Ferdie J. Deering

Producerism Losing Rightful Ground

A POPULAR political cause these days is consumerism, but Americans should never forget that it was producerism that built this country and made our living easy.

Consumerism has been growing as people demand more necessities, more luxuries, more fun, more leisure and more welfare. Producerism has been losing ground as we shift to more pay for less work, bigger jobs for lower skills, shorter hours and more time off.

The producer philosophy of doing more in order to get more has been displaced to a considerable degree by the consumer ideology of trying to get more while contributing less.

When President Ford visited Oklahoma City last month, observers expressed surprise that he spent nearly an hour with agricultural leaders. It may be more useful for him to spend time with people who know where food comes from than with people who can tell him only where it is going.

It is apparent now that consumerism is not benefiting the public as much as promoters would like for us to think. Lewis A. Engman, chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, said:

"Though most government regulation was enacted under the guise of protecting the consumer from abuse, much of today's regulatory machinery does little more than shelter producers from the normal competitive consequences of lassitude and inefficiency.

"In any case, the consumer, for

whatever presumed abuse he is being sparted, is paying plenty in the form of government-sanctioned price fixing." Many plans to help consumers turn out to be something quite different.

Consumerism is not just an American ailment. All around the world, people are demanding more for less. The World Food Conference in Rome, called to divide up and consume the earth's food supply, is finding out that the real answer to problems caused by overpopulation rests in producerism—growing more.

There has been some talk of reorganizing the political parties, perhaps changing the names from Democrat and Republican to Whigs and Tories, or Liberals and Conservatives. The existing parties certainly could stand some renovation.

How about changing them to the Producer party and the Consumer

party? True, there might be some overlapping among those who do some of both, but probably less of it than now prevails.

The Consumer party might include those who are too young or too old to be employed, who are disabled, who don't want to work or won't work, those whose occupations are non-productive, and those who are supported on welfare or other public assistance.

The Producer party might be made up of those who grow our food, who manufacture our cars, appliances, houses, clothing and other necessities or luxuries, who render essential services, and who pay the taxes that support the non-producers.

The main weakness with such a proposal is that the Spenders party would remain in control of Congress and the legislature, as it is now.

ROWLAND W. LAUGHLIN 1305 KENILWORTH ROAD OKLA CITY, OKLA 73120

November 19, 1974

Mr. Ferdie J. Deering, The Daily Oklahoman, P. O. Box 25125, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73125

Dear Mr. Deering:

Correct you are ! "Producerism Losing Rightful Ground"

Ex: Three years ago we shut down the feeding out of 80 feeders, in Ohio.

In 1973 - 1974 we have reduced mother cows from 100 to 50. I suggested to Mrs. Laughlin that we were moving over into "R" and "R". She said, "Whats that "?

About 8 months ago I wanted to come up with a definition of the word consummer and the word producer.

Producer - one who does his best in his environment, and strives to do better.

Consummer - one who does less than his best, strives to do less, and prides himself in his ability to accomplish it.

Anyway, thanks for the reminder. Its difficult to write what the average reader doesn't want to hear.

Yours truly,

Lowled H. Laughlin

R. W. Laughlin