# TUITIII 30c NEW ZEALAND VALUES PARTY DOINT

May/June, 1975

Registered at Post Office Headquarters, Wellington, as a magazine

Vol. 1, No. 6

# A NEW ECONOMIC RECIPE

Economics is that part of our culture through which we seek to satisfy our material needs—our needs for goods and services. Realising that our material needs are only a part (and a small part too) of all the needs we have as human beings, then we must be sure that we meet our material needs in a way which does not restrict our chances of meeting our non-material needs.

At present our economic system is geared completely to meeting our material needs, but while it provides many of us with some pretty fantastic gadgets it has failed to meet the most basic material needs of some New Zealanders and most of the world's people. Furthermore, it has begun to threaten the wellbeing of mother Nature.

The destruction of the human spirit caused by both excess material poverty and by excess material wealth, and the destruction of the natural environment caused by the latter, is a direct result of an obsolete economic system—a system based on greed, envy and selfishness.

The Values Party is proposing an economic\_system based on co-operation, sharing and conservation. We do so in the belief that it is possible to meet the material needs of everyone, in harmony with mother Nature; and in a way which not only does not restrict, but actually promotes the satisfaction of our non-material needs. Non-material needs include friendship, play, self-expression, a sense of individual identity, social approval, self-esteem and peace of mind.

Finally, we would like you to understand that it is a basic tenet of the Values Party that for too long economics has been the dominant preoccupation of our culture, and over-

time, a colour TV and a second car have very little to do with true happiness and that it is time we put aside our foolish notions.

# PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING VALUES ECONOMICS

- 1. The introduction of a stable state world economy is necessary to the survival and wellbeing of mankind.
- 2. The establishment—and maintenance of a stable state economy is dependent upon an equitable distribution of wealth both between nations and within nations.
- 3. The Values Party's economic policies are based upon long-term proposals to secure this type of stable state economy. In pursuing our long-term aims our intermediate policies must, of necessity, be concerned with the equitable distribution of the products of our economy and the preservation of its basic resources.
- 4. We hold that there is a minimum level of income below which, as of right, no one should fall. (This minimum would replace the necessity for social security benefits and superannuation.) We further believe that excessively high incomes are a travesty of human justice and therefore oppose the tradition of inherited wealth and support a steeply progressive tax scheme.

- 5. Values Party economic policies will lead towards community control and management of production, finance and distribution. Initial steps will be based on the concept of Co-operative Enterprise, which provides for equal control of an enterprise by its workers, its consumers, the suppliers of its finance and its local community.
- 6. An important aspect of New Zealand's future is its role as a major supplier of agricultural products and expertise in a hungry world. Values policies would support the farming community in the fullest possible agricultural production compatible with sound environmental principles and the food needs of the world.
- 7. The Values Party sees a major role of the government in economic matters as one of promoting and maintaining regional balance. Planning and co-ordination will also seek to ensure that economic enterprises serve social purposes compatible with the values of the community. Government will be guided in this by the ongoing public forum on the one hand, and on the other by social, environmental and technological research units, independent of the government
- 8. The Values Party seeks to promote decentralisation of political and economic activities, with delegation of administrative decisions to the lowest possible level of operation.

#### POLICIES

#### Introduction

We face a situation in which the needs of humanity demand urgent attention. The urgency and size of the problem mean that government action is required. This poses a difficulty for the Values Party, for we believe that administrative power should not be centralised, and that governmental, commercial and other centralised activities must be trans-

ferred to local communities wherever this is made possible by the desire of local people to take over these functions.

Our solution to this difficulty lies in seeing the role of government changing over time. In the short term much of the development of the new economy will be dependent upon government actions, and the provision of a lot of information about the new system to the public for them to study and debate. In the intermediate term step-by-step progress will be made towards the new economy, with government acting as a guide and a watchdog. In the long term local communities will carry the major responsibility for the economy, with government acting mainly as a forum for co-operation between communities and assisting with special functions such as energy, trade, transport and communications.

#### A. What Sort of Cake?

- 1. Decentralised The Values Party believes that to ensure a humane and ecologically sound economy we must have a stable state based on, controlled by, and oriented towards local communities. We need this decentralised stable state to combat the twin evils of economic Growthmania and the concentration of power.
- 2. Stable State A stable state world economy is one in which the total population and the total stock of physical wealth are maintained constant at some desired levels by a minimal rate of throughput. In other words, birth and death rates are equalised at the lowest feasible level and the rates of physical production and consumption are likewise equalised at the lowest feasible level. This, of course, means that the average life expectancy of both persons and products is maximised.

Cont. page 3

## EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

The 1975 Conference decided to entrust the Christchurch branch once again with the responsibility for producing your national magazine—at least for a further year. The magazine is now to appear every two months, and the branch has made a number of changes in the personnel involved in running the magazine.

Field Editor Ivan Finlayson.

Copy Editors Hilde Wright and Sarah Clarkson.

Production and Layout Robert Clarkson.

Distribution Barry Cresswell and Neil Williams.

Treasurer Neil Williams.

The Editorial Committee would very much appreciate maximum support from the Party as a whole in the form of plenty of copy, comment, and a concerted effort to distribute as many copies as possible at branch and personal levels. Please note that we now have a new P.O. Box number, taken over from Conference—this is P.O. Box 5237, Papanui, Christchurch.

## CONTENTS

				Page
	112	*	-	1
-	-	-		2
	-	-	-	7
8	-	-	-	8
ice -	-		-	9
		-	-	9
	-	-	-	10
١.	_	0		10
	-	-	-	11
			-	11
	_	-	-	12
-		-	-	13
	- - ice - -	ice		ice

But we may ask why the stable state should be necessary. The world is finite; the ecosystem is a stable state. The human economy is a subsystem of the stable-state ecosystem. Therefore, a stable state for the human economy becomes a physical necessity.

3. Global Orientation The introduction of a stable state world economy is necessary for the survival and wellbeing of mankind. The establishment and maintenance of a stable state economy is dependent upon an equitable distribution of wealth both between nations and within nations.

So, not only must we have decentralised, stable state economy, but that economy must realise its global responsibilities. New Zealand is a trading nation and this trade must take account of the global needs we can assist in satisfying and the global resources we must share equitably with others.

4. Size Human beings must have at least a minimum level of goods and services, e.g., food, clothing, shelter, entertainment, education. We need these things for our survival and for our humanity. Human beings also need a minimum level of opportunity to be creative and to feel useful and important. Our cake must be at least big enough to enable the satisfaction of these basic human needs. We believe New Zealand is in a favourable position to demonstrate to the world that these needs can be met on a global scale.

However, it is not enough to know the minimum requirements for our economy. We must realise that in a finite world our economy cannot grow ever larger. The need for a stable economy shows us that there are in fact limits to the size of the cake. The size of this global problem is increased by the fact that some countries are already using up more of the world's resources than they are entitled to. Comparison of consumption levels reveals New Zealand as one of these countries. It follows then that the application of the first two principles underlying Values economic policies will mean that the overall size of our 'cake' will not be greater than that which we have today. However, we believe we can change our 'cake' so that eating it will be more satisfying and making it will be more fun.

5. Ingredients Our ingredients are our resources. The world has a number of valuable resources which we can share, and New Zealand has a number of valuable resources which we must nurture for ourselves, for the rest of the world and for future generations. We have a climate and we have the soils which enable us to reap a rich harvest of primary products, especially meat, milk (and its byproducts), fruit, vegetables and wood products of all kinds. It is difficult in New Zealand to be more than 100 miles from a sea which, if carefully managed, is capable of providing a constant supply of food and other resources. So, although we don't have large mineral reserves it is not necessary to go into the detail of our energy resources, modern transport systems, advanced communications technology and skills and talents of our working people for us to realise that New Zealand is well endowed with resources. But these resources must be nurtured. We cannot go on drugging our soils with chemical fertilisers, clogging our air with pollutants and ruining our waterways with waste. We cannot go on endangering our human resources with jobs that are demeaning and often dangerous. We cannot afford to continue to export our electricity and coal at a loss. We cannot pillage our way through our forests in pursuit of foreign exchange. We did not inherit these resources from our parents; we have borrowed them from our children.

#### B. Making and Baking

The centre of the 'making and baking' policies in Values economics is the principle of Co-operative Community Control and Management of the means of production, finance and distribution.

To be successful, economic enterprises must satisfy the needs of their customers, their workers, the suppliers of their finance, and their local community. To achieve this success all four groups must work together to harmonise the operations of the enterprise with the needs of all four groups. At present the four parties are seeking to outbluff and outwit each other rather than working together for a synthesis of interest and the attainment of the respective goals.

To ensure that customers get goods and services which satisfy their needs, that workers get material and non-material satisfactions from their jobs, that suppliers of finance get security for their savings and that the community at large is ensured of the widest choice of lifestyles possible, both now and in the future—all these people must be involved in economic decision making.

In order to do this the Values Party proposes the progressive application of the concept of Co-operative Enterprise to all medium and large-sized economic enterprises. (Small enterprises are usually already co-operative in nature because of the close relationships between their customers, workers, financiers and community.)

A co-operative enterprise, be it a farm, a mine, a factory, a bank, an insurance office, a wholesaler or a big department store, is characterised by the existence of two boards which control the operation of the enterprise, as follows.

The Supervisory Board can be seen as replacing the old board of directors. It is composed of the elected representatives of the workers within the firm, its customers, its suppliers of finance, and the community at large (including future generations). This board sets the goals of the enterprise and has the authority to ensure that they are met. This board has responsible to it an independent 'Audit Staff' to ensure that the Executive Board cannot pull the wool over its eyes.

The Executive Board replaces the old managerial group. It is composed of the elected representatives of the workers within the firm. Blue and white collar workers in the plant are represented on a proportional basis and make the operational day-to-day decisions of the enterprise.

The Executive Board would continue to draw on experts such as finance, personnel and computer people in much the same way as does the present managerial group. The big change is that all the employees of an enterprise elect their management team.

#### Success Criteria

The myth that 'only enterprises making a high return on capital are efficient' must be dispelled. The true criterion of performance must be the extent to which an enterprise meets the needs of its component groups while minimising social, ecological and financial costs.

The inclusion of all four components in the decisionmaking processes of the enterprise and the growing awareness of the social and ecological costs of economic activities will ensure a much more satisfactory contribution from economic enterprises to our culture.

#### Rate of Change

The most important effect on the rate of change-over to co-operative enterprises will be the desire of people in their communities to take on their new roles. As more people come to realise the value of running their own lives the pace of change will quicken.

A Values Government would be able to require particular enterprises to become co-operatives and would provide incentives for others to change over voluntarily.

### The Co-operative Enterprise

Customers — Individuals and organisations which purchase output from the enterprise;

Workers — Blue- and white-collar workers, administrators and other persons whose activities maintain the operation of the

enterprise;

Financiers — Individuals and organisations who have supplied funds for the construction, maintenance and operation of the enter-

prise;

Community — Persons who feel that the operations of the enterprise are important to themselves and future generations.

(This group would obviously tend to be drawn from people living near the enterprise and would include, for example, potential customers and environmental groups.)

All these people would be of voting age. Persons holding recent receipts from the enterprise would vote for the customer representatives on the Supervisory Board; persons currently employed by the enterprise would vote for the workers' representatives; current shareholders would vote for finance representatives; and self-defined members of the community would vote for the community representatives. These elections would take place every year at the annual general meeting of the enterprise.

It is easy to imagine the operation of specific enterprises such as factories, mines, farms (subject to the detail of our agricultural policies), large stores, and service enterprises such as transport, by our knowledge of who are, or could be, the customers, workers, financiers and community for the specific enterprise. (We should note that this concept of co-operative community control and management can be applied to enterprises not usually seen as being economic enterprises—e.g., it would be possible to apply these principles to the functioning of our health and education services.)

#### Some Special Cases

As has already been mentioned, the application of this concept to farming enterprises would need to be in accordance with our agricultural policy. This, together with the fact that many farming enterprises are co-operative in nature already, and the special role of farming in our culture, makes farm enterprises something of a special case.

Banks and other financial institutions also need special mention because it is the application of the concept of co-operative enterprise to these organisations which gives us community control and management of the means of exchange.

The co-operative enterprise as applied to a bank would be structured as follows:

Customers — Those people who borrow from the bank;

Workers - Bank staff:

Financiers - Depositors and the Reserve Bank;

Community — Already the existence of a bank's community has been ably demonstrated by the activities of Trustee Savings Banks.

To obtain real co-operative banking, all these four groups must have a say in the policy decisions of the banking enterprise.

Distribution enterprises, particularly wholesalers, also need special mention. In fact the most significant institution in the distribution system will be the community co-operative wholesaling enterprise. While this enterprise will be structured in the same way as our production units, the local nature of the enterprise and the consequent overlap of interests of its participants assures it of a strong bargaining position with its suppliers. Further co-operation between the wholesaling units would mean that they would be able to have a strong influence on the production units as to what will be produced, and to what quality, in what quantity, and at what price.

While dealing with distribution, let us look at the problem of promotion. The Values Party has already made its opposition to traditional promotion methods clear through its policy of making advertising as an expense item non-deductible for tax purposes. Looking further ahead, how do we see promotion activities? First, if a producing unit wishes to promote one of its items it would forward it to an impartial organisation for a comparative test and evaluation rather like that which is carried out by the present Consumer Institute. The cost of the testing and publicity would be borne by the enterprise whose products and services were involved in the tests. There would be a minimum required sequence of tests with production enterprises and the Technology Assessment Board having the right to request further tests over and above the minimum

if they so desire. All national promotion would be handled impartially by this comparative test organisation. Local promotion from the wholesaler to the customer would be in the hands of the wholesaling enterprise which may make use of the present methods of promotion, or it may discover alternative methods of informing its customers that the goods have arrived. We are sure that the local community would not allow itself to be abused nor would it allow itself to be deprived of media previously dependent upon advertising moneys if it felt they were a useful part of the community life.

What we have in distribution, then, is a series of channels through which consumers can make their desires known to the producers and through which producers can indicate to what extent they can meet these desires. This is a system vastly superior to our present situation, where often a producer will make what he can and then attempt to stimulate a demand for it. Market research and biassed promotion are poor substitutes for giving consumers the means of expressing (and enforcing) their needs directly to (and on) the producer.

#### A Note on Industrial Relations

With the day-to-day operations of the enterprise in the hands of the blue- and white-collar workers within the enterprise, and with elected representatives of the customers, workers, financiers and community developing the art of fruitful compromise in the making of policy decisions, the disruptions caused by workers having to fight shareholders (wages and salaries vs. profits), shareholders having to fight customers (profits vs. prices) and everyone fighting the community at large (over the state of the environment, for example) will diminish considerably and over time disappear completely.

#### The Role of the Government

(See also Introduction to Policies)

The Values Party sees a major role of the Government in this co-operative economy as one of promoting and maintaining regional balance. It is a function of Government to ensure that no community has too little economic development and that no community has too much.

Government planning and co-ordination will need to ensure that there is co-operation and understanding between the communities. This will be achieved by the use of Government as a meeting place and forum for local communities.

In the short and medium term Government will need to act as a watchdog to ensure that enterprises serve purposes compatible with the values of their communities.

Government will be guided in its activities by the on-going community forum and by technological, environmental and social consequence research units independent of the Government.

#### C. Sharing the Cake

Having looked at what sort of cake we will have and how we will make it, let's look at how we would share it.

#### **Income Distribution**

The Values Party advocates a more even distribution of

assets and facilities. You will also have noted in Principle 4 that we believe that there is a minimum level of income below which no one should fall, and that we oppose the tradition of inherited wealth and support a steeply progressive tax scheme (i.e., the richer you are, the more you pay to the community).

Our short-term policies include changes in the graduated tax scale to relieve the tax burden on lower and middle incomes and to increase taxation on high personal incomes, unearned incomes and company profits. Also negative taxation would be applied to all income levels below an agreed national minimum to bring them up to the minimum, provided that any person able and unwilling to work full time would not be entitled to the minimum income. This guaranteed national minimum income would also replace all government social security benefits and superannuation schemes.

We believe that, as our culture develops, we will come to recognise that the minimum income is made up of two parts—that part which belongs to everyone equally and as of right, and that part which is the actual payment to be made to those working usefully without proper remuneration by society.

In the longer term income distribution decisions will be made by individual co-operative community enterprises. The performance of the enterprise in meeting the needs of all members of the community is best determined by the community.

#### Notes on Inflation

Inflation has important effects on the sharing of our cake. As it progresses, persons on fixed incomes get less, while people able to command scarce resources (such as land) get more; wages and salaries must follow inflation; prices and therefore profits stay right up with it.

Stated simply, inflation occurs when consumer prices rise. The price of something can go up because a lot of people want to buy that one thing and there is a limited amount of it available, or because the cost of making it goes up, or because someone wants to make more out of selling it.

The present world-wide inflation is a result of human greed. There is not enough in the way of world resources to allow the developed countries to continue their incredible levels of consumption; carefully shared, there is enough for all to live satisfying lives.

The attempts of the rich to continue to get richer and the attempts of the poor to become less poor have resulted in a global 'bidding up' of the prices of the world's resources (e.g., oil), for much of the world economy is run like an auction with resources flowing to the highest bidder. The rich bid highest and push prices up. New Zealand, as a trading nation, imports many items whose prices have been raised through this bidding for increasingly scarce resources, and this is a significant part of our own inflation. The applications of the principles of zero population growth and stable state economics with equitable distribution of resources on a global scale would soon bring this

inflation under control. Unfortunately, it will be some time before these global moves are made.

Another source of inflation in New Zealand is the existence of a small number of very wealthy people who have sufficient excess wealth to enable them to speculate in the buying and selling of items important to our economy. Especially in the land market the 'bidding' activities of these people push prices far beyond the reach of ordinary people. The Values Party intends to use taxes on unearned incomes, a wealth tax and its opposition to inherited wealth to cut back the negative impact of these 'bidding' activities.

Part of our inflation is due to a lack of harmony in the division of our 'cake'; in fact such is the disharmony that we are attempting to get more 'cake' than there is—this is inflationary. Application of the concept of co-operative enterprise will do much to combat inflation from this source, for reasons which have already been outlined. Through the co-operative community control of our economy not only profits, wages, salaries, rents and interest will be decided upon and controlled by local communities, but also prices. This, combined with our overall moves towards a stable economy, will remove the worry of inflation.

In the short term we believe more must be done to help those hurt through inflation, and more must be done to hurt those helping themselves through inflation.

Pensioners and others on fixed incomes must have their allowance raised to equality with adequate living standards, and tied to the consumer price index. The basic necessities of life, especially food and housing, must be ensured to all, even if it means short-term price controls enforced and financed by Government.

If wages and salaries are to be controlled then so must prices, profits, rents, interest and private incomes be controlled. Holding of excess wealth will need to be cut back to discourage speculation and promote a fairer sharing of the 'cake'.

Values economic policies will control internal inflation by giving control over prices to local communities and will limit 'imported inflation' by cutting back our dependency on the other rich countries. But that will not occur immediately. Immediately we must be prepared to face inflation, but the blow can be softened if we take strong action to discourage those who are benefiting from promoting inflation and to support those who are being hurt by it.

#### Trade

Sharing of our 'cake' is very much affected by our relationships with the rest of the world, for we share in their 'cakes' and they in ours. Trade is one of the economic activities which will require government co-ordination.

One of our objectives is to choose a population and a mix of lifestyles which will enable us to sustain ourselves to the highest degree possible within our shores. We also have a role to play in the provision of food for areas of our planet which are incapable of becoming self-sufficient in this commodity. On our way toward self-sufficiency (which we may never attain) we are going to need to import certain items and we are going to need to finance such imports with exports.

Our predominant export will be our primary produce and our predominant imports, for some time to come, will be oil, manufactured items, and some raw materials. This means that we are most likely to be trading with rich countries, but a deliberate diversification into increased trade with poor nations, in a manner which assists their development, should be made.

Exports of our farm products are covered under our Agriculture policy; exports of manufactured articles would be the responsibility of producing units which may find benefit in forming export co-operatives.

Imports would be considerably changed from the present situation. In the first instance the foreign exchange available for the purchase of imports would be put up for auction by the government; enterprises would bid for the overseas funds in New Zealand dollars. A market price (or series of market prices) would be established at which the overseas funds would be sold on the New Zealand market. Once an individual or enterprise has purchased overseas funds it can use them to import whatever it likes, subject to approval from the government (e.g., the incumbent government may have decided to ban imports of heroin and electric toothbrushes). In some instances where there is no precedent the import department may refer to the Technological Assessment Board concerning the desirability of a particular import.

With regard to the development of our import substitution manufacturing industries we must be sure we are not developing substitutes for items which we can import from poor countries and which may represent significant contributions to their economies. For example, the development of a local sugar beet industry would be detrimental to Fiji's economy.

#### Epilogue (What It's About)

A stable state world economy based on equitable distribution of resources and co-operative community control of the means of production, finance and distribution.

An economic base enabling the satisfaction of the basic material needs of all, through people working at safe, satisfying jobs.

An economic base which supports the satisfaction of nonmaterial human needs.

An economic base for our new way of life—a way of life that knows that people are more important than property, and ecology more important than being 'rich'.

An economy based not only on the physical necessity of limiting our material expansion and the humanist ideals of sharing what we have, but also on the realisation that many wise people have chosen what we have called poverty as part of their path to happiness.

Geoff Neill Dunedin

## TOWN PLANNING AND HOUSING

Nikolaus Pevsner, world famous critic of art and architecture, said in his visit to this country in the 1950s of New Zealand architecture that it was an 'ingratiating chaos'. Whilst New Zealand undoubtedly has unrivalled natural beauty, no-one who has seen the charm and beauty of the towns, cities and villages in Europe can deny that the man-made scene in this country is a mess. Whilst the desire for non-conformity and individuality may be laudable in many spheres, when it comes to imposing tasteless, dull or ugly buildings on the townscape for all to see, some control is essential.

In Europe up until the time of the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century, most buildings, whether they were great architectural essays built by craftsmen, or more humble buildings, honestly built by tradesmen using the available building materials and techniques, were (and still are, where they exist) a pleasure to behold.

In New Zealand, apart from a few well designed and built modern buildings, the only buildings having this quality were built before the nineteen-twenties. Generally speaking, nearly all the towns and cities in this country suffer from a total lack of harmony, due to the multitude of materials and building techniques used. There is a complete lack of good-mannered neighbourliness in shopping streets, commercial zones and housing areas, and whilst proud house owners may delude themselves into believing that their own home is different, in fact most of them are basically the same, as a careful examination of the plans of houses available will show.

Whilst the New Zealander may consider it an infringement of his right to build what he wants anywhere, there is no doubt that some sort of aesthetic Planning Control such as exists overseas is necessary.

Conservation of Buildings of Historic or Aesthetic Value What little building heritage we have here is rapidly being destroyed to make way for 'more economic' buildings, i.e., usually to make some developer a quick profit. No building should be destroyed unless it is to be replaced with something of greater visual amenity. Powers do exist to preserve buildings, but these powers are not sufficiently exercised.

#### General Layout of Towns and Suburbs

Except where winding rivers, hills or other features of the landscape dictated otherwise, nearly all the towns in this country were laid out on a rectangular grid. This was probably because it was easier to sub-divide land in this manner, and leads to almost every street being long, straight and dull, with numerous hazardous crossroads, each street looking much like the rest. Road widths become wider and wider as traffic engineers impose motor transport requirements on the environment, forgetting that towns are for people.

#### Large Buildings

Most of the large buildings being erected today are not built to enhance the environment, and may not even be required at all. Many commercial undertakings are erected purely to enable their developers again to make a large profit by creating the maximum lettable space permitted on any given site. Most of the developers have no interest in the appearance of the building, except that it should be sufficiently attractive to possible tenants. Whilst large scale shopping developments no doubt make the cost of food distribution easier, and therefore probably cheaper, there can be no delight in shopping expeditions to many of such establishments. The same, of course, applies to vast drinking taverns, with their huge car parks.

#### Housing

When sections were a quarter of an acre or more, or when houses are built on hillsides, when each dwelling can have its own complete individuality without offence, novelty or originality is quite acceptable. When sections drop to as little as fifteen perches in size the only sane way to build is to design areas of housing which complement each other and give a sense of community. This does not necessarily lead to dullness. In recent years some housing schemes have been designed and built which are quite delightful. Unfortunately, most of these tend to be very expensive, due to the excessive profits going to the developers. There is no reason why such housing schemes cannot be produced at reasonable prices.

#### High-density Housing

High-density housing (say, 60 persons to the acre) is most necessary today in towns, if we are not to increase the sprawl of suburbia and further stretch our lines of communication and services. However, the current trend of demolishing one house on a quarter-acre and replacing it with a row of half-a-dozen flats at right angles to the street, to be followed by similar developments all down the street, must be stopped. High-density developments should be permitted only on larger areas of say one acre or more, so that more amenable layouts can be produced.

#### **High-rise Housing**

In the early nineteen-twenties Le Corbusier had the idea of building large high blocks of flats, surrounded by large areas of open countryside. Unfortunately, this was seen as a means for producing more housing in a smaller space, leading to extremely high-density schemes (several hundred people to the acre) with no outlook other than the next block of flats. It has been discovered in recent years that this is not only extremely undesirable for numerous reasons, but is not even necessary. High-density housing can be produced at no more than three storeys high, if carefully planned.

#### Government Building

The Government is one of the biggest (if not the biggest) developers in the country. It is therefore unfortunate that most government building does nothing to enhance the urban scene. In the housing field alone the State House is, visually at least, something to be abhorred. Because it has the facilities at its disposal to produce large areas of housing, State housing should be, as it is in Britain, some of the best in the country. Certainly state housing is not cheap, and the standards of workmanship required by the government are high. There is no reason why the design of state housing should not be the subject of architectural competitions, which could produce some brilliant schemes as may be seen overseas. The same can be said for all other government building.

#### Long Life, Low Energy, Loose Fit

This concept has been keenly examined in Britain, and to a lesser extent in this country. Briefly the idea is that buildings should be constructed with materials which will last, of materials and building methods using little energy (not aluminium, for instance, or buildings designed needing artificial heating, ventilation, lifts, escalators, etc.) and planned in such a manner that if their existing use becomes outmoded they can easily be converted to a different use. For example, a multi-storey car park, with seven feet from floor to ceiling, will not serve much useful purpose if we run out of cars or petroleum. If more headroom were available they could, in time, be converted to some other use.

#### Street Furniture

There seems to be a total lack of consideration when it comes to the impedimenta which clutter our streets, such as overhead power lines, power poles, street lighting, traffic signs, advertising hoardings, sky signs, etc. This has been recognised overseas, and much can be done to improve the mess that burdens our towns.

Leo Taylor Christchurch

# CONFERENCE 1975 — AN EVALUATION

It has been said that this year will be a decisive one for the Values Party. If we poll well, we're on the way to becoming a major political force. If we poll badly the setback may well damage the party morale so badly that we will settle, disillusioned, into the rut that Social Credit has been in for the last decade.

And it was with those thoughts that many people went to the national Conference. With anxiety on the one hand, and on the other the fervent hope that the spirit of the last elections would again be evident—and that there would be enough momentum to send them back, recharged for the elections.

Throughout the entire Conference in fact the urgency of the situation was evident. There was little bickering over trivial issues; there was an obvious desire from all delegates to get on with the big issues, not to waste time, not to get bogged down with the hogwash of political manoeuvres.

Maybe it was the awareness of the importance of this year, maybe it was because people are now genuinely thinking more about the importance of the issues that we face. Whatever the reason, this year's conference was the most cohesive conference the Values Party has held.

This year's conference did more to unify the party than any previous gathering. The issues raised in remits, although not as thorough nor as thoughtful in many cases as most people would have liked, provided a solid policy background to our philosophy.

But while there was far more radical thinking obvious within the party than the media would have us believe, there was also a vague feeling of unease within many members that the extent of our radical thinking is still superficial; that we are still accepting the current systems which govern our lives instead of questioning and attempt-

ing to rebuild those systems—for one, the present system of government. It hasn't met the needs of people to date—do we expect it to work if we come into power? As a political party one would expect members to be questioning the root causes of why the system doesn't work at the moment instead of docilely accepting and travelling along the same lines to political chaos that Governments in the past have done. We surely have to change the whole meaning of the word 'politician' into something which means people who govern the country, rather than people who merely go around sticking bandages on the country's assorted trivial bumps and scratches.

An interesting point was made by a former Labour candidate, Brian Edwards, recently, when he said: 'I say to the people I'm going to help you change your lives, I'm going to try and make a better life for you, make a small person mean something again. And the woman I'm saying it to says to me, "Great, you do something about that bloke who's burning his fire too close to my boundary and I'll vote for you".' And that's what the meaning of politician has become: the local odd job man, instead of one of the people who are supposed to decide where our country is going.

We talk about our two major policies, steady state economy and population stabilisation. But how we are going to effectively implement them is the question that most people want to have answered. And unless we get down to a little serious thinking about that question and come up with a solution we'll never achieve what we want to achieve.

But back to the Conference and its meaning for this year's election and the eventual success of the policies we did come up with. It's obvious when talking to delegates that most party members still base their understanding of the party on a rather nebulous 'feeling' about Values rather than a concrete set of principles which can be explained

to non-party members. Many, in fact, express difficulty in being able to get 'the point' across to people who ask them what Values is all about. Most, I feel, including myself, could still not tell people what steady state economy was all about. We're a little better at explaining about humanitarianism, or telling people why uncontrolled growth is bad for them, or why unlimited population is bad.

And when people ask us if we are realistic enough ever to become Government, how many of us can make enough sense to show that our policies are the only realistic ones? In the minds of most party members, it's a matter of self education. We have to know what we are talking about to be able to convince others. The Conference provided the basis for us to work on—it must be up to us now to go home and expand on the general guidelines we could draw from the Conference, and so be able to convert enough people to the party way of thinking, to take more votes this year and to take us one step further towards having our policies implemented.

Raewyn McKenzie Auckland

## A REPLY FROM THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE?

Office of the Minister of Justice, Wellington 1. 7th May, 1975

Mr Dave Woodhams, National Chairman, Values Party.

Dear Mr Woodhams,

The Prime Minister's Private Secretary has referred to me your telegram protesting at the recommendation of the Electoral Act Committee to raise an election candidate's expenses from \$20 to \$100.

The purpose of requiring a deposit at all is to provide some assurance of good faith and at least minimal support. I for one would readily agree that this deposit should not be set so high as to deter all except persons having substantial funds at their back, but in my opinion the deposit of \$100 is by no means unreasonably high. As long ago as 1893 it was the equivalent of \$20. It therefore represents must less in relation to everyday wages and salaries than it did 80 years ago.

Yours sincerely,

Martin Finlay

Minister of Justice

This communication was received in response to a telegram sent by the Values Party 1975 Conference to the Office of the Prime Minister. The telegram read:

THE 1975 CONFERENCE OF THE N.Z. VALUES PARTY DEPLORES THE IMPLICATIONS OF YOUR TOTALLY UNDEMOCRATIC PLOY TO RAISE ELECTION DEPOSITS TO \$100 STOP WE REGARD THIS AS A FURTHER INDICATION OF TWO-PARTY POLITICAL ELITISM.

Editorial Comment: It may have escaped the Minister's attention that the right to stand for election bears no relation to everyday wages and salaries and must in a Democratic society remain the prerogative of all who wish to exercise it.

## CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Editor,

I have a fear that the Values Party will become little more than a series of talking sessions with some well-meaning people discussing, in the best of grammar, the popular issues of the day. They'll talk of their disgust for pollution, as they eat Big Tex coleslaw from plastic containers, and they'll talk of reforming the great beer-swilling masses as they drink their wine and eat their cheese.

Perhaps I'm taking an over-pessimistic view. Sure, the Values Party is thinking along the right lines, but so far there seems to be little more than a cosmetic approach. We're still talking in vague middle-of-the road language (e.g., 'a more equitable distribution of wealth') just to satisfy our consciences. The party seems to lack the guts to commit itself. The majority of the party seem to me

to be in what Terry McDavitt calls 'the anti-ideology' group. That is, they don't know where they stand. I, for one, want to be counted as one of the radical Left group. Hopefully we will soon start talking in a positive and meaningful way (e.g., Capitalism must be abolished, not given a facelift). We must be dedicated not to the reform of capitalism but to the eradication of capitalism. That will not be achieved by good intentions expressed at wine and cheese evenings and the like. The party must commit itself to the activist approach. Otherwise people will vote Values expecting change and get 'short-changed' in return (apologies to Reg). Perhaps the 1976 Conference will get down to basics.

With all best wishes and hope for the future,

Mike Nicholls Lincoln

# DEVELOPING EDUCATION AND WELFARE POLICIES

Maybe the most educational aspect of membership of the Conference committee dealing with these subjects was what was learnt about policy making. It is chastening to realise that policy making in major political parties can follow a similar course, but it is much to be hoped that the Values Party can avoid some of the pitfalls that made our work so difficult on this occasion. It is worthwhile therefore to try to analyse what went wrong.

The remits that poured in on Education were not only staggering in their number, they were remarkable in their diversity, in some cases their redundancy, or just because many were contradictory. No distinction was made between short-term, intermediate, and long-term policies.

#### Some Broad Principles

It would be wrong to create the impression our endeavours were fruitless. The most concrete achievement was that Conference adopted the following principles for developing education policy:

- (a) We see education as the full development of the whole personality rather than simply the processing of the person into society.
- (b) If we are to achieve participatory democracy in New Zealand, then it is clear that there must be participatory democracy in the administration of education; this goes a long way further than mere community involvement in the schools and vice versa.
- (c) Decentralisation of the administration of education.
- (d) We see education as a lifelong growth and not something confined to age-specific and/or formal institutions.
- (e) We see education as a basic human right and the entitlement of all New Zealand citizens.
- (f) If there is to be real equality of educational opportunity there must be room for diversity (to allow for individual differences and preferences); if there is to diversity there must also be equality.

#### Identification of Major Issues

The Remit Committee, with Conference sanction, has passed on to Manifesto writers and to future policy makers substantial material which should assist the task ahead. It is possible to suggest some trends. A plan to devolve decision making to the most appropriate level should emerge. Emphasis is given not only to attempting to define the proportion of the nation's wealth that should be invested in education, but ways and means of making economies on present provision. Alternative programmes in education receive strong support. Child-care and preschool provision get considerable attention. Conditions governing enrolment, attendance, and size of schools all receive close scrutiny, as do curriculum and assessment. ('That the Values Party would accept the use of assessment only when used for valid educational goals' was a resolution receiving unanimous support of the committee.) The vexed question of conflicts between 'private' and 'public'

schools was seen as one on which the Values Party must try to find a consensus.

#### Welfare Policy

If the problem of education was that of having far too many resolutions to consider, in welfare it was having far too few.

No doubt it can be argued that population, environmental, and economic policies if acted upon could create a society with minimal welfare needs. But even our most Utopian members are surely not suggesting that such a society can be created in less than two decades. That's a generation of misery for the present outcasts. And it's not as if the Welfare field lacks issues. Two examples—welfare workers constitute the most undertrained or untrained group among all helping professions. Attempts within statutory and voluntary agencies to correct this inadequacy are putting their members under intense strain, the senior officers being defensive about their lack of qualifications, the juniors paranoic about hierarchic absolutism. Community workers represent an exciting new group concentrating on prevention, but their aims are widely misunderstood-not least by the mayor of our fair capital-and their free individualistic style a headache to those trying to make them acceptable to established bureaucracies. Values should be in there, pointing ways forward.

#### Conclusion

I was worried and disappointed to go to Christchurch and see the areas I have been most closely associated with in my career given such inadequate or scant attention. Just before going to Conference I had been asked if I would let my name go before the branch as a candidate nominee.

Cont. page 11

## I'D RATHER GO NAKED

Naked through all the streets I'd rather go, let them laugh at me if it gives them fun.

Naked through all the streets I'd rather go, or have them jail me for a crazy one.

Naked through all the streets I'd rather go, and freeze like trees do, blackness petrified.

Naked through all the streets I'd rather go, act like a poor dull fool you'd all despise.

Naked through all the streets I'd rather go, and die as the man who ends with suicide.

Naked through all the streets I'd rather go, but never dress up in a suit of lies.

Peter Kuczka

I went to Christchurch hoping I would find an excuse to turn down that request, but I didn't find it. It seemed to me that between them Reg and Cathy and Dave were saying something about society that was not being said by any other political party. If some of the statements coming from the economic committee sounded wild to me, they were being said by people that I felt I could have trusted with my worldly wealth. Finally, I felt I was among people who could and did listen to each other, and were therefore capable of learning fast. I hope therefore that what gloom the above summary may create will be of the potent variety. As I go-God help me-to the hustings my intention if challenged is to be candid about my party's shortcomings in education and welfare policy, but argue that if encouraged by increased support, and given time, I am confident that the party is more capable than others of creating sound policies in these areas.

Peter Rutherford

# EXTRACT FROM A SPEECH TO N.O.W.

The Values Party policy of decentralisation extends to the health service in that it believes that there should be community control of that service so that the needs of that particular community may be met. We seek the establishment of community-based health centres which would provide a focus for many services including contraception, abortion, counselling, ante and post natal supervision. This will enable greater access to these and assist in overcoming the problems encountered either with the 'dehumanisation' in large hospitals where such services as presently exist are situated, or with individual doctors imposing their own beliefs on patients.

Beverley Hughes Christchurch

## A SENSIBLE HEALTH SERVICE

#### 1. Prevention is better than cure.

It is also cheaper. A fence at the top of a cliff costs less than an ambulance at the bottom. So we would emphasise public health, education, and early diagnosis, rather than elaborate heart transplant units and the like.

For prevention and early diagnosis to work properly, people must be able to have medical contact before they are 'really ill'. Prevention is often a political business—pollution control, food additives and that sort of thing. Prevention is also a matter of educating people in how to avoid illness. Neither of these jobs needs an elaborate training in diagnosis, so they could be done perfectly well by people other than doctors.

Early diagnosis is of two sorts: picking up a disease before it has any symptoms, and picking it up shortly after the symptoms start. The first depends on routine screening procedures, blood tests, chest X-rays, cervical smears and so on. They are very time-consuming, and fairly expensive. On the other hand, they could also be done perfectly well by technicians or nurses.

The spotting of a serious disease hiding behind a trivial symptom is still very much an art, and it requires long training and practice. I do not believe there should be too many filtering stages between a patient and a doctor. Already every G.P. has some horror stories of his telephonist giving a late appointment to something urgent. It is also not uncommon to find a serious disease, not in the patient but in the patient's mother or friend, who just came along. If you have to fail several exams before you see the doctor, these people would slip through the net.

It is very difficult to do this early diagnosing at the best of times. It is almost impossible if you are rushed. More medical resources must be put into primary care.

#### Health care should be available to all, and the only criterion should be need.

Currently we fall down in two ways. If you are rich you get a better deal in private hospitals. If you live in one

area you get easier access to a doctor than if you live in another.

We would phase out the private hospitals, while improving the public ones. Not only do private hospitals deflect the energies of consultants away from long public waiting lists, they also diffuse the pressure from rich and influential people to get the public system improved. Why stir for everyone, if you can avoid the problem by paying?

The other problem is the maldistribution of doctors. The 'inverse cone law' describes how doctors tend to concentrate in the areas of least need. The idea of a salaried system is supposed to stop this, but in fact the inverse cone law works in all non-totalitarian countries, whether salaried or not.

Many people assume it is money that causes this, but in New Zealand there are already financial gradients to stop it. The truth is that money is really a minor motive, and it is really the fear of unlimited demands and overwork which makes doctors head for the well-supplied areas. A nine-to-fiver will find it difficult to imagine the anguish that can occur when you have been working for 100 to 130 hours without a real break. Most doctors have had this experience and many will go to considerable lengths to avoid repeating it. All talk of compulsory service in the wop-wops, or free access to the surgery (which most feel will increase demand) will continue to meet medical opposition until there are strong safeguards against excesses like these. Pilots and lorry drivers have legal maximums to the time they work. Why shouldn't doctors? Forty-eight hours without a break from duty would be a

# 3. We recognise there are limits to the amount that can be spent on health.

This qualifies the second principle. The demand for money for health can be unlimited. To what extremes should we go to postpone death? Always a very difficult question, and made worse when politics gets involved. I think a certain percentage of the budget should be put aside for health, and priorities should then be worked out within that budget.

That still leaves a lot of room for improvement. Something similar to inverse cone law operates with the money given for research. High prestige projects like coronary care units get a lot of money for specialists and equipment, although several studies have shown you do just as well staying at home.

Almost half the hospital beds in the country are occupied by psychiatric patients, yet preventive research is minimal. The main controversy is between hospitals and hostels, which is about as exciting as arguing whether to give polio victims crutches or wheelchairs.

Much more research is needed in this sort of area. It will involve education research, child development studies and investigating things like Gestalt encounter groups. Success would almost certainly have benefits across the board, including physical medicine and political sanity.

Dave Straton
Palmerston North

# THE VIEW FROM CHRISTCHURCH Late May, 1975

Last year little Bill Rowling as Minister of Finance lowered the Labour flag in the face of the then rapidly deteriorating economic situation and proceeded with the attempt to make New Zealand safe for capitalism. This year his soul mate Tiz the Whiz carried on the good work. A close reading of the dreaded budget throws into relief the business protection, growth orientation of this present Labour Government . . . 'it is essential to maintain the confidence and productive capacity of our agriculture and industry so that output, exports, and employment continue to grow. If business profits and farm incomes are seriously eroded by rising costs then investment, production and jobs will inevitably suffer'. Further on in this most revealing document the budget's author writes, 'When the Government funds the lending activities of these organisations, (Housing Corporation, the Development Finance Corporation, and the Rural Banking and Finance Corporation,) it is acting as a financial intermediary providing credit for the private sector'. The implications of the policy revealed in these statements is frightening. In effect we have a Labour Government, clearly and unequivocally extolling the virtues of capitalist enterprises, exploitation, economic growth, and state aid and protection for a private sector dominated by supranational combinations of North America, British, Western European and Japanese banking and industrial concerns. Closely interlinked and with overwhelming economic powers transcending those of their own national governments, these supranational enterprises are the real and final arbiters of our economic destiny.

#### **\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

Ever since the so-called Keynesian revolution in economic theory, economic growth has been a convenient crutch for social democratic politicians reluctant to face up to the necessity for fundamental structural reform. In the midst of a deepening recession in the capitalist world, policies formed to restimulate economic growth have become the panacea for getting the system going again. Clearly a stable state society within a capitalist system is a contradiction in terms. Without economic growth the capitalist system cannot survive. Messrs Rowling and Tizard understand this fact very well — hence the panic.

They are the latest representatives of a continuing tradition among social democrat politicians.

**\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*** 

The whole question of economic growth has to be related to existing political and economic institutions and their increasing irrelevance to human needs and community aspirations. A key to the answer to our current dilemma lies therefore in redirecting economic growth and allocating scarce resources. The socio-economic institutions and procedures necessary to achieve these objectives are explicit in the Values Party's 1975 Conference documents. These issues are not resolved by tinkering with the banking system as proposed by the Social Creditors. They are not implicit in the turgid war cries of the extreme Left

#### **\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\***

The difficulties the Values Party faces in getting its message through the strident, heavily financed babble of current political debate is exemplified in a recent comment by W. P. Reeves in the Sunday Times: 'In such a contracting economic situation, I am sad to say the appeal of a party like Values which assaults the god of unrestrained growth and its accompanying ecological and other disasters evaporates'. It is emphatically clear from the documented proceedings of the 1975 National Conference that the Values Party has produced an economics policy which effectively confronts the challenge of socially irresponsible capitalist development, with a system of decentralised co-operatively owned and operated enterprises working within a democratically planned society. The problems which demand a response today, including the heralded return to unrestrained economic growth and its ultimate ecological disasters, can only be resolved through community control and management of production finance and distribution. The role of a Values Government will be to ensure through planning and co-ordination that economic enterprises serve social purposes compatible with the values of the community and that regional balance is promoted and maintained.

Indeed mounting unemployment, the exhaustion of finite resources, and climbing inflation are the manifest symptoms of an irretrievable breakdown in the industrial system which has dominated the so-called advanced

world since the 1850s. Add to these physical manifestations of breakdown, the incidence of stress illnesses, alcoholism, delinquency, crime and violence and the problems of alienation in the industrial capitalist system, and the irrelevance of the National, Labour, and Social Credit political positions becomes startlingly evident. Values is not just another environmental group, Mr Reeves, it is a political movement based on a rejection of the present obviously unsatisfactory system and on the belief that human beings can and must rationally order their affairs both in the interests of their children and in the interest of survival. The Values Party is concerned with the promotion and building of a sane society in a threatening world. This seems a more relevant plat-

form than a mish-mash of private enterprise, economic growth, cheap money for public purposes and the 1930's utterances of a rather obscure Major Douglas.

#### **\$**

In a comment on the budget by Ian Templeton, the following statement deserves fearful consideration. 'If an expert were asked to read both the OECD document and the budget he would find a striking identity in the economic analysis — almost as if the same hand wrote the basic material for both'. If Templeton is correct, one could well ask who really owns and controls New Zealand.

John Stewart

# VALUES AND (THE) REVOLUTION



Revolution?

By yoking Values and revolution together in the same phrase I mean to achieve more than titular tricks at getting attention; the tone is serious. In a previous essay I wrote for Turning Point I discussed answers to one half of the questions the Values Party has to answer clearly before becoming 'a viable alternative' — what Values? what political philosophy? what position on the spectrum? In this essay I intend discussing the other half, the how questions—how are we going to create and achieve the kind of society we aim at? how do we live, act, work, now? how do we make the alternative not merely viable but visible? In thinking these questions through the only broad answer I can see consistent with our needs and aims is . . . 'revolution'.

Now, 'revolution' is one of the those words that have acquired a tinge about them. The tinge comes about through misunderstanding and misuse of the word, from the simple sloganeering of the dogmatic and/or deranged, and from widespread confusion between denotation and connotation in the meaning of a word. Thus when someone talks seriously about revolution you may visualise machineguns in Willis or Queen Street, petrol bombs being lobbed into the local offices of the AMP, poor farmers woken up in the middle of the night and told to join the Manawatu collective or perish, and a few bearded longhairs gesturing a few unbearded shorthairs before firing squads and checking off lists entitled 'Those to be Shot in the Revolution'. That vision is connotation, arising from the kind of misuse of the word referred to.

It would be the easiest thing in the world to leap in and say, 'ah-ha, that not what I mean at all.' But I'm not going to. In my understanding of the word the above is an

'The objects for which the Party is established are:... to act directly in the community to facilitate positive social change...' (Values Party constitution, 3.4)

image of what I would call militant revolution, and militant revolution is part of what I seriously propose for the Values Party. We can get dysfunctional militant revolution, as described above, or functional militant revolution. The dysfunctional kind is ineffective and inefficient, revolution gone wrong. If any New Zealand revolution reaches that stage it's time to go back to the cell-groups and analyse the mess. But I have no doubt that any New Zealand revolution will inevitably go through a militant stage, and that some blood will be shed. I'd rather blood wasn't shed at all, that we could confine the militancy to providing stretchers for the wealthy once they realise they're not going to be compensated at all, but unless we and others start seriously on revolution now, it will be.

#### Why Revolution?

Values' principles opt for choices absolutely opposed to established social and economic mythology. 'Progressivism' and 'authoritarianism' are ingrained in the way we live, work, learn, play, think, bring up children. 'Socialisation' they call it, the way in which everybody from birth is inculcated into the dominant and established culture. Maoris and women's libbers know it very well, by other names. But sex role education is only a minor, and not necessarily integral, aspect of it. The other roles we have been socialised into accepting in our daily lives are, I think, much more crucial to the maintenance of the status quoproduction worker or social service dispenser; consumer cog; dehumanised inferior (or dehumanised superior); awestruck tourist of big dams, big roads, sprawling institutions, lofty buildings; homemaker; quarter-acre section tender; mumbler about 'them'; ballot-ticker; 'owner' of property; club member . . . ordinary citizen. To the degree that each of us is not an extraordinary citizen we each keep the System going.

Take another tack. Despite having proved to itself that democratic decentralisation 'doesn't work' as a social structure, Values opts for precisely this as a policy for New Zealand. To some extent New Zealand has already applied democratic decentralist principles to the administration of its services. Are our schools any better for local Boards of Governors, school committees, a slightly regionalised Department? Are our Hospitals and Harbours outstanding examples of how well decentralised representation-elected at large-leads us all into the Promised Valuesland? Are the local Licensing Trusts significantly different in their operation from Big Business? Perhaps the best example of decentralisation is the Post Office, but who is going to say that it is democratic? Isn't it true even of Values members that as long as the mail gets delivered you couldn't care a stuff about the postie who delivers it? And that if (s)he goes on strike the first thing you'll say is 'bloody unions!' and not 'what caused

We want the maximum participation in the decision-making process, do we? How do we match that with the less than 50 percent poll on local body elections, the abysmal lack of objections and submissions on the host of decisions open to objection or submission, the dismal flop they called the EDC? O.K., there are lots of other reasons behind all these examples, but the fact remains that the record of New Zealanders in enacting even a limited degree of democratic decentralisation and participation is not encouraging.

Values' principles lead on to the necessity of fundamentally changing the established System, and that leads on to the prior necessity of changing the culture in which the System is steeped and from which it draws its daily bread. We can piddle around as much as we like, even become Government and piddle around on a higher salary, but we will not enact Values' policies without fundamental and wide-ranging change in conventional mythologies — i.e., without revolution. Our policies are an act of hope in revolution, being an act of faith in the good sense of ordinary people.

#### What Revolution?

It should be clear by now that I'm talking of the kind of revolution exampled in the Industrial Revolution rather than the kind exampled in the Russian or French Revolutions. Fundamental social change that takes place gradually, without much conscious participation and direction, and in which we acquiesce as 'a good thing' is not what I mean either-that's really evolution (as best seen in the change from a hunting to an agricultural society thousands of years B.C.). Not very far removed from it is the liberal view, the piecemeal social engineering approach. The Values' revolution is neither apocalyptic nor piecemeal; instead it involves both militant and cultural actions, deliberate intervention in history, and the aim of achieving goals sooner rather than later—in our lifetime if possible. Accession to political power is not, as Charles Reich would have it, 'the final act'; it's only the middle act. The nearest contemporary example is the continuing Chinese revolution.

Unless we are psychotic, we want the revolution to be a success rather than a brief blaze of glory for a few hapless martyrs. And it is my contention that simply political revolution turns out to be the latter not the former. Thus the U.S.S.R. is an example of gloriously unsuccessful revolution. The reasons why the U.S.S.R. of 1970 is vastly different from the visions of the Bolsheviks in 1917 are not hard to find, and not simply the fault of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: (a) totalitarian politics have been the necessity in Russia for centuries, vast and hemmed in as it is by potential, armed, enemies; if anything the Soviet Union is less totalitarian than Tsarist Russia; (b) the Leninist line of revolution as the consciousness and prerogative of an elite group was admirably suited to elitist Russia and carries on in the meritocracy called the C.P.S.U.; (c) the militant-political changes of 1917 were not preceded by fundamental change in the values of the people: historical circumstance, rather than adequate groundwork, gave the Bolsheviks their power. Similar remarks might be made about the unsuccessful French Revolution, or Gandhi's, or Allende's. These 'revolutions' didn't have the strength to succeed.

In distinguishing successful revolutions such as the two English ones—that culminating in the Magna Carta and the other which went through Civil War, Commonwealth, and more Civil War before culminating in the bones of the present System, the current Chinese revolution, the Industrial Revolution, or the current Technological Revolution, I suggest the following features are all pertinent to our case. These are the kinds of lessons we must apply to the present New Zealand scene:

- (a) The deep-wide nature of the change, not simply political but also social, economic, cultural, philosophical/religious; technical;
- (b) spread over a period of time, about a generation but less than a half-century;
- (c) involvement of large numbers of people from different levels of society and with different interests in the outcome;
- (d) the presence, sometimes only on the fringe, of philosophers and managers who were at all times prepared to refashion tactics and ideology in the light of circumstances but at no time prepared to jettison their overall principles and objectives;
- (e) the lifetime—and total lifestyle—commitment of dedicated activists (cadres) who not only preached and fought but also exemplified what they were saying in concrete, visible ways by how they lived;
- (f) the differing levels of involvement of people—ranging from the deliberate conscious efforts of cadres through the passive conscious support of hundreds to the unconscious participation of the thousands;
- (g) historical accidents like weak kings, visible corruption, and acute crisis coinciding in the established System with the appearing strength of the revolutionaries; in general though the major contribution of time was to verify the revolutionaries' case;
- (h) deliberate intervention in circumstances by the revolutionaries at every opportunity—sometimes to preach, sometimes to march, sometimes to shoot, sometimes to negotiate; the revolutionary is not a determinist but one who believes that his/her action matters.

Now that describes the scope and kind of action that should be the programme of every Values' branch and member. We—not we alone, we in co-operation with likeminded New Zealanders—must become the cadres of the New Zealand revolution. I doubt whether there is a case for the Values Party to exist at all unless this happens, but I'm acutely aware of the unfortunate fact that to ask that much of most Values' members is rather like the unemployed asking Muldoon for a raise. You don't find much understanding, and still less sympathy, for the unemployed at wine and cheese parties. And the party as a whole has slung the albatross of bourgeois Niceness around its neck.

#### Revolution Isn't Very Nice

In practice if not in precept the Values Party has rushed to the barricades of the Nice ideology whenever the good ship Conflict has steamed over the horizon. The Nice ideology, like most ideologies, is a very appealing bundle of truisms: that we can build the better world through being polite to each other, that you learn more about people through encounter groups than you do through peeling spuds together, that policies of encouragement and incentive backed up by 'raising public awareness' through education and psychology and Nice social action will charm the hearts of the biggest land speculators and polluting manufacturers in the country. In some respects this ideology is a direct eunuch descendant of the hippies and Provos of the late 60s, and one of the arguments against it relates to their demise in the early 70s. It isn't deep and broad enough to qualify as viable, it is idealism carried through to the point of naivety, it rests on the false assumption that people in an imperfect society are perfectly reasonable and perfectly virtuous.

The Nice ideology leads us to fight guns and vested interests with flowers and 'good vibes', to counter institutionalised violence with appeals to reason, to seek grants in aid of environmental research from the Forest Service, to accept 'pedestrianisation' as a Good Thing or 'worker participation' as a Very Good Thing rather than look at who is going to profit from it, by how much, and with what deprivation of rights and opportunity to the rest of us. It leads us to tinker with the System, not to change it; it transforms New Zealanders' political choice to Tweedledoon, Tweedleding or Tweedledough.

While it is reasonable to presume the Nice ideology would be the means of action in a perfect society it is begging the question to presume it should be the means of action in New Zealand now. We must first analyse New Zealand society. No analysis of New Zealand society, even the most establishment-oriented, has concluded that it is perfect. Even then, it's not really the proposed means of action I disagree with: I for one would see these as revolutionary if in context, with a clear objective and other means. It's the 'simply and solely' that precedes the proposals. This outlaws not only terrorism-which I would reject as ineffective, inefficient and irrelevant anyway-but also actions and policies against anti-Values trends and institutions. Nice means we can encourage but can't coerce, that we can strew carrots all over the economy but can't use sticks.

Within the Values Party the Nice ideology has been used negatively more often than positively. The 'simply and solely Nice' has been used to head off debate on crucial issues (conflict isn't Nice, it destroys the good vibes), to avoid analysis of New Zealand society (the conclusions may not be Nice), to legitimise lack of action rather than broaden the front (action and co-operation may lead us into not-Nice situations). It hasn't in fact engendered very much activity, even Nice activity: where are the Values Party's educative packages, pamphlets, research, awards to deserving groups, donations to public appeals? In what ways do Values' members provide positive example by practising what they preach in their own lives, as regards consumerism for example? What degree of communication with ordinary people has the party ever really sought and effectively carried out? This is the classical bourgeois attitude to Niceness: Nice defines what thou shalt not. not what thou shalt.

Already we have eschewed large chunks of the Nice ideology. The 'classification of industry' remit passed at the 1974 National Conference involved both incentive and coercion policies being approved in principle; several other remits, notably the land remit, included specific mention of policies designed to 'eliminate abuses and misuses arising from private ownership'. At the political level anyway, Values has become no longer Nice. All I'm proposing in suggesting we become revolutionary is that on the social action side too, we become no longer Nice.

#### An Activist Manifesto

If all that's accepted at the party level it would get us a long way further in becoming a viable alternative. It would open up vistas of social action not seriously contemplated before in the party: pickets, strikes, demonstrations, graffiti; support for other groups like NZUSA, NZCSM, CARP, CARE, HART, RAVPOC, FOL and the unions; boycotts, and building up now alternative economic structures-food and land co-ops, local People's Unions, garage and farm co-ops, cut-price shops; recycling centres, anti-advertising campaigns, hoarding-chopping expeditions, sit-down strikes in front of bulldozers, massive invasions of Cromwell just before evacuation, resigning from jobs where the employer is either foreign-owned, large-scale, retrenching or underpaying, or, horrors, a multi-national. (And setting out in business as a co-op in competition with them.) It involves too defining the anti-Values trends and institutions, publicly naming them, and undertaking actions that direct attention to their abuses, frustrate and if possible really hurt them.

Obviously not all of this can be attempted at once, or even right now; Values is too weak to contemplate it. But in drawing up the following I've borne in mind the scope and kind of action that an effectively functioning cell-group (branch) would be involved in.

A. Programme Action—individuals should enact Values' policies in their own lives, decide their every interaction with the System on the basis of Values' principles, and one of the things each branch meeting should do is examine how best to do this, how well members are 'living Values' and suggest remedies where called for.

Branches should also set a broad programme (short-term: this month; middle-term: the next couple of months; long-term: the rest of the year) of carrying out at least one action of every type described below during a year. Every action should be planned, supervised, and reviewed: to learn better ways of doing things, to build self-confidence and group-confidence, to avoid repeating mistakes. Thus planning and reviewing action should be on the agenda of every meeting: and some Values' branches fold for lack of anything to do! The decisions of the group should be the catalyst of revolution.

- B. Realism-There are, particularly right now, huge limitations imposed on most branches by the number and kind of personnel, the history and situation of the branch, the diverse areas of interest and levels of involvement of members, the lack of clear objectives and a clear guiding philosophy. This is unfortunate, but not an excuse. Many of the suggestions can be done by one person in half an hour; any multiple of this is a decided head start for a branch. Energy and commitment are required, not expertise; expertise is a luxury, but energy is a necessity in a social action movement. Start small and simple on sure-fire actions like litter clean-ups, bottle/paper drives, painting a slogan, arranging a public forum outside the Town Hall one Sunday. Then you can go on to relatively sophisticated activism such as pickets, demos, submissions, newsletters, research, rostering support for other groups, appointing members to attend likeminded groups at meeting, self-criticism.
- C. Types of Action—action can be personal, communal or national in scale: it all counts; it can be (on your own) initiative or supportive (of others) in development: it can be political, economic, social or militant (anti anti-Values) in focus; direct, indirect or organisational in content (e.g., strikes are direct, research is indirect, fundraising is organisational); positive (Nice) or negative (not Nice) in effect. I doubt if any group is really viable as part of an alternative social movement unless it addresses itself at some stage to all these types, though local circumstances will determine priorities.
- D. A List of Suggestions, by focus-political actions-media statements; research groups; keeping files on issues; pooling books/resources into a library accessible to all; cell-group meetings; starting petitions; filing objections and submissions on proposals-watch the local public notices; recruitment and fund-raising raffles; speeches; attending local council meetings; writing to MPs; writing to papers; subscribing to papers, especially minority group papers; taking out injunctions; pickets; demos; marches-arrange and support; delegate members to attend other groups as Values' rep, or take advantage of existing memberships; self-cricitism and review of action; polls; questionnaires; surveys on local issues; canvassing; set up headquarters; man phones; advertise meetings in local rag; write/discuss policy; commission analyses of New Zealand and local conditions; heckle Lab-Nat-Socred meetings; applaud Values' speakers . . .

Economic actions—resign present job, or change it; awards for unions and union officials; share home appli-

ances; set up neighbourhood resource centre or investigate present possibilities for one (try the nearest church for a start); start/help food co-ops; form land co-ops; choose locally-made, small-scale, ecological products always in preference to opposites; boycott-and tell others-crap goods; define what's a crap good first; sell/get rid of any colour TV sets, deep freezes, sports cars in your 'ownership'; better still, share them with neighbours; support justified strikes, especially, e.g., those in Kawerau arising from Values-type principles; provide employment/retraining for the retrenched; evaluate ads., products, technology-publish your results . . . Social actions—paint-ins (phone boxes, post boxes make 'em bright and breezy); slogan writing; chop down hoardings; recycling centres; litter clean-ups; paper/ bottle/metal drives; write to advertisers; picket local polluters; set up aid bureaux-legal, rent-or support where already existing; join communes; join people's unions; sell Turning Point in streets, at factory gate (!); police prices; report breaches to everyone, mostly the media; poetry readings; street theatre; plant cabbages/ beans/spuds/carrots in the local park; phone talkback shows; arrange concerts, public forums; sell raffle tickets; set up budgeting advice bureau (in opposition to Consumer Price Index); hire bins for the main street for people to put excessive packaging in-start the ball rolling by sweeping the litter off the street into it; tell shopkeepers /manager why you're not buying their crap lines; support corner groceries and discount stores and Self Help, spit when you pass Woolworths, Gubay's, Ford, Todds, IBM, etc.; make the spare room/sunporch into a crashpad; put exclamation marks after 'Trespassers will be Prosecuted' signs; mow the neighbour's lawn (using his lawnmower 'cos you don't own one, being a Values' member); get a branch to build houses, run stalls, package firewood, erect children's playgrounds, take out scrubclearing contracts instead of having wine-and-cheesies as fund raisers . . .

Militant actions—all the above, but mainly plan and organise, develop cadres and cell-groups, build group solidarity, communicate to the people, get paid fulltime Values' workers, and develop an intimate knowledge of local topography/features/people/resources.

According to all this any behaviour consciously undertaken with Values in mind is revolutionary. The supposedly thorny problem of whether Values is a political party or a social action movement is no problem at all: it rests on a false either/or assumption. Politics is social action; social action is politics; any successful step taken in either area takes us a step nearer the ultimate goal of a Values society. The problem as presented is not only false but dangerous: to answer it either way is to exclude the other area of action. Such has been the recent fate of the Values party. We have opted to be a political party and forgotten we are a social action movement too. We have gone in for advertisement of policy rather than actions on policy and ignored the fact that our only ads should be our deeds.

Terry McDavitt Wellington