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THE UNITED STATES is finally becoming a caring country. Shocked by assassinations, Viet Nam, Watergate and ‘stagflation’ the people have turned to caring as the one ideal that cannot be corrupted.

Young people flock to schools of medicine, law, social work and urban planning. In spite of Proposition 13, two-thirds of Americans derive their income from delivery services that are mainly caring.

The American caring that is growing most rapidly is service to the old. Our aging population is increasing so rapidly that a caring society can no longer ignore them. Lawyers, doctors, social workers, psychiatrists, physiotherapists, counsellors and housing officials are now directing their care and concern to the old.

Concern for the elderly has resulted in an increasing professionalisation of those who care for the old. This professional concern was expressed by the title of a recent conference convened by a major midwestern university: ‘Frontiers In Aging: Life Extension.’ The 700 participants were caring professionals from all the disciplines that help the aging.

Having been asked to speak to this group, I immediately consulted my mother-in-law. She is 81 years of age, comes from a Lithuanian background and likes that name because she believes it makes her an authority.

When I told her that a conference called ‘Frontiers in Aging: Life Extension’ was about her, she shook her head. She couldn’t imagine they were talking about her because their language is of a different order than the words that Old Grandma knows.

OLD IS BEING

Words like ‘frontiers,’ ‘aging’ and ‘extension’ are about going, becoming and moving forward. Old Grandma doesn’t think those words relate to her life. To her, old is being. When Old Grandma says ‘old,’ it isn’t good or bad. ‘Old’ is like saying she’s a woman. It is a condition, a state. To her, old is something that is not associated with problems. A problem is how to get the janitor to get the steam heat up to the right temperature. But old isn’t a problem.

For Old Grandma, old is:

... finally knowing what is important.
... when you are, rather than when you are becoming.
... knowing about pain rather than fearing it.
... being able to gain more pleasure from memory than from prospect.
... when doctors become impotent and powerless.

... using the strength that a good life has stored for you.
... enjoying deference.
... worrying about irrelevance.

Old Grandma’s ‘old’ cannot be counted. Therefore, people who count things will never know about her old. They are trapped by the tools of counting. The economists, social scientists, census takers and actuaries are closed out of her world because they can’t count what counts to her.

Old Grandma wonders about the problem of people who have a conference on ‘old.’ She thinks that there is a problem with people who think old is a problem.

Old Grandma is supported in her view by a famous physician named Lewis Thomas, past dean of the Yale Medical School and now President of the Sloan Kettering Cancer Foundation. In a recent article he noted that in 1975 our life expectancy reached 72 years and less than 1% of us died. He goes on to suggest that the major problem in the United States, in terms of health, is that we are becoming a nation of hypochondriacs.

Here we are, a people living to 72 years and we hold conferences called ‘Frontiers of Aging: Life Extension.’ Old Grandma cannot understand that. To her, the conference is a problem.
problem because she has never understood the Gross National Product! The Gross National Product is a number that we have been led to believe is the best indicator of how well we are doing as a society. It is a number made up of two parts. One part is the number counting the production of goods. The other part is the number counting the provision of services. Each year we want that number to be bigger if we are to be a better society.

In 1900, when Grandma was 3 years old, her job was to wipe the blood from her father's boots when he came home from the slaughterhouse. That year, 90% of the people in the United States who were working for an income were making things. 10% of the people produced services. Today, 35% of the people in the United States who receive an income through work are working in services. In the year 2000, 22 years from now, it is probable that only 10% of the people working for an income will be making things while 90% of the people will produce services.

From 1900 to 2000, in one century, we will have changed from a society where 90% of the people produced goods to a society where 90% of the people produce services.

Old Grandma doesn't understand that the importance of 'old' is that the majority of Americans must now derive their income from producing services. Each year we need fewer people to produce goods. Therefore, we need to create something else for them to do. The American ideal of caring directs them to 'produce' services. Because these services are critical in the accounting of our Gross National Product, we necessarily need more ways of delivering services if our economy is to grow. In an economy primarily based on the production of services, the essential 'raw material' is people who are in need or have more needs - people who are deficient.

Just as General Motors needs steel, a service economy needs 'deficiency,' 'human problems' and 'needs' if it is to grow. It is this economic need that creates a dilemma for Old Grandma because it demands that we redefine her condition into a problem. This economic need for need creates a demand for redefining conditions as deficiencies.

One amusing example of this 'need' is my baldness. Old Grandma thinks that is a condition. Nonetheless, there are an increasing number of caring service deliverers who are trying to persuade me that my baldness is a problem, and recently, a disease.

We see a much more serious expression of the economic need for need in the professional view of women. Old Grandma thought that child bearing and menopause were conditions of womanhood. Professionals have now redefine these conditions as problems to be treated like a sickness.

Another example is children who are called childhood. Nonetheless, our need for more service income is inventing another age classification called 'oldness.'

The economic use of classifying 'oldness' as a problem serves two purposes. The first is that it produces more service jobs by classifying old people as problems. Second, by the very act of classification it also defines old people as less productive or non-productive and diminishes their capacity to compete for jobs. Thus, we create more jobs for one class by diminishing the job capacity of another. Indeed, one might say that what has happened in the United States since the Second World War is that those people of middle years have needed 'problems' called 'old and young in order to create more 'needs' while diminishing the number of people eligible to meet the needs.

As our caring society needs to create more income and productivity, professionally defined oldness and youngness must grow. At Northwestern University where I work, 83% of the people who receive undergraduate degrees go on for at least two more years of education. Their 'childhood' is extended to at least 23 years before we declare them useful. For those who are old, useless retirement is being declared to be necessary at an earlier age. The productive years narrow as the 'valuable deficiencies' of age classified uselessness expand.

THE ECONOMY NEEDS OLDHOOD

There is a driving need for more oldhood and childhood in our economy. The human impact of the economic need to care is the great peril facing the Old Grandmas of this world. Indeed, Old Grandma persists as old because she will not become a client of the oldhood industry. She will not become a 'need,' a 'problem' or a 'deficiency.' She insists on being one of the players in the professional and national need for her oldness.

The primary 'need' facing Old Grandma is whether she can survive our economic need for her oldness. When we hold professional conferences called 'New Frontiers of Aging: Life Extension,' we are clearly about the commodification of age. We are creating an oldness industry dependant upon 'oldhood.' It is an old 'business,' making people of age into clients, consumers, and commodities because we need oldhood.

This in another way requires us to recognise that 'old' is more important than the 'need' for oldness. For many people in our society, old is a tragedy. For millions of people like Old Grandma, the critical question is not adequate service. It is a decent income and the care of their kin and neighbours.

If those who wish to 'serve' old people want to deal with a real problem, they might consider the fact that in 1950, for every six people who were receiving social security, a hundred people were paid workers. In 1978, for every thirty people...
old will be sixty five, present projections indicate that for every person receiving social security there will be two people who are working for an income.

When there are two paid working people for every person receiving social security, there will be a critical political problem for 'old.' Indeed, we are already seeing its ramifications in the current social security funding crisis. As more and more people are defined as old and unproductive in the society, what will happen to our desire to provide them with a decent income? When every two paid working people must support a third person defined as unproductive because they are old, we can predict a negative political reaction. It will no longer be the welfare recipients who will be seen as a 'burden.' Instead, it will be a new 'burden' - Old Grandma. That is the real problem for people who care about old.

This problem may create a great opportunity. We may see a movement to redefine old as productive. It is clear that the oldhood industry will grow as long as old is profitable. Nonetheless, as our society creates too many old consumers and not enough middle-year producers, the political and economic equation may begin to shift. Therefore, for those who seriously care about old, the critical question may be how to allow the old to be productive and valued.

For those who are involved in research regarding old as a deficiency, we should declare a moratorium. Instead, we should ask them to focus upon efforts to define the competence, the skills, and the capacities of old. Perhaps they could use their need to serve to develop understandings that would allow the capacities of old to be valued.

Unfortunately, if we declare a moratorium on research defining old people as 'deficient' and in 'need' of professional service, we will create an economic crisis among those who need the oldhood industry for their income. What will we do with all the professionals, bureaucrats and working people who now live off 'old' defined as unproductive, deficient and of no value? What will they do to make a living?

Perhaps they could use their hands to make solar energy units on the top of our houses. Perhaps they could do the work needed to conserve and rebuild our city neighbourhoods rather than providing 'services' that are needed because our communities have decayed.

If this work is too menial, perhaps the displaced persons in the oldhood industry could be paid for taking care of their parents.

We cannot afford the oldhood industry because it disables Old Grandma. Instead, we need a genuinely anti-age policy. Policies that use age to separate people into the three categories of youth, middle age, and old in order to meet the needs of a growth oriented caring economy should be systematically dismantled. The age orientated service industries break families, neighbourhoods, communities...