

## CHAPTER 18

## Alternative Scenarios for the Way Forward

From: Raven, J. (1995). *The New Wealth of Nations: A New Enquiry into the Nature and Origins of the Wealth of Nations and the Societal Learning Arrangements Needed for a Sustainable Society* (pp.199-212). Unionville, New York: Royal Fireworks Press; Sudbury, Suffolk: Bloomfield Books.

The subsequent chapters of this book describe a number of developments, the importance of which we initially became aware from our research into the management of the educational system, but which seem to be necessary if we are to create a sustainable society.

In part to indicate how necessary it is to develop an entirely new perspective and in part to enable us to learn from, and build upon, them the present chapter will briefly summarise alternative suggestions for a way forward.

### **Buddhism/Restriction of Desires**

It has been widely argued, perhaps most coherently by Bahro<sup>18.1</sup>, that we are most likely to find a way forward by adopting the tenets of Buddhism and learning to limit and control our desires. In theory, this has great appeal. But it is difficult to see many people choosing it. Perhaps more importantly, it is difficult to see how Buddhism could cope with the problem Milbrath<sup>18.2</sup> so clearly highlights - the way dominators always win in the short-term. Finding a way forward through Buddhism also involves a fundamental internal contradiction: Pursuit of an otherworldly way of life by some depends on others doing the worldly things that are required for survival of the flesh. In Buddhism itself this contradiction is resolved by a neat device which decrees that those who labour to support life will, at precisely the right time, see the light and give up their worldly concerns. As a result, all will arrive at nirvana together. This hardly seems a recipe for survival of the species, although it may well help to extend the life of Gaia.

### **Return to a Celtic, American Indian, or Similar Way of Life**

Like those who argue that 'we need to restrict our desires and embrace Buddhism', advocates of a return to certain types of 'primitive' (or - less perjoratively - 'vernacular') society - who include Sale<sup>18.3</sup> and Goldsmith<sup>18.4</sup> - have a great deal of importance to say. Many of the cultures described have much to teach us. The so-called 'New Values' discussed earlier have much in common with ancient Navajo values: recycling, conservation, returning the things we use to nature, rights to the use of land rather than ownership, responsibility for husbanding water, soil, plants, and animals, and

living in harmony with nature. Many of the unscientific beliefs of these societies like 'life comes from death' and 'since all comes from nature it is to nature that all must be returned' - have much to commend them in ecological terms.

The problem with looking to these other cultures as models for the future is that, to develop, from our present situation, societies which have much in common with the more sustainable of these vernacular societies, we would have to understand their life philosophies and functioning and take deliberate ('scientific') steps to adopt them. The difficulty is that, in the process of trying to understand - i.e. cast the ideas of these societies in a Western framework - we are almost certain to corrupt and destroy them. Our ends are not their ends. We will misuse what we learn. The outcome will be distortion and destruction.

The problems involved in moving toward anything which connects with a vernacular society run deep. Goldsmith has brought together a number of anthropological studies illustrating the ways in which vernacular societies are held together by myths which have the effect of regulating the depletion of resources, population growth, and so on. McClelland<sup>18.5</sup>, following Weber, has shown how the myths of Calvinism promoted economic development. For example the belief in predestination - which asserted that one could not influence where one was going to end up, but allowed that, since God favoured his elect in this world as well as in the next, one could find out - led to hard work and austere living and thus, perversely, to the wealth it would have been such a sin to strive for. Likewise we have in this book seen how our own society is held together by the myths used to justify education, defence, the marketplace, and finance - all of which generate devil's work for otherwise idle hands and give meaning to people's lives.

What this indicates is that, if we are to create a sustainable society, we will need to study and, somewhat paradoxically, decide to employ such myths. Yet it is not easy to see how we can rationally move ourselves from being a society governed by modern myths back to being a society governed by the kind of myths which were appropriate to vernacular society. If myths are knowingly crafted and adopted, must they, in a sense, cease to be myths? And yet ... and yet ... at the back of one's mind there is always the question of whether the myths of vernacular societies were knowingly created because they had the effect of inducing people to conform to what shrewd observation had shown to be laws of nature. Or did they just evolve in the way in which it is possible some of the myths of modern society (such as those governing education, privatisation, the marketplace) have evolved?

Beyond these philosophical problems there is the fundamental difficulty that the most successful and sustainable of these ways of life have actually been destroyed by exploitative, dominator, societies. Faith in the step-wise re-creation of vernacular societies therefore hardly seems realistic. They would soon be destroyed by a dominator society, a dominator-generated nuclear winter, or dominator-generated pollution. Unless, that is, ways can be found to control the dominators themselves. As we shall see, this has to be one of our central concerns.

### **Small is Beautiful / The Future in Our Hands**

Despite their worldwide acclaim, the 'Small is Beautiful' and 'think globally, act locally' movements of Schumacher<sup>18.6</sup> and Dammann<sup>18.7</sup> also seem unrealistic. It is simply illogical to think that we can take control of our destinies so easily. We cannot, for example, create a network of small, sustainable, communities offering high quality of life in Edinburgh or Oslo. Such societies would be destroyed by an army of tax collectors demanding - as they do of subsistence farmers - tribute to support dominators, or by the arrival of an externally-generated nuclear winter, global warming, or pollution. And if, despite all odds, some such communities were, to some extent, successful, they would be quickly destroyed by their own success as immigrants in search of a better life flocked to them. To move forward, one must act in a coordinated fashion, not just locally, but also nationally and internationally. One must intervene in America, China, Japan, India, and Africa.

Once again it is important not to disparage the work of these authors (and apologies must be made for having moved so quickly here) for we have much to learn from them and from attempts to implement their ideas. But we believe that they do not, any more than Bahro's or Goldsmith's writing, actually reveal The Way.

### **A Phoenix from the Ashes**

The fatalistic / optimistic view that, although no one knows how, something worthwhile will arise from the ashes of our 'civilisation' is widely held and has been publicly endorsed by such authors as Robertson and Dauncy<sup>18.8</sup>. It seems to us that this position is untenable, even irresponsible. Not only does it not sufficiently emphasise the all-pervading devastation which would be caused by such things as global warming or a nuclear winter, it creates a false sense of security by dulling the senses to the evidence that the global warming and probability of nuclear winter trajectories are exponential and virtually unstoppable once they have passed critical points. In fact, these points of no return are, in all probability at levels which appear harmless - and have quite possibly already been passed. Concerted action is urgently required. We cannot afford to sit around - still less continue our frenetic destructive activities - and hope.

### **Ecological Anarchism**

Goldsmith and 'P.M.'<sup>18.9</sup> have, in very different ways, suggested that The Way is to be found by creating a kind of ecological anarchism (although neither actually uses this phrase).

Goldsmith underlines the importance of attending to our feelings in order to discover whether our actions are in harmony with Gala. Emphasis on this kind of personal responsibility for acting in harmony with God's purposes has a long history not only in organised religion but also in such diverse fields as anarchist philosophy and Jungian psychoanalysis. Goldsmith, like many writers in the areas just mentioned, underlines that the process is not so individualistic as might appear because the

reactions of other people and the environment exert a marked effect on an individual, just as the wider cellular 'environment' controls what chromosomes can do. Thus, if individual actions are not in accord with the needs of Gaia, they will be met by reactions which will constrain, even eliminate, the individual.

It is important to note that Goldsmith is not putting this view forward as an ideal. What he demonstrates in his book - which has revolutionary implications - is that the analytic/reductionist image of science, the individualistic image of society, and the rape of the planet are part of the same destructive complex of thoughtways. If we are to survive as a species, we have no option but to change our focus and pay more attention to contexts. Otherwise the context (Gaia) - that we so persistently choose to ignore - will eliminate us.

There is no doubt that we have become increasingly distanced from our feelings. Morgan<sup>18,10</sup> brings together the writings of a number of authors who have suggested that modern organisations function in such a way as to distance us from awareness of the consequences of our actions. We would not maim and destroy the peoples of other countries as we do through our trade and 'defence' systems if we could personally see and feel the effects of our actions. Many of the processes and devices of modern society lead us to ignore our feelings. City life and modern agricultural production systems distance us from contact with nature. Our use of contraceptives distances us from an awareness of bodily rhythms. Everything is increasingly distant. We are alienated both from ourselves and our environment.

But is it sufficient to rely on our feelings? How are we to study the context other than with the aid of some variant of our reductionist scientific methodology? How are we to study the systems processes which govern our actions other than by using our traditional science? How are we to intervene in the system of myths which governs our society except by developing a theoretically-based understanding of invisible processes and mounting evaluated experiments?

But actually, the idea of 'Working with Gaia' may have more to commend it than at first sight appears - for it leads us to change our image of science. Goldsmith demonstrates the vacuousness of many scientific 'explanations' because they do not take account of the way in which a whole organises and replenishes its parts and succeeds in surviving long after each of the parts has been replaced. This underscores the need to provide explanations in terms of purposes, rather than in terms of the origins of processes. At the same time it illustrates the poverty of much current thinking about social processes and thus provides a basis for alternative ways of thought. More specifically, it underlines the neglect of the teleological components of evolution ... and the tendency of traditional scientists to ignore the evidence for them and thus render them invisible - because they do not fit into their thoughtways. The tendency to perceive science as being concerned with hard objects and to develop theories based on 'hard' elements is quintessentially human. Typically, only mankind and geological forces create things out of the inanimate, the inorganic. Nature mostly conjures up 'hard' things out of thin air. The trees, the plants, the animals are mostly composed of carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen which the plants extract from the air - not the soil - and transform into hard material with the aid of sunlight. Only humankind,

with the aid of vast quantities of stored energy, quarries stone and mines minerals from the bowels of the earth and chisels, smelts, and beats them into shape. Most engineering and science has been concerned with forcing stone, minerals, wood, plants, and animals to comply with the wishes of humankind. To work with nature we would need to focus on and understand organisational processes. Science would need to see itself as dealing with principles of organisation instead of with seeking to understand and describe the supposedly 'hard' 'building blocks' of which substances are currently said to be composed. It is the organisation which plants impose on the carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen they extract from the air which transforms their character. Much of what scientists regard as hard is purely Organisational. What distinguishes one animal or plant from another is not the substances of which they are composed, but the way those substances are organised. The blueprints which determine these differences in organisation - the genes and the cells in which they are embedded - are not, as current science would have us believe - hard and enduring. They are said to be 'laid down at birth'. But what is actually transmitted is a tendency toward a particular pattern of organisation. In due course, our genes revert to carbon dioxide and water, with only the slightest trace of minerals.

In this book we have repeatedly seen that principles of natural organisation - hidden systems processes - regularly over-ride humankind's attempts to impose a concrete, human, order. We have seen that, if we do not quickly learn to work with them rather than against them, these natural organisational forces will eliminate humankind.

We need to reconstruct our image of science to move it away from the notion that it deals with the (hard) building blocks of nature and toward the idea that it deals mainly with organisational arrangements and principles of organisation. That done, it would be immediately obvious that much of what we have been concerned with in this book merits description as 'scientific'. This would legitimize the release of funds to explore the 'soft' issues with which we have been concerned. And it might help to ensure that we do not, as Faust feared, only dig ourselves more quickly into our graves by attempting to solve our problems through the application of (hard) science.

'P.M.'s blueprint of an anarchist society published as Bolo'Bolo, is of a very different character. Having more quickly than we identified work - actually the devil's non-work - as the central evil of modern society, P.M. moves on to describe a network of anarcho-syndacalistic organisations which would make it possible to substitute a meaningful network of communities, activities, and community- network-based health care activities for industrialist-society toil. It is the most complete blueprint of the kind of society which needs to be introduced, why, and how we are to get there, that we have read. It outlines a wide variety of individual actions which, executed in a semi-coordinated way, at least offer the possibility of introducing the desired transformation in society. The recommendations are much more coherent and systems-oriented than most of those made by participants in the Green movement.

However, two major problems remain. The first is how to orchestrate the necessarily universal and co-ordinated activity without provoking devastating reactions from those with vested interests in maintaining our present society and in such a way as to avoid neutralisation by the systems processes which operate to

maintain the status quo. The second is to elicit sufficient self-motivated participation in the network of activities required to develop an alternative. Serious though both these problems are for our own perspective, they seem to pose more serious problems for P.M. because he (she?) relies very little on research conducted by organisational psychologists and does not envisage a major role for organisational psychologists or the procedures of organisational psychology in running the kind of society that is envisaged. The book's thinking and recommendations are either much more directly rooted in, or at least parallel, the thinking of anarchist philosophers. The result is that, while P.M.'s injunction to accept personal responsibility for one's actions and establish network-based working arrangements corresponds to our own recommendations, P.M. outlines no arrangements to allocate responsibility for public action. Nor does he (or she) outline the nature of any feedback and learning system of the kind that seems to us to be so essential. Our blueprint is not a blueprint of how a society should or could work, still less of the particular policies which should be introduced, it is a blueprint of how to find out how society should work, how to discover what the policies should be, and how to ensure that innovative, self-correcting action is initiated on the basis of available information.

Goldsmith's and P.M.'s works forcefully raise a dilemma of which I first became aware when I was sent a copy of an article by Binswanger<sup>18.11</sup>. Recalling Faust, Binswanger suggested that the more we attempt to solve our problems through the application of science, the more we find ourselves doing the devil's work and dig ourselves deeper and deeper into a hole. But I could see no alternative but to pursue a scientific approach. To my mind, Goldsmith offers the only solution. This involves re-focusing the attention of scientists and other members of society on the context - and especially the context of action. This is particularly appealing because, retrospectively, it is clear that I have, in my own work, come to pay more and more attention to the (sociological) context than the psychology of the individual. Nevertheless I have a sneaking suspicion that, to Binswanger, those who understand the Faustian legend, P.M., and even to my son, I am still doing the kind of science that amounts to the devil's work. Put another way, I am not sure whether Goldsmith would feel that my work was serving Gaia's (God's) purposes, and fear that he might well view it as heterotelic to - i.e. out of kilter with - Gaia.

### **A Council for Long Range Societal Guidance**

Uniquely similar in its orientation to our own among the works we have studied is that of Milbrath. His *Envisioning a Sustainable Society: Learning Our Way* highlights many of the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 2. What it does not do is discuss the defects of our economic and public management systems that have been highlighted. Milbrath's focus on the question of how to establish a learning society and its interlinkage with values coincides exactly with our own.

From our point of view, his critique of existing governmental and management arrangement is sufficiently trenchant and his advocacy of a Council for Long-Range Societal Guidance is altogether too weak. He fails to recognise the problem of

government overload, government dis-interest in the survival of the public, and the role of the public service. He does not sufficiently recognise the need for pervasive innovation in every nook and cranny of society and hence for experimentation, comprehensive evaluation, and new kinds of research.

As a result, while Milbrath, out of all the authors we have reviewed, alone grapples with what we agree to be the most important issues, he has, in our opinion, not engaged sufficiently with the task of providing an alternative answer to the central problem Smith and Hayek sought to address in advocating market mechanisms. This was how to coordinate widely dispersed and mutually interacting bits of information and empower it in such a way that it could stimulate organic growth and development.

### **Skills Exchanges and Local Currencies**

The New Economics Foundation (NEF), especially through the conferences it organised under the rubric of The Other Economic Summit (TOES) (many of the papers from which were brought together and edited by Ekins<sup>18.12</sup>), has performed a great service by exposing some of the inadequacies and iniquities of traditional economics. Much of what was said earlier in this book stems directly from NEF's work.

When it comes to proposing ways forward, however, NEF authors have been less successful. On the one hand, they have not been short of good ideas – ranging from the construction of wind-powered electricity generating plants in India to the introduction of energy taxes and local currencies everywhere. Their problem has been to get these ideas implemented. As Ekins (more or less) put it, 'there is no shortage of good ideas if only our leaders would listen'. This book is, in a sense, an attempt to address that problem. It aims to shift the focus from a discussion of the need for a new economics to a focus on the need for a new political-economics.

The most thoroughgoing of their suggestions have been those originating with Kennedy (on solid money), Turnbull (on democratising ownership), and suggestions for building on Local Exchange Trading Systems (LETS) (including within that concept the development and use of local currencies like Green Dollars). Douglas<sup>18.13</sup>, Robertson<sup>18.14</sup>, and BIRG<sup>18.15</sup> have forcefully argued the case for a guaranteed basic income.

Local currencies themselves have a long history of re-invention, outstanding success (in terms of traditional economic development), and destruction by the banks. They can be traced back to Owen in the 1830s in the UK, and then onward through the use of a local currency by the town of Worgl in Austria a century later, to the Green Dollars of modern British Columbia<sup>18.16</sup>. More recently Robertson<sup>18.17</sup> has presented them as a hierarchy for European use. However, much of the information, and many of the ideas, now being disseminated by NEF were anticipated by Douglas<sup>18.18</sup> early this century.

Local Currencies and LETS schemes have much to commend them as means of preventing banks diverting money from poor to rich communities and by way of enabling communities to gain greater control over their own destinies. Despite their

merits, as Bookchin<sup>18,19</sup> noted, they hardly at all come to terms with the problems which were highlighted earlier or help us to understand what a complete sustainable 'economy' would look like.

An example illustrates some of the problems. While there is no doubt that the practicalities involved in making skills exchanges work will make us think about the steps needed to demonetarise the economy, they hardly at all jolt us into thinking about how the vast sectors of the economy which have been socialised - and are thus outside any effective market control - could be run more effectively.

To illustrate what is meant by this, let us consider the care of elderly people. Professionalisation of such care through social welfare and health care agencies is extremely expensive and fails to address some of the most fundamental issues - such as the need for companionship on the one hand and the need to have a meaning and purpose in life on the other. Mutual support networks have three great advantages. They lead to:

- (i) Higher quality of life for those who are being cared for because the carers attend to the important, rather than the only superficially relevant, determinants of quality of life (note the connection with our earlier observation that economic indices, and market processes generally, fail to engage with the really important determinants of quality of life);
- (ii) More satisfying work (ownwork) for the carers, who are able to obtain the satisfactions which come from providing a service which is appreciated by the client and not merely those they can purchase using the money they would be paid for the job, and
- (iii) Cost less.

In all these ways mutual support networks overcome some of the limitations of services provided through market processes. But what would happen if one tried to formalise the exchange of these services and benefits in a skills exchange system?

So long as one looks at a network of only two, three - or perhaps half a dozen-people, one could conceive of a way of keeping track of such things as the emotional costs and benefits of a network of interactions. But it is hard to believe that, if this network of mutual services were incorporated into a system of recording exchanges in a whole community, the tracking system would not as again fail to take account of the key gains which are achieved by a mutual-support system.

The pursuit of LETS schemes as a way forward has another important limitation. We have seen that our monetary system is really irrelevant to the operation of the vast sectors of the economy which have necessarily been socialised. It is difficult to see how the proliferation of LETS schemes would lead to this realisation or help us to tackle the problems which this development poses. It would seem that a way forward is more likely to be found if we try to find ways of embedding health care, insurance, education, and so on in the community without linking them to LETS schemes. Likewise, it is extremely difficult to see how choice between dramatically different types of educational programme, health care arrangements (including, for example,

the re-design of living and working arrangements), or mutual support can be facilitated by any form of token system. Such developments are much more likely to stem from improved arrangements for information-based decision taking and the creation of choice between options the personal and environmental costs and benefits of each of which are known but not tokenised.

Having used the development of LETS schemes as a basis on which to introduce the idea of demonetarising the economy, we may now highlight some of the problems posed by any kind of ticket or token system which purports to facilitate the expression of individual priorities and preferences. In the first place, discretionary spending and market processes have very little influence on the main quality-of-life-enhancing activities of modern society - the execution of R&D, the production of healthy foodstuffs by sustainable agriculture, the introduction of means whereby people can influence what happens in society, people's ability to develop and utilise their talents, the quality of the urban environment, freedom from crime, and so on. Provision in all of these areas has been virtually withdrawn from the market and so does not have to be funded from taxation. Where there is a need to be able to exercise discretionary spending, it could be handled by pocket money or tokens.

But, even in this, seemingly non-problematical, area, the range of decisions which can legitimately be left to personal choice is much less than may be imagined. Should one be able to choose between spending one's tokens on a car or a good meal? Or even between different types of car? As we have seen, the market price of a car (a) depends on a host of government interventions (R&D, robots, marketing practices) and (b) fails to reflect many of its most important costs (pollutants produced in manufacture and use, the costs of treating those injured in accidents, etc.). The same applies to food production. It follows that the whole notion that the appropriate mechanism to enable people to exercise choice and thus influence the direction of development through some kind of token system is off-beam. Much more careful decision-taking, based on explicit consideration of a much wider range of issues, is required.

More specific problems with skills exchanges and local currencies include: How is the time of a doctor to be set against the time of a someone looking after children or a Parkinson's patient? How is a doctor's time to be set against that of a decorator, artist, or someone who 'merely' soothes frayed tempers?

Behind such problems lie fundamental questions concerning the relative value of, and relationships between, different types of work. These include:

1. Unpaid work ... often on behalf of family, relatives, or community, but including work not categorised as work - such as relieving family tension;
2. Paid work - employment.

Considering the huge amount Of unnecessary - even destructive - but (often highly) paid work in our society and comparing it with the contributions of many people who get scant reward for their efforts leads one to question the legitimacy of the idea that paid work represents the only entitlement to an income - i.e. the only entitlement to

opportunities to share in the good things of society.

The link between paid work and money first takes one back into the discussion of the role of money in modern society which was presented in previous chapters. What kind of work enables people to (i) create the kind of money society requires for its operation, (ii) accumulate a store of money which will give one an entitlement to purchase, or share in, wealth, and (iii) enhance one's own quality of life or contribute to the enhancement of the quality of life of others?

As one considers such questions the links to be established between different kinds of work and reward become highly problematical. If those promoting LETS schemes are to justify many of their hopes for them they will need to consider such issues and show how their schemes engage with them.

The question of how citizenship activity is to be encouraged and recognised - even in skills-exchanges - merits serious attention. Paying for such work without extending payment to all sorts of vital, but currently unpaid, work would further trivialise and marginalise some of the most important and most satisfying types of work in our society such as caring for children, the sick, and the elderly and contributing to community life. Yet not recognising the importance and value of such work is one of the fundamental problems of the monetary economy. Recognising them means the establishment and maintenance of a huge apparatus to keep track of exchanges.

It is worth reiterating that the transaction costs - i.e. the time required to weigh up the costs and benefits of each and every action taken during the day and to express the result as a price indicating 'what's it worth to me' - of any kind of market based mechanism for orchestrating the contributions made (and to be made) to an organisation or society are enormous. So, too, are the costs of monitoring and enforcing the 'deals' which have been struck.

In sum: while local currencies have proved themselves of value from the point of view of orchestrating local, economic development and stemming the drain of finance, people, and resources to distal communities, they offer no panacea.

Beyond LETS lie proposals for guaranteed incomes - perhaps going well beyond guaranteed basic incomes.

The most thoroughgoing rationale for a high, guaranteed, basic income was provided by Douglas who noted that: (1) One cannot tell where innovation is going to come from or which activities are going to turn out to be most useful; (2) The basis of most important innovations came from the activities of those who had the security and the time to find new ways of thinking about things and try out new ways of doing them - and that, if we want innovation, we will need to provide people with more security; (3) Most of the work and the innovations on which the prosperity of modern society is dependent came from the labours of untold millions of people in the past (and as many in the present) who got (or get) no special reward for their efforts, and not from the few 'innovators' who know how to work the institutional machinery - and especially the patents and legal machinery - of modern society to secure disproportionate reward; (4) The activities of many of the most highly paid people in modern society are much more destructive of the social fabric and the future than the free riders who incur so much opprobrium; (5) By applying what we know about the

origins of money and the (unrelated) causes of inflation it would be possible to inject the cash necessary to offer a high basic income into the system without causing inflation.

## **Conclusion**

While there are important things to be learned from each of the suggestions for ways forward that have been examined in this chapter, none come to terms with many of the problems highlighted in this book. A radical new perspective is, indeed, required.

### **Notes**

- 18.1 Bahro, 1986
- 18.2 Milbrath, 1989
- 18.3 Sale, 1991
- 18.4 Goldsmith, 1992
- 18.5 McClelland, 1961
- 18.6 Schumacher, 1974. See also McRobie, 1982. Despite worldwide endorsement, the writings of some authors (for example Janicke, 1990), seem to amount to little more than grasping at a straw for the lack of any articulate alternative.
- 18.7 Dammann, 1979, 1984
- 18.8 Robertson, 1985; Dauncey, 1988
- 18.9 P.M., 1985
- 18.10 Morgan, 1986
- 18.11 Binswanger, Faber and Manstetten, 1990
- 18.12 Ekins, 1986
- 18.13 Douglas, 1935/78b
- 18.14 Robertson, 1985
- 18.15 Basic Income Research Group
- 18.16 See especially, Chapter 8 of Ekins (1986).
- 18.17 Robertson, 1985
- 18.18 Douglas, 1935/78b. Douglas knew all about the nebulous nature of money, control of the financial system by international bankers, the generation and dissemination of mis-information by that community in order to manipulate both public and governments, the lack of connection between money wealth, and quality of life, and the possibilities of intervening in the system without generating inflation by injecting newly created money in an appropriate way and/or moving toward systems of exchange explicitly based on tickets instead of a system misleadingly presented as 'money'. He developed a more fundamental argument to legitimise a high, guaranteed, basic income than any put forward by modern authors. The emphasis in his writing does, however, differ from them in that the seriousness of the environmental problems which the energy-consumptive machine age has generated were not then apparent. As a result, he is much more inclined to advocate wider use of machines. Likewise, there is more unquestioned acceptance of the importance of eliminating work (or acceptance that work is a curse) and a failure to acknowledge the contribution that working life makes to quality of life.
- 18.19 Bookchin, 1992