

RESURGENCE

VOL. 1 NO. 9 SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 1967 2s 6d



Here is an example of a recent offer which could have been used as a basis for such a project: in South Wales, innumerable buildings, 60 acres of good arable land suitable for grazing, and all other rights of 10 miles of mountains, all for £2,800. With a mortgage and a sound economic basis, a community of 12 or more people or couples could start production given £300. The eventual accumulation of capital from such a farm's production could then be used to increase its acreage by further purchase, or used to start another farm, to eventually have a number of these in various parts of the country.

A Progressive School

To educate children for peace and good human relations is something the peace movements cannot afford to continue to ignore. This would consist of a primary-secondary private school in each city, then in each major locality and region. We need to take the initiative of educating the younger generation within the context of non-violent, non-authoritarian, self-programming and international humanitarian values, along the general lines of Summerhill School (Leiston, Suffolk, U.K.). Parents who have pacifist, progressive and radical ideas will, no doubt, make a special effort to send their children to such schools which represent humane values as opposed to the present power and money-worshipping society.

A "Pirate" Radio Station*

If commercial interests have taken the initiative of setting up a radio transmitting station on a small craft outside territorial waters (Radio Caroline), why can't progressive movements do the same? In the U.K., for instance, there are hundreds of organisations (charities, minority political parties, humanist and similar organisations, law and social reform bodies, etc. etc.) which cannot get their message through to the public because they are faced with mass media controlled by forces hostile to their message, and because publicity costs are enormous. If 100 or so of these contributed £100 or so each, which would make them co-operative owners of the radio ship which they would set up, and give them a set number of free hours regularly over the air, would not the £10,000 be sufficient to start the scheme? Surely another £10,000 could be borrowed from private sources and the income derived from selling time on the air to commercial and other interests would enable the co-operative owners to pay off their debts in a short period of time and make the venture a highly profitable one. If the radio programme is attractive enough, with music, humour, satire, talks, interviews and discussion of the news, personal experiences, short stories, poetry, etc., it could not only become very popular and entertaining, but informative, and a leading force in a revival of folk culture and a chance for the man in the street to communicate to the public any injustices or generally unknown situations which exist in the country.

Already a number of such ventures are being attempted and some are on the road to achievement. All persons interested in taking active part in such creative and constructive efforts are invited to contact the author c/o. 13 Prince of Wales Terrace, London, W.8.

*Written before the current British legislation on Pirate Radio Stations. (Ed.)

THE FOURTH WORLD

BOTH Biafra and Anguilla have received a fair degree of attention in the press in recent weeks, and elsewhere in this issue we have already added our mead of attention to their problems.

IN August a crisis suddenly blew up in Britain's relations with *The Isle of Man*. The Manx Parliament, which claims to be the oldest in the world, complained that legislation at Westminster designed to make 'pirate' (pop music) radio stations illegal amounted to a gross interference in Manx affairs (it also resulted in the loss of a useful source of revenue from a nearby 'Pirate'). Of course it did, and the complaint raised eyebrows in London, where the assumption had long slumbered that such interference was the natural order of things. Natural or no, part of the ensuing rumpus which continues as *Resurgence* goes to press, has jolted many people into an awareness that there is yet another independence conscious minority within the grip of British law.

AS though this were not enough, another island community subsequently announced its desire for independence, this time in *The Orkneys*. Fed up with the drift to the South of their people and the chronic economic stagnation that afflicts them, the islanders have raised a banner for independence from Britain and unity with Denmark. The Danes are reported to be somewhat surprised at this in view of the fact that the Orkneys' historic links are in fact with Norway.

THE *Quebec* nationalists recently received a shot in the arm from General De Gaulle, no less when, during an official visit to Canada, he gave a cheer for free *Quebec*. *Quebec* is of course the predominantly French province of Canada, and in the ensuing rumpus De Gaulle was lambasted by nearly everybody. His Canadian hosts said he had been very rude and most people tended to agree, except those who suggested his remarks were evidence of senility. Gwynfor Evans, the U.K.'s only Welsh nationalist M.P. asked reasonably enough whether De Gaulle's support for the *Quebec* separatists was evidence of the beginning of a new deal for the *Breton* separatists.

IN the *United States* there were rumblings of discontent among the Spanish Americans of New Mexico (a sizeable minority) and in South America *The Times* was discussing at length the possibility of an American Indian uprising in Peru.

RESURGENCE. Articles, poems, short stories and other items for publication in *Resurgence* are welcomed. A "Statement of Intent" appeared in the May/June 1966 issue (*Resurgence* 1), obtainable from 22 Nevern Road, S.W.5, price three shillings, post free.

Contents

3	Editorial	<i>The Sick Giant</i>
5	Comment	<i>Biafra</i>
5		<i>Congo</i>
6		<i>Prisons</i>
7		<i>Anguilla</i>
8	Robert Webster	<i>The Republic of Anguilla</i>
10	Correspondence	<i>from Dennis Gould</i>
11	Paul Goodman	<i>The Psychology of Being Powerless</i>
15		<i>Publications</i>
16	Paul Goodman	<i>Poem: 'For A Young Widow'</i>
17	Ernest Bader	<i>Peace in Industry</i>
18		<i>Resurgence Affairs</i>
19	Roger Franklin	<i>'The Breakdown of Nations'</i>
22	John Papworth	<i>'Political Parties'</i>
24		<i>Quotes</i>
26	Emanuel Petrakis	<i>An Economic Backbone for the Peace Movement</i>
28		<i>The Fourth World</i>

This Issue

ERNEST BADER has devoted much of his life to promoting common ownership in industry, he is the founder of Scott Bader & Co. Ltd. and the Scott Bader Commonwealth Ltd.; he is of Swiss origin and has now retired from his business activities after 45 years, and has been appointed Founder President of the Scott Bader Commonwealth Ltd. Is now building up a second Commonwealth, Tylon Ltd., and STRIVE (OVERSEAS) Ltd., Society for Training in Rural Industries and Village Enterprise. He is a Vice-President of Demintry, Society for Democratic Integration in Industry, and Hon. Secretary of STRIVE.

ROGER FRANKLIN—lived until recently in the United States, working and teaching in science; has a growing concern for the dangers now facing mankind from products of science applied without foresight; has long made peace an avocation, and is presently studying and writing about possible ways to a safer and better world; is married and living near London, with four contributions to the population problem.

PAUL GOODMAN, who described his position as 'anarchist decentralist', was born in 1911 and received a B.A. from the City College of New York and a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. He is a novelist, poet, critic and playwright, as well as being an Editor of 'Liberation', the monthly journal of the American radical pacifist movement. His numerous books include *Growing Up Absurd*, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *People or Personnel*,

Communitas (with Percival Goodman), *Utopian Essays & Practical Proposals*, and *Like A Conquered Province*. His profoundly perceptive essay on powerlessness is reprinted from *The New York Review of Books* Copyright © 1966 *The New York Review*, and the poem on the death of his son is taken from the same source, Copyright © 1967 *The New York Review*.

EMANUEL PETRAKIS was born in Egypt in 1934 and is a former editor of "The Middle East Observer". He settled in England in 1961 and besides taking an active part in many forms of peace activity has published a volume of poetry and founded the 'Sexual Emancipation League'. Is married, has three children and lives in a community house he has established in South East London.

The cover artist of this issue is **SHANE WEARE**. He studied at the Royal College of Art and has taught at Iowa University. Now in his early 30's he is married to an American painter and teaches at the Central School of Arts and Crafts in London.

Editorial Group

John Furnival, Graham Keen (Art Work), David Kuhrt (Poetry Editor), Brenda Jordan, Sybil Morrison, Peter Taunton, Roger Franklin.

Editor: John Papworth.

Business Manager: Jacob Garonzhki.

EDITORIAL

The Sick Giant

In one week of late July there were reports in the British press of the biggest outbursts of mob violence in the U.S.A. since the Civil War, of a refusal by each of the U.S.A.'s allies in S.E. Asia to accede to its request that they send more soldiers to fight in Vietnam, of the almost total failure of the much vaunted 'pacification programme' in the Mekong Delta, of festivities in Bucharest to celebrate Rumania's assertion of independence from Russian control, and of moves towards a state of civil war in China.

Any one of these items (which by no means complete the list) would be enough to raise strong doubts about the validity of the whole professed strategy behind the American presence in Vietnam. Taken together they constitute an affirmation that that presence has become one of the biggest, the most wasteful, inept and disastrous blunders in all military history. The refusal by America's allies to subscribe more cannon fodder for this campaign is possibly, at present, the most eloquent assertion they can make on their views of the way the war is going; the news from the Mekong Delta in fact confirms the validity of those views; it confirms that the U.S. military forces have once more fought themselves to a standstill if only because they are operating beyond what Leopold Kohr would call their 'critical range of effectiveness' (as Napoleon did in Moscow), a range which puts a local peasant on a bicycle, with a few hand grenades on a military par with a jet bomber the controlling chain of command of which is over 6,000 miles away.

Such a standstill is clearly the prelude to a slithering deterioration of the American soldiers' morale; on one pretext or another the S.E. Asian allies will begin to reduce their forces in Vietnam and it may not be long before the U.S. finds itself threatened with a debacle which will make the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu look like a small scale rehearsal.

The U.S. can counter this threat by yet again redoubling its forces in Vietnam, which now amount to around half a million men, a course that Pentagon officials have been urging on President Johnson for some months already, but such a step will soon bring into play its own counter forces, both political and economic. Casting for the quadrennial pantomime of the presidential election has already begun, and if it is unlikely to be won by a Vietnam victor, it is even less likely to be won by a man identified with defeat.

The rioting in U.S. cities is another sharp reminder of the essential squalor which pervades the American domestic scene despite (or possibly because of) the unthinking prodigality of its exploitation of natural resources; it is also another reminder to the U.S. authorities that whatever the immediate fruits of this prodigality may suggest to the contrary, all the options are not open to them to play around with as they please. The mounting incidence of crime, the racial persecution and violence, the hippie dropout and drug scene, the pervading and growing spirit of unease and disquiet among students and creative workers

of all kinds, are warning enough to the leaders of the U.S. that a failure to achieve splendour at home may well be all of a piece with policies that permit the national purse to run dry on obsessively conceived and futilely conducted military fantasies abroad.

But if U.S. claims to be fighting for democracy in Vietnam are rendered hollow by the collapse of serious belief in its democratic norms at home, they are confounded altogether by the course of events beyond its frontiers. According to its policy spokesmen, democracy is in danger from an international Communist conspiracy, and this conspiracy can only be contained by countering with arms the threat of Communism wherever it appears.

One must be wilfully blind not to perceive that this belief rests on a major premise that does not hold. The Sino-Soviet conflict, the unrest within China, the three way split between China, Russia and Cuba, the existence of an independent Yugoslavia, and the independent foreign policies of Rumania are all evidence that a monolithic worldwide Communist plot is the stuff of dreams rather than reality; and that the affairs of mankind are far too diverse for any creed to capture control of them entirely. For decades Western capitalists have raised the bogey of Stalin's undoubted tyranny over the peoples of the Russian Empire as a warning of what Communism might do elsewhere. In doing so they have ignored the factors that made Russia a very special case in this context.

The irrepressible yeast

For centuries the peoples of the Asian territories adjoining Eastern Europe which today are presumptuously styled 'Soviet Republics' have been terrorised and misgoverned by the dominant group in Moscow. These Asian peoples were remote from the centres of technological development and in consequence, like the peoples of Africa, became an easy prey for expansionist colonial adventurers. With the advent of Communism the economic exploitation of the Asian peoples became more pronounced. But, as elsewhere, it could not fail to create its own counterforces, and just as new forces of nationalism arose to throw off the yoke of colonial oppression in Africa, so it may be inferred a similar and equally irrepressible yeast is working in the Russian hinterland today. It would be a bold man who would affirm that before another generation is past the subject colonial peoples of Russia will not be as independent as today their counterparts are in Africa or indeed, as they are in other parts of Asia.

It would be wrong to assume from this that the Soviet regime is simply another name for a centuries old framework of tyranny and nothing more. Of course it is not; its experiments (if they are that) in the field of education and welfare, as well as the vast changes in economic institutions its leaders have accomplished are enough to indicate that such a view is far too simplified.

Nevertheless the power relationship remains essentially what it has been for centuries, one of totalitarian domination by Moscow. All modern experience suggests that with the advent of technology this domination can only be a passing phase. It is noteworthy that in China, where a tradition of regional independence, even if only under the rule of local warlords, is far stronger, it is proving correspondingly more difficult (it may well prove impossible) to fit the whole country into a uniform communist mould.

It may be thought that the Russian grip on the Eastern European countries since the Hitler war is evidence to the contrary of this thesis. It should be noted that all these countries came under Russian control at a time when the Russian Empire itself was aroused to an unprecedented degree of unity and military strength by the ferocious behaviour of the Nazi invaders. It should also be noted that all these countries are fairly close to Russia. This of course, is hard luck on the Czechs, the Poles and other peoples of Eastern Europe although it is instructive that Yugoslavia, the country that first broke away from Russian control was the one furthest removed from Moscow. Does this not suggest that the fear of the Russians overrunning the rest of Europe, and then the world rests on an inadequate appraisal of the critical limits of Russian power, just as the murderous folly of American barbarism in Vietnam stems from an inadequate appraisal of the limits of its own?

Is not the recent decision of the Yugoslavs to invite private capital investment in their country from the capitalist West a far more significant indication of the ultimate trend of economic policy of the Communist world than any of the doctrinal principles of Marxist Leninism? And if all these indications signify nothing in American eyes, do they suppose that the group of ruthless, venal and infinitely mischievous military puppets they have established as a government in Saigon, a government as hated by its own people as much as it is despised abroad, can do other than tarnish whatever 'democratic' goals their American masters may set for them? And does the U.S. leadership still at this late hour suppose that its policy of total war can do other than inspire the people of Vietnam to a mood of total resistance—resistance to an alien invader who mouths a creed he himself repudiates by his actions, and which he appears unable to practice even in his own land?

In one way or another these criticisms and questions have been raised many times; on the whole the point is fairly fully taken. Powerful interests in the U.S.A. believe they have much to gain in terms of hard cash by breaking the morale of the Vietnamese people and destroying the power of the Vietcong. In the land of the almighty dollar this may be taken to justify what follows in Vietnam, however horrible. Yet this is far from being the whole story; mere greed, however powerful, could not alone produce this appalling situation unless other factors were at work, and a glimpse of these may be seen in considering not least the British involvement in the situation. British leaders, like their American counterparts, will state the same empty formulae about Communism when asked to justify their support for the U.S. aggression in Vietnam; but this selective concern for democracy, a concern that evokes no response when the threat emerges as a Greek

militarist dictatorship for example, merely conceals the reality of Britain's dependence on the U.S. government's goodwill for the maintenance of sterling as a stable currency.

To this sorry pass have come the dreams and hopes of the socialist pioneers of a generation ago; as the head of an increasingly shaky and unstable economic structure, socialist Prime Minister Wilson feels impelled to connive with the irredeemable turpitude of America's futile and murderous military pretensions in Vietnam. Such support, for a misapprehended policy that cannot conceivably hope to achieve its own declared objectives is presumed to be the bedrock of whatever stability the Pound is able to achieve. So a preposterous failure of historical imagination on the part of the world's sick giant and major aggressor is buttressed by countries such as Britain who assume they have no option but to go along with it if they are to survive as economic units. Not even the prospect of being dragged down to disaster deters them, but a rapidly growing awareness that it is indeed a disaster course on which the U.S. Government is set may yet save the day if the protest against it is made explicit enough in time.

For all its fulminations against the horrors of Communist rule, the United States has now made clear that in the ultimate resort its own policies are equally murderous, equally destructive and degrading, and even more suicidal. Those who content themselves with lambasting the excesses of Communism as a justification for the horror of the American Vietnam aggression are victims of doublethink—and their own at that. This is the basic lesson of the Vietnam tragedy. The world is not divided into goodies and badies; its bigger nations, regardless of their political colour, are leading mankind by different routes into the same quagmire of insensate militarism and war, a quagmire which is also marked by far-reaching and little understood forms of social malaise of many kinds.

In Britain, as a journal such as the weekly 'New Statesman' amply demonstrates, there is still a peculiar tendency for liberal British intellectuals to identify the Party and the Government led by Harold Wilson with historical forces that promoted it half a century ago. This lazy-minded wooliness is responsible as much as anything for the failure to mount a really massive protest against Wilson's Vietnam policies. The innocent are maimed and killed in Vietnam because our intellectuals refuse to shed their illusions. The time is overdue for realism.

For amazing new imports from the States
and other assorted ephemera from the
Underground

INDICA BOOKS LTD.

102 Southampton Row, W.C.1 HOL 5824

10 — 7 Monday to Saturday

COMMENT

rest on the freely given consent of the peoples of different tribes of the area. To force a federal government upon people who do not want it is not a step towards progress and the light, it is simply to perpetuate the oldest as well as the most odious aspect of government known to man—tyranny.

Those who bewail the economic consequences of small scale political organisation can at least console themselves that it is none of their business to presume to decide how other people should live. But if, as now seems possible, the Biafran independence cause succeeds, the new Biafran government is in honour bound, by the nature of its own cause, to respect the rights of the peoples of the Efik and Ijau tribes who together comprise a quarter at least of the population of Biafra. If, as seems likely, these peoples want *their* independence, Biafrans must not stand in the way. A forced unity cannot but be a source of division and weakness; on the other hand, there is nothing to suggest that when people are free to choose (and to withdraw) they will hesitate to embark on whatever forms of economic and other co-operation may be required to meet their real needs. Nor is there anything to suggest that such forms of co-operation will not endure and meet those needs just as well as those that are more involuntary and oppressive.

The real danger today is that these questions will not be settled by the people themselves, or even by misguided Fabian well-wishers, but by outside interests concerned to exploit the oil in Biafra, or to secure some transient advantage from the external political alignment of a forcibly united Nigeria. The governments and the commercial interests involved should realise by now that it is in their own interests to steer clear of entanglement here, and those with any concern for freedom should make it a primary matter to impress this lesson while there is time. All the evidence suggests that a precedent of non-interference here is one that will be greatly needed in other parts of Africa before very long.

It suggests a further conclusion. It can only be a matter of time before the tribal and regional realities of African life again assert themselves as the natural expression of the people's political desires in many parts of Africa. Those who have inherited power from the colonialists and who rule through the political structures established by the former colonial regimes need to see clearly that their role is but that of trustees during a period of transition to full tribal government. It is unlikely that this period will be a long one and attempts to prolong it unduly will lead not to security and stability but to bloodshed and military despotism.

CONGO

It would need a Gibbon armed with Keesings Archives to do justice to the tragedy of the former Belgian Congo. Since its independence, one province after another of that vast territory has been racked by military rebellion, civil war, mercenary invasion and insurrection, mob violence, and tribal feuding. The luckless inhabitants have suffered indiscriminate massacres, burning and looting of their villages, and all the consequences of social breakdown including famine, disease, unemployment and economic collapse.

BIAFRA

Piece by piece the Fabian inspired independence framework of the ex-British colonial empire is falling apart. The only people who saw any virtue in the idea of a single country consisting of such diverse regions and tribes as the Ibo of the East, the Western Yorubas, and the Hausa North were the colonialists, who wanted to simplify tax gathering, the capitalist investors, who wanted to expedite their profiteering, the Hausa leaders, who, as the majority tribe by far, saw the prospects of rich post-independence pickings, and those trendy intellectuals of yesteryear, the Fabians.

It is probable that the influence of the last named was predominant, for with their 'Colonial Bureau', their journals and pamphlets, their comprehensive factual knowledge, and their many members in leading government and ministerial jobs, they held all the aces for getting their policies across and accepted by successive conservative governments, particularly when those governments went under the nominal name of Labour.

Despite all their expertise and undoubted goodwill, Fabian thinking on the subject of post-independence government in the colonies never varied or went beyond the patronising concept of a mere transplantation of Westminster type institutions to the countries in question. "After all," they argued, "these things work well here, so there is no reason to suppose they won't, in time, work equally well in the colonies".

They ignored, or failed to see, that far from working well, Westminster was already betraying a pronounced creaking of the joints which has come to make its workings increasingly open to question here, and they ignored altogether the realities of local life in the colonies, especially the realities of tribal life in Africa. All around the continent, the dynamics of tribal rule and the prerogatives of tribal affinity were ignored and trampled over as new states were constructed on no other basis than the old colonial frontiers. People who had lived within a particular framework that might well have predated the 'mother of parliaments' were expected to forget this basic aspect of their lives and culture and to opt for an alien structure foisted upon them by conquering depredators and colonialists. The proud and formerly sovereign Ashanti peoples were expected to become good Ghanians of Nkrumah's wonderland, the Jowaba and the Ibos, with centuries of sophisticated trading relations with the world beyond Africa behind them were expected to submit to the tender solicitude of the numerically larger Hausa tribes, ruled in turn by feudal-minded Emirs in their desert provinces of the North, in something called Nigeria, and so on.

The same folly is observable in the Eastern and Central parts of Africa formerly under British rule, and there is no reason to suppose that before long tribal roots will not reassert themselves there too. As Biafran independence becomes a reality there will doubtless be the usual sneers about the 'Balkanisation of Africa'. This point is dealt with more fully in a note about the Congo below, but what must be grasped now is that no form of government can prevail in Nigeria today that does not

One group of upstart political and military adventurers after another has sought to impose its rule from Leopoldville, and all have failed, as the so-called-General Mobutu is failing today. What is the cause of this seemingly endless violence? Briefly, it stems from attempts to rule an area that is far too large for one modestly armed central government to control. The Belgians could do it, for they had the guns to extend their critical power over the whole territory, and they had besides the no less indispensable community of interest which kept it in one piece. True that interest was their own, and was expressed through a network of white officials who seldom hesitated to kill if it were threatened (public hangings were a common feature of Belgian rule long before General Mobutu shocked world opinion by publicly hanging some of his political rivals last year); but on the whole that interest prevailed, and public order (of a kind) was maintained.

Once the draconian rule of white officials was removed, the divergence of interest of the various provinces was bound to manifest itself, and only a constant resort to Belgian methods of repression can today assert the power of a Leopoldville government over that divergence. What identity of interest is there today between the Katanga tribes and those of the Congo delta a thousand miles away? The Bemba of Katanga are the co-tribalists of the Bemba on the Zambian copperbelt. Their tribal area was bisected by a boundary commission which did not include a single African among its members, and whose work was concerned solely to establish a demarcation line in the territory for rival governments in Europe.*

It needs to be affirmed unequivocally, especially as every other organ of opinion, and every government department involved in the tragedy seems ignorant of the fact that *there will never be order or peace in the Congo until the various provinces (themselves quite sizeable territories) achieve full independence and self-government.* The Congo is a product of colonialism, and it should have disappeared when the colonialists departed.

Those who react with alarm to this proposal to 'Balkanise' Africa might do worse than re-examine what is happening in the Balkans today. The Balkan countries have enjoyed nearly a generation of stability and peace, and the main reason for this is the fact that the major powers have strictly observed an agreement not to interfere in the affairs of the countries within each other's 'spheres of influence'. In the past, the Balkans became a by-word for quarrelling and strife precisely because they were caught up in the manoeuvrings of rival 'great powers'. If the great powers had refrained from interfering, as they largely refrain now, or if they themselves had been 'Balkanised', such quarrelling as would doubtless have occurred would have been very small beer, and people might even have achieved a sufficient degree of freedom to have learnt something from their own mistakes.

The inference here for the Congo is obvious; yet there is not a single organisation, not a significant section of official opinion in the world able or willing to draw it.

*That extraordinary Englishman, Sir Stewart Gore-Brown, who died only in August, was a member of this boundary commission. He used to relate how his work was interrupted by the outbreak of World War I, and how the job was hurried to completion by doing little more than drawing a line across a map of those areas that had yet to be surveyed.

It might be expected that this sorry failure in ordinary practical political wisdom about achieving peace was being repaired by some of our peace organisations around the world. It might be supposed that here, at any rate, was a body of informed and influential opinion to which the tragically afflicted people of the Congo area might look for advice and help, and perhaps release from their troubles. At present they will look in vain. Few peace organisations have yet advanced beyond a vague and sentimental concern about the evils of war, a concern that results in endless 'conferences' and a haphazard sequence of 'demonstrations,' protests, letters and deputations to ministers and so on. The war peril is spawning a considerable fringe effort at what is blithely termed 'peace research' at various centres around the world, and nearly all of these are bogged down in the study of something called 'conflict resolution', as though the vast and complex social and political pressures that are impelling huge nations on war courses can be explained in terms of models from individual psychology applied to this or that general, politician, or victim of oppression.

Many people besides the luckless inhabitants of the Congo are paying dearly indeed for this cardinal failure of the peace movement to formulate a political as well as a moral philosophy of peace. We might today have a powerful and influential body of peacemakers around the world, drawing up memoranda which would be read, and proposals hearkened to not only because their sponsors had done their homework and were speaking from a genuinely independent position, but because they were speaking on the basis of a clear-sighted and comprehensive political vision. Such a vision would derive its own natural authority from truth, and would evoke, as Gandhi found, an unmistakable and affirmative response from the hearts and minds of millions of people who at present are hapless victims of confusion, turmoil and despair. Whether the existing peace organisations can rise to this challenge, or whether a wholly new organisational initiative is required is still not clear. Meanwhile, in the Congo, the innocent continue to suffer.

PRISONS

The recent proposal to permit conjugal visits to men in prison is a very much overdue recognition of the harm a man can suffer from a long period of enforced sexual deprivation. There will be many who will acclaim this as a sign of the enlightened attitudes prevailing among our rulers, as though the whole range of value postulates on which prisons are run, whether they are seen as centres of punishment, retribution, reform, or for the protection of society, was not blown sky high by Freud and his associates more than half a century ago.

If ordinary sexual life is seen as an attribute of human nature, and which will generally impair its full flowering if its capacity for self fulfillment is blocked, as in our prisons it is, what is one to say of the other humanising influences of which a prison inmate is deprived? Do family relationships, relationships with parents, spouse and children do nothing to promote gentleness? Is there any reality in the power of nature and art to transcend the beast in man? And is not liberty itself, liberty to enjoy and explore these things, liberty to experiment and create, a pre-condition

for feeling their power and their potentialities for self-realisation in forms that can ennoble man where a prison will rarely other than deprave him? The logic of the situation is so apparent it is little wonder that today discussion centres increasingly not on ways to reform the prisoners, but how to reform the prisons.

But equally the logic of the situation indicates that prison reform is no longer a matter for radical concern; what needs to be discussed is not how to improve our prisons, but how to shut them down. Many people in prison are there because they are sick, some because they may have fallen foul of outdated legal machinery in a moment of stress, and some because they are incorrigible rascals or misfits. There are doubtless others, but these categories of prisoners include by far the majority. The sick should be given the care that is their due, and it is surely remarkable that classification in our prisons of those who are neurotically sick or unstable in one way or another is still about as advanced as the reforms in physical medicine instituted by Florence Nightingale in the Crimea one hundred years ago. Clearly, in the case of violent psychopaths, there is a need for restraint and skilled supervision, but if this is to be done with the objective of rehabilitation, or, where this is not possible, with making life for the afflicted as tolerable as possible; it is in any case a matter totally at variance with the operation of a mere prison.

For the rest the main justification of prisons today rests on the hypothesis that it 'deters offenders'. The expanding figures of 'crime statistics' would suggest that prisons promote rather than deter crime, and if this should appear too crude an interpretation of them the increase at least suggests that there are other factors at work which make the deterrence factor largely irrelevant to the problem.

Those who run the prison system are not aware of all this and they respond by doing what they can to reduce its grosser inhumanities. Such attempts at 'reform' are, of course, in complete contradiction to the objective of deterrence. Every step towards making a prison a place more fit for human beings diminishes such effectiveness as it may have as a deterrent.

Let us encourage their efforts, but let us be

aware that the real battle, for the total abolition of prisons, has yet to begin. In place of coercion, or of deterrence and revenge in the guise of punishment, there needs to be compassion and understanding and attempts to come to grips with the maladies of the mind which increasingly afflict members of our societies. This needs a wider awareness of man's total needs as a citizen rather than specific 'scientific' approaches to 'the criminal'. It involves an awareness of the extent to which modern society, in its everyday workings, is increasingly frustrating those needs, and how they can only be fully met in societies which are really geared to human needs, rather than to machines and machine-orientated fantasies such as space travel or total war.

ANGUILLA

Anguilla is a small Caribbean island and recently its people opted for their independence. We seek to do justice to this major occasion by reproducing elsewhere in this issue the full-page advertisement its leaders caused to be placed in a U.S. newspaper. An independent Anguilla raises numerous problems; how will it protect itself from wealthy American interests which will surely see it as a first class site for a gambling and racketeering centre and other forms of exploitation, or from the efforts of Marxian communists to turn it into a 'people's democracy' where all men will be equal but where some will undoubtedly become more equal than others?

These and many other questions help to indicate the nature of the considerable gap in radical pacifist thinking and in its literature. The U.S. peace movement recently held a conference on the theme. "What is to be done?". The time seems ripe for a similar discussion in Britain, for the answers now being sought by the people of Anguilla are precisely those which confront the forces of peace and freedom everywhere. In wishing the people of Anguilla success in their new-won freedom there is a constant need to recall the extent to which our own failure to make progress is balked by our failure to achieve clarity about the nature of the political base on which the goals of peace and freedom can be attained.

Don't be a dropout . . .

Have you remembered to renew your subscription? The answer is probably affirmative, but do save us work and expense reminding you individually if you haven't.

Send your subscription to:—

The Business Manager,
Resurgence,
94 Priory Road,
London, N.W.6.

PEACE NEWS

The world's premier independent weekly peace journal for news, views and comment on all aspects of peace activities

Price — 1/- £3 per year.

Special introductory subscription offered of 6 weeks (6 issues) for 5/-

From PEACE NEWS

5 CALEDONIAN ROAD, LONDON, N.1.

The Republic

THE New York Times, in its editorial of August 7, described the Republic of Anguilla's desperate efforts to remain independent as "touching and silly."

With a pat on the head, the Times advised us to return to the awkward Federation of St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, itself newly formed, from which we had withdrawn shortly after its arbitrary inception on February 27.

We say "arbitrary" because, as you can see from the map, Anguilla does not, even geographically, have much in common with the other two islands. St. Kitts and Nevis are right next door to one another and share a common one-crop, sugar cane, economy dominated by huge, foreign land holdings. Anguilla's land is owned by the islanders themselves; each family has its own little plot and lives off it. Why, then, did Britain lump us in with the other two islands? Because we were their last odd-parcel of real estate in the Caribbean; it's probably that simple. (The Times disregarded these basics, if it ever knew them.)

The Times then dismissed our aspirations to independence by pointing out that, "Anguilla has an area of only 35 square miles and a population of 6,000. Its people subsist on agriculture and fishing and *lack such modern amenities as telephones.*" (Italics ours.)

This is a terrible indictment in New York eyes, we suppose, but do you know what one Anguillian does when he wants to telephone another Anguillian? He walks up the road and talks to him. Primitive as this arrangement is, it is hardly grounds for justifying the Times' conclusion that Anguilla cannot hope to go it alone.

The fact is that we *have* gone it alone economically, socially, and politically for centuries. The British have neither bothered us, nor bothered about us. We have never been exploited, possibly because there has been nothing much to exploit.

Ugly Duckling

To understand this, you must know that Anguilla is referred to in guidebooks as "the ugly duckling of the Caribbean." Objectively that may be so, though to us Anguilla is beautiful because it is our homeland.

There is not enough water on the island for major crop cultivation, nor is it a "tropical paradise"; it is not the prettiest island in the West Indies. The highest point on Anguilla is but 200-and-some-odd feet. There used to be a lot of trees we are told, but these were burned for charcoal long ago. So we must bring in wood to build Anguilla's famous knife-like schooners and sloops.

Older than U.S.

Anguilla has been left to herself, with generations of the same people, since the 17th century.

We are, therefore, a very old nation by any standards. It can even be argued that, as a distinct nation with a stable people, we are older than the United States.

Anguilla is only "new" in the sense that the New York Times had never heard of us before, nor have we had to assert ourselves recently. The last time we were threatened was 250 years ago when the French attempted an invasion with 600 men. They were thrown back by 60 of us, men whose names nearly all Anguillians still bear in direct descent.

There is also this, and it is all-important: Anguilla has proved its self-reliance. It can feed itself, and does. How else do you suppose it could have withstood a blockade—the impounding of our funds, and even our mail—plus the threat of siege by the St. Kitts Government for more than three months now?

"Erratic Procedure"

Back to the Times editorial, there is more than a suggestion that Anguillians, though enthusiastic for freedom, are also undisciplined, unrealistic, and given to "erratic procedure." In a word: natives.

We would point out that, whatever the British failed to do on Anguilla, they did give us 300 years of grounding in democratic institutions; and they did establish schools: Anguilla's literacy rate is over 70%, by far the highest in these islands.

Which brings us to the Times's unfounded assertion that "there is no truly representative government to speak for the island." That is quite untrue. Anguilla is ruled by a duly elected Council. The premise for this statement was the supposition that Mr. Peter Adams, who has served as a member of the Council, "had a mandate to negotiate for Anguilla" with the British. This is not true either.

Mr. Adams was in the United States seeking help and recognition for us when he, already at the point of exhaustion, enplaned in the middle of the night for Barbados to meet with Great Britain's Minister for Commonwealth Affairs, Lord Shepherd. He flew there from San Francisco arriving after 15 hours of hard travel, with no luggage—only the clothes on his back.

Unremitting Pressure

It is impossible to know the pressures that were subsequently exerted on this man whom we know to be ordinarily unswerving and extraordinarily dedicated. But after a week, virtually incommunicado toward the end, he submitted to the following demand (in writing) by Lord Shepherd:

"If you now reject the settlement which we regard as being very reasonable, I must say, in all seriousness, that the British Gov-

of Anguilla

ernment cannot continue to countenance the present situation in Anguilla, which constitutes a threat to the stability of the whole Caribbean.

"I shall therefore have to consult with the other Caribbean Governments as to the steps which shall have to be taken to deal with this serious situation."

This "serious situation" was simply that Anguilla, after withdrawing from the embryo Federation in May, had, on July 11, held a plebiscite by secret ballot (above) to confirm its independence beyond question. To insure complete accuracy and believability to the world, this election was supervised, and the ballot count confirmed, by outsiders; correspondents, chiefly.

The returns were embarrassingly lopsided: 1813 For independence, 5 Against. It is therefore utterly impossible that Mr. Adams carried with him what the Times calls "a mandate to negotiate"; i.e., to give up.

British Threat not Empty

Why did he succumb? Well, the British threat of force has seldom been an empty one. Also recall that the St. Kitts government's Prime Minister Bradshaw had, in addition to blocking our mail and our money, threatened—and continues to threaten—our small island with armed force; with no success thus far, though it has meant manning our beaches all night every night for months.

Meanwhile, a British frigate with a force of Royal Marines aboard, lies off our shores. One imagines that the least civil disturbance on Anguilla would serve as a pretext for landing these imposing troops. There is small likelihood of an *internally* induced incident of any kind.

To resume, the Barbados Agreement was immediately declared invalid by the Island Council and by the people themselves in mass meeting. A provisional head of state, Mr. Ronald Webster, was immediately acclaimed pending regular election.

One last insight into why the unfortunate and unauthorized Barbados Agreement calling for Anguilla's return to the St. Kitts-Nevis Federation was signed at all: We do not mean to suggest that melancholy measures were applied to gain assent, but the might and authority of Great Britain—especially when embodied in one who is a high British official *and* a Lord—is not easily ignored after centuries of respect.

Why Want Us Now?

It occurs to us that one question may remain in American minds. If Anguilla is as we say it is, why would St. Kitts-Nevis, or the British for that matter, wish to bother with us now? Well, we *are* somewhat of an affront to what they

would regard as fitting and proper; and we are a maddening challenge to Prime Minister Bradshaw's authority over his own troubled domain. The fact that unreachable Anguilla is not troubled by St. Kitts's inherited economic and political ills likely does nothing to allay his discontent; that is only human nature.

But there is another reason, quite new, for finding Anguilla desirable. Anguilla, though unassuming, does have an extremely pleasant climate, cool and dry . . . and magnificent, untouched beaches. We are "developable."

We could settle our financial distress today were we willing to sign any of the numerous offers we have received from land and resort developers. One company dangled \$1,000,000 cash for gambling concessions. We turned it down flatly, despite the anguished realization that this amount of money would underwrite our development for years.

Even One Great Hotel

Why did we turn these offers down? Because even one magnificent, Hiltonesque hotel on an island of 6,000 people, *4,000 of whom are youngsters*, would turn us into a nation of bus boys, waiters, and servants.

There is nothing wrong with service or hard physical work, you understand, but a whole *nation* of servants is unthinkable. In five years—or perhaps less—Anguillians would become as sullen, malcontent, and rootless as the rest of the Caribbean; or Harlem, as far as that goes.

Though we haven't mentioned it before, we are a nation of what you would call "Negroes." To us, we are simply Anguillians, because nobody has ever brought the subject up, and that's the way we intend to keep it. But you do see what we mean, don't you? Even one fine hotel and we would become "natives."

How Long Can We Resist?

That brings us up to now. As of this writing the British have not landed troops nor are we given to despair. We still hope for recognition from the United States, from the United Nations, from Great Britain, or from anyone. But if no one chooses to recognize us we shall continue, as we always have, to go it alone.

How long can we hold out? Indefinitely—even without recognition—but we can use temporary financial aid in the meantime.

Our needs are ridiculously small by any standards but our own. For example: our entire island budget—including schools (for those 4000 children)—comes to only \$25,000 per month. All our island funds to the amount of \$250,000 U.S. are impounded in St. Kitts, yet we have managed.

We have eased the currency shortage somewhat by the issuance of emergency coinage.

These "Anguilla Liberty Dollars" are over-stamped South American silver dollars, for the most part.

These coins are being redeemed by friends of Anguilla abroad, and we are putting into circulation the money they fetch.

... To Survive Now

It is a little embarrassing for our government to ask you for financial aid on the basis of the unique collateral we have presented here. However, we have no doubt that we will survive this crisis—and do it without selling ourselves out—if we have enough money to survive *now*. We must seek assistance from individuals.

To show our gratitude, we should like to give you something in return, if only to prove that Anguilla is really here and thinking of you even as you think of us.

First off (to disapprove the Times's allegation that we don't really have a "representative government"), we had better send you an auto-graphed picture of the Island Council, a facsimile of the original handwritten version of our national anthem, and a small Anguillian flag (a replica of the one now flying over the airstrip). If you wish to help us with as much as \$25.00, we'll also send you one of the Anguilla Liberty Dollars.

Those sending \$100 or more will become Honorary Citizens of Anguilla. They will receive a document in the form of an Anguillian passport, identical to that which we are issuing to Anguillians, except that it will have an Anguillian Dollar inlaid as shown in the picture. While Americans should not expect to use this passport for foreign travel, it will be good for entering Anguilla. In fact *only* holders of this passport will be able to visit Anguilla as guests. Why?

In the first place, we have only 30 guest rooms on the entire island at the moment, with no plans to expand. We would not think it either good or polite that so many visitors should be on the island at once that they couldn't at least have lunch with the President. (Besides, since we have such a small population, any more than a very few guests would automatically become "tourists"; we wouldn't want that, and neither would you.)

How to Send Contributions to Anguilla

Since we are cut off from direct postal service—and to give you assurance that your money is safe—an account is being established at the Chase Manhattan Bank on nearby St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands. So please make out your check to: THE ANGUILLA TRUST FUND. And address the letter to: The Anguilla Trust Fund, Chase Manhattan Bank, St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands.

Thank you for your kind attention during all these troubled weeks, and for hearing us out now, and for your generosity. We won't forget it, or you.

Ronald Webster

Chairman, the Anguilla Island Council.

Correspondence

Last autumn I decided to organise a tour of colleges of education—teachers' training colleges—reading poems, singing folk songs with the belief that poetry and folksong are important. I chose colleges of education because of their central role in our system of education, and because their approach to poetry is basically still dull: unimaginative and stifling. Poets are only considered as far as their relevance to English Literature, not because of themselves—their own critical importance in the society of their day. There are no scholarships for poets in England apart from the Gregory Fellowship at Leeds University. There are no lecturers in poetry. Why is it that we have lecturers in painting: sculpture: pottery: literature, but treat poets and their poems as just a tiny part of the study of literature? Well, I would suggest it is because the poet is often a danger to his society. He is often a prophet and revolutionary: a vagrant, a troubadour: a clown and a lover: a priest and a politician of anarchy. Beware: because it is based on radical non-violent direct action. Beware! Because it is based on gentleness and love. When will there be a lecturer of poetry in every college and university: school and community... when will there be a recognised poet in every community?

Since the end of January I have been reading and singing in many parts of England, Scotland and Wales. Not only in Colleges of Education, but also in Universities: Schools of every kind: Technical and Art Colleges: Youthclubs and Folkclubs: Peace and Freedom Groups: Pacifist and Anarchist Groups: Quaker Meetings and S.C.M. Societies: C.N.D. and Committee of One Hundred: Concert Halls and Theatres: Prisons and Hospitals: APPEAL. At present I am faced with two problems. I am appealing for help in order to buy a second-hand Volkswagen or mini-van to cut out the coach journeys and hitch-hiking which mean often narrow margins between readings in different places: I have been offered one for £20, and perhaps £30 required spending on it.

The other problem is that the book of Kenneth Patchen poems—"Love and War Poems" is still unpublished and lying in my bag I have to give an advance of some £50 in order to satisfy the printer. This small book will contain an introduction by Dadine Raines and a postscript by Henry Miller—an essay on Patchen he wrote 20 years ago.

Since I have no money and am being sponsored by no trust or society I have to rely solely on expenses I get from folkclubs and universities. Sometimes, often, I get nothing for I ask no standard sum, and at present expect nothing from schools: peace groups: youth clubs: institutions—other than a collection, if they make one. Why not? Well, the schools invite me unofficially, not through the education committee: the other groups, in the main, have no funds. This is a pioneering tour, especially the entry into institutions. It is possible I shall get fees from education committees next autumn if they feel the work is of importance. But now I need your help if you think this work is of value in our technical society?

DENNIS GOULD.

"The Whisper and Shout,"
56 Jackson Avenue,
Mickleover, Derby.

Paul Goodman

The Psychology of Being Powerless

PEOPLE believe that the great background conditions of modern life are beyond our power to influence. The proliferation of technology is autonomous and cannot be checked. The galloping urbanization is going to gallop on. Our over-centralized administration, both of things and men, is impossibly cumbersome and costly, but we cannot cut it down to size. These are inevitable tendencies of history. More dramatic inevitabilities are the explosions, the scientific explosion, and the population explosion. And there are more literal explosions, the dynamite accumulating in the slums of a thousand cities and the accumulating stockpiles of nuclear bombs in nations great and small. The psychology, in brief, is *that history is out of control. It is no longer something that we make, but something that happens to us.* Politics is not prudent steering in difficult terrain, but it is—and this is the subject of current political science—how to get power and keep power, even though the sphere of effective power is extremely limited and it makes little difference who is in power. The psychology of historical powerlessness is evident in the reporting and the reading of newspapers: there is little analysis of how events are building up, but we read—with excitement, spite, or fatalism, depending on our characters—the headlines of crises for which we are unprepared. Statesmen cope with emergencies, and the climate of emergency is chronic.

I believe myself that some of these historical conditions are not inevitable at all but are the working out of willful policies that aggrandize certain interests and exclude others, that subsidize certain styles and prohibit others. But of course, *historically*, if almost everybody believes the conditions are inevitable, including the policy-makers who produce them, then they are inevitable. For to cope with emergencies does not mean, then, to support alternative conditions, but further to support and institutionalize the same conditions. Thus, if there are too many cars, we build new highways. If administration is too cumbersome, we build in new levels of administration. If there is a nuclear threat, we develop anti-missile missiles. If there is urban crowding and anomie, we aggravate it by stepping up urban renewal and social work. If there are pollution and slums in engineering because of imprudent use of technology, we subsidize Research and Development by the same scientific corporations working for the same ecologically irrelevant motives. If there is youth alienation, we extend and intensify the processing of youth in schools. If the nation-state is outmoded as a political form, we make ourselves into a mightier nation-state.

In this self-proving round, the otherwise innocent style of input-output economies, games-theory strategy, and computerized social science becomes

a trap. For the style dumbly accepts the self-proving program and cannot compute what is not mentioned. Individual differences, belief and distrust, history, landscape, the available time, space, and energy of actual people—such things tend to be left out. Then the solutions that emerge ride even more roughshod over what has been left out. Indeed, at least in the social sciences, the more variables one can technically compute, the less likely it is that there will be prior thinking about their relevance to human life. Our classic example—assuming that there will be a future period to which we provide classic examples—is Herman Kahn on Thermonuclear War.

But what is the psychology of feeling that one is powerless to alter basic conditions? What is it as a way of being in the world? Let me list half a dozen kinds of responses to being in a chronic emergency; unfortunately, in America they are exhibited in rather pure form. I say unfortunately, because a pure response to a chronic emergency is a neurotic one; healthy human beings are more experimental or at least muddling. Instead of politics, we now have to talk psychotherapy.

By definition, governors cannot forfeit the symbol that everything is under control, though they may not think so. During President Kennedy's administration, Arthur Schlesinger expressed the problem poignantly by saying "One simply *must* govern." The theme of that administration was to be "pragmatic"; but by this they did not mean a philosophical pragmatism, going toward an end in view from where one in fact is and with the means one has; they meant turning busily to each crisis as it arose, so that it was clear that one was not inactive. The criticism of Eisenhower's administration was that it was stagnant. The new slogan was, "get America moving."

This was rather pathetic; but as the crises have become deeper, the response of the present administration is not pathetic but, frankly, delusional and dangerous. It is to *will* to be in control, without adjusting to the realities. They seem to imagine that they will in fact buy up every economy, police the world, social-engineer the cities, school the young. In this fantasy they employ a rhetoric of astonishing dissociation between idea and reality, far beyond customary campaign oratory. For example, they proclaim that they are depolluting streams, but they allot no money; forty "demonstration cities" are to be made livable and show the way, but the total sum available is \$1.5 billion (John Lindsay says we need \$50 billion for New York alone); the depressed area of Appalachia has been reclaimed, but the method is an old highway bill under another name; poor people will run their own programs, but any administrator is

fired if he tries to let them do it; they are suing for peace, but they despatch more troops and bombers. This seems to be just lying but, to my ear, it is nearer to magic thinking. The magic buoys up the self-image; the activity is either nothing at all or brute force to make the problem vanish.

In between the ideality and the brutality there occurs a lot of obsessional warding off of confusion by methodical calculations that solve problems in the abstract, in high modern style. A precise decimal is set beyond which the economy will be inflationary, but nobody pays any mind to it. Eighty-seven per cent of low income nations but only 48 per cent of middle income nations have had violent political disturbances. A precise kill-ratio is established beyond which the Vietcong will fold up, but they don't. Polls are consulted for the consensus, like the liver of sheep, without noticing signs of unrest and even though the administration keeps committing itself to an irreversible course that allows for no choice. And they are everlastingly righteous.

In more insane moments, however, they manufacture history out of the whole cloth, so there is no way of checking up at all. They create incidents in order to exact reprisals; they invent (and legislate about) agitators for demonstrations and riots that are spontaneous; they project bogey-men in order to arm to the teeth. Some of this, to be sure, is cynical, but that does not make it less mad; for, clever or not, they still avoid the glaring realities of world poverty, American isolation, mounting urban costs, mounting anomie, and so forth. I do not think the slogan "The Great Society" is cynical; it is delusional.

Perhaps the epitome of will operating in panic—like a case from a textbook in abnormal psychology—has been the government's handling of the assassination of John Kennedy. The Warren Commission attempted to "close" the case, to make it not exist in the public mind. Thus it hastily drew firm conclusions from dubious evidence, disregarded counter-evidence, defied physical probabilities, and perhaps even accepted manufactured evidence. For a temporary lull it has run the risk of a total collapse of public trust.

COMMON people, who do not have to govern, can let themselves feel powerless and resign themselves. They respond with the familiar combination of not caring and, as a substitute, identifying with those whom they fancy to be powerful. This occurs differently, however, among the poor and the middle classes.

The poor simply stop trying, become dependent, drop out of school, drop out of sight, become addicts, become lawless. It seems to be a matter of temperature or a small incident whether or not they riot. In anomie circumstances, when people are left out and can't get in, it is hard to tell when riot or other lawlessness is a political act toward a new set-up and when it is a social pathology. Being powerless as citizens, poor people have little structure of meaning in which to express, or know, what they are after. The concrete objects of their anger make no political sense: They are angry at themselves or their own neighbourhoods, at white people passing by, at Jewish landlords and shopkeepers. More symbolic scapegoats like "the capitalist system" or "communism" do not evoke much interest. One has to feel part of a system to share its bogey-men or have a counter-ideology,

and by and large the present-day poor are not so much exploited as excluded.

But to fill the void, they admire, and identify with, what is strong and successful, even if—perhaps especially if—it is strong and successful at their own expense. Poor Spanish youth are enthusiastic about our mighty bombs and bombers, though of course they have no interest in the foreign policy that uses them. (If anything, the polls show that poor people are for de-escalation and peace rather than war.) Readers of the *Daily News* are excited by the dramatic confrontation of statesmen wagging fingers at each other. Negroes in Harlem admire the Cadillacs of their own corrupt politicians and racketeers. Currently there is excitement about the words "Black Power" but the confusion about the meaning is telling: In the South, where there is little Negro anomie, Black Power has considerable political meaning; in the Northern cities it is a frantic abstraction. Similarly, the contrary word "Integration" makes economic and pedagogic sense if interpreted by people who have some feeling of freedom and power; but if interpreted in an atmosphere of resentful hopelessness it turns into a fight for petty victories or spite, which are not political propositions, though they may be good for the soul.

The anomie of middle-class people, on the other hand, appears rather as their privatism; they retreat to their families and consumer goods where they still have some power and choice. It is always necessary to explain to non-Americans that middle-class Americans are not so foolish and piggish about their Standard of Living as it seems; it is that the Standard of Living has to provide all the achievement and value that are open to them. But it is a strange thing for a society to be proud of its Standard of Living, rather than taking it for granted as a background to worthwhile action.

Privacy is purchased at a terrible price of anxiety, excluding, and pettiness, the need to delete anything different from oneself and to protect things that are not worth protecting. Nor can they be protected; few of the suburban homes down the road, that look so trim, do not have cases of alcoholism, insanity, youngsters on drugs or in jail for good or bad reasons, ulcers, and so forth. In my opinion, middle-class squeamishness and anxiety, a kind of obsessional neurosis, are a much more important cause of segregation than classical race-prejudice which is a kind of paranoia that shows up most among failing classes, bankrupt small property owners, and proletarians under competitive pressure. The squeamishness is worse, for it takes people out of humanity, whereas prejudice is at least passionate. Squeamishness finally undercuts even the fairness and decency that we expect from the middle class.

The identification with power of the powerless middle class is also characteristic. They do not identify with brutality, big men, or wealth, but with the efficient system itself, which is what renders them powerless. And here again we can see the sharp polarity between those who are not politically resigned and those who are. Take the different effects of what is called education. On the one hand, the universities, excellent students and distinguished professors, are the nucleus of opposition to our war policy. On the other hand, in polls of general opinion there is always a dismaying correlation between years of schooling and the "hard line" of bombing China during the Korean War or bombing Hanoi now. But this is

not because the educated middle class is rabidly anti-communist, and certainly it is not ferocious; rather, it is precisely because it is rational, it approves the technically efficient solution that does not notice flesh-and-blood suffering. In this style the middle class feels it has status, though no more power than anybody else. No doubt these middle-class people are influenced by the magazines they read, which explain what is efficient; but they are influenced because they are "thinking" types, for whom reality is what they read.

The bathos of the irresponsible middle class is the mighty T.V. newscast on our national networks. This combines commercials for the high Standard of Living, scenes of war and riot, and judicious pro-and-con commentary on what it all means. The scenes arouse feeling, the commentary provokes thought, the commercials lead to action. It is a total experience.

LET me illustrate the psychology of resignation with another example, for it has come to be accepted as the normal state of feeling rather than as pathological.

During the hearings on Vietnam before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Dodd of Connecticut—who had been mentioned as Lyndon Johnson's favoured choice for Vice-President in 1964—was asked what he thought of the sharp criticism of the government. "It is the price that we pay," he said, "for living in a free country." This answer was routine and nobody questioned it. Yet what an astonishing evaluation of the democratic process it is, that free discussion is a weakness we must put up with in order to avoid the evils of another system! To Milton, Spinoza, or Jefferson free discussion was the strength of a society. Their theory was that truth had power, often weak at first but steady and cumulative, and in free debate the right course would emerge and prevail. Nor was there any other method to arrive at truth, since there was no other authority to pronounce it than all the people. Thus, to arrive at wise policy, it was essential for everybody to say his say, and the more disparate the views and searching the criticism the better.

Instead, Senator Dodd seems to have the following epistemology of democracy. We elect an administration and it, through the intelligence service, secret diplomacy, briefings by the Department of Defense and other agencies, comes into inside information that enables it alone to understand the situation. In principle we can repudiate its decisions at the next election, but usually they have led to commitments and actions that are hard to repudiate. Implicit is that there is a permanent group of selfless and wise public servants, experts, and impartial reporters, who understand the technology, strategy, and diplomacy that we cannot understand, and therefore we must perforce do what they advise. To be sure, they continually make bad predictions and, on the evidence, they are not selfless but partial or at least narrow in their commercial interests and political outlook. Yet this does not alter the picture, for if the President goes along with them, outside criticism is irrelevant anyway and no doubt misses the point, which, it happens, cannot be disclosed for reasons of national security. And surely irrelevant discussion is harmful because it is divisive. But it is the price we pay for living in a free country.

What can be the attraction of such a diluted faith

in democracy? It is what is appropriate in a chronic low-grade emergency. In an emergency it is rational, and indeed natural, to concentrate temporary power in a small center, as the ancient Romans appointed dictators, to decide and act, and for the rest of us to support the *faits accomplis* for better or worse. But since we face a low-grade emergency—nobody is about to invade San Francisco—we like to go on as usual, including sounding off and criticising, so long as it does not effect policy.

Unfortunately, this psychology keeps the low-grade emergency chronic. There is no way to get back to normal, no check on *faits accomplis*, no accountability of the decision-makers till so much damage has been done that there is a public revulsion (as after a few years of Korea), or, as seems inevitable, one day a catastrophe. Worst of all there is no way for a philosophic view to emerge that might become effectual. Who would present such a view? In the classical theory of democracy, the electorate is educated by the clashing debate and the best men come forward and gain a following. But in Senator Dodd's free country, acute men are likely to fall silent for what is the use of talk that is irrelevant and devisive?

The discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee, excellent as it was, was itself typical of a timid democracy. Not a single Senator was able to insist on basic realities that could put the Vietnam war in a philosophic light and perhaps work out of its dilemmas. (Since then, Senator Fulbright has become more outspoken). In this context, here are some of the basic realities. In a period of world-wide communications and spread of technology, and therefore of "rising aspirations," nevertheless a majority of mankind is fast becoming poorer. For our own country, is it really in our national interest to come on as a Great Power, touchy about saving face and telling other people how to act, or else? In the era of One World and the atom bomb, is there not something baroque in the sovereignty of national states and Legalisms about who aggressed on whom?

It will be objected that such anti-national issues can hardly be raised by Senators, even in a free debate. But the same limitation exists outside of government. In the scores of pretentious TV debates and panel discussions on Vietnam during the past two years, I doubt that there have been half a dozen—and these not on national networks—in which a speaker was invited who might conceivably go outside the official parameters and raise the real questions. Almost always the extreme opposition is himself a proponent of power politics, like Hans Morgenthau. (It usually is Hans Morgenthau.) Why not A. J. Muste, for instance? Naturally the big networks would say that there is no use in presenting quixotic opinions that are irrelevant. (The word "quixotic" was used by General Sarnoff of the National Broadcasting Company in his successful bid to Congress to deny to third party candidates equal free time.) By this response, the broadcasters guarantee that the opinions will remain irrelevant, until history, "out of control," makes them relevant because they were true.

THIS brings me back to my subject, how people are in the world when history is "out of control." So far I have noticed those who unhistorically will to be in control and those who accept their powerlessness and withdraw. But there is another possi-

bility, apocalypse, not only to accept being powerless but to expect, or perhaps wish and hasten, the inevitable historical explosion. Again there are two variants, for it is usually a different psychology, entailing different behaviour, to expect a catastrophe and beat around for what to do for oneself, or to wish for the catastrophe and identify with it.

To expect disaster and desert the sinking ship is not a political act, but it is often a profoundly creative one, both personally and socially. To do it, one must have vitality of one's own that is not entirely structured and warped by the suicidal system. Going it alone may allow for new development. For instance, when the youth of the Beat movement cut loose from the organized system, opted for voluntary poverty, and invented a morals and culture out of their own guts and some confused literary memories, they exerted a big and, on the whole, good influence. Also, the disposition of the powers-that-be to treat gross realities as irrelevant has driven many intellectual and spirited persons into deviant paths just to make sense of their own experience; thus, at present, perhaps most of the best artists and writers in America are unusually far out of line, even for creative people. They hardly seem to share the common culture, yet they are what culture we have. (According to himself, Dr. Timothy Leary, the psychodelics man, espouses the extreme of this philosophy, "Turn on, tune in, and drop out"; but I doubt that relying on chemicals is really a way of dropping out of our drug-ridden and technological society.)

We must remember that with the atom bombs there is a literal meaning to deserting the ship. This factor is always present in the background of the young. For instance, during the Cuban missile crisis I kept getting phone calls from college students asking if they should at once fly to New Zealand. I tried to calm their anxiety by opining that the crisis was only diplomatic manoeuvring, but I now think that I was wrong, for eyewitnesses of behaviour in Washington at the time tell me that there was a danger of nuclear war.

More generally, the psychology of apocalypse and the decision to go it alone are characteristic of waves of populism such as we are now surprisingly witnessing in the United States on the streets, in Sprout Hall, at Meetings of City Councils, and so forth. The rhetoric of the agrarian populism of the Eighties and Nineties was vividly apocalyptic, and that movement brought forth remarkable feats of co-operation and social invention. The current urban and student populism has begun to produce its own para-institutional enterprises, some of which are viable.

The practice of civil disobedience also must often be interpreted in terms of the psychology of apocalypse, but even sympathetic legal analysts of civil disobedience fail to take this into account. It is one thing to disobey a law because the authorities are in moral error on some point, in order to force a test case and to rally opposition and change the law. It is another thing to disobey authorities who are the Whore of Babylon and the Devil's thrones and dominions. In such a case the conscientious attitude may be not respect but disregard and disgust, and it may be more moral for God's creatures to go underground rather than to confront, especially if their theology does not include an article on paradise for martyrs. As a citizen of the uncorrupted polity in exile, it might be one's civil duty to be apparently lawless. There is a fairly clear-cut distinction between civil disobedience in a legitimate

order and revolution that may or may not prove its own legitimacy; but the politics and morality of apocalypse fall in-between and are ambiguous.

QUITE different, finally, is the psychology of those who unconsciously or consciously wish for catastrophe and work to bring it about. (Of course, for the best youth to desert the sinking ship also brings about disaster, by default.) The wish for a blow-up occurs in people who are so enmeshed in a frustrating system that they have no vitality apart from it; and their vitality in it is explosive rage.

Very poor people, who have "the culture of poverty," as Oscar Lewis calls it, are rarely so psychologically committed to a dominant social system that they need its total destruction. They have dreams of heaven but not of hellfire. A few exemplary burnings and beheadings mollify their vengeance. Their intellectual leaders, however, who are verbal and willy-nilly psychologically enmeshed in the hated system, might be more apocalyptic. For instance, Malcolm X once told me—it was before his last period, which was more rational and political—that he would welcome the atom bombing of New York to vindicate Allah, even though it destroyed his own community. James Baldwin is full of hellfire, but I have never heard much of it in popular religion.

On the whole, at present in the United States the psychology of explosive apocalypse is not to be found among rioting Negroes crying "Burn, baby, burn," nor among utopian beatniks on hallucinogens; it is to be found among people who believe in the system but cannot tolerate the anxiety of its not working out for them. Unfortunately, it is a pretty empty system and anxiety is widespread.

Most obviously there is the large group of people who have been demoted or are threatened with demotion, businessmen and small property owners who feel they have been pushed around; victims of inflation; displaced farmers; dissatisfied ex-soldiers; proletarians who have become petty bourgeois but are now threatened by automation or by Negroes invading their neighbourhoods. Consciously these people do not want a blow-up but power to restore the good old days; but when they keep losing out, they manifest an astounding violence and vigilantism and could become the usual mass base for fascism. In foreign policy, where imagination has freer rein, they are for pre-emptive first strikes, bombing China and so forth. I do not think this group is dangerous in itself—I do not think there is an important Radical Right in the United States—but it is a sounding board to propagate catastrophic ideas to more important groups.

My guess is that, under our bad urban conditions a more dangerous group is the uncountable number of the mentally ill and psychopathic hoodlums from all kinds of backgrounds. Given the rate of mental disease and the arming and training in violence of hundreds of thousands of young men, there is sure to be an increase of berserk acts that might sometimes amount to a reign of terror, and could create a climate for political enormities. Not to speak of organised Storm Troopers.

THE most dangerous group of all, however, is the established but anomic middle-class that I described previously. Exclusive, conformist, squeamish, and methodical, it is terribly vulnerable to anxiety. When none of its rational solutions work

out, at home or abroad, its patience will wear thin, and then it could coldly support a policy of doom, just to have the problems over with, the way a man counts to three and blows his brains out. But this cold conscious acceptance of a "rational solution" would not be possible if unconsciously there were not a lust for destruction of the constraining system as sober citizens excitedly watch a house burn down.

The conditions of middle-class life are exquisitely calculated to increase tension and heighten anxiety. It is not so much that the pace is fast—often it consists of waiting around and is slow and boring—but that it is somebody else's pace or schedule. One is continually interrupted. And the tension cannot be normally discharged by decisive action and doing things one's own way. There is competitive pressure to act a role, yet paradoxically one is rarely allowed to do one's best or use one's best judgment. Proofs of success or failure are not tangibly given in the task, but always in some superior's judgment. Spontaneity and instinct are likely to be gravely penalized, yet one in supposed to be creative and sexual on demand. All this is what Freud called civilization and its discontents. Wilhelm Reich showed that this kind of anxiety led to dreams of destruction, self-destruction, and explosion, in order to release tension, feel something and feel free.

A chronic low-grade emergency is not psychologically static. It builds up to and invites a critical emergency. But just as we are able to overlook glaring economic and ecological realities, so in our social engineering and system of education glaring psychological realities like anomie and anxiety are regarded almost as if they did not exist.

The psychological climate explains, I think, the peculiar attitude of the Americans toward the escalation of the Vietnam war. (At the time I am writing this, more bombs are being rained on that little county than on Germany at the peak of World War II, and there is talk of sending nearly a million men.) The government's statements of purpose are inconsistent week by week and are belied by its actions. Its predictions are ludicrously falsified by what happens. Field commanders lie and are contradicted by the next day's news. Yet a good majority continues to acquiesce with a paralyzed fascination. This paralysis is not indifference, for finally people talk about nothing else. One has the impression that it is an exciting attraction of a policy that it is doomed.

Reprinted from *The New York Review of Books* Copyright © 1966 *The New York Review*.

PUBLICATIONS

This feature is provided as a free service to our readers and to help the editor of small magazines by making their journals more widely known. It would help if editors would send a regular copy of their respective journals and it would be appreciated if they would reciprocate by featuring a notice about *Resurgence* in their own columns.

It is regretted that details of a number of journals already received have had to be held over for the next issue.

PUBLICATIONS

Editors of journals wishing to appear in this column are invited to send details to Resurgence, 22 Nevean Road, London, S.W.5, England.

VOLUNTARY ACTION (Formerly AVARD) Association of Voluntary Agencies for Rural Development. Gives a useful and detailed picture of development work on gandhian lines in India. Available from Housmans, 3/- post free.

THE PACIFIST The monthly journal of the Peace Pledge Union. Price 1/- from P.P.U., 6 Endsleigh Street, W.C.1.

NEW DEPARTURES International Review of literature and the arts. Editor Michael Horowitz, 29 Colville Terrace, London, W.11.

LIBERATION Monthly. Editor, Dave Dellinger, £2 p.a. from Housmans, 5 Caledonian Road, N.1.

WAR RESISTANCE Quarterly of the W.R.I. Price 1/6. 88 Park Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex.

THE ANGLO-WELSH REVIEW 8s. 6d. (\$1.50c) a yr; (80c) singles; 2 a yr; fiction, poetry, articles, art, reviews, criticism. Poetry competitions and anthologies regularly—details (stamped envelope, please) from Dock Leaves, Croft Terrace, Pembroke Dock, S. Wales.

EAST VILLAGE OTHER Newspaper with everything. 20c. or 1/6 fortnightly. 147 Ave. A., New York, NY 10009.

SANITY Formerly the viewspaper of Canadian C.N.D., Sanity is now the leading independent peace magazine of Canada. Published ten times yearly. Annual subscription \$3.50 (Air mail \$5.50) from 3837 St. Lawrence Boulevard, Montreal, Canada.

SMOKY HILL REVIEW 1 Poetry, fiction, reviews. Ed. Robert Day, Fort Hays, Kansas State College, Hays, Kansas 6701. \$1.00.

THE SCHOOL OF LIVING promotes decentralist answers, elimination of basic economic monopolies, and land-based family and community living. Published bi-monthly A way Out—\$4.00 a year; (32 page journal) and The Green Revolution, monthly newspaper, \$3.00 a year. **Go Ahead and Live!** counsel on decentralist living, \$4.00 book. Organised in 1936. Lanes End Homestead, Brookville, Ohio, U.S.A. 45309; Heathcote Community, Freeland, Maryland, U.S.A. 25103.

BB Bks thrice yearly book issues at cheap sub. rate, which includes the PM Newsletter. Seer poetry, psycho-experimental works etc. First-print limited editions. 10/6 for three postpaid. Available, **Deep Within This Book** . . . poems, mindplays, filmplays, peace therapy workings by Dave Cunliffe. Out in August, **A Song Of The Great Peace**, poetry/prose fragment guide/trip thru, before, beyond the mind by Tina Morris. Screeches Publications, 11 Clematis St., Blackburn, Lancs.

NEW CORNWALL Postal Subscriptions 8/-. Editors:—Richard and Ann Jenkin, 'An Gernyk', Leedstown, Hayle, Cornwall, G.B.

NEWS & VIEWS Journal of the Lancaster Peace Research Centre, Editor: Robin Jenkins—10/- per year from, 7 Common Garden St., Lancaster.

WIN Peace and Freedom through Non Violent Action. The monthly journal of U.S. Peace Activists. Price 25 cents (about two bob) from CNVA 5 Beekman St., Room 1033, New York, N.Y. 10038, U.S.A.

UNDERGROUND New Youth Peace Magazine. News, Poetry, Comment, Views, etc. Price 6d. copy (Monthly) or 4/- per dozen (+ postage). Available from 14 Tib Lane, Manchester 2, or Tony Everington, 494 Woolwich Road, London, S.E.14. Contributions to Tony Hetherington, 47 Teilo Street, Liverpool 8.

THE LIBERTARIAN A Common Wealth Publication. Four times a year. Price 1/- from W. J. Taylor, Scamps Court, Pilton St., Barnstaple.

SOIL ASSOCIATION NEWS Short practical articles on farming and gardening together with news for those who care about food and are worried about chemical cultivation. Available monthly from The Soil Association, New Bells Farm, Haughley, Stowmarket, Suffolk, price 1/-.

RESISTANCE Journal of Birmingham Committee of 100. Monthly 1/-. Editor Peter Neville, 12 South Grove, Erdington, Birmingham 23. **R.S.G. (Resistance Shall Grow)** Journal of London Committee of 100. Price 1/- monthly. Editor Douglas Kepper, 13 Goodwin Street, London, N.4.

TALKING POINTS Cyclostyled sheets of news, views and details of projected peace action from Peter Cadogan, National Secretary, Committee of 100, 5 Acton Way, Cambridge. No charge for this, Peter will add you to his mailing list for free but of course he won't refuse your donation.

for a young widow

Playing too happily
on the slippery mountainside,
my only son fell down and died.
I taught him to speak honestly
and without stalling come across,
but I did not teach him the cowardice
and the hesitation necessary
to live a longer life unhappily.

You see, girl, you ought not to
centre your affections so,
little short of idolatry
— a young man is untrustworthy,
in the morning satisfied
he gets up from your bed
and in the evening he is dead.

His mother and I did our best, Lord,
for Matty, and it was pretty good;
and he for twenty years gave us
the chance without our disappointment or remorse

But now this leaves us nothing
— to blame or regret; only this bawling
and the bright image that
around the grave his friends confabulate.

Paul Goodman

Ernest Bader

Peace in Industry

Pacem in Terris is a document that has already inspired two international peace conferences. The first in New York in 1965 and the second, earlier this year in Geneva when it clashed, appropriately enough, with the latest round of the Arab/Israeli war.

The conferences have been organised by the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions in California and Ernest Bader, the well known pacifist Quaker industrialist who founded the Scott Bader Commonwealth, attended the second and we publish here his contribution to the conference proceedings.

The encyclical letter of Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, clearly states that the problems of peace "are intimately bound up with the progress of human society." It specifically includes "the task of establishing new relationships in human society, under the mastery and guidance of truth, justice, charity and freedom." The spirit which is expressed in these principles gives a central place to "the needs of the whole man" and to an order based on moral law. This demands an organisation of industry in which "authority is before all else a moral force" and in which everybody can participate in accordance with his or her experience, knowledge and potentialities. The fundamental purpose of productivity is not mere multiplication of products, but the service of man.

"In the economic sphere," *Pacem in Terris* says, "it is evident that man has not only the inherent right to be given the opportunity to work, but also to be allowed the exercise of personal initiative in the work he does. The conditions in which a man works form a necessary corollary of these rights. They must not be such as to weaken his physical or moral fibre, or militate against his full development to manhood."

We cannot have peace between nations unless we have peaceful relations and a progressive growth of human solidarity especially in the economic spheres of life. While there are different ways to a peaceful social order, I am convinced that the kind of welfare-capitalism which we have developed in the West is incompatible with the spirit to which we, as Christians, owe allegiance. To speak about community without giving it a foundation in the daily work relationships of people is giving false witness. To speak about love while building up a system which disregards genuine human relationships and enmeshes all of us in a meaningless rat-race is equally false. And to speak about peace without attempting to realize justice and love in all our relationships is missing the main point.

As a conscientious objector, I searched for ways of contributing my share—however little that might be—towards a peaceful world imbued with the spirit of brotherhood and non-violence. As a businessman and founder of a growing and flourishing company, I decided that whilst refusing to supply our products for military purposes, we must find the right relations in our field of daily activity. As a result we have developed new ways of organising work, and we are attempting to realise the very objectives in business which *Pacem in Terris* indicates so clearly, namely truth, justice, charity and freedom.

Reading the "Summary of Events" leading up

to the Convocation, I was struck by the similarity of some of the ideas expressed regarding co-existence, to those which animate our venture. The 'Communal Bros.' which Paul Tillich mentioned, seems to me essential for a peaceful order. The spirit of Community and Belonging must come fully alive and be expressed in the actual relationships at work. We concluded that this calls for constructing a system in which "profit as the key motive for economic progress . . . and private ownership of the means of production as an absolute right without social obligation" (Pope Paul) are eliminated.

Many different methods for achieving this have been tried: profit sharing, employee shares, co-ownership and similar expedients. However, such attempts are quite insufficient to bring about real harmony and identity of interest between people in a factory and the means of production, or the way in which their work is organised. Such methods are no substitute for the lack of brotherhood among individuals in the economic process. Neither is it sufficient to neutralise ownership of the means of production or the invested capital, by setting up a Trust. Although by neutralising ownership, employees can feel that they no longer work for the private enrichment of the owners, this does not really awaken the concern of the workers for the general good of the enterprise, nor for the way their work is organised.

We feel that economic tension and strife can only be resolved on the principle of voluntary action and on leadership founded on approval and not compulsion, whether by the state, the employers, or the trade unions. "The dividing wall of partition" between the 'have's' and the 'have not's' at a time of crisis like the present, can only be removed by voluntary self-divestment on the part of those who wield power and privilege.

Since 1951 when the first decisive action in this direction was initiated, we have endeavoured to mobilise the goodwill of our co-workers in our enterprise, to increase their co-operation and sense of responsibility for the progress of our firm. This having been achieved to some degree, it became necessary that the capital invested in our enterprise should be administered by a separate legal body, the Scott Bader Commonwealth Ltd. This was done on the basis of a constitution which was thoroughly discussed and agreed upon by all concerned. Apart from deciding on the form of this organisation, the allocation and use of the profits was agreed upon in our General Meeting.

The conversion from private ownership to common ownership amounted to a metamorphosis of

our enterprise, not unlike a celebration of a marriage for good or ill—a breakthrough to material and spiritual gain in which everyone could share. To some it brought release from fear of want, others welcomed freedom from dominion of management on the one side and sometimes from unions on the other, whilst assuring greater efficiency and will to work throughout the firm. Henceforth everyone had a voice in the running of the daily affairs and a constitutional right to participation in profits, in the increasing assets from common efforts, full support during sickness and old age, and other fringe benefits.

Today we approach an entirely new world. For the first time in history it appears that with the coming of abundance and the age of nuclear power and cybernation, we can be confident and indeed even convinced that, given the right spirit of courage as a first condition, and a scrupulous care as to technical skills and constitutional structure in the second place, industrial communities of work will not only be able to exist and expand but might

well become pilot projects with stupendous consequences for the world of tomorrow.

And here is a hint which often crosses our minds when thinking of the tragic misconceptions about ownership in industry on both sides of the iron curtain :

“MAY IT NOT BE THAT, IF UNDERTAKEN GENEROUSLY AND WHOLEHEARTEDLY, THE RESPONSE TO THE CHALLENGE OF DEVELOPMENT WILL HELP TO ELIMINATE THE ABUSES AND EVEN ABERRATIONS BOTH OF CAPITALISM AND COMMUNISM, NARROWING THE GULF BETWEEN CONFLICTING IDEOLOGIES, TO PROVIDE A PLATFORM FOR DIALOGUE AND ACTION WITH ALL MEN OF GOODWILL FOR THE BUILDING-UP OF A BETTER WORLD ?” —

And when this happens it will be understood why I believe PEACE IN INDUSTRY IS THE KEY TO WORLD PEACE.

RESURGENCE AFFAIRS

A letter writer in the press recently referred to people who leave ‘party politics’ as ‘going into the political wilderness’. This quaint notion, that only inside our major political parties is there any worthwhile political activity dies hard, even though it is rapidly becoming almost a reversal of the real situation. It coincided incidentally with a report that during the past year the Labour party lost more than one twentieth of its individual membership, a sign to be welcomed, not because of any ill-will towards that organisation, but because it indicates the possibility that many more people are at last coming to see the need for a drastically new approach towards the major problems of our time.

Not least is there an awareness that it is in the very workings of our political system, the nature of the parties themselves and the assumptions upon which they are based, assumptions about a mass basis organization, about the subordination of individuals to machines (in this case bureaucratic ones) and the denial of liberty implicit in the workings of a system based on a hunger of leaders for more power over others, that our problems have their roots.

There are increasing numbers, especially among the more ardent and idealistic of the younger generation, who would never dream today of entering party politics at all. They might flirt briefly with a Student Labour Club, or the Young Liberals, but on the whole they are helping to swell the growing ranks of the anarchist movement, or they opt for flower power, drop out, drugs and other forms of hedonistic negativism.

Many of them share a rather naive assumption that as people get the message about the futility and freakishness of the present political set up they only have to practice love and charity towards one another, and explore themselves more with the help of drugs, for our problems to resolve themselves.

They won't of course. There are hard, positive reasons why we are in a mess today, reasons susceptible to rational analysis and resolution;

something has gone badly awry with the heritage of law and custom we have inherited and if we want to bequeath a sounder structure to our posterity we cannot afford to abandon the tools of reason, analysis and perception in favour of some psychedelic freak-out.

Our social institutions need to be recast if they are not to afflict us with the most terrible disasters. This is a task which must always be done with love and passion, indeed the search for new social forms which will enable such virtues to be practised is now one of the major preoccupations of decent men everywhere. In the pages of *Resurgence* we are seeking to explore new forms where human rather than other relationships are dominant. Our approach suggests a need for a smaller scale of organisation in nearly every direction; inevitably perhaps, bearing in mind our readership is growing all the time, we are apt to sound repetitive, and for this we ask indulgence. But to people who want peace and decency to prevail we seek to offer a constructive and hopeful basis for a new order of civilisation. Its elements are seen in almost any newspaper as a varied and increasing number of groups campaigning against the growing abuse of political power as it afflicts their lives in one form or another. Those who campaign against ministerial presumption in fluoriding their drinking water, against ill treatment of gypsies, of institutionalised children or old people, who campaign against the siting of an airport in Essex, or for local rights in Cornwall, Wales, Scotland, the Orkneys, the Isle of Man or anywhere else, have far more in common than they appear to realise. They are the advance guard of a wholly new order of things the full nature of which cannot be predicted because human beings everywhere are assuming themselves the burden of creating it.

To leave the aridity and barrenness of ‘party politics’ in order to share in this task, far from going into a wilderness, is to leave one behind and, by comparison, to make a positive move towards the promised land.

The Breakdown of Nations

By Leopold Kohr, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957; 240 pp., New York: Rinehart, 1957 — 8 maps, 30s.

How much does sheer size, and the power relations that arise out of it, affect the conduct of human affairs? This is the question that Professor Kohr sets out to answer in this pioneering book. Although he does not reach a final answer, and although not all of his arguments are fully convincing, he succeeds in bringing up issues that we continue to neglect at our peril. This is an important book, and in the ten years since its publication, it has lost none of its importance; indeed some recent political developments that would generally be considered retrogressive (such as the weakening of central power in India or the establishment of Biafra), are when seen from the viewpoint of Kohr's ideas, commendable and encouraging.

Kohr does not attempt any formal proof of his view that there is an upper limit to the viable size of human groups. He argues mainly by analogy, and includes many anecdotes and examples. He is far from hopeful that his suggestions will find acceptance, and there is a certain wry cynicism running through the book, which culminates in the condensation of a chapter entitled “Will It Be Done?” to the single statement, “No !”. But this is not the end of the book, and it must not be the end of the investigation of the ideas that Kohr sets out to explore. Compared with many political tracts, this book makes easy, enjoyable reading, and it certainly deserves the serious continuing consideration of all students of politics—and, of course, of the politicians themselves.

That Professor Kohr's ideas do not yet have a large following may be due, in part, to the manner in which he presents his case. As Anatol Murad says, in an introduction to a second book by Kohr,¹

“Professor Kohr writes with wit and humour, with sarcasm and satire. From this, an academic pedant may possibly get the impression that the arguments are not serious. To confuse the humorous with the trifling is a common error. Yet some of the most profound truths have been couched in satire and presented in a humorous vein . . .

“(furthermore) Professor Kohr launches many of his ideas in a tentative way, without complete verification . . . but (they) should certainly not be lightly discarded merely because . . . empirical proof has not yet been forthcoming in sufficiently conclusive quantities. As Professor Kohr says, his purpose in advancing a new idea is to *start* a discussion, not to say the last word about it . . .

“For two decades this theory was developed and discussed only *extra muros*, so to speak

¹“The Overdeveloped Nations” (not yet published in English).

REVIEWS

This fate (it) shares with many other new ideas . . . which had to wait as pariahs outside the walls before eventually being admitted as honoured newcomers to the inner circle. One thinks of Pasteur's germ theory of disease, . . .” —

an apt comparison, for medicine at the time of Pasteur was as full of irrational notions as is politics today.

A large part of “The Breakdown of Nations” consists of arguments from many angles showing how it is the smaller units of human social organisations that function best. Thus, in the chapter on “The Glory of the Small,” we find :

“The citizen of a small state is not *by nature* either better or wiser than his counterpart in a large power. He, too, is a man full of imperfections, ambitions, and social vices. But he lacks the power with which he could gratify them in a dangerous manner . . .

“Thus Wolf Dietrich, a famous prince-archbishop of Salzburg—to give one of a myriad of examples—reputedly put the torch to his cathedral as Goering did to the Reichstag, not to create an issue, however, but to build a monument to his taste that should outlast the victories of Alexander. With no chance of enlarging his possessions, his aggressiveness was diverted into the construction of a magnificent Renaissance cathedral whose façade became the incomparable backdrop of *Everyman*, the still flourishing attraction of the Salzburg festivals. His successors built other churches, all wholly unnecessary but each more beautiful than the other, blew tunnels through rocks, hewed theatres out of the mountainsides, built lovely fountains and gorgeous marble pools in which their horses could bathe in the heat of summer, and lovingly created enchanting forest castles for their fertile mistresses. They turned Salzburg, the tiny capital of a state of less than two hundred thousand inhabitants, into one of the world's architectural gems. This is nothing, of course, compared with the construction of autostradas, Maginot and Siegfried lines, battle cruisers, rockets, or atom bombs, producible only in large powers, which, because they *can* produce them, seem to be driven into producing nothing else.”

Essential to the creativeness thus described is the rivalry between a multitude of small, militarily weak states, each trying to out-do the other in cultural achievement. Today, the remaining smaller states seem desirous only of aping the socially disastrous material accomplishments of the great powers, producing mini-deterrents, where they cannot manage the real thing, and threatening (or indeed trying) to annihilate each other with the worst weapons they can muster. One begins to wonder whether technology has perhaps permanently perverted human character, so that even a return to a small state system would fail to restore culturally constructive activities. But certainly such

a change could not make the situation any worse.

The greatest of the small state cultures—Ancient Greece, Renaissance Italy, and (the first) Elizabethan England—flourished during periods when these states were at the height of their *small scale* imperialist expansion; thus the excellence of these cultures is often considered to have been the by-product of imperialism. However, Kohr would claim that such a worthy by-product can occur only in the case of smaller societies, and certainly the massive empires of France, Britain, America and Russia (and now China)—not to mention Rome—have produced little of really outstanding value in any of the arts.

Economics

Besides a fine presentation of the cultural arguments, Kohr includes intriguing discussions of many other aspects of smallness. One of the areas in which he succeeds most strikingly in showing the value of reduced size is, surprisingly, in economics. His arguments go a long way toward de-bunking the widely accepted belief in the efficiency of bigness, pointing out how much of the effort expended in giant corporations and conglomerations of humanity is required only to combat the effects of size. Thus Kohr makes one realise how mass production and mass marketing increasingly reduce the actual use value of much of what is produced, while prices are raised in order to benefit non-productive parasites such as advertisers, distributors, and business tycoons. A recent decision of the United States Supreme Court* confirms Kohr's thesis, by showing that the trend to bigness and monopoly is propelled by advantages in advertising, and unfair price-cutting, rather than by any increase in productive efficiency.

Transportation is an obvious example of the costs of size, as we are driven to expend such a ridiculous amount of time and energy on the production of vehicles and roadways to move masses of people and material, whereas rational, decentralized living could give a much more productive, rewarding, and leisured life quite close to home—and with much less dependence upon remote resources. Kohr's sardonic comments on the pointlessness of modern, high-speed travel between identical agglomerations of humanity spotted around the globe, as compared with the richness of a fifty mile journey in bygone days, shows as clearly as anything in the book the folly of our continuing pursuit of unity, vastness, and centralization.

Breakdown and Federation

Kohr includes specific suggestions for the *painless* dismantling of Europe's larger nations so as to bring into being a federation of the smaller historical units, including such states of ancient lineage as Wales, Normandy, Alsace, Saxony, Bavaria, Lombardy, Naples, and a couple of score more. The extension of his approach might ultimately bring about a world federation containing a few hundred small states, which could evolve from a drastic revision of the United Nations. However, Kohr, limits himself primarily to the problem of breaking apart the larger power units into their original, more manageable components, and argues

that their subsequent federation would then be relatively simple. With minority feeling rising in so many parts of the world, with Africa and India tending to revert to their pre-colonial small-state format, with even England's oldest colonies, Wales and Scotland, and the Isle of Man, seeking to re-assess their identity and independence, why do so few people recognize the need for a general move in this direction? It even seems possible that, if the Cold War tension were removed, centrifugal tendencies would also act to break down the giant Communist powers.

Kohr takes pains to dispel the common fears that an anarchic arrangement of independent small states would bring continual bloody conflict. He points out that conflicts which occurred in the small state Europe of the Middle Ages were usually on a minute scale, even if relatively frequent, and could nearly always be locally settled, leaving the vast majority undisturbed in their peaceful pursuits. Also, the mere division back into historically distinct peoples can eliminate one frequent cause of strife, the subordination of minorities. Furthermore, a quite small amount of federal power could control conflicts with relative ease, once a federation of small states was established. When looking at the Middle East today, one wonders whether Kohr made enough allowance for the evolution of modern weaponry, and its effect on conflicts between small nations. Presumably, however, a small state world, without a smoldering Cold War, would exclude a situation where big powers lavish terrible weapons on to small antagonistic states; and there cannot be many situations, present or potential where small states harbour sufficient resentment against their neighbours to cause them to undertake the sacrifices needed to produce modern weapons on their own, at least on the scale used in recent wars.

Kohr also includes examples and maps of successful and unsuccessful federations of the past and present (and a fascinating map of all the original small states of Europe), and points out that failure has nearly always occurred where the federations incorporated one or two excessively large (cancerous!) units. Thus, in his view, the recent split in the Nigerian federation was predictable because of the inclusion of one state that was much bigger than all the rest; belatedly, Nigeria tried to form twelve more equal smaller units, and after the present blood-letting, a solution may be found along these lines. The most successful federations, like the United States and Switzerland, have contained many units, each only a small part of the whole; they have remained together in spite of heterogeneous populations with varied and diverse interests. The most fearful failure of all resulted from an attempt to include Prussia in a federated Germany: that oversized unit devoured the rest in pursuit of "unity", and then started on a rampage of "unifying" conquest that led to three terrible wars. With Prussia excised, a more stable Germany remains—but, of course, the passion for unity, like cancer, could recur. There is oversimplification, perhaps, in this case, if seen as a failure in federation. But as an example of how power leads to aggression, it is but one of many obvious examples throughout history; in this context Professor Kohr discusses and discards several other theories of aggression in order to stress the danger of sheer power.

Indeed, probably the most convincing and at the same time disturbing part of Kohr's book is the

description of what he calls the "power theory of aggression": nation states that have grown in relative power to a point where they cannot be deterred by any balancing power, *automatically* commence an aggressive policy. Kohr indicates that the United States was already (1957) close to this situation, and, regardless of its type of government and pretensions to democracy, nothing would stop its imperialistic expansion—except, perhaps, the precarious balancing power of others, notably the U.S.S.R. Ten years have now made this United States trend to expansion quite obvious, although the fact that the power used is primarily economic, and only secondarily military tends to conceal the extent of the expansion from all but the more perceptive observers; it may not be many more years before it is clear for all to see that the "free world's" economy is largely controlled by United States business, and brings the most benefit to United States corporations—at the ultimate expense of the poorer peoples, of course. But the balancing imperialist pattern of the Communist world is hardly more defensible.

Kohr indicates that a balance of power may be restraining the imperialism of both sides, but is scarcely stable; and it can never become stable in terms of the 'balance' of a few huge units. What he calls for, then, is a restoration of the old balance of power system that prevailed in Europe until it succumbed to Napoleon, (to be later restored as a balance of *big* powers, whose instability brought disaster). Furthermore, Kohr's suggestion that a stable federation requires a large number of small units, controlled by a federal authority of only moderate strength, is a re-formulation of the old Roman maxim of "divide and rule," (which, after all, was also responsible for the success of the late unlamented British Empire, as is now clear when the British leave one pathetic divided mess after another in their inglorious withdrawal). Kohr admits this lack of novelty, but claims that it is still sensible to divide human society, leaving any ruling that is done to the mutual interest of all the states, rather than to an imperial, unifying power centre. He has to admit, also, that the stability of a small state world, once attained, could not be guaranteed; the history of big power formation could easily be repeated, leading, perhaps, to a cyclical pattern. Hence he stresses that division is more important than union, since the natural tendency seems to have been toward the latter. He maintains that whenever the world does return to a condition of small, relatively independent states, civilisation will flower, and human life will be at its best.

Problems and Prospects

His recognition of instability, together with his fondness for analogies that relate only distantly to his topic, have left Professor Kohr open to criticism from unsympathetic readers who are perhaps looking for neat, final solutions. Certainly, Kohr's selection of examples is by no means faultless. Sometimes he is very convincing, as when he says, "A small state has the same governmental problems as the most monumental power on earth, even as a small circle has the same number of degrees as a large one. But what in the latter cannot be discerned by an army of statisticians and specialized interpreters could be perceived by every leisurely stroller in Ancient Athens." At other times, as in his chapter on "The Physics of Politics," he

is making some pretty tenuous analogies from quite tentative theories regarding the natural limits of size in things like stars and atoms. Although it could hardly be as dangerous, this kind of analogy from natural science to social science is rather too reminiscent of the distorted use of Darwin's theories of "the survival of the fittest" by the Nazis to justify their racial theories.

Besides including some arguments of dubious relevance "The Breakdown of Nations" does leave untouched several important problems that somehow have to be faced if mankind is to survive. Primary among them is the desperate race to supply the means of livelihood to a world population that is now doubling every generation. A humane approach to checking this growth, and the prevention of starvation and misery may well require all the co-operative effort that can be brought to bear. Granted that the present disgraceful waste on arms, and extravagant living by the rich is a disaster in itself, and probably does result from the excessive concentration of power, one wonders whether dismantling the ties within the larger groupings could be accomplished now without a lessening of ability to help the rest of mankind. This does not need to be the case, of course, and perhaps a coming together at the top will accompany a breaking apart at the bottom, as Kohr implies. Certainly many poor people of the world would be better off if their governments broke all connections with the exploiting nations than they now are as they struggle against the limits of their inherited environment, and against native and foreign privilege as well. However, unless there is full co-operation amongst an emerging multitude of new independent states, each with very much reduced power, it is not easy to see how the terrible inequalities of wealth that now exist and persist are ever going to be removed without widespread and violent conflict.

But, despite its tentative nature, the path suggested by Professor Kohr in "The Breakdown of Nations" is among the most hopeful of any that have ever been proposed—however unlikely it is that men can be persuaded to follow it. Those who do see, already, that the dreadful dangers now threatening mankind are mainly due to the abuse of power by the over-centralized accumulations of power to which we now submit, must consider most seriously Kohr's suggestions of ways to dismantle them, and how to build anew—on a more human scale.

That Kohr is no longer alone in seeing our fundamental problem as one of size is indicated by the following comparison which was made recently by Dr. Desmond Morris, in *The Radio Times* (May 25th, 1967):

"... animals adjust their numbers to fit their environment. Our own increasing population problems are acute because as a species we are not equipped to live in large numbers. We lived in small tribes for millions of years, but in the last few thousand years we have flourished so successfully that our cultural organization cannot cope. Thus we get mobs out of control and such horribly unique animal conduct as large-scale war. I feel sorry for politicians and religious leaders because they are struggling to control a situation too big for the species."

The more one considers Kohr's proposals, the more sense they seem to make. In my view, we have to limit not only the power of nations, through breaking them down into smaller states, but also

*see Consumer Reports (U.S.A.), July 1967, p. 360, "The Clorox Case".

the power of individuals and groups within nations. Many drastic changes are needed, and most involve reducing the power that arises out of the control of productive resources (by individuals and corporations, as well as by nations). Where control of resources gives extensive power over other people's lives, by political means, or economic, it is bound to bring abuses. The power must be levelled *right down*. Isn't that what democracy really means?

To reduce the power, to bring democratic control—"participatory democracy"—we have to reduce the scale. We have to arrange the essential business of living into units of a size that fits our human capabilities.* This is Kohr's message; may it be heeded in time.

ROGER FRANKLIN.

Political Parties

By Robert Michels, Published by The Free Press, New York, 1966, 370 pp. \$2.45.

Freudians claim that we all have strong inbuilt defence mechanisms which impel us to 'forget', and then ignore, aspects of reality which we would otherwise find distressing, unpleasant or even merely uncomfortable. This must surely explain the fate that has attended Robert Michels' vitally important contribution to political theory, "Political Parties." It first appeared in German in 1906, translations were made into French, Italian and Japanese, and in 1915 the first English edition appeared. This incidentally was a most appropriate time for the publication of a work attacking the foundations of social democratic political theory. In 1913 the Socialist International meeting at Stuttgart proclaimed that in the event of a war they, the workers of the world, would have no part in it, it would be a war between rival capitalist interests and the workers would not be guilty of killing one another in consequence. Scarcely a year later, when war broke out, all the socialist parties became ardent militaristic patriots overnight and their members proceeded to kill one another by the million in one of the most meaningless wars in history.

The tragedy of the intellectual confusion revealed here, (a confusion all the more tragic when one reflects how easily the famous Stuttgart resolution could have been adhered to and what enormous suffering would have been averted if it had not been so readily abandoned), might have been avoided if any notice at all had been taken of what Michels was saying.

His message is very clear and simple—the masses are incapable of governing themselves and are largely indifferent to their own political concerns. For this reason leaders arise who have a firm grip on the reins of power through their control of the bureaucratic machine which any mass organisation inevitably produces. By this means the leaders perpetuate a form of rule which is not democratic and which is fundamentally and inevitably oligarchic. In short, mass organisation, through bureaucracy, means oligarchy.

This principle explains at once the failure of the social democratic leaders to make a stand for peace in 1914, it explains why Lenin inevitably became a dictator after the overthrow of the social democrat Kerensky (another oligarch), and paved the way for the Stalinist terror; it explains the mystery of MacDonald's long and inept rule of the Labour Party in Britain, it explains the portentous failure of the general strike as a weapon of revolution in every country that tried it (in each instance it was betrayed by its 'leaders'), it explains the failure of the old left, the left, the keep left, the new left and now the new May Day Manifesto Left, it explains the transformation of Aneurin Bevan from being the hallowed embodiment of all the socialist strivings of his time into an intemperant anti-nuclear disarmament figure of the establishment, as well as the transformation of sure-footed Harold Wilson from the high minded devotee of the socialist principle that people should not pay for their false teeth, into the head of one of the most reactionary, supine, cowardly and mischievous administrations Britain has had in the modern era. Not least, it explains why that government is full of the stars of the old 'Keep Left' brigade who, despite the arms build up, the polaris launchings, the infamy of Porton and the genocidal wickedness of the Vietnam war, keep publicly silent on these issues in their preoccupation with problems of road safety, housing, widows' pensions and so forth.

More than anything it helps to explain the almost total lack of basic principle that informs the activities of social democratic parties today, their confusion, their lack of honest purpose and the benumbing shoddiness of their working assumptions. 'Let's Go With Labour' was the much placarded fatuity during Britain's last general election. Where we were going did not matter, we were clearly going towards another era of monster wars and social disaster, but never mind, let's go! And how appropriate that we should go with the Wilsonian smoothies rather than with Heath's, for more than anything it is the moral betrayal implicit in Labour's lust for power which has made any clear appreciation of the alternative road we must take so difficult to achieve.

Michels, despairing of democracy, subsequently became a fascist, receiving a plum academic post under Mussolini which he retained until his death in 1936. He despaired of democracy because of his failure to question one of the factors in his equation, the masses. He failed to see that the masses were a product of the oligarchic introduction of machines. Had that initiation been effected on the basis of democratic ownership and control, people would not have been driven from the land to form pauperised masses in city slums, instead we might today be enjoying the fruits of small, independent, self-governing, vital and culturally rich agro-industrial towns and villages. These communities might have developed and enlarged on the wonderful traditions of the renaissance, and for every Mozart, Bach and Beethoven then, to take only one sphere, we might have had fifty today; instead we are in danger of being overwhelmed by the deathly blight of mass urbanism, which is helping to choke all forms of art and morally responsive creativity to their roots.

The reasons why Michels' book has received so little attention are not of course simply subjective, although his emphasis on the inevitability of oligarchy remains a truism far too uncomfortable for most workers' leaders to give it serious attention.

In no real sense did he attempt to prove his theory. In politics this is not always possible anyway. Only the impersonal forces of history can provide the kind of data that enables the political scientist to amass enough evidence to prove or disprove a general principle, and Michels, drawing freely on his social democratic background, was writing at a time before the totally catastrophic consequences of a mechanised mass society had shown themselves. Instead, by building up his case from the evidence around him, he left his readers with little choice but either to stick to their 'democratic' principles regardless and make the best of a bad job, (an argument doubtless echoed by Wilson and Co. today), or to despair, as Michels did, of the masses altogether and seek progress through avowedly totalitarian forms of manipulation. In the event either conclusion seemed to be leading to "1984" and the task today of anybody with any radical pretensions at all is to seek an alternative that doesn't.

Michels makes it clear he is not concerned to formulate a theory, but simply to examine and explain the forces at work. He shows how in a mass party very few members have the time, far less the inclination, or even the ability, to keep a close watch on the workings of their party machine; most of them, indeed, are almost completely indifferent. This vacuum of interest is readily filled by the leaders and the functionaries, and the main struggle inside the party is then conducted in terms of what we now call a public relations exercise. The significance of what this or that leader does, or says, or thinks, becomes minimal beside the 'image' of how that can be projected.

Michels was familiar with a scale of mass party operations considerably smaller than the scale that often prevails today. But even he was quick to see the technical reasons which made any form of direct democracy impossible and why in consequence there was 'an iron law of oligarchy'. He explains how this 'iron law' is buttressed by the cult of leadership, how the machine is able to play on the credulity and loyalty of the members, how the machine creates its own traditions of bureaucratic prerogative and place keeping, and how these factors are strengthened by the power implicit in a centralised party administration as well as by the personal ambitions of local leaders and back bench M.P.'s, the influence of party newspapers and so on.

Michels illustrates his work with a wealth of illustrative detail, a great deal of which is now, of course, out of date. But the lessons he draws are more topical (and urgent) than ever and history has amply justified all his principles except one. He believed, and this was a cardinal error which led to his fascism, that some form of mass organisation was inevitable. He does not even discuss the possibility of a form of government where the mass is replaced by numerous self-governing groups. Unconsciously he was accepting the assumptions of the classical economists, who in turn never appeared to grasp that their marginal utility theories which accepted 'labour' as simply a factor of production were a form of moral impudence when applied to a small community, and a one-way track to totalitarianism when applied to a large one.

The real mystery of Michels' book is this. If he is right, and history has surely proved him so, then the working assumptions of the Labour Party, the

Fabian Society, the Trade Unions, the Co-operative Movement, *The New Statesman* and Harold Wilson are all profoundly wrong. All of them believe, or appear to, that democracy by means of mass organisation is the only fit and proper way to run our affairs. Michels says they are wrong and explains why in a manner which in more than half a century has yet to be refuted.

A whole generation of political effort has bogged down on a simple refusal to face up to what Michels had to say, and in the event mankind has paid dearly for this failure. Millions of people, beset by a gnawing sense of anxiety and frustration, have no rational explanation of the forces that are rapidly reducing them to a state of passive acquiescence to such affronts to human conscience as nuclear weapons; they see no way of countering these forces and they are devoid of any vision or hope for the future. Such attempts as they have made to get to grips with their situation have ended always in defeat and frequently in betrayal. Their leaders could not but betray them, as Michels makes clear, and if they had hearkened to him fifty years ago we might today have a genuine alternative to the blind and blundering giants of capitalism, communism and socialism. The alternative would not have come from the Trotskyists, or the Henry Georgists, or the Socialist Party of Great Britain or any of the numerous shrill, stale fringe-group panaceas that now distract one another, if nobody else, and which is all that remains of the great debates of the last century. It would have come from an awareness that genuinely ameliorative social power can only operate effectively when it is in the hands of the people themselves. Since there are stark limits to the size of a group in which that power can be used democratically and without Michel's 'Iron Law of Oligarchy' coming into play, it follows inexorably that those units must be modest in size. Whether such units are run on communist or capitalist lines is an important but secondary question. We must not be too hard on our grandparents for failing to see this. Michels himself failed to see it and today this failure has fathered much of the cynicism and despair that surrounds us.

JOHN PAPWORTH.

DIGGING THE ROOTS OF WAR . . .

you know about

- . . . the farmer who locked the barn door after the horse was stolen
—like the people who "protest the war" after the shooting starts;
- . . . the one who poultices her cancer sore, yet never alters her nutrition to correct her unbalanced body-chemistry
—like the pacifists who form "peace groups" instead of changing the body-politic;
- . . . those who time after time feed and house the victims of the river flood, instead of planting trees and cover crops at the headwater to prevent the floods
—like those who protest the savage atrocities of governments in Vietnam instead of getting rid of government, and stopping the legal leaks of rent and interest which cause the flood of war.

ECONOMICS OF PEACE helps uncover root causes of war and suggests basic activities for elimination of war. Send 2/- (25c) to School of Living, Brookville, Ohio, U.S.A.

*With modern technology, the proper unit size can be much larger than that of the Greek city states, but not nearly as large as we now have in many places today. This is a topic discussed at length in a brilliant chapter of Kohr's second book.

Quotes . . .

Technologically, we in Western Europe and North America have achieved man's historic goal: the feasibility of material security for everybody. But socially and culturally, we are mired in the attitudes, institutions, and values of the barbarous past. Despite the potentialities of complete human freedom, we live in the concrete actuality of material insecurity, amid a subtle and increasingly oppressive organised system of personal coercion. Hypocrisy pervades every pore of advanced industrial society. Above all, we live in a society of fear, be it of war or dehumanisation.

ROGER BARNARD.

Round House Dialectics,
"New Society,"
August 3rd, 1967.

"Jesus said

*I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life
What else would one expect Him to say?
I am a false path, a lie, and death?
What would one say one's self?
If one is not some false way, a lie, and death,
one must be what Jesus said he was.
If we are not Christ, who are we?"*

R. D. LAING.

"appearances and disappearances"
FIRE, No. 1, July 1967.

"The end result of complete cellular representation is cancer. Democracy is cancerous, and bureaus are its cancer. A bureau takes root anywhere in the state, turns malignant like the Narcotics Bureau, and grows and grows, always reproducing more of its own kind, until it chokes the host if not controlled or excised, Bureaus cannot live without a host, being true parasitic organisms. (A co-operative on the other hand can live without the state. That is the road to follow. The building up of the independent units to meet needs of the people who participate in the functioning of the unit. A bureau operates on opposite principle of inventing needs to justify its existence.) Bureaucracy is wrong as a cancer, a turning away from the human evolutionary direction of infinite potentials and differentiation and independent spontaneous action, to the complete parasitism of a virus. Bureaus die when the structure of the state collapses. They are as helpless and unfit for independent existences as a displaced tapeworm, or a virus that has killed the host."

WILLIAM S. BURROUGHS.

"The Naked Lunch."

The experts have all kinds of standards by which they judge the degree of civilisation of a people. In the African traditional society the test is this. How does that society treat its old people and, indeed, all its members who are not useful and productive in the narrowest sense? Judged by this standard, the so-called advanced societies have a lot to learn which the so-called backward societies could teach them.

KENNETH D. KAUNDA.
(President of Zambia)

"Humanism in Zambia."
Issued by Zambia House,
London, 1967.

Wanted: An Economic Backbone for the Peace Movement

Many peace activists have long been aware of the need to set peace action in a wider context than one of immediate concern with violence and war. If, as is frequently asserted, there are important sources of violence in the nature of many of our social institutions, or in the assumptions on which they are operated, then clearly radical pacifists need to ask (and answer) the question, what alternative forms of social organisation should we promote? The importance of this discussion can scarcely be emphasised too much; we are glad to publish this contribution to it and we should be grateful if readers would send us their comments.

The time has come for the Peace Movement to outgrow the stage of teenage rebellion and protest against the father-figure of the State, and to create practical alternatives. We are not going to conquer the Warfare State and bring about the Non-Violent Society by marching, sitting down, immobilising our organizers for months on end through imprisonment, or by filling the coffers of the State with our fines. War and the Bomb are, after all, the climax of a long process and way of life, the roots of which are to be found in everyday attitudes and social-economic relations.

We cannot really be free or effective in waging a struggle for peace when we are financially under the control of employers and landlords. The time has come for us to create our own economic and social set-up in the form of working models of the kind of society we wish to see developing. These pilot projects would incorporate our values and ideals, and would influence more by example than would thousands of speeches, leaflets etc.

The excuse that no money is available to initiate such shops, workshops, community houses, and other projects and ventures, is a rather weak one when we consider the cost of demonstrations (C.N.D. spent £1,732 on the last Easter March alone, with nothing to show for it after it was over), the hundreds of pounds paid in fines, the potential sums of money we are not getting because we have no constructive projects to offer (money which was forthcoming to set up the Factory for Peace, for instance), and potential voluntary work available if we mobilized to create something useful. Moreover, all of us, however limited our means are consumers. We find the money to pay our rent, food, clothes, leisure, etc. A lot of this money goes as profits to vested interests, when it could go to the peace movement if these goods and services were provided by it. Again, most of us are workers, but we do not get the full equivalent of our work in cash; part of it is transformed into profits for employers. Here, then, are two avenues by which capital is drained from us to fill the pockets of the Establishment. Such funds could have gone for peace work had we been working in economic ventures initiated by the peace movement. Without economic teeth we are like a dog who barks but cannot bite. The public and the Establishment know this, that is why they do not take us too seriously.

The way to become an effective force is to pool our labour power, skills and resources to initiate

our own economic ventures, which would then supply our supporters with essential goods and services. This would be more creative than pursuing the worn-out paths of agitation in a vacuum. To those who say that this is a far-fetched programme, I would say that this is less far-fetched than trying to defeat the financial-military complex with bare hands and controlled pockets. We cannot fight an economic system geared to war unless we can set up the beginnings of an economic system of our own geared to peace. Pious exhortations will not earn us the support of the average man and woman. However, if we can provide people with creative work and community living, they will listen to what we have to say, respect us for it, and consider the alternatives.

Only within such a context does refusal to pay taxes for war (by remaining below taxable level or by registering as Charities) become possible and effective. How can a son rebel against his cruel father when he has to go back to ask him for spending money? How can we ask workers to give up their jobs in war industries when we have no jobs in the peace industries to offer them?

According to a number of surveys, the man in the street places the issues of defence last on his list of priorities. He is much more concerned with day-to-day and bread-and-butter issues such as employment, accommodation, cost of living, pensions etc. If we are to gain his allegiance, we must start where *he* is and show him a way out (in deeds, not words), not impose upon him a debate he finds irrelevant to his immediate problems.

As for the excuse that we are short of manpower to initiate such projects, this is putting the cart before the horse. No-one suggested we should carry all the burden for each project. However, once we have launched it, we are very likely to find that we have involved a number of people interested in that particular scheme who were previously not involved in traditional forms of peace protest, because they felt this was getting us nowhere. Once these citizens are thus activated and see a practical, limited goal which they can attain, they can then take over part of the responsibility for the project, freeing our activists for other ventures.

Let those of us who think solely of concentrating on the Bomb or on anti-military agitation between this issue and the social-economic foundation get on with our flank attack without hindrance or recrimination. Both approaches are necessary and complementary. There is more than one path to

the mountain top. The structures we are up against are complex ones and need to be tackled by a multi-sided involvement. In this experimental field only a dogmatic person would declare that this method is the right one and attempt to stifle other forms of expression.

COMMUNITY ENTERPRISE

The time has come for the peace movements to start their own businesses, which would be the economic expression of their ideas. It is a historical fact that organisations, churches etc., which have grown in influence also own land, buildings and assets of various kinds, and can offer their supporters more than just words and noble principles. Moral and ideological power goes hand in hand with material self-sufficiency and financial means. As peace activities are financially non-productive and create a constant drain on funds, and as collections, donations etc. cannot guarantee a sufficient and regular income, the shortage of funds has got to be solved by the setting up of business ventures. These should further peace activities, not only financially but ideologically as well.

Another reason why the peace movements should control business projects is that it is unfair to ask supporters to campaign and struggle for peace and then, when their employers put them out of a job for such activities, to regretfully apologise to the supporter by saying that the peace bodies are unable to offer him employment. This is particularly painful when the peace worker has a family to support. It is also a sad state of affairs when the peace movement loses many useful skills which its peace workers have to sell to employers who exploit them and who are indifferent or hostile to the peace movement. Such talents are often wasted because the peace worker is too busy earning his bread and butter elsewhere to free himself for effective work in the peace movement.

Here then are some projects which are essential if the peace movement is to develop:—

International Friendship Houses

This is a must in view of the increasing inter-European tourist activity in general, and exchanges between European peace movements (within the context of the international peace movement) in particular. There is a growing need for communication between the peace movements of various countries to enable a free flow of ideas, information, facilities and co-operation in regional and international projects. Therefore, in every European country where a strong peace movement exists, there should be an International Friendship House which would act as a peace centre and hostel, and include a conference room, a peace library and other facilities.

This could be co-operatively owned by peace organisations, trade unions and sympathetic bodies (political, cultural and social), and would be run for profit. Its function would be to provide visiting delegates and goodwill ambassadors from other countries with sleeping accommodation and meals on a self-service basis, at reasonable prices. It would also provide them with assembly and conference facilities. It would stimulate international exchanges of students, young people, members of Peace, Cultural, Trade Union and Progressive organisations, by reducing rates for such groups. In any case, even prices for free-lance tourists should be competitive. Accommodation should

consist of dormitories for young and single people, as well as private rooms for couples and families. Such a centre can cement international contacts and friendships, particularly between Eastern and Western Europe, a very potent weapon against the Cold War.

Youth C.N.D. (2 Carthusian Street, London, E.C.1) has already taken the first step by launching "Project 67", which is designed to encourage young C.N.D. supporters under the age of 30 to establish personal contacts with young people in Yugoslavia, Poland, Denmark, Israel and East/West Germany. Such a service would be desirable for the not so young as well. An International Friendship House in every major European country would complement such visits and provide a steady source of income.

A Printing Press and Publishing House

The continually increasing volume of literature on peace, in the form of pamphlets, books, periodicals etc. makes it imperative for the peace movements of each country to try to purchase (or part purchase and control) a printing press and publishing house. This could be co-operatively owned along with other sympathetic organisations, mentioned earlier, and is a necessity in view of the high costs of printing. There is no reason why profits from such orders should go to capitalists instead of being ploughed back into the peace movement, thus reducing printing costs for peace printing, as distinct from the other commercial orders, and provide priority in times of crisis for urgent peace printing.

Such a printing and publishing service would, besides providing a regular income, publish books, novels literature produced by progressive and avant-garde writers of talent whose works are at present automatically rejected by capitalist-controlled publishing firms. Greeting, Christmas and Peace Cards are also a profitable side-line, as the experience of Housman's Bookshop (the Peace News bookshop in London) shows. It has also shown that there are great potentialities in such a business, and that the volume of sales can be greatly increased to bring in substantial profits.

The setting up of such a service in even a few countries where the peace movements are more organised can help solve the printing problem for peace organisations in neighbouring countries where the peace organisations are too weak to own a printing press of their own.

A Community Farm and Workshops

Such a farm would be run along communal lines (kibbutz style), would be co-operatively owned and would practise mixed farming. It would raise poultry, pigs etc. and would also produce milk and its derivatives. The fraternal way of life would demonstrate what could be repeated in the larger society. It would be a working model of the Non-Violent Society, and a pilot project in human relations. It could also provide hostel facilities for students and city people wanting to spend their holidays in the country and to take part in communal living for a short or longer period at a reasonable cost. Workshops for making shoes, toys and clothes, also arts and crafts, would also produce added revenue, providing employment outlet's for unemployed peace activists. A small, progressive school serving the local area could also be integrated into the farm which would aim for as great a self-sufficiency for its members and guests as possible.