining Powers & Hall, Mr. Small was an attorney-advisor in the Office of Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service in Washington, D.C., where he wrote the income tax regulations on conservation easements. A conservation easement is a recorded restriction on the use of land, generally restricting or preventing further development, to protect some important conservation characteristics of the land such as open space, habitat, scenic views, or watershed. Mr. Small is also the author of The Federal Tax Law of Conservation Easements (Land Trust Alliance, 1985).

Mr. Small has worked with landowners or consulted on private land protection projects in more than thirty states. Since 1986 he has given more than one hundred speeches, seminars and workshops around the country on tax planning for landowners and tax incentives for land conservation.


Paul O'Keefe Buterbaugh

Upon reading this book I wondered if future generations will look back on our times as a second dark age. There is enough information in this book to awaken anyone’s concern over the viability of life on earth, and yet few have heeded the call to halt the destruction of our home, the Earth. The Dark Age was characterized by the suppression of knowledge—our age is known as the information age but people act as if the information is not available. Two problems persist: one is accessibility to information; and the second is lack of motive to act.
Accessibility to information is limited and distorted by the owners of major media outlets where advertising, recreation, sports, natural disasters, foreign debacles, and more entertainment take precedence over news of life-threatening dangers to our health and the health of the earth. "Out of sight, out of mind" is the old adage, but out of media, out of mind, is now the rule. This book supplies the lacking information in fifteen chapters. In an all-encompassing survey, the authors move through water and air pollution to concerns of sustainable agriculture, the industrial laborer, the multinational corporate colonialism, the effect of militarism across the globe, genetic engineering, soil erosion and energy. In a particularly apt section on Haitian boat people, the authors identify them not as economic refugees, not as political refugees, but as environmental refugees. Haiti, once a tropical paradise, is described as a near desert with its natural resources and forests stripped by foreign corporations and a local elite. To return boat people now is to guarantee their further persecution as excess population by a dictatorship representing those who have made Haiti unlivable.

To further the usefulness of this book, each chapter is concluded with discussion questions and references to hundreds of other books and articles. These features make it an excellent class workbook and source book for individual study. Although published in 1991, this book is still relevant; unfortunately the problems described are still with us, and proposals in this book have not been begun.

In approaching the second problem, the lack of motive to act, the authors challenge Christian churches to take the lead in establishing a relationship between Christian ethics and the care of the Earth. Earthkeepers calls on Biblical references for its authority in establishing a relationship between Christian churches and their responsibility to the Earth. An acceptance of this responsibility would seem to require that the hierarchical model of church organization be given up for a shared authority with its members. It requires questioning where monetary wealth comes from and how that affects all inhabitants of the Earth, and the planet itself.

Certainly if Christian churches led their 145 million U. S. members to an acceptance of a partnership with all things, then a total revolution of our chances to survive in peace will have taken place. This book contains both a challenge to Christian churches and provides a real workbook for an awakening society. A thorough reading of this book will lead to the conclusion that the Earth is both a planet and a plant.

Paul O'Keefe Buterbaugh is a trustee of Community Service, Inc. and the founding director of the Gap Media Project.

Creativity and Sharing in Community

COMMUNITY SERVICE FALL CONFERENCE

"Creativity and Sharing in Community" is the title of our conference to be held October 22nd to 24th in Yellow Springs this fall. We hope the title reflects the participatory nature of this year's gathering where those who attend will be asked to share their own creative ideas in living in community.

The resource people this year will be William Alexander from California and Trivandrum, India, a Light Living consultant for the Institute for Land and Development Policy; Walter Tulecke, former professor of biology at Antioch College where he also taught classes on botany and nutrition; Meskerem Brown, resident of Yellow Springs, who came from Ethiopia 13 years ago to attend college in California and who is now married and the mother of two children; and Ernest Morgan, co-founder of the Antioch Publishing Company in Yellow Springs and the Arthur Morgan Junior High School in Celo, North Carolina.

At our evaluation session at the end of the conference last year, there was interest in changing the format of previous conferences to allow more time for workshops and interchange between attenders and less time for formal talks.

This year Walt Tulecke will lead a workshop on "food, nutrition and/or tree grafting." and Meski Brown one on making toys from discarded materials, called by some people "trash." Ernest Morgan will lead one on "taking opportunities as they occur."
A brochure giving more information about schedule and costs will be sent out in the summer. Please save the dates of October 22-24 and plan to join us at that time.

Readers Write

ABOUT MITRANIKETAN

Our activities are in full swing to promote education and development of individual and society in a holistic manner. Recognition for our efforts, at national and international levels, also makes us feel more responsible for every step we take. Our work is not silent any longer as it draws attention from all quarters because of the recent National Award from the Bajaj Foundation, India, for adaptation of science and technology to promote Rural Development. But it is a stupendous task to live up to the expectations that come with honours bestowed on us. We are now taking more interest to see autonomous centres like Mitraniketan in different needy areas in the country, while constantly trying to improve our own performance.

Although we are making an all-out effort to make Mitraniketan stand on its own feet financially, it may need support for three to four years more because of a number of items such as educational and maintenance needs of 250 children who stay in Mitraniketan, a senior citizens’ home, a speech therapy centre, and the administrative requirements thereof. Various training-cum-production units are improving in their quality of marketable items to bring a good margin of profit which in turn can meet our day-to-day requirements.

We are trying to tap resources from within the country as far as possible.

Problems and challenges also provide opportunities. Sethu and our three daughters are also contributing their best, along with other members in the Mitraniketan Community, to realize its objectives. We are trying to be helpful to other voluntary agencies working at grassroots level around the country by sharing our experience and making available our facilities to them.

The Earth Watch group, the light living group, etc., are now using our campus facilities. Recently a Folk High School group of seventeen from Finland was here. From Edinburgh University in Scotland a student group came for a month. They, by joining the local people, built a Community Hall in one of the villages where we have extension work among the people in a tribal area.

Health-wise I feel much better these days. Regular activities and greater responsibilities of my choice make me feel happy and enable me to work more.

With warm regards to all. Our love and respect to Griscom Morgan. We hope that the year 1993 will be a year of accomplishments and consolidation of efforts for self-sustainable economic development.

Viswan, for Mitraniketan Community, Kerala, India

ABOUT "SIMPLY LIVING"

Simply Living is actually ready to take flight. Since I last visited you, we have been working on developing the by-laws, mission, purpose statement, etc., and finally are ready to elect our board, institute membership and undertake projects.

Because the work you do with Community Service is so similar to what we are about, I have a favor to request of you. Can you send us your blessings, your wishes, and your moral support so that we know we do this work together? We value your work and what your personal commitment is, and it would mean a great deal to us to share that sense of common journey.

Marilyn Welker, Columbus, OH

ABOUT ECONOMICS

It would seem that the key statement of Breton’s and Largent’s paper is the last sentence of the first column. I have long thought that economists in both parties have long missed this essential concept of what money is, at least in part. Money can be a means of expressing one’s values and organizing people into useful entities. Money, in this sense only, is an organizing tool. Money, as a means of exchange, also fits into this more ethical concept.
Quite frankly, I don’t believe that I personally would want to live in Tom Peters’ world. Not all of us have that kind of energy or ambition. Competitiveness, while very important, is not the whole bowl of wax.

Of course you realize that some people make love to their stock certificates. Personally, I wouldn’t do that unless social pressures required such. If someone were to give me 47 shares of XYZ Company, I’d prefer to sell them and put more into a mutual fund. Some mutual funds (such as 20th-Century) are quite convenient that way—even for the small investor.

Dan Baright, Lebanon, MO

ABOUT THE MEMBERS DIRECTORY

It was good to get your January, 1993, Members Directory. It is most helpful to have. Keep up your wonderful leadership. It is a real inspiration to me.

Morris Milgram, Langhorne, PA

Announcements

SIMPLY LIVING

Through Simply Living we strive to recognize the sacredness of all Creation and to participate in its life-sustaining renewal. We wish to connect with all who grapple with what it means to become the change that we seek for the world.

In the words of Thomas Merton, “Our job is to love others without stopping to inquire whether or not they are worthy.” It is the whole world which is worthy. Harmed by apathy, confusion, neglect, and misuse, it needs to be healed by people working together in love and inclusiveness.

Through Simply Living we are dedicated to learning how to live responsibly and to sharing our journey.

The purpose of this corporation shall be to educate ourselves and others in order to live responsibly, sustainably and joyfully in relation with the earth and each other. This purpose shall be pursued through the following activities: establishing a resource center, addressing personal and household lifestyles, redefining our roles as responsible members of the community and fostering new initiatives which further the purpose of the organization.

For further information write to Marilyn Welker, 335 E. 19th Avenue, Columbus. OH 43201.

ALTERNATIVE COMMUNITIES TODAY AND TOMORROW, JUNE 7-16

Credit course through University of Massachusetts—June 7-16, 1993, with Corinne McLaughlin.

Held at the Sirius Community near Amherst, Massachusetts, this course will explore the benefits and challenges of community living, and the innovative ideas being pioneered by these “research and development centers” for both personal and social change. New community approaches to societal problems will be surveyed, including solar energy, biodynamic agriculture, Mondragon cooperatives, land trusts, bio-shelters, social investment, group attunement and creative conflict resolution techniques. 30 new age communities around the U. S. and the world will be explored, including Findhorn, Twin Oaks, Stelle, Chinook and High Wind. Includes slide shows, presentations by visiting community members, and field trip, with text Builders of the Dawn by instructor. Live-in experience in community is also available.

Cost: $323/classes only. For those wanting accommodations and meals: $35-45/day (shared room), $55-60/day (private room).

For credit, apply to University of Massachusetts, Dept. of Continuing Education, Amherst, MA 01003; for non-credit, apply to Sirius University, 5904 Madawaska Road, Bethesda, MD 20816. For program information call Corinne McLaughlin at 301/320-6394; after June 1: 413/259-1505.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE, AUG. 1-6

The Community Development Institute will be held August 1-6, at the University of Central Arkansas in Conway, near Little Rock.
The curriculum includes development principles, community analysis, needs assessment, leadership, demographics, working with volunteers, program planning and evaluation, marketing, community surveys, financing, environmental considerations, and recreation.

Cost of the instruction is $350 per person. For further information, contact Bill Miller or Lois Love Moody at the University of Central Arkansas, Conway, Arkansas 72032; (501) 450-3139.

HOUSING CONFERENCE, AUGUST 5-8

"Heading Home: A National Conference on Community Land Trusts and Building a Progressive Housing Policy." will be held August 5-8 in Cincinnati, Ohio, and is sponsored by the Institute for Community Economics. It includes a two-day introductory training on CLTs as a vehicle for investing home federal housing funds and preserving long-term housing affordability. Cost: $130 for two-day intro CLT training, $210 for CLT conference, $290 for both. For more information contact Technical Assistance Dept. ICE, 57 School Street, Springfield, MA 01105-1331; (413) 746-8660.
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Membership
Membership is a means of supporting and sharing the work of Community Service. The Basic $25 annual membership contribution includes a subscription to our bimonthly NEWSLETTER and 10% off Community Service-published literature. Larger contributions are always needed, however, and smaller ones will be gladly accepted. Community Service is a nonprofit corporation which depends on contributions and the sale of literature to fund its work so that it can offer its services to those who need them. All contributions are appreciated, needed and tax-deductible. Due to added postage costs, overseas membership is $30 in U. S. currency.

Have Your Friends Seen The Newsletter?
Please send the names and addresses of your friends who might enjoy receiving a sample NEWSLETTER and booklet. If you wish specific issues sent, please send $1 per copy.

Editor's Note
We welcome letters to the editor (under 300 words) and articles (700-2000 words) about any notable communities or people who are improving the quality of life in their communities. Please enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope if you wish the article returned. The only compensation we can offer is the satisfaction of seeing your words in print and knowing you have helped spread encouraging and/or educational information.

Editor's Note #2
We occasionally exchange our mailing list with a group with similar purposes such as the Arthur Morgan School at Celo or Communities Magazine. If you do not wish us to give your name to anyone, please let us know.

Address Change
If there is an error on your mailing label, or you are moving, please send the old label and any corrections to us. It increases our cost greatly if the Post Office notifies us of moves, and you will not receive your newsletter promptly.

Consultation
Community Service makes no set charge for formal or informal consultation. Customarily, we ask for a contribution at a rate equal to the client's hourly earnings.
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