

LET'S MOVE - FROM RIGHTS TO ETHICS

Katherine Peet*

Federation of Workers' Educational Associations in Aotearoa New Zealand
and Network Waitangi Otautahi

with

John Peet+

Engineers for Social Responsibility

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the case for a move away from the current individual rights system of social relationships. The goal is to put in place a community ethics-based system which first identifies and names the key issues at stake and then puts in place, wherever possible, community-initiated means to determine how these issues should be resolved.

Our starting point is assertion of the need for Treaty of Waitangi-based constitutional change in Aotearoa New Zealand. Our commitment is to work in solidarity with the indigenous Maori peoples (**Tangata Whenua**) as they collectively retain and regain their self-determination (**Tino Rangatiratanga**). As non-Maori (**Tauiwī**) ourselves, we see it to be appropriate to work for an honourable Governance (**Kawanatanga**) in this land as a contribution towards a just, peaceful and sustainable world.

In order to bridge tensions between local and global action in the Third (voluntary) Sector, some general guiding principles are explored, particularly the nature of Control in this sector, the place of Gifting (**Koha**) and that of Subsidiarity.

A five-step process is proposed, for those who are not Maori. While this process is, naturally, focused on Aotearoa, the 1994 UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples suggests a similar approach may be appropriate in other lands.

INTRODUCTION - INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS VERSUS SOCIAL ETHICS

As we see it, political, economic, social and cultural rights (e.g. human rights) are commonly reduced to individual (often property) rights by governments. These reduced rights are then wherever possible placed within a market (producer-consumer, user-pays) framework for social planning.

Such a process makes it difficult to distinguish between government and commerce, and moves many issues of policy out of the public policy domain and into the private sector. The result is a pale shadow of what Democracy means to us. A fuller meaning is nicely encapsulated by the conclusion of a recent workshop on Democracy at Highlander Research and Education Centre [1]:

"... It's not just voting, but setting the agenda. It's not the tyranny of the majority, but it's finding common ground between different people and groups, and it's definitely not the clever manipulation of people to simulate grassroots support..."

The gulf between the broad concept of democracy, citizen rights and responsibility reflected in that quotation, and what has been put in place in this country, is large and widening. In practice, a narrow fiscal concept (macroeconomic structural adjustment) has provided New Zealand/Aotearoa with a blueprint for socio-structural adjustment [1].

A recent example was our Prime Minister's description of what we see as the rich, complex concept of **Self-Sufficiency** as *"the ability of households to meet their own needs through paid participation in the*

* 87 Soleares Avenue, Christchurch/Otautahi 8008, New Zealand/Aotearoa.
Phone/fax (64)(3) 384-1281

+ Email j.peet@cape.canterbury.ac.nz

work force" [1]. He also expressed the opinion that **Social Cohesion** means "... *maintenance of a society where everyone has the opportunity to achieve through individual effort...*".

While in one sense these definitions are unexceptionable, in another they reduce the social context to that of the individual, and the satisfaction of family and societal needs to the ability of an individual to find paid wage work in the labour market. From our viewpoint of society, such reductionism is both distortionary and unethical.

As another example of the imposition of the market framework on social planning, "targeting" of social welfare and similar benefits and incentives means many **people in society** are effectively redefined as **units of cost in the economy**. Student fees, asset stripping of long stay elderly hospital patients, and accommodation benefits instead of state housing provision are also areas where ethical, human rights issues have been redefined, individualised and monetarised to fit a (user-pays) market economic model. These are then of direct financial benefit to either public or private providers, and such issues are further removed from the public policy domain.

To us there is a need to talk about Ethics as well as Rights when dealing with social issues. Otherwise a number of important concepts, whose meaning we thought we understood, are transformed into a "problem" suitable for market remedies. For example, the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) no longer talks of "poverty", but of "25 thousand dysfunctional families". One result is a programme of mainly financial incentives and disincentives put in place to induce individuals to behave in a way that will create "Exemplary Communities". In a few words, a new, simple cartoon has been created out of the old, complex reality.

While in no way wanting to undermine the rights of, for example, freedom of speech, association and assembly, it is our intention in this paper to highlight the dangers to democracy of a reduction of such collective rights to individual rights, and to explore some of the ethical ramifications of doing so.

NEEDS AND WANTS

The question of how to define Need has bred a substantial literature, much of which acknowledges that any definition assumes an ideological stance on the part of the definer. To us, evaluating Need involves more than collection of information about the expressed needs of individuals. Need has a collective dimension which is influenced by a wide variety of social forces, including advertising.

In practice, however, need is often defined via the concept of Disadvantage, which seeks to remedy social problems through the imputed inadequacies of individuals. Individuals are responded to, in the mistaken belief that multiple individual responses can be equated with a collective understanding of need.

In addition to the reduction of rights to individual rights, we have noticed that individual rights are then often placed within Maslow's Hierarchy of Human (individual) Needs. A common assumption in this approach is that individuals are equally capable of developing their potential, regardless of their political, economic, social, cultural or educational circumstances. Such an assumption also disregards the time available to the person, the language that person speaks, or any intellectual, physical or emotional disability they may have. Nor does it take into account any responsibility people may have to care for others.

In reality Needs are dressed in historical and cultural garb; only Wants can be readily identified or measured empirically [1]. The bearing that each Want has on Need can be studied, but not immediately observed. The outcome of this approach is, again, a reduction of the rich, social context to that of the simple individual. Of course, if there is a healthy social conscience it is quite possible to have a healthy individuality rather than a malignant individualism, but in the absence of an ethical foundation and associated social conscience, we believe malignancy will prevail.

A further point is that any assertion that the market responds to individual actors' Wants or Needs is a cruel hoax. Quite apart from the reductionism inherent in assuming rights are individual rights, let alone merely property rights, we note that the market does not respond to demand unless it is *funded* demand. If you do not have the funds to go with your demand the "law of supply and demand" does not work! That "law" also assumes that a suitable supply is always immediately available, for example in special needs education and many health areas.

In our opinion, there needs to be a continuing social dialectic about the distinction between Needs and Wants. This is necessary if so-called ordinary people's Wants and Needs are to be unpacked and if the nature of individual Wants as well as of collective Needs is to be understood. "Experts" become guests in this dialectical process; people experiencing the inequities should set the agenda.

CRITIQUE OF THE DOMINANT MODEL

We want to highlight the inadequacy of the process of imposition of the individual rights Framework, in a human rights context. In particular, our criticism is directed towards the reductionism that maps a complex structure (people and communities of people in a living, evolving society) onto a simple model (a marketplace where individual producers and consumers pursue the maximisation of their own self-interest). This simplification may well support the agenda of those who wish to remake society into a form that fits their personal model of economic utopia. Most of us are also well aware of the severe damage that same process is doing to the complex fabric of the real society onto which it is being forced.

We would reiterate here, our feeling that the market is an entirely appropriate mechanism for certain types of activity within an economy. Our criticism is of its extension into areas where it has no proper place, and where its use causes distortion. As an example, it is common to come across clear examples of socially- or environmentally-undesirable outcomes of market processes. The common response is that these are only examples of "market failure". We want to assert the contrary, namely that they are in fact entirely logical outcomes of inappropriately-applied market processes. The failure is that of a Framework which excludes the full reality from policy, preferring instead to rely on simplistic mechanisms such as the marketplace for resolution of complex allocation problems. Our suggestion is that in such situations, use of the market should be referred to as "reality failure".

Imposition of the Framework for policy analysis and decision-making also has the effect of hiding a great deal of what many people regard as valuable, important and creative. Many aspects of social life (ethics, human rights and responsibilities and interaction with the natural environment, for example) lie outside the conventional market framework. Since they are not normally expressible in dollar terms, they and their values are largely invisible. Without direct (e.g. government) intervention to ensure they are included in decision-making, they gain no recognition. Even then, if they are included, it is often by requiring or inducing them to change into a form that fits the Framework.

It is a further important point that the Framework is seen by its proponents as widely - if not universally - applicable, with the result that policies are usually imposed indiscriminately and without due regard to local circumstances, social structures and community ethics. A good example is its imposition, via the producer-consumer model, on the public health system in NZ, where it has signally failed to meet many of the claims originally made to justify its introduction.

ALIENATION OF DISSENTERS

Imposition of this policy Framework has the effect of excluding people who decline either to operate within it, or to communicate in its "market-speak" language. Assertions that people have been "consulted" hide the lack of proper communication. We who do much of our work beyond the Framework are entirely "free", of course, to busy ourselves by talking with each other to our hearts' content about the things we believe really matter, and coming to firm policy conclusions. While we are doing so, of course, those with real control over power and resources get on with making decisions which are defined within and constrained by the Framework.

This process is exhausting for those working to keep issues of people's hopes for ethics-based rights and responsibilities in society in the forefront of attention. There is also a huge personal cost, in that those people not only have to engage in the structural battle with few or no resources, but also survive put-downs, thinly-disguised contempt and often invidious personal attacks by those in power, or their acolytes. A poem from a 93 year old [1] nicely illustrates this point:

*When someone raises voices of dissent
Against those things that violate her creed
The sound is drowned
By those who value choice
Against the drab indecency of need*

Our fear is that with the embedding of the market Framework in social policy, this country will become a nation of timid industrial animals, of which the government is the shepherd (identification of the landowner is something we leave to the reader's imagination!). We need to find how to honour community, ecological rationality and democracy, in building a much richer model for the future. Proper recognition of the Third Sector alongside government and commerce is an essential prerequisite to this.

THE LIMITS OF THE LAW

The current legal system is also based on the vesting of property rights and control over activities in individuals. Instead of clearly naming what is really at stake, and addressing issues as they appear to those involved, arbitration of conflict is usually referred for a decision within a framework of individual-based legal argument. We see the outcome as a loss of ability to bridge the tensions between the hopes and aspirations of, for example, indigenous peoples, the poor, or the unemployed. We need to find ways to create a climate of mutual appreciation which honours the global, regional and local relationships between people

WHY START WITH THE TREATY?

There are two parts of a response to this question.

One is to acknowledge that any search for justice in this country must acknowledge both the monocultural history of social and environmental exploitation in our colonial past, and the associated current reality of control over many of our resources by transnational interests.

The second is the individualising of social relationships.

Both are, we believe, well countered by the requirement to build relationships that is inherent in a Treaty-based approach.

Almost more important than either of these two strands, however, are the values that we experience in relationship with Tangata Whenua who are reclaiming and regaining Tino Rangatiratanga. A Treaty-based approach is rooted in clarifying our Tauwi values. This work must be done prior to formalisation of structures. A corollary is the need for a commitment to equity within and between the individuals and groups that make up Tauwi.

Treaty-based development for Tauwi comes from an understanding of the commitments in the 1835 Declaration of Independence *"to frame laws for the nature of Governance (Kawanatanga) and for the dispensation of justice, to preserve peace and good order, to regulate trade and to consult the safety and welfare of our common country"*. Also vital is a clear approach to natural resource use and the guarantee of retention of *all things precious (Taonga)*. These are the ethical constraints we Tauwi would find ourselves addressing, if the Treaty was our starting point.

The series of hui organised by Sir Hepi Te Heu Heu are enabling Tangata Whenua to build their future on a clear understanding. The urgent need now is for groups within Tauwi to similarly address what they hold precious. This is, we believe, an essential first step, if Kawanatanga (Treaty-based national governance) is to be ready to respond to any invitation which may be extended from the work being done by Tangata Whenua.

WHAT DO TAUWI HOLD PRECIOUS?

And how do we know if we are getting nearer to understanding the full extent of what Tauwi hold precious?

A framework that can begin to answer that question in a whole-system manner is the Daly Spectrum (named after the economist who proposed it [1]) which relates natural wealth to ultimate human wellbeing through technology, economy, politics, and ethics. It allows us to order and see the relationships between natural, economic, human, and social capital [1].

At the base of the spectrum, supporting everything, are what Daly calls Ultimate Means. These are

Natural Capital - the stuff of the planet, the sun's energy, the bio-geo-chemical cycles, the ecosystems and the genetic information they bear, and the human being as an organism. All life and all economic transactions are built upon and sustained by it.

Ultimate Means are converted through technology to Intermediate Means; built capital and human capital. Intermediate means are necessary but not sufficient to accomplish all higher purposes. Intermediate Ends are the goals that governments, commerce and the Third Sector promise, and economies are expected to deliver as outputs - consumer goods, health, wealth, knowledge, leisure, employment, communication, transportation (social capital). The Intermediate Ends are not ends in themselves, but instruments to achieve something yet more meaningful.

The conversion of Intermediate Ends to Ultimate Ends depends on an effective ethic or religion or philosophy or culture that can answer the question: What are health, wealth, education, and mobility FOR? The Ultimate Ends are the answers to that question; desired for themselves and not as the means to the achievement of any other ends. The words we use for these ends are vague and abstract - wellbeing, happiness, harmony, fulfilment, self-respect, self-realization, community, identity, security, creativity, enlightenment, love, grace, bliss. The impossibility of defining or measuring them demonstrates that they are qualities, not quantities; non-material, though they require the whole material structure underneath to support them.

The use of this Spectrum by community-initiated groups would help create a base-line for responding to the question of whether we are getting nearer to understanding what *Tau iwi* hold precious. Such conclusions can be complemented by scientific, academically-thorough research, some of which is currently being done under the banner of "Sustainable Development".

Research of this type indicates the need to expand our present limited economic calculus to include both Development (Ultimate Ends) and Sustainability (Ultimate Means). To do that the entire Spectrum, from technology to philosophy, must be **efficient** in terms of minimising the inputs required for the desired level of output, and **balanced** in terms of avoiding excessive emphasis on one part of the Spectrum relative to another (e.g. concentration on GDP growth rather than achievement of Wellbeing). If this argument is accepted, then the current dominant Framework is seen to occupy only part of the full Spectrum and to be blocking recognition of both fundamental resources and the purpose of it all.

Myopic individualism in policy development and amongst researchers needs to be challenged. For example, identification of what is "precious" must not be put inside the Framework by being reduced to a measure of price or of cost-benefit calculation.

An opportunity to contribute to the collation of research and information has recently been created in the organisation **Kotare Research and Education for Social Change Aotearoa**, whose purpose is expressed in the statement [1]:

"We are joined by a common determination to work for a society in which all have the right and ability to take an active part in the political, social and economic structures which affect our lives."

WHY A THIRD SECTOR RESPONSE?

In any situation where the rules of the Government and the commercial sector are inextricably reduced to the market framework, social and Treaty issues alike are reduced as far as possible to fit within that Framework. The Third Sector has the potential to promote an alternative framework, where these matters are dealt with in a way that is unfettered by an all-pervasive market ideology [1].

We sound a note of caution here, however. The strengths of Third Sector organisations (NGOs) can be turned to the advantage of groups promoting the ideology of the Framework. As an example, the World Bank (in a document aimed at governments) has published guidelines suggesting *"Ways in which voluntary organisations contribute to civil society"*. These include: *"Efficiency; Public sector market failure; Support for a market economy; Freedom of association; Pluralism and tolerance; Social stability and the rule of law; and Privatisation of public properties and services"* [1]. Clearly, the World Bank knows both that voluntary organisations are valuable, and that some can be induced to work in support of the market ideology.

POWER AND CONTROL

Considering the history of this country, community-based ethics must address Power in relationship to Tangata Whenua regaining and retaining Tino Rangatiratanga. Both Tino Rangatiratanga and community-based ethics are inherently collective in nature and must not be reduced to individual, self-interested behaviour and property rights. Nevertheless, the current Framework requires Tangata Whenua to address conflicts of interest involving issues of resources and society with tools that involve legal and/or economic processes which are inherently inimical to their view of those issues. Tauwiwi must address these issues of power and control in relation to the current Framework if such road blocks for Tangata Whenua are to be removed and if there is to be the development of community-based ethics and sustainable living.

A better process would be to be able to identify what is at issue, and how decisions will be made, not rely on obtaining power through competition for property rights. We need to examine matters of public trust, stewardship, common good, and the preservation of the things we hold dear or precious. Arbitration of disputes becomes much more than the vesting of control over resources held in private hands.

THE PLACE OF GIFTING [1]

The reductionism which encourages humans to think of themselves as items of production, consumption and exchange (i.e. commodities) can perhaps be broken by an affirmation of Gifting. In this land we are fortunate that Tangata Whenua have never lost the full meaning of such gift relationships (Koha). Tauwiwi need to act with humility in understanding Koha relationships among Tangata Whenua. However, it is worth emphasising that such relationships are also deeply ingrained in the cultures of most other societies, including that of the Pakeha, although now often submerged beneath a veneer of more recent cultural accretions.

Gifting is distinct from informal exchange relationships; it has no immediate or direct expectation of monetary reward or equivalent *quid pro quo*. In many cultures, gifting has become limited to the family or small group. The imposition of emotional burdens as a price for social cohesion through gifting has largely come about through the domination of market exchange relationships. While the market is believed to be efficient and relatively free of these burdens, the consequent loss of relationship should be recognised.

In promoting the need to consider Gifting, however, we do not at the same time assume that an individualistic approach to Gifting is valid. In collective gift relationships, care must be taken to ensure the autonomy of the gift-giver is enhanced. Exploitation must be avoided. This experience of giving and receiving is fundamental to the building of community, where the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The gift response may well enable the reframing of those assumptions about individualistic behaviour which lie behind the market Framework approach to social planning. For example, the current preoccupation in education policy with the development of the New Zealand Qualifications Framework means any educational activity that does not fit the dominant industrial-training model is made invisible. Neither the universities nor the WEA are yet willing to be reduced to fit within this particular framework.

While no-one knows where the affirmation of gifting would lead, it would at least be better than the current imposition of an ideology which fails to reflect the full range of human experience and wisdom.

VALUES OF SUBSIDIARITY

"A nation is a community to the degree that it is a community of communities." (Martin Buber). As we understand it (not being of that denomination ourselves) the Roman Catholic social teaching of Subsidiarity refers to one fundamental expression [1] - that *"A social undertaking of any sort, by its very nature, ought to aid the members of the body social but never to destroy and absorb them."* Similarly [1], *"These objectives must be pursued in such a way, however, that the resources organised for this purpose can be shared as effectively and justly as possible. This same community should regulate economic relations throughout the world so that they can unfold in a way which is fair."* Pope John's model was for each individual, basic community and group to contribute actively, respecting authority that serves the common good. This is no mean challenge, as authority usually manifests itself as authoritarianism.

Subsidiarity, then, requires that the group affected by the decision is the group which makes the decision. It also embraces the understanding that there are different sites for different aspects of decisions e.g. local groups make certain decisions, regional or interest groups make others, national and international

groupings, as appropriate, make others. This commitment to "no bigger than necessary" needs to be juxtaposed against a no less strong counter-principle, that wherever the welfare of a community requires concerted common action, the unity of that common action must be assured. Thus, "no bigger than necessary" has as its corollary, "as big as needed to achieve the common good". This body of thought on Subsidiarity argues that the State should act in ways that utilise and favour, rather than simply supplant, voluntary associations [1].

Subsidiarity is rooted in the urge to formulate common understanding about the common good, which is built on consensus, cooperation and reconciliation. Authority has validity only insofar as it serves the common good. In turn, there needs to be a will to animate expression of the common good and a society of assent.

Formulation of "The Peoples Charter" gives us a starting point [1] for such an expression by Pakeha, and maybe Tauīwi, in this land. What is needed for this is the coordination and stimulation of such appropriate decision-making amongst Tauīwi. The newsletter "Common Ground" [1] is currently providing an opportunity for such coordination and stimulation.

We see the values of Subsidiarity as being consistent with the values that underpin Tino Rangatiratanga., and therefore vital to a Treaty-based approach for Tauīwi.

A RESPONSE TO THE PROBLEM

As a response to all the imbalances in opportunity, access **and power** referred to so far, we believe there is a need to focus on Treaty-based ways of assessing what is being accomplished. For Tauīwi, policies of social, environmental and economic equity could bring about new conditions where people have more equal ability to achieve dignity, rank and privilege. Access, opportunity and outcomes will all be key concepts in such policies.

Equal access and equal opportunity are not enough, though. Equal access cannot respond to social inequality, and equal opportunity is in practice only the opportunity to succeed. Similarly, when equity is expressed in relation to access it runs the risk of being reduced to an economic definition. We observe that many people in the lower socio-economic groups see themselves as failures, lack confidence, give up easily and become virtual non-participants in society. Continual deprivation imprints emotional and psychological marks on their characters. These can lead to loneliness, alienation and violence, with the result that many of the poor opt out of society and institutions. Such alienation has consequences for us all.

The gap between rich and poor is growing in this country faster than in any other OECD country [1]. The collective dimension of this issue, summarised in the expression "Think globally - Act locally", brings a new means of looking at the gap. In this context it implies the individual looking beyond personal considerations to a response which acknowledges the complexity of interdependence between people, groups, communities and nations.

There are basic points of rationale in looking at the rich-poor gap in the context of the collective dimension. These are implicit in such questions as "Who defines the problems and needs?", "Who sets the goals?", "Who benefits and who loses?", "Who controls?" and "Who makes the decisions?". If these questions are addressed, outcomes can be assessed in ways that acknowledge the collective rather than the individual dimension alone.

A further point is that the post-industrial society is service-based and depends upon the manipulation of information. It is a data-processing society, and the person who dominates in this society is the "professional". The relationship of the professional to society is therefore of critical importance, and in our opinion the role of the professional must take this into account. If such a person is to take seriously his/her tasks of "professing" - of inducting amateurs (lovers of a subject) into his/her subject - theirs must be a gift relationship. The resource person must refuse to be mesmerised by the two idols of individualism on the one hand, and love of organisation on the other, or there will be little room left for a collective response.

Those involved in this professional, resource-gifting relationship have personal, not structural links with the communities they serve, and seek to develop rather than dominate or regulate them. In this way their role could become a transforming one, alongside the leaders of change who need to be those who are experiencing the inequity. Professionals must acknowledge that they are the ones who have freedom of choice to be involved in change. Those experiencing inequity do not have the same level of freedom of

choice. Many people interpret the lack of involvement of those people as apathy; a more helpful understanding is, we think, to see it as a "culture of silence" [1]. This latter expression captures the level of structural violence [1] inherent in the imposition of the Framework.

A FIVE-STEP PROCESS

In our opinion, both a commitment to justice and a firm rejection of the reductionist market Framework require Tauwi to give both recognition and resources to assist work that is being done in the Third Sector to adopt a Treaty-based approach to social policy.

We propose a five-step process as a basis for discussion among Tauwi:

- * Seeing the Treaty-based approach as a whole.

We have no blueprint for the future, but we believe without a commitment to the Treaty there can be no justice. The ongoing work of (for example) Network Waitangi is committed to helping Tauwi understand the meaning and place of the Declaration and the Treaty, and the creative opportunities that come from them.

- * Planning the process by which society can move from a concentration on individual rights to one based on community ethics.

This requires Tauwi to consider;

What they want to pass on to the next generation;

What keeps them going when they are "down in the dumps"; and

Where the pain is, for them [1].

In determining what is held precious there is a need to develop ways of assessing whether our goal is being reached. Extension of the market Framework to e.g. incorporate use of the Daly Spectrum is critical to such assessment.

- * Identifying and Building on Existing Strengths and Assets

This means identifying people who are deeply concerned about the imposition of a "bean-counting" approach to assessment of human rights. These people, and their concerns, need to be seen as assets and strengths in their own right, not as aberrations or market failures.

Another strength is the people who are talking about what they believe in, their hopes and aspirations and their aims for future generations.

If we can pull these people and concerns together, as a basis for an agenda in the third sector, we will be better resourced to continue the process of constructing an alternative Framework. This could involve using, for example, the Peoples Charter, Kotare Research and Education Centre, Common Ground Newsletter and the full extent of the NGO networks though the Association of Non-Government Organisation in Aotearoa (ANGOA), which is developing a relationship with Tangata Whenua.

- * Organising production and distribution of goods and services (i.e. economic activity) in a way that does not conflict with these goals, while at the same time identifying and accounting for "bads and disservices" in the process.

The aim of this step is to return the market to its proper place, namely the coordination of a number of aspects of the production and distribution of goods and services, in a way that is both efficient and does not conflict with the ethical guidelines of this five-step process

At present, the marketplace in most countries is legally structured in such a way as to largely ignore other than the most extreme environmental and social issues; these are left to be dealt with as "externalities", via environment and social policy ministries and (usually weak) legislation. But along with market ideology has also come a commitment to reducing the size of the State, meaning that resources to deal with these externalities are reduced to as low a level as possible, while transferring as many as possible of these troublesome areas to private ownership. One common result is that government fiscal policies satisfy neither a social nor an

economic objective.

Improvements in means of accounting for these externalities to the mainstream economic model will require better measures of economic and social wellbeing. At present, GDP (and its rate of growth) is regarded as the key indicator of welfare for a country, despite its well-known social and environmental deficiencies. Better measures are needed, to incorporate a measure of accounting for bads and disservices associated with economic activity, along with the more obvious goods and services. The Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) is a useful improvement but all such measures need to be seen in relation to previous steps in this five-step process.

- * Mapping the connections between parts of the whole, and celebrating!

Keeping on painting the big, Treaty-based picture and celebrating the full richness of human experience will do much to keep up the momentum of the transformation away from the limitations of the market Framework. In particular we should aim to go beyond giving accolades to those who "win" in a competitive context, and aim to affirm the little successes that people have in both cooperation and competition.

In conclusion [1]:

"It has been easy for the public to believe that the main object of the changes since 1984 has been to save money. The 'reforms' have often been advanced under that guise. It is, however, a mistaken view. The object is ideological. The millenarian vision of ideologues involves an unremitting attack on the structures of democratic pluralism. Their central project is the negation of community values and the redefinition of the citizen as merely consumer. The aim involves the destruction of that sense of communal responsibility which infused the creation of the modern democratic state, but which Hayek traduced as an inconvenient hangover from tribal consciousness. When public activity is privatized, the very idea of society is undermined. These are the issues that New Zealanders have to consider."

We hope our five-step process assists in not only considering these issues but also in providing some common ground for action.

References and Notes

Copies to be made available of:

Declaration of Independence	Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi
Peoples Charter	ANGOA brochure
Kotare brochure and kaupapa	NWO brochure
WEA brochure	ESR brochure

-
- i. "Highlander Reports", December 1995-February 1996 p 1, Highlander Research and Education Center, New Market, Tennessee,
 - i. Jane Kelsey "The New Zealand Experiment; A World model for Structural Adjustment", Auckland University Press and Bridget Williams Books, Auckland, NZ, 1995.
 - i. notes on a speech to the AGM of NZCSS, 11 Sept 1995, quoted in "Signpost", Sept 1995 p 1
 - i. e.g. via Revealed Preferences, or other market measures
 - i. GD Ashton, private communication
 - i. Herman E Daly, "Steady State Economics", 2nd edn, Island Press, Washington DC, 1991 p 19)
 - i. from a draft report by Donella H Meadows and others (including John Peet), on a workshop on Indicators of Sustainable Development, Bilthoven, Netherlands, 13-17 April 1996 (to be published).
 - i. Kotare Charitable Trust, 33 Wyndham St., PO Box 3813, Auckland 1.
 - i. (But) where it is readily acknowledged that markets have much to contribute in situations where they are appropriate
 - i. World Bank, "Global Standards and Best Practices for Laws Governing NGOs"
 - i. Some of the material given here was first published in Katherine Peet's paper "Gifting and the Consequences of its Absence", FWEA 1985

-
- i. Pius XI, "Quadragesimo Anno", 1931
 - i. "Church in the Modern World", para 86, Documents of Vatican II, 1966
 - i. John A Coleman S.J. (ed), "One hundred years of Catholic social thought", Orbis Books NY, 1991 p 38
 - i. "The Peoples Charter", Peoples Assemblies Strand of the Building our own Future Project, published August 1994 (copies c/- PO Box 3813, Auckland 1; PO Box 11-891, Manners St, Wellington)
 - i. "Common Ground", Newsletter of the Peoples Network, Arising from the Building our Own Future Project, PO Box 3813, Auckland 1.
 - i. Rowntree report
 - i. Paulo Freire, "Pedagogy of the Oppressed"
 - i. Freire, op cit
 - i. These questions came from the work of the late Fr John Curnow.
 - i. Ruth Butterworth and Nicholas Tarling, "A Shakeup Anyway: Government and the Universities in New Zealand in a Decade of Reform", Auckland, Auckland University Press, 1994 pp 250-1