

THE POLITICS OF GLOBALIZATION: WINNERS AND
LOSERS IN THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

GREENFIELD GROUP

NOVEMBER 27, 2007

THE REV. DR. WILLIAM GARDINER

“Seldom is global policy discussed in terms of social justice.”
Joseph Stiglitz

This paper is written in solidarity with the billions of people around the world who are living in poverty, the millions struggling to make a living in developing countries, and the hundreds of thousands whose lives in the United States have been negatively affected by globalization.

On October 12, 2007, in an interview with the Wall St. Journal, President Bush said many Americans have lost faith in the ability to compete in the global economy. “We have lost confidence in the ability to compete internally.” “We have lost sight of what it means to be a nation willing to be aggressive in the world and spread freedom or deal with disease.” The Journal reported that Mr. Bush pledged to turn the situation around.

Those among the most committed to globalization— a republican President and the Wall St. Journal – are acknowledging that the American people are asking serious questions about the consequences of economic globalization.

The President’s remarks came amid recent polls showing declining voter support for globalization and free trade even within his own party. The Wall Street Journal reports by a margin of two to one Republican voters believe free trade is bad for the American economy. (1)

Important trade deals which the administration is trying to push through – involving Columbia, Panama, Peru, and South Korea - are stalled in the Democratically controlled Congress.

Democrats won control of Congress in 2006 in part on the strength of antitrade and anti-globalization feelings among the electorate. A recent editorial on globalization in the Economist magazine noted “The American election (of 2008) is shaping up to be a battle over nothing less than America’s attitude toward globalization.” (2)

Democratic candidates John Edwards and Barack Obama denounce the NAFTA treaty. None of the leading democratic candidates favors fast tracking of trade agreements. They advocate for fair trade policies with labor standards – rather than free trade policies.

What is going on here?

People in the United States and across the globe are asking questions like:

- What are the good things about globalization? What are its limits?
- Who really benefits from globalization? Who are the winners and losers in this economic drama?
- Does Globalization give every person living in the United States - or indeed other parts of the world- real hope for the future?
- What about the arguments of those who advocate for globalism. Do those arguments make sense?

The focus of this brief paper is on the economics and politics of globalization. We should also note there are a number of other global issues that are worthy of discussion: population growth, environmental destruction, climate change, sex trafficking, HIV-AIDS, nuclear weapons, food safety, immigration, the politics of oil, terrorism, and so on. Each of these issues would benefit from more extensive comment. And a number of them are directly tied to the economic and political issues we will be discussing.

Let's start by considering the case made by those who argue in favor of the economic benefits of globalization. What are the key points that they make?
(3)

- Global competition and cheap imports keeps a lid on prices so inflation is less likely to derail economic growth.
- Expanded trade lowers consumer prices.
- An open economy creates innovation with new ideas from abroad.
- Export jobs often pay more than other jobs.
- Open capital flows give US access to foreign investment and keep interest rates low.

- The free market rewards those who contribute economically and it provides freedom so that individuals can choose how they will use their resources.
- Open borders means new ideas and technologies flow freely around the globe.
- Globalization makes US companies more competitive.
- It is a good thing for advanced economies to make capital and technical know how available to less developed economies.
- Low wages are the comparative advantage for developing countries
- Millions of poor people have been lifted out of poverty because they are now a part of the global economy.

So there are some real benefits that are possible from a global economy.

Free trade is the economic theory driving the move toward economic globalization. We were introduced to the concept of free trade when we read Thomas Friedman's article "America and Free Trade: Is Ricardo Right?" from his book The Earth is Flat.

According to Friedman, Ricardo articulated the idea of comparative advantage. If each nation specializes in the production of goods in what it has comparative advantage and then trades with other nations for the goods they specialize in there is an overall gain in trade and everyone benefits.

One of the core assumptions in this theory is that every one around the world will benefit from free trade. Such trade is supposed to lift the poor of the world out of poverty, improve the lives of workers in developing countries, and enable workers in economically developed countries to also get higher paying jobs. Everyone is supposed to end up a winner.

Drawing on Ricardo's concept, Friedman argues that as long as the global pie keeps growing people in the United States should be okay because new jobs are created. If jobs are lost to foreign competition the market will reallocate displaced labor to a more productive function.

Friedman believes that as long as we educate knowledge workers we can be successful in the global economy. Of course Friedman discusses in great detail what he calls our "quiet crisis"- our failure as a nation to educate our people adequately so we can compete successfully in the global economy.

He even calls for us as a nation to make a “comprehensive energetic response” - as when we met the challenge of communism.(4)

So those are the core arguments of the free trade philosophy. But what are the actual results? Here are my findings:

- Globalization has had little impact on the two billion living in dire poverty in the world.
- Globalization has improved the lives of some workers in some developing countries but even in those countries inequality between well paid workers and other workers is increasing.
- The results for many people around the globe - whether in developed (United States, Europe, and Japan) or developing countries - is what many commentators call “the race to the bottom.”
- One of the consequences of globalization is that income inequality between rich nations and poor nations is increasing because the rich nations are more technologically advanced.
- The gap between rich workers and poor workers within both developed and developing nations has widened – leading to the phenomena of “dual economies” in both contexts.

Let’s briefly explore each of these themes in more detail.

Globalization has had little impact on the two billion living in dire poverty in the world.

According to Daniel Cohen in his recent book Globalization and its Enemies the belief that financial globalization is promoting economic development in poor countries is just not true. The basic reason that poor countries stay poor is that they have little that rich countries want or need from them. (5)

While the economies in some part of the world have achieved rapid growth, there has been little overall progress in much of the rest of the developing world. Income in Latin America grew by only 6% in the seventies and eighties when the continent was opening up. In Africa growth has fallen from 3.5% in 1970s to 2.2% in the 1990s. Average incomes in some Eastern bloc countries have actually contracted. All of these nations suffer from lack of education for their people, political instability, wars and ethnic turmoil, lack of borders with the sea, poor infrastructure, and cultures of poverty. (6)

Daniel Cohen says the poverty of developing countries is often blamed on unfair terms of trade and there can be little doubt that protectionist practices in agriculture both within the European Union and the United States have hindered poor countries; but Cohen argues that on the whole trade is not as unequal as has been widely thought. Cohen believes that the poor of the world are not so much exploited as neglected and forgotten.

So that is the impact of globalization on the very poor around the world who are shut out of the global economy. Thomas Homer Dixon notes – because the very poor are marginalized in the global economy – if current trends continue, the gap between the global rich and the global poor will widen for hundreds of years! (7)

But what about those developing countries where people have benefited from globalization?

Globalization has improved the lives of millions of workers in some developing countries but even in those countries inequality between well paid workers and other workers is increasing.

Because of recent developments in the global economy, there are positive results for workers in China, India, Taiwan, S. Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, Hungary, Poland, and Ireland. These countries have been able to become integrated into the global economy

But contrary to free trade theory, several of these countries established trade barriers and tariffs to protect new industries so they would have the time to grow. They developed business friendly policies to lure multinationals, good public education for at least some of their citizens, and legal systems that protect property rights. Moreover, these countries have developed their economies - not because of foreign aid - but because conditions were created for their countries to grow economically.

One significant thing is in the fastest growing economies in the world – China and India - poverty has fallen but economic inequality has risen. (8)

The rich are growing richer much faster than the poor in both these countries. The income of lower income workers has risen in the past two decades but at a slower pace than for higher skilled workers. (9)

Why is the gap between higher paid and lower paid workers increasing? Foreign investment increases economic inequality because investments are made in technology intensive industries where there is a demand for skilled workers. Skilled factory workers and high tech workers in China and India

are getting higher pay checks while farmers, those working in state run industries (i.e. China), and those in low wage jobs are left behind. This creates a dual economy in these developing countries – one economy for the well to do workers and one for the poor workers. As we shall see a dual economy is also a reality for the United States as well. (10)

The results for many people around the globe - whether in the United States and Europe or developing countries - is what many commentators call “the race to the bottom.”

Of course, there are those who are working in sweat shops across the world – rather than the global high tech industries. A good illustration is the garment industry which is one of the most globalized in the world employing over 23 million workers – essentially women of color- in over 130 countries. (11)

Workers in most of the garment and other assembly industries in developing countries suffer from poor working conditions and often exploitative wages. They usually have no labor standards like freedom of association and no rights to organize in unions. Children, prisoners, and those in bondage are forced to work for little or nothing.

Many of the good we consume in the United States are cheap because they are produced in these global sweat shops.

According to Business Week, only 10% of corporations in Western countries have done anything meaningful about labor conditions in developing countries. (12) Basic labor rights are not supported by those in international corporations and the institutions that work for them – those who believe in unrestrained free trade. Most countries in the World Trade Organization ratified the core labor standards of the International Labor Organization (ILO) which is a body of the United Nations. But that does not mean these regulations are followed. Many companies in the United State and Europe do everything they can to avoid such regulations in order to benefit the “bottom line.”

American corporations are also doing business in countries run by dictators. A New Economy Information study claims that 72% of United States corporations investment in manufacturing is in countries with authoritarian regimes. Dictatorial leaders usually resist labor standards such as the rights of their workers to organize, form unions, and engage in collective bargaining. Worse than this they actively oppress workers who try to work for these rights.

I was surprised to learn that even leaders in developing countries reject such labor standards! These leaders believe the United States and European nations will use sanctions against developing countries for not following labor standards in order to preserve their dominance in world trade. (13)

What about the impact of globalization on American workers?

According to the theory of comparative advantage all of American workers are supposed to benefit from our participation in the global economy. Of course some theorists argue this is not a painless process since old industries will have to give way to new technologies but workers can be retrained for even better jobs in a “wonderful economic future.”

But what is the reality?

- As a result of globalization the United States has become a country of winners – those who benefit from globalization - and losers – those who suffer from the changes that have occurred.
- Like other parts of the world we see the development of a dual economy with the winners doing very well and the losers falling behind.
- Inequality between the incomes of the rich and that of working and poor people is increasing as a result of these economic changes.
- The middle class especially is being squeezed by globalization.

Let's start with the impact of globalization on the middle class. David Wessel, a writer for the Wall St. Journal, describes what is happening to the American middle class as a result of globalization.

“In the 1980s technology whacked employment and wages of those at the bottom whose jobs were easily automated or shipped overseas. And, it helped those who leveraged computers to be more productive. In the 1990s though, those whose work was made more valuable by computers saw wages and job prospects grow. But the same goes for low wage workers who worked for those at the top - janitors, waiters, gardeners, home health aids. The losers are in the middle, those whose jobs and wages are threatened by the increasing sophistication of computers and workers overseas.(14)

Several analysts use the concept of the dual economy. What they mean by this is that globalization has different effects on different parts of the United

States economy. Those in the sophisticated high end do well while workers with fewer skills in factories and poor people do badly.

What are the forces in a global economy that lead to a dual economy and a squeezing of the middle class?

First let's consider the impact of the global economy on wages and working standards in developed economies in the United States and Europe.

Alan Tonelson has written a book entitled The Race to the Bottom: Why a Worldwide Worker Surplus and Uncontrolled Free Trade Are Sinking American Living Standards. Tonelson argues that when national economies are integrated through free markets lower living standards in some countries make it more difficult to raise or preserve living standards in countries with higher living standards. Lower wages in developing economies not only put downward pressure on first world wages they put downward pressure on first world labor and environmental standards as well. This is contrary to the argument that workers in the United States will in the long run benefit from our participation in the global economy.(15)

Second is the impact of outsourcing and offshoring on middle class jobs. Outsourcing involves contracting work like building maintenance, food preparation, payroll, and human resources to outside firms. Offshoring is the shift of work abroad to other countries.

In the seventies and eighties millions of blue color- factory production jobs in cars, textiles, furniture, and clothing - went to Mexico and Central America In more recent times these production jobs have been going to China and other parts of Asia. This has had a devastating impact on industrial workers here in the United States, especially in People of Color communities.

Now it is high value service and professional jobs – white collar jobs -like software design, product development, scientific research, pharmaceutical development, and accounting – that are shifting from the United States and Europe to developing countries.

Many of these jobs are going to English speaking countries with comparatively low labor costs and high skills like Ireland, India, and the Philippines. Of course the people of China are busy studying English so they can get a piece of the action as well.

And what about the new better paying jobs that workers are supposed to get as a result of the free trade policies of globalization? Louis Uchitelle in his book The Disposable American: Layoffs and Their Consequences explains

that the vast majority of laid off workers never get back to where they were financially when they find new employment – if they find new employment. There is typically a 6% loss of income.(16)

Moreover, Uchitelle says, retraining programs are offered but very few workers actually get retrained because appropriate jobs are less available. Many of these programs exist to defuse the anger of the workers and to lower their expectations. Employees are told they need to be committed to life time learning - as though the issue is their work skills and not the way the economic system is working.

In a June issue of Business Week economist Michael Mandell argues that in the last decade half of US productivity growth had been because of globalization. The cost savings US companies are reaping is not because of increased productivity of US workers. This benefits the managers who get salary increases and the stock holders but it does not benefit the workers who end up in lower paying work. (17)

Here is the “perfect economic storm” for many American workers: jobs lost overseas, foregone pay increases, lower salaries at new jobs or no new jobs at all, longer working hours, increases in health care costs, lost pension benefits, and movement from a progressive to a flat tax system. Welcome to life for US workers in the global economy.

Last spring both the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times had articles on inequality and the disappearing American dream. This was a major event in American media. Here was the establishment press is describing the impact on American workers who have suffered the results of economic globalization Their conclusion is that the myth of unbounded opportunity in America is now just that - a myth. Opportunity has shrunk as the gap between the rich and poor in the United States has widened.

I have provided an appendix that provides recent statistics on the widening gap in incomes in the United States. A recent article by Greg Ip in the Wall St Journal entitled “Income-Inequality Gap Widens” provides a good summary of this data. According to data from the Internal Revenue Service, the wealthiest 1% of Americans earned 21.2% of all income in 2005. That is up sharply from 19% in 2004 and surpasses the previous high of 20.8% in 2000. The bottom 50% earned 12.8% of all income, down from 13.4% in 2004 and a bit less than their 13% share in 2000. (18)

In summary we can see that there are some winners and a large number of losers in the new global economy.

If you are one of the two billion of the poorest people living on the planet how is globalization working for you? Not very well because you have been marginalized in the global economy. And policies of international institutions like the International Monetary Fund, that are supposed to help you, have actually made your life situation even worse.

If you are a worker in a developing country struggling to make a living in a sweat shop, how is globalization working for you? Not very well because you are caught in a “race to the bottom” – competing with other poor workers around the world. And you are often prevented from your right to organize by oppressive governments supported by the institutions of global capitalism.

If you are a worker here in the United States how is this working for you? If you are part of the knowledge worker elite - and those in jobs that support them - you are doing better. But the rest of the American people are living on the down side of the dual economy and seeing the gap between their incomes and those of the rich widen every day.

Several critics offer insight into what is happening here. M. D., Litonjua describes the evolving nature of capitalism itself. In 19th century competitive capitalism small businesses compete on the basis of price. In 20th century monopoly capitalism large companies try to control a large part of the market within a nation. But the main characteristic of 21st century global capitalism is the mobility and volatility of capital as it moves across the globe. (19)

In his book Turbo Capitalism: Winners and Losers in the Global Economy, Edward Luttwak describes global capitalism this way,

“Everywhere the logic of turbo-capitalism is that nothing should stand in the way of economic efficiency, neither obstructive government regulations nor traditional habits, neither entrenched interests nor feelings of solidarity for the less fortunate, neither arbitrary privileges nor the normal human desire for stability.” (20)

Joseph Stiglitz in his book Making Globalization Work provides a trenchant analysis of the impact of economic globalization. Stiglitz notes that globalization has potential to bring enormous benefits to both developed and developing countries, “but the evidence is overwhelming that it has failed to live up to this potential.”(21) He notes that the rules of the game are unfair. Current approaches favor the strong over the weak. In the global market

corporations can locate factories where they can pay the lowest wages for labor intensive work. And, developing countries are losing their sovereignty in the process.

Even Thomas Friedman, an avid supporter of globalization, writes,

“The flattening of the world is going to be hugely disruptive to both traditional and developed societies. The weak will fall farther behind faster. The traditional will feel the force of modernization much more profoundly. The new will get turned into old quicker. The developed will be challenged by the underdeveloped much more profoundly. I worry because so much political stability is built on economic stability and economic stability is not going to be a feature of the flat world. (22)

William Pfaff says the impact of economic globalization on developing countries “is radical and disruptive.”(23) William Grieder refers to finance capital as “the Robespierre of this revolution.” (24)

Those comments move us into a discussion of a crucial issue - the politics that lies behind globalization.

Major global corporations are the players creating global capitalism. Corporate leaders have an agenda and a central ideology – open markets and free trade. Thomas Homer Dixon describes the underlying world view of these corporate leaders,

“A particular language of capitalism – a “discourse” of economic rationality and competitions that penetrates into every nook and cranny of our economies, societies, and lives – helps us understand and abide by these rules and institutions. This language says that people maximize their pleasure from consumption and that they make decisions as if they were calculating machines, constantly weighing costs and benefits to evaluate their choices. Capitalism’s language also says that our labor is a commodity to be bought and sold in a competitive market place. And it equates our personal identities with our economic roles in the market place.” (25)

This world view is supported by international institutions, the media, think tanks, control of the democratic political institutions, and the power of the military.

Leaders of the global corporations have created institutions to manage economic globalism such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization. Trade policies are created in these institutions to “manage” global economic policies. As a result globalization is accelerating on corporate friendly terms at the expense of workers, communities, and the environment.

The policies of this leadership are trumpeted by the corporate media. Read the editorial pages of the Wall St. Journal to see how the so called virtues of the system are celebrated. The media itself is increasingly owned by a handful of mega-corporations who support the ethos of globalization.

Do you need intellectuals to justify your ideology and argue for your policies? Just fund think tanks like the American Enterprise Institute or the Cato Institute to provide “rational” arguments for your economic policies.

And don't worry about being controlled by American politicians. They need campaign contributions to get re-elected and the international corporations have access to plenty of cash. As a result of all the money that has corrupted out political process, globalization has been actively supported by both parties. Our elected officials also select people for the Supreme Court who will protect these corporate interests. As a result America has turned into a plutocracy rather than a democracy. Global capitalism now runs our government.

If it weren't for so much pressure from the unions the Democratic party would be totally acquiescent. Remember it was President Bill Clinton favored free trade and pushed for the NAFTA trade agreement. He also dismantled welfare programs pushing the poor into labor markets crushed by globalization. Let's be clear here – this is what the political “liberals” have done to working people in the face of globalization.

Unfortunately, while global corporations have grown more powerful politically, the countervailing power of labor unions has weakened. The percent of unionized workers in the United States has dropped from 35 % in the 1950s to less than 8% today. And outsourcing and offshoring have weakened the power of collective bargaining for American workers.

Let's not lose sight of the importance of American military power in defending these corporate policies. We have over 700 military bases and the most powerful navy in the world. The CIA operates all over the globe protecting the interests of global capitalism. There are any number of countries where the United States military provides support for dictatorial

regimes that oppress working people. Currently we have 150,000 troops in Iraq fighting for the right of our oil companies to control the oil in that country.

Robin Hahnel writes about the power dynamics that are operative here.

“The unfortunate truth is that for the foreseeable future the balance of power in the US government, the balance of power in international economic organizations, the balance of power in the mainstream media, the balance of power between corporate America, and the balance of power between rulers of the first world and the citizenry of the third world are extremely favorable to those who favor further undemocratic, inequitable, environmentally destructive and inefficient globalization...”(26)

That to me is a pretty good assessment of who holds the power right now in the global economy and the magnitude of that power.

But that is not all that there is my friends. There is resistance. People are organizing in every nook and cranny around the globe to oppose the people running this system. People are creating new networks and coalitions to work for change. People are putting forth a new vision to humanize globalization. People are beginning to push back in what Lyle Schaller calls “globalization from below.”

In November of 1999 some 30,000 people from around the world came to the city of Seattle to protest at the meeting of the World Trade Organization. In April of 2,000 there was a huge protest in Washington DC against the policies of the World Bank. And there have been an ongoing series of protests at meetings of these international institutions ever since then. As Joseph Stiglitz notes, globalization has succeeded in unifying people around the world – against globalization (27)

Participants in these demonstrations include a broad spectrum of workers from the developing countries, indigenous peasants, labor activists from the United States and Europe, and environmental group members. These folks put the issues of human rights, labor rights, and environmental rights on the table with the issues of economic rights.

Activists from across the world have also developed a format – The World Social forum - for organizing and putting forth a positive view of a shared global future. Meetings of the Forum have been held in various countries.

This past summer (June of 2007) some 10,000 people attended the World Social Forum in Atlanta. Global activists are saying - we know there can be benefits from globalization, but the way it is operating today is not meeting our needs.

As Unitarian Universalists we can also note the grass roots organizing work on issues of globalization by organizations like Unitarian Universalists for a Just Economic Community and the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee. There is an appendix that describes the issues they are involved with and how they are organizing.

Global activists are very critical of the core institutions –The World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) that are responsible for providing leadership for the process of globalization. In an appendix I provide a detailed account of the criticisms of these organizations. The core issues raised are:

- The decision makers in international organizations like the WTO and IMF and international corporations are remote from the ordinary citizens across the planet. Activists ask who is running these organizations and who are they accountable to.
- Critics are concerned that the World Trade Organization has the power to override government legislation meant to restrain corporate power in sovereign countries. Environmentalists are concerned about the WTO's ability to override environmental protection laws.
- Critics assert that the World Bank favors large expensive projects regardless of the appropriateness to the local conditions.
- The International Monetary Fund is supposed to provide leadership to end world poverty. But their policies of structural adjustment have actually driven whole peoples in whole nations into more desperate poverty.

For me, the most serious charge against these international financial institutions is that they fail to live up to their own free trade values. They insist that countries around the world support free trade policies. Yet they do not insist that their own countries – the United States and the European countries - carry out the same policies when it comes to providing subsidies for agriculture in their countries. (28)

Where do we go from here? Those of us in the religious community – who are in the values business need to articulate values that will serve people across the globe as the forces of economic globalization impact on them.

I like what John Sweeney President of AFL-CIO said (Davos, 1-22-99) “Our job is not to make societies safe for globalization but to make the global system safe for decent societies.”

And Joseph Stiglitz writes “We need to create a new global social contract” (29)

Yersu Kim (Philosophy and Prospects of Universal Ethics) notes the need for a global ethic in the fact of the global issues at stake and growing global interdependency. He describes the many forums and conferences where people have come together from across the world to discuss common values and principles. The quest is to find values that can be universal while still respecting the norms of different cultures. We can learn a lot from ethicists who are grappling with these issues.(30)

As Unitarian Universalists we have an excellent resource for framing the values needed to promote global economic fairness. Our 2003 Statement of Conscience on Economic Globalization uses our Unitarian Universalist Principles to guide our discussion of the critical issues involved here. The statement is provided in an appendix.

We also need a new politics and new policies to give flesh to these values.

In 1999, leaders of dozens of non governmental organizations, labor unions, and environmental groups from across the world came together to draft a Global Sustainable Development Resolution. (31) The goal of the resolution is to provide democratic control over the global economy. The key provisos are:

- Cancel debts of poorer countries to alleviate world poverty.
- Regulate international money flows to prevent currency crises and reduce financial instability.
- Develop codes of corporate conduct and mandate international fair trade agreements to raise labor standards and protect the rights of workers.
- Make environmental sustainability a priority in all trade and lending agreements.

- Stop loans for environmentally destructive projects; support green development projects.

Joseph Stiglitz calls for the following changes in the global economic system: put limits on capital liberalization, change the global governance system and reform international institutions, create greater transparency and more accountability in these institutions, and involve the people of the world in governance issues.(32)

And there are many proposals for what to do to support those living in the United States who are impacted by the forces of globalization. These include:

- Strengthen the economic safety net.
- Raise taxes on the winners to provide programs to help those most affected.
- Provide portable health insurance.
- Provide aid programs for workers who lose their jobs due to offshoring to provide income, health insurance, and retraining aid.
- Offer wage insurance to ease the pain of taking a lower paying job.
- Expand the ownership of stocks in companies.

Max Stackhouse has criticized those of us who are religious leaders for not providing leadership on the moral issues involved in globalization. (33)This is a time for us to join and support organizations like Unitarian Universalists for a Just Economic Community and the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee and encourage members of the congregations we serve to do like wise. These are the organizations in our religious community that are eager to work for change.

I think we in the Unitarian Universalist Community also have a wonderful resource in David Kortin author of [The Great Turning:From Empire to Earth Community](#) I heard Mr. Kortin speak at our Unitarian Universalist General Assembly in Portland. He offers a trenchant analysis, with powerful visions for the future and practical proposals for making systemic change. We can invite him to speak at local events and create reading groups to discuss his writings. I believe he is truly a prophet for our times.

