

COMMENTS FROM BOB SCROFANI OF THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL
DURING AN "OPENINGS" LUNCH HOUR.

In the pre-market society there were many conventions for the use of land without money.

One way was to rotate the use of lands of different fertility so that everybody got a section of the best producing lands. If you lived on land near water, and others didn't, you had to share pieces of land with them. (Look at what's going on today in California with water. It's insane.)

Anthropologists have discovered many cultures that had no money that got along fine without it. In some cultures hunters and gatherers were given "rights" to harvesting plants in all seasons.

Bushmen today are dedicated totally to using forests as their homes and use cooperation as total mode of survival.

What has happened since we created modern society, money and the concept of private land/property? Do we then make it inevitable that some will never get money and food? (The enclosed article on Bihar, India seems to say 'yes.')

Are there models anywhere that can guide us? It seems essential to keep this conversation about land&poverty going. For instance, the situation in the Philippines represents a typical land/hunger/poverty cycle. Through lack of seeing the cat sincere people think it is ok to pay the few privileged land owners billions to "give it up" so that others do not starve.

The reason Communism seems to be an opening is that they speak to people's concerns. (Lenin's slogan: LAND, BREAD, PEACE)

People are concerned about the maldistribution of wealth. The Communists spoke about land reform but they didn't know how to produce that reform, so in the end everything collapses and they literally have no production. (Of goods.)

The Maoris in New Zealand have a saying that "each man needs a place to stand." And not just metaphysically or ontologically but literally. They "saw the cat" hundreds of years ago and today are having confabs with the New Zealand government about reclaiming "their" lands.