

## RESURGENCE AFFAIRS

Is *Resurgence* suddenly redundant? The question is prompted by a leading article in the London 'Times' which comes out strongly for separate parliaments, no less, for Scotland and Wales. But bless us, Auntie doesn't really mean it, for further passages indicate that she is a long way from urging that Westminster give up its control of their foreign affairs and defence policies. For Auntie, that would be going too far altogether. So we are not redundant yet, and we continue to work for the time when people will actually decide for themselves what it is they want.

\* \* \*

The Editorial Group is planning a 4th World Conference for early summer 1968. One aim is to have a good hard look at efforts now being made to enlarge the area of decision-making at grass-roots level. This covers the various drives towards regional independence now proceeding in many parts of the world—Wales, Scotland, Tibet, Quebec, Anguilla, Brittany, Catalan, Nagaland, Biafra, Cornwall, etc., etc., as well as the work of decentralisers in various functional capacities—Factories for Peace, Demintry, Intermediate Technology and the International Foundation for Independence, together with various ad hoc campaigns being organised which premise local decision-making in the fields of education, medicine, regional planning and so on.

This aspect of the conference will be covered by reports and related discussions, plus an exhibition of the practical work being done. But it will be only one aspect. The main purpose of the event will be to project some of the theoretical issues at stake in the task of deconstructing the monster nation states of the world and of clarifying ways of overcoming the dangers they are creating, of which even a thermonuclear world war is only one.

Readers comments and suggestions on this project are earnestly invited and as fuller details will be given in the next issue it is hoped their response to this appeal will be speedy.

\* \* \*

One of the most important features of any serious journal of opinion is the correspondence column. In a rigorously democratic order each reader would possibly have an equal voice in the whole range of editorial decisions and thus be able to make his weight felt directly. In default of such a state of perfection may we extol the merits of Letters to the Editor? We accept readers views as news, especially when they differ from views expressed in other parts of *Resurgence*, and we are sure other readers find them of equal interest. There is an abundance of provocative material in *Resurgence*, and well reasoned letters that project alternative viewpoints are always sure of an editorial welcome—especially if they are not too long.

The *Resurgence* Editorial Group is predominantly a working party, and almost every member makes some working contribution to the journal—Roger Franklin who monitors many of our quotes and prepares the material of the Fourth World Column, and who has been active behind the scenes in a number of other ways has now agreed to become our Corresponding Secretary. In this capacity he will be responsible for writing to individuals whose views or activities suggest they would be favourably disposed towards us. We hope in this way to make a modest circulation increase and also to expand our contacts with writers and thinkers in other countries besides our own. We badly need help in a variety of other ways. Jacob Garonzki, our indefatigably enthusiastic Business Manager needs help for example with addressing wrappers and, perhaps even more pressing, the regular help of a car owner who will assist with distribution to bookshops in the London area. Any offers?

\* \* \*

On Friday December 1st the members of the Editorial Group of *Resurgence* will be going to the Soviet Embassy to make representations on behalf of the two imprisoned writers Synyavsky and Daniel. All *Resurgence* readers are invited to join this representation, and a similar invitation has been sent to the Editors of many national newspapers and journals of opinion in Britain. Those seeking to make such representations may like to meet at 11.50 a.m. at the entrance in Kensington High Street (next to Royal Gardens Hotel) to the private road in which the Embassy of the Russian Empire is situated:—

Friday 1st December 11.50 a.m.

\* \* \*

One of the ideas to emerge from a recent student peace conference at Oxford, where a new national body for student peace action was formed, is that *Resurgence* should produce a special additional issue dealing with peace action in the student world. The Editorial Group will be looking into this, but meanwhile authors of manuscripts on student peace projects (actual and projected), as well as student peace poetry and fiction are invited to submit them for consideration. The publication is likely to appear at the beginning of April, 1968.

\* \* \*

Lastly a word about money. The response to our appeal has been generous and whilst solving some of our immediate difficulties, still leaves us precariously poised. We are most grateful for this help but our major need is for more regular subscribers. Each issue of *Resurgence* always includes a subscription form and whilst these make good fire-lighters, or useful scrap paper for shopping lists or telephone messages, may we urge priority for our own need for gaining new readers! If you have not responded to our appeal there is still time, and if you would also take advantage of our seasonal gift on page 22 you will be helping *Resurgence* most where it most needs help.

FOR THE RADICAL NON-VIOLENT REVOLUTION

# RESURGENCE

VOL. 1 NO. 10 NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 1967 2s 6d

A number of peace workers have been distributing leaflets to the armed forces of the U.S.A., stationed in Britain, suggesting that they desert rather than go to fight in Vietnam.

RESURGENCE fully supports the message of this leaflet and is ready to help all such deserters in every way it can.



## Contents

3	<b>Editorial</b>	"Intelligence."
4	<b>Comment</b>	<i>Latin-American Illusions,</i>
5		<i>I.F.I. — International Foundation for Independence.</i>
6		<i>Publications.</i>
7	<b>E. F. Schumacher</b>	<i>Man Need Not Starve.</i>
10	<b>John Stallworthy</b>	<i>Poem — Portrait of Robert Capa.</i>
14		"Quotes."
16	<b>Mildred Loomis</b>	<i>Go Ahead and Live!</i>
17	<b>Correspondence</b>	
19		<i>The Fourth World.</i>
20	<b>Sybil Morrison</b>	<i>Review — "Enzio Sereni. A Hero of Our Times."</i>
21	<b>John Papworth</b>	<i>Review — "20 Letters to a Friend."</i>
22	<b>Roger Franklin</b>	<i>Review — "Direct Democracy."</i>
23	<b>David Kuhrt</b>	<i>Poem — Narcissus.</i>
24	<b>John Papworth</b>	<i>Polaris Notebook.</i>
27		<i>Publications.</i>
28		<i>Resurgence Affairs.</i>

## This Issue

**DAVID KUHRT** started writing poetry at an art school where he trained as a graphic designer. After a year in advertising he felt disinclined to help capitalist forms of enterprise further and spent a year at an adult education college. He then went abroad for 15 months, including six months studying art therapy. He is now teaching at the Maudsley Hospital School for maladjusted children in South London.

**MILDRED LOOMIS**, now in her sixties, has been the Director of Education of the School of Living (at Brookville, Ohio) since 1950, and Editor of its publications since 1945. With John Loomis she has been an active homesteader since their marriage in 1940. A graduate in economics, and with another degree in education, she has ground all her own wheat and baked all the bread in her home for more than a quarter of a century. In 1965 she edited a new book on homesteading entitled "Go ahead and Live!"

**SYBIL MORRISON** has served the peace movement in numerous capacities since she entered it at the end of the first World War. She has been a regular columnist of Peace News (under the editorship of Gilbert Murray), a chairman of the Peace Pledge Union and a prominent advocate of pacifism at more meetings and conferences than she can hope to recall. Although nominally retired she

is still in constant demand (and supply) as a speaker, she is currently Chairman of the Consultative Committee of Peace Organisations, and has been a member of the Resurgence Editorial Group since its inception.

**DR. E. F. SCHUMACHER** is the Director of Statistics of the National Coal Board whose writings on questions of aid and development have attracted so much attention in recent years. He was educated at the Universities of Bonn, Berlin, Oxford and Columbia (New York) and has worked in business, farming and journalism. Since 1946 he has been Economic Adviser respectively to the British Control Commission in Germany, the Government of Burma and the Indian Planning Commission. He is the main inspiration behind the Intermediate Technology Group. The article published here is taken from a lecture he delivered in 1966 at a conference organised by the Ruth Morrison Advisory Group and the West of England Campaign Against Factory Farming.

## Editorial Group

John Furnival, Graham Keen (Art Work), David Kuhrt (Poetry Editor), Sybil Morrison, Chris Reeve.

Editor: John Papworth.

Business Manager: Jacob Garonzhki.

Corresponding Secretary: Roger Franklin.

# EDITORIAL

When one reads that the head of the Soviet Section of the British spying system, who was actually being groomed (whatever that may mean) to be the chief of all British spies, was himself at the same time a spy in the pay of the Russians for more than a quarter of a century, one may be forgiven for supposing this finally puts paid to the whole sleazy, futile business of espionage; but of course modern forms of irrationality are more persistent than that, and the farce is likely to be with us a long time yet.

It is tempting, as well as dangerous, to assume that spying is only a lot of governmental nonsense (which it is) on which rival governments spend fabulous sums which have the net effect of cancelling each other out. There is more to it than this. All forms of spying are carried on against an elaborate backdrop of official secrecy. This secrecy (sic), whatever its immediate purpose, which the Philby affair suggests is invariably aborted, has the long-term consequence of removing from public discussion and public decision-making questions of outstanding importance not only to the people of one country, but to the well-being of the whole of mankind.

The development of atomic and nuclear weapons is a major case in point; the generality of people were kept in total ignorance of the decision to develop these weapons, and the first indication that the atomic bomb was even contemplated came for the majority of people when one was actually exploded over Hiroshima.

The fact that such weapons are an unmitigated evil which may result in the end of civilisation did nothing to persuade those responsible to make the issue public. There was no public discussion at all before Governments took this most fateful step and neither, for that matter, was there any public evaluation of the type of research (all paid for from public funds) that led to this development.

Now the people of the world are saddled with these and other weapons of mass genocide, which have come to dominate and overshadow the entire future of the human race. The major and most urgent need now is to get rid of such weapons, but even as this overriding need presses inexorably upon humanity its governments, under greatly extended cloaks of secrecy, are plotting and producing even greater horrors of mass destruction, horrors which are bound to increase the already considerable difficulties of restoring the world to sanity and peace.

The human mind is simply not capable of rapidly integrating even the concept of such a moral enormity as nuclear weapons into its scale of values without traumatic side effects and without a pronounced coarsening of its capacity for moral responsiveness. The mere existence of such weapons mocks the moral codes that men have sought to elaborate and affirm over the centuries, and undermines, if indeed it does not eventually destroy, the habits of compassion, tolerance, forbearance and self-discipline which are the foundations of civilised life. Through all the long ages of what Winwood Reade once eloquently described as "The Martyrdom of Man" there has been no threat over which man himself could not reasonably hope

## "Intelligence"

to prevail, to eventually put a term to that martyrdom at last and to enter a new dawn of time that was truly his own. Not savage beast, not famine nor disease, nor the dark terrors of the unknown were ever able to rob him of that hope and his ultimate sense of rightness in the scheme of things around and within him.

Now all is changed. What is the point of caring about the life and quality of a city which may be reduced to dust in a matter of seconds this afternoon, this evening, or sometime tomorrow? Why care about the sick, the handicapped, the homeless, the unwanted and the dying when this afternoon these categories may suddenly encompass most of us? Why care about anything with such prospects hovering before us?

There are of course quite rational and positive replies to these questions, but the human mind operates at multitudinous levels of perception, and at those deeper levels where instinct fuses with external reality there is abundant evidence to indicate that the deadly corrosion of despair has already made deep inroads into man's will to hope, to affirm and to create.

It is not the custom of politicians and generals to reflect thus far on the consequences of their decisions and it is doubtful if any of them anticipated for example, the thousands of broken lives from drug addiction which is only one result of the failure of the human psyche to adapt itself to the realities of a nuclear world. We must anticipate there will be many others which all too often will doubtless prove to be of pathological proportions.

Not least there will tend to be increasing paranoia about the need for more secrecy over a growing range of government and military affairs. This drift must be reversed. There can be no meaning in new knowledge if it is not compatible with the moral philosophy by which a society lives and if it cannot be integrated into its existing scale of values. It is only in this way that new knowledge can provide a sure basis for yet further advances in directions that avoid the horrible consequences of simply seeking knowledge, as we seek it today, in a moral vacuum.

What on earth can be the point of devoting a vast range of human skills and resources to a field of knowledge which produces for example, all the war consequences that stare us in the face today and, which even in its so called 'peaceful' application in the field of nuclear energy, produces a steadily increasing burden of virulently radioactive waste which will threaten our posterity with mortal danger for centuries to come? What ethical or moral right have we to bring such infamous researches within the merest possibility of fruition?

Mankind is being blindly led up the primrose path to the everlasting bonfire; as a consequence the will to live and create which ordinarily prevails abundantly in the generality of men is being sapped and undermined by people in high places who presume they know better when in fact their blindness is greater than that of those they mislead.

If the real interests of mankind are to prevail it is quite imperative for men to have unfettered access to all the available knowledge of the con-



temporary world. Only in this way can they establish a philosophy of existence which will enable them to bring to bear the discipline of moral choice in determining their future course and only in this way can the future be a natural development and response to the needs implicit in that choice.

The alternative, as is plainly evident, is an erratically accelerating descent into the abyss of barbarism. "Facts," indeed "are sacred"; they are sacred no less to man's quest for self-realisation as to ascertaining the true nature of that quest. To prevent access to any form of knowledge is to shut off access to life, for only through the expanding universe of knowledge can the biological purpose of life as expressed in man retain its dynamic and acquire a more meaningful purpose.

It is time to state plainly that to restrict knowledge is to deceive and to mislead, and to unwarrantably obstruct the path of progress. To do this at a time when our failure to progress has already resulted in a quite staggering increase in the magnitude of the dangers around us is to be involved in a supreme act of betrayal of human kind. No supposedly 'national interest' can possibly or conceivably justify such a course, for on an ordinary plane of morals it presupposes that the particular interests of any given governmental power group

(invariably an oligarchy saddling itself with absurdly erroneous pretensions or assumptions of being a democracy) are superior to the general interests of the human race.

This is not only contrary to the essential teaching of nearly all the great moralists, from the Buddha, through Jesus and Marx, to Gandhi, it is today utterly incompatible with the survival of civilisation. Plainly our world must advance to a common acceptance and practice of certain essential moral truths and philosophic values or it will perish from the anarchy of power that now prevails.

It is essential for peace and life that where Governments seek to conceal new knowledge men should repudiate such treason and work to stop it. This involves a readiness to publish any information over which *any* governments seeks to maintain any form of secrecy.

RESURGENCE WILL READILY PUBLISH ANY SUCH MATERIAL THAT IS OF READER INTEREST WHICH COMES INTO ITS HANDS, AND IN SOLICITING SUCH MATERIAL FROM ITS READERS IT URGES THE EDITORS OF OTHER PUBLICATIONS IN EVERY COUNTRY IN THE WORLD TO PURSUE A SIMILAR COURSE.

## COMMENT

revolution as a Marxist, but as a Nationalist. His conversion to Marxism, if indeed he was converted, came some two years later. Before that he had opposed the Cuban communists as rivals to his own power, and his subsequent acceptance of Marxism has about it all the characteristics not so much of a road to Damascus conversion as a pure marriage of convenience. The folly of the U.S. blockade drove Castro to seek communist help, but he could hardly expect Russia or China to come to his rescue whilst he was still suppressing the Cuban communists. In effect, just as the Cuban communist leaders were beginning to grasp that they, (a very insignificant minority), could never achieve power without the help of Castro's charismatic qualities of leadership, so Castro discovered that without communist help he could not keep the power his military daring had so easily enabled him to grab from the corrupt Batista regime.

What has happened behind the Cuban scenes since is not easy to assess. Nationalists and communists are bound to be uneasy bedfellows, and the fact that Castro has since publicly quarrelled with both the Chinese and the Russians seems to indicate that he has the upper hand with his local communists. He has achieved this at the stiff price of stealing their ideological clothes and publicly wearing them, but it is possible that he has concluded they don't really fit, and some of his public utterances now seem to suggest he is discarding them.

Clearly, despite some successful diversification of the Cuban economy, Castro is not soundly based and his refusal to be the creature of China or Russia makes it imperative for him to end his isolation in Latin America and find new allies to help him parry the monolithic might of the U.S.A.

Since such allies do not exist, they must be created, hence Ché Guevara's abortive military mission to Bolivia. It was a mission arising from the political and economic exigencies of Castro's Cuba, and it was these exigencies that made Castro

reject the cool, thermonuclear-conscious, coexistence-realism of the Russians in favour of the appalling folly of fomenting war. Of corruption, bigotry, tyranny and oppression in the Latin American countries there is no end, but is a foreign inspired move to armed rebellion the quickest, or even the likeliest way to end it?

It is here that the activities of certain so-called leftist elements, notably the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, need to be called in to question. In taking the lead in apparently championing the cause of Latin American freedom by giving full support to Ché Guevara's efforts they are not only betraying the aspirations to freedom of the Latin Americans, they are exhibiting their incapacity to learn the lessons of their own experience.

In the twenties and thirties an entire generation of leftists hitched their waggon to the then rising star of Soviet Communism. The results of this ineptitude are discussed elsewhere; what might be justifiably asked here is whether the course of Soviet affairs might have been different and better if these intellectuals of the left had insisted on measuring what was happening by the ordinary yardsticks of liberty and freedom.

Perhaps charity should be extended to them for believing that censorship, arbitrary proceedings of any arm of government, conscription, the persecution of minorities and much else can be justified on some grounds, however speciously they may be linked to what is assumed to be 'progress'. Charity, even though the lessons they needed to heed were writ large in Cromwellian England and in the Thermidorean perversities of the French Revolution; but charity because the horrors of capitalism and militarism seemed to overshadow everything at that time, and the onset of a revolution which rejected the one even while it bolstered and glorified the other, made it exceedingly difficult for any generously minded person not to greet it with hope and faith.

That they were catastrophically mistaken is now a matter of history, or it might be if a new generation of intellectuals were not so ready to repeat the same tortuous blunders. It needs to be shouted from the house-tops that the Russian and Chinese people have found betrayal, not fulfilment in their revolutions; that there is no substitute for freedom, not even a revolutionary government; that that people is governed best that is governed least; that only quite small countries today stand the remotest chance of retaining such liberties as they have; that in poor countries the cry for bread is a cry for freedom, which does not mean that a full stomach is incompatible with life under conditions that do not differ greatly from a broiler house; that all revolutions have produced a new ruling class capped by a new ruling elite; and never never trust anybody with power you cannot control, it will corrupt them as surely as it will be used to enslave you.

Life in technological countries is so claustrophobically oppressive that a flight to political romanticism and a readiness to suppose solutions are to be found in remote and perhaps exotic parts rather than on our own doorstep is understandable. But to encourage Latin Americans to repeat the mistakes of the unfortunate Chinese and Russian peoples is surely a quite needlessly inept exercise in political tutelage. In any event the only people who can solve Latin America's problems, which are pressing enough in all conscience, are the Latin Americans themselves, and if we want to help them

to solve them we should give them some indication that we are capable of solving our own.

The strategy of peaceful progress is not something that can be pushed aside on grounds that what is required now is 'action', meaning mindless mob-action. Progress has an inexorable tempo of its own and there is no substitute at all, in mounting an attack on poverty and privilege, for the careful analysis and lucid pinpointing of the types of techniques and small-scale enterprise which will do the job. Which will do it moreover with a minimum of waste and bureaucracy, and without the currently endemic involvement in the corruption of mass power politics, and which will bring measurable gains to people by means that do not assail their liberty or affront their self-respect.

## I.F.I.—The International Foundation for Independence

The snags attendant upon rich countries seeking to help poor countries to increase the means of life are endemic and, invariably insurmountable. The biggest snag of all is the failure of the rich countries to help enough; others are the difficulty of giving aid which does not distort and hamper a recipient country's own attempts at self-development, and the apparent impossibility of ensuring that aid really does filter down to the people who need it most and who can use it to best advantage.

These by no means exhaust the list but they all add up to one appalling truism, that despite all that has been done or attempted the rich countries continue to grow richer whilst the poor get poorer.

Not least of the difficulties is that intergovernmental aid is generally on a scale that does not reach to the man on the ground floor who needs it most, and that aid on the ground floor is generally from 'private' sources such as Oxfam, where it can easily inhibit rather than fructify local development possibilities (a danger of which OXFAM field officials are fully aware).

In many respects development problems are rural problems, these in turn centre on that of securing varying types of credit, and it is here that a new approach has been initiated by a libertarian decentralist group in the U.S.A.

The International Foundation For Independence is a brainchild of Ralph Borsodi, who for many years has worked on small scale farming schemes after a successful career as an economic consultant. It is basically a non-profit bank and its function is to provide a revolving fund for the provision of credit to small-scale farmers and rural workers. Money will be lent through established local institutions, especially soundly based voluntary associations, at a rate of interest generally well below that prevailing in the free market.

In order to avoid the effects of fluctuations in the value of money, (generally inflationary and hence, downwards) the loans will be valued, and redeemable, in terms of prices of commodities.

For example, using round figures simply for clarity, a rice farmer who borrows £100 for nine months will have his borrowing 'valued' at, say 10 cwts. of rice. At the end of nine months he will repay the monetary value of 10 cwts. of rice (plus interest and servicing charges). If money values have not changed his principal will be the same, if there has been inflation he will repay a higher sum to correspond to the increased money value

## Latin American Illusions

Now that Ché Guevara is dead, the legend about him is growing, which is a pity if only because it is distracting attention from more important matters. In many significant matters Ché exhibited a pedestrian quality of mind and his intellect was so clouded with 19th century romanticism that he believed that progress could come from fighting and killing. He never once appears to have asked himself what real gains have accrued to ordinary people anywhere in the world in the modern era by the use of militarism and war. Even in a nuclear age he believed stoutly in 'wars of liberation' and he devoted the latter part of his life to fomenting civil war in Latin America.

In straightforward terms of moves in the power struggle, which is not to be confused with the struggle for bread and liberty, this made some sense. It is true to say that Cuba's economy is almost completely hamstrung by the American blockade of its trade, for until the Castro takeover Cuba exported most of its staple commodities, sugar, tobacco and rum, to the United States, and in return spent much of its resulting trade balance on American consumer products. In addition Cuba was the favourite holiday resort of numerous wealthy dollar-spending U.S. tourists.

With the advent of Castro and the imposition of the U.S. blockade the Cuban economy all but collapsed; it was saved by the panic and the elation engendered by the revolution itself, by the iron grip the Castroites imposed on Cuba's political life, which gave short shrift to any manifestation of opposition, or even independence, and not least by large-scale but by no means massive aid from the main communist countries.

It should be recalled that Castro did not win his



of 10 cwts. of rice, and if there has been a slump or other deflationary forces at work he will pay correspondingly less. The money and the interest will be paid back into the revolving fund and be available for fresh borrowings.

Fine, it may be said, but where does the money come from in the first place? This will be drawn from private investors, charitable bodies, trusts, foundations and similar sources, who will receive fixed interest debenture bonds in return. These bonds will be valued in terms of a world commodity index and, to use investor's jargon, will thus be a safe hedge against inflation.

In an imperfect world it would be odd for any scheme as far reaching as this to satisfy all the criteria of the best theoretical approaches for small-scale development, or for that matter a dozen or so other viewpoints. But the scheme does appear to stand a good chance of overcoming the obstacles that have so far aborted so much effort

to get economic development moving in the poorer countries. It does so moreover in a way that avoids the almost obsessive preoccupation of the western world with mere quantitative targets of production, and maintains due focus on those subtle, indefinable and frequently ineluctable qualitative factors which, to its quite needless impoverishment, the western world so determinedly ignores. The I.F.I. proposes to ensure this by making capital available not in vast sums at a few bureaucratic centres, but at numerous points of involvement and individual decision-making.

Following a recent visit to Europe by Ralph Borsodi and Robert Swann, the Foundation has been established as a corporation under the laws of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, and a group to promote its work in Britain has been formed.

Further details can be obtained from Roger Franklin, I.F.I., 29 Gt. James St., London, W.C.1.

## PUBLICATIONS

*This feature is provided as a free service to our readers and to help the editors 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. Details to Resurgence, 22 Nevern 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 newspaper 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.

**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/-.

**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.

*Continued on page 27.*

*E. F. Schumacher*

# Man Need Not Starve

The World Food Problem has hit the headlines again, and rightly so. World population last year has risen by another seventy million, while world food production has remained stationary. The headlines talk about "The World Hunger Gap — Shock Report," and the report in question, entitled "The State of Food and Agriculture, 1966," comes from the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. Its central message is that food availability per head of the world's population has fallen by two percent during last year. But this is not the crux of the story. Food production in the developing countries has dropped by four to five percent per head, and it is they who are really short. The fact that North American production has risen by about four percent and Western European production by one percent does little to improve the situation, except statistically.

Looking behind the surface of things, we find a dramatic change in the world food situation: the North American grain surpluses are running out. The large shipments of American grain to the developing countries did not come out of current production but out of stocks accumulated since the beginning of the 1950's. These stocks have now fallen to their lowest level in fourteen years; at fifteen million tons, they are said to be not enough for adequate protection against a domestic crop failure. "Time" reports in its issue of 12th August, 1966, that "the supply of soybeans, the dull yellow seed that goes into everything from vegetable oil to paint and constitutes the world's cheapest source of protein, equals just four months' consumption. Five years ago, Government warehouses were jammed with butter and cheese; now they have none. Washington has had to go into the market to buy dried milk for its program of free school lunches for 50 million children in 52 foreign countries."

In August, 1966, the U.S. State Department told American embassies that aid shipments of wheat would have to be cut by 25 percent, and Mr. Orville Freeman, the U.S. Secretary for Agriculture, declared that "unless the hungry nations learn to feed themselves, there will be world famine in less than twenty years." He also said that "more human lives hang in the balance than have been lost in all the wars of history." If anything, he may have understated the seriousness of the situation by talking about the world as a whole. Food supplies do not and cannot "average out". The danger of famine in the developing countries is much nearer than "less than twenty years": it is here already. It is unlikely that there will be famine in North America, the Argentine, Australia, or the Soviet Union, or indeed in many smaller countries like Rumania or Burma. No, the problem is much more concentrated than that and therefore much more urgent than world averages suggest.

The world food problem, of course, is closely allied to the world population problem; but here again it is not the rise in the total that is really significant. There are many countries, large and

small, where further large increases in population will do no harm at all and may even be beneficial. What is really significant is that of the seventy million increase last year some fifty million accrued to the population of particular developing countries which are unable to cope. Neither people nor food will "average out".

Let us look at the proposition that "food does not average out". People say that it does not make sense to have restrictions on food production in America or Europe when there are starving millions in India. All right, if it does not make sense, can we get a more sensible world? By letting the North American plains produce food for India? This sounds simple enough, but how is India going to pay for it? If she cannot pay, the food has to go as aid. How, then, is the North American farmer to make a living? He would have to be paid by the American taxpayer through the American Government. Is this a feasible long-term proposition? I think not. In a short-term emergency, anything is possible and anything will do. But as a permanent way of life it seems to me to go against the most basic laws of human nature that the population in one part of the world should be maintained free of charge by the population in another part of the world. It is man's first task and duty to feed himself, either directly from his own soil or indirectly by way of trade.

### Man's first task

Aid makes sense only if it is conducive to development, not if it merely supports a basically unsupportable situation. What should ever come of such an arrangement? Do you think that permanently, as a matter of world planning, the Indians or the Egyptians or whoever it might be could be pensioned off, as it were, to live on the work and effort of the people of another nation? No man can be free and maintain any kind of self-respect if he cannot even feed himself, directly or indirectly. This, I think, is an unalterable law of human nature, and we must dismiss from our minds any notion of a world with food aid as a permanent feature.

It is interesting to look at the statistics on world food movements with these thoughts in mind. The most relevant food items are grains because they are easily transportable in bulk. Before the war, intercontinental grain shipments amounted to about twenty-four million tons a year, and all of this went to Western Europe which had the means to pay for it. In 1964/5, inter continental grain shipments amounted to sixty million tons, a tremendous increase. Europe took much the same as before, some twenty-four million tons. New purchasers were the Soviet Union and China, taking a similar amount and being able to pay for it. But a further amount of over twenty million tons went to Asia and Africa as aid. Now this aid food will progressively diminish and probably fade out altogether. It had come out of stocks, and it seemed good business to turn these stocks, if not into cash, at least into aid. As

## URGENT

IN CASE YOU FORGET . . .

Resurgence needs £500 to see it into its third year, and to pay off existing debts.

With the last issue a personal appeal from the Editor was sent to every subscriber.

To date : £164 has been received.

For many readers Resurgence has become a Must. Will you help to lighten the load of producing it?

Please send cheques and other forms of money to:—

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



the stocks disappear, so food aid will disappear and only trade will survive. This is the new situation which the developing world will have to face.

A certain inter-continental division of labour as between agriculture and industry will no doubt continue, and the rich countries which cannot feed themselves from their own soil will continue to be able to send industrial goods overseas so that overseas farmers will produce food for them. But will the poor countries, the so-called developing countries be able to obtain significant amounts of food in exchange for industrial exports? I should think that to produce food for internal consumption will almost invariably be easier for a developing country than to produce industrial products competitively for export, to pay for food imports. There may be exceptions—there always are—but as a general proposition this is an obvious truth. For many years to come, it will be utopian to think that arrangements could be made so that developing countries could become large exporters of industrial goods to, say, the United States, so as to be able to pay for large food imports from North America, or that they would make such exports to Europe, while Europe exported to America, so that American food could flow to the developing world. In short, Mr. Orville Freeman is undoubtedly right when he says that the hungry nations must learn to feed themselves. If they do not do so there may not be *world* hunger but *they* will starve, and this will not come to pass in twenty years but almost right away. Of course, this could have unpleasant effects on the countries—mainly Western Europe and Japan—which have for long been feeding themselves by trade. The “terms of trade” might change against them, so that they have to give more manufactured goods for their food imports: but there is no reason to fear that these countries will starve, because they are rich enough to pay. They have, moreover, the possibility to improve further upon their own agricultural performance, possibly to the point of self-sufficiency in food.

### Productivity

If this general line of argument is accepted, we can move on to the crucial question: *Can the hungry nations feed themselves? Is it possible? Have they got enough land? Can they develop enough productivity? And here we come to a vital question: What do we mean when we say “productivity”?* I know I am talking to a highly experienced audience and I apologise if the points I am going to make may seem too simple. It is often the most simple things that are most confused. When we talk of productivity in connection with the world food problem, the problem of hunger in developing countries, we are primarily talking about *productivity per acre* and not about *productivity per man*. Unless we keep this distinction constantly in mind, we shall get everything mixed up. A given population with a given amount of land will have enough to eat if the output per acre is sufficient to feed them, irrespective of whether a quarter, or half, or 90 percent of the population are actually working on the land. If the output per acre is insufficient they will starve, even if the *productivity per man* is so high that only ten percent of the population are needed for work on the land.

Let us see, therefore, which countries have the highest agricultural productivity in terms of output per acre. To measure the over-all productivity of land is a difficult business, and the best statistics

available are probably those produced by the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. Of the twelve countries shown with the highest productivity, per acre classified as agricultural land, in 1956-60, six were in Europe—the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Norway and Italy; three were in the Far East—Nationalist China (Taiwan), Japan, and Republic of Korea; two were in South East Asia—Malaya and Ceylon; and one in the Near East—the United Arab Republic. While statistics of this kind must not be taken too literally, they give valuable indications. It is interesting to note that the productivity per acre in the United Kingdom is shown as only one-half that of Germany, a third that of Belgium, and a quarter that of the United Arab Republic, and that that of the United States is shown as only about one-half that of the United Kingdom.

Now let us look at the other end of the scale, the dozen countries with the lowest overall productivity per acre. There are two of what used to be called the white dominions—Australia and South Africa; six countries in Latin America—Venezuela, Mexico, Argentine, Uruguay, Brazil, and Honduras; and four countries in Africa—Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and Ethiopia. The productivity gap between the “highest” and the “lowest” is as much as one to forty.

The ranking order of countries when it comes to productivity *per man*, i.e., per man engaged in agriculture, is of course entirely different. Whilst Australia has the lowest productivity per acre, its productivity per man is among the highest, and Korea, with its very high productivity per acre, is among the countries with the lowest productivity per man. There is no correlation between these two ranking orders, neither positive nor negative; for productivity per man correlates with the general wealth of the country, whereas productivity per acre correlates (if only to some extent) with the country's density of population.

All this goes to emphasise the importance of distinguishing these two measures of productivity—per acre and per man. As there is absolutely no positive correlation between them, you can imagine what confusion results when people fail to keep them apart.

One fact, at least, stands out: in a poor country a high output per acre is obtainable only through high labour intensity, see Korea, or Taiwan. This is hardly surprising, because *something* has to be applied to the land to make things grow, and if the country is poor it has little capital to apply to the land; it has only labour power. If it does not go in for labour intensive cultivation, it will certainly not obtain high outputs per acre.

If we talk about the problem of hunger, as I said, we must talk primarily about productivity, or output, *per acre*. If we wished to discuss rural poverty, we would have to talk about productivity, or output, *per man*. Hunger and poverty, although they often go together in towns, are easily distinguishable as regards the rural population. A lot of farmers and small cultivators in developing countries are desperately poor, but not necessarily hungry. It is often quite easy to increase the productivity *per man* at the expense of the productivity *per acre*. This may alleviate poverty but does nothing to solve the problem of hunger. It is often also quite easy to increase the output per acre at the expense of labour productivity. This helps to feed the hungry but does nothing to alleviate the poverty of the

cultivators. The best, of course, is to raise both productivities,—but where it is a matter of choice it must never be forgotten that the problem of hunger can yield only to an increase in the productivity per acre and is virtually unaffected by increases in the productivity per man.

Let us then turn to our central question: How can the hungry countries learn to feed themselves? It is indeed a matter of learning. Of all the factors that serve to improve agriculture, unquestionably the most important is *method*—the methods of good husbandry. To talk only of better seeds and better stock, of a better “infrastructure” in the shape of roads and other facilities, or of the injection of more capital, is in my opinion to miss the decisive factor. To go even further and suggest that the “hunger gap” could be closed by industrial type farming with high mechanisation, chemical fertilisers, insecticides, and so forth, is to become dangerously misleading.

### Good husbandry

If there is an answer to the problem of hunger in the developing countries, it can be found only in the principles of good husbandry. The spectre of hunger arises because in chasing after the unattainable people fail to attend to that which is within their reach. Countries with surplus populations on the land, largely underemployed or even unemployed, allow themselves to be enticed into the adoption of farming methods which are suitable for the wide open spaces of underpopulated continents or for highly industrialised communities with a shortage of agricultural labour. Countries desperately short of capital mechanise agriculture, substituting capital for men, adding to unemployment, and reducing the yield per acre. In general, most types of high mechanisation and most chemicals used on the land are labour saving devices and as such quite inappropriate for poor countries with a large unemployment problem. There are of course exceptions—which merely prove the rule. Some land, if it is to be ploughed at all, must be ploughed very quickly, which can only be done by mechanised means. Some soils suffer from certain pronounced chemical deficiencies and cannot grow any proper crop at all unless these deficiencies are made good. But these exceptions must not blind us to the fact that high mechanisation and the use of chemicals in agriculture are primarily labour-saving devices which can add to output only on the assumption that the labour otherwise needed could not be made available.

I am very much aware that these statements may strike many of you as highly controversial. Since chemical fertilisers are for the soil a stimulant, they often have a striking short-run effect, and since they cause something like an addiction, their withdrawal can produce a sharp drop of yields. But this proves nothing. Comparisons have to be made with non-addicted soils and over long periods of time. Where these have been made, the results speak for themselves. In every case it emerges that good husbandry, methodical working with the maximum use of farm wastes, etc., produces long-run results which are as good, if not better, than those produced with the help of chemicals. And much the same applies also to modern pesticides, weedkillers, and so forth, all of them, some special cases apart, labour-saving devices.

Where labour is the bottleneck, let us by all means apply labour-saving devices. But where lab-

our is in surplus and industrial products are scarce, it is bad economics to substitute the latter for the former, and to do so means to divert attention from the one thing needful—honest, good husbandry.

### Farm Accountancy

We are talking about the developing countries, countries in the grip of poverty, containing about two-thirds of the world's population and growing fast. The total world production of artificial fertilisers in 1961/63 amounted to about 35 million tons a year of which only 1.8 million tons, or 5 percent was produced in the developing countries. The Food and Agriculture Organisation has calculated that these countries should use 19 million tons by 1970 and 35 million tons by 1980—about thirteen years from now. I consider the attainment of such targets an absolute impossibility. But even if they could be attained, can millions, hundreds of millions of cultivators be taught to use them in a manner that does not hopelessly poison the soil? And if they can be taught, can they not equally, and probably more easily, be taught to adopt methods of good husbandry capable of achieving the same or even better results without artificial fertilisers? Experience shows that excellent farming with superlative yields per acre is possible and in fact being practiced by individual farmers all over the world, without recourse to these costly products of industry. Where the methods are good, the yields are high, and where the methods are poor, slovenly, and therefore wasteful, even artificial fertilisers do not produce good results. I wish the time would come when people would pay as much attention to a simple matter like farm accountancy in developing countries as they now devote to utopian dreams of educating a largely illiterate population in the intelligent use of dangerous materials like fertilisers, pesticides and so forth.

However that may be, one thing stands out: the hungry nations cannot get enough of these devices. They do not have the money to buy them and there is not enough aid available to let them have them free. It is no use telling them what they could do if they were already rich. A classic example of this kind of thinking can be found in the same issue of “Time” from which I have already quoted. I quote again—

“If the short-range solution to hunger overseas is more United States food, the long-range answer must be the export of technology, along with capital and brains to see that it is applied wisely. The rest of the world needs to catch up with the mechanisation and efficiency of U.S. farms. Half the world's tractors operate in North America. California rice growers have gone so far as to plant, fertilise and spray their crops entirely from planes. A single U.S. farm worker now feeds 37 people.”

One wonders to whom this advice is directed. To Japan, or Italy, or Egypt, or Spain, where rice yields per acre are substantially higher than they are in the United States? Or to India, Pakistan and others, where the rice grower's income is so pitiful that he could not afford a bicycle, let alone a plane? But let me continue to quote:

“Vital as research is, victory over hunger also demands that backward countries scale new heights of social, political and economic organisation. As the U.S. example shows, it takes vast amounts of capital—\$30,500 per U.S. farm worker vs. \$19,600 for an industrial worker . . .



## a portrait of Robert Capa

Three eyes in the mirror  
behind the bar (one of them shut  
since five o'clock) burn and burn out  
in time to the mortar

like a severed vein  
ejaculating on the night  
jet after rhythmic jet of light.

'How did it go?' The brain

unreels its images  
frame by frame: holding to the flash  
troops kneeling by a stream to wash  
unfamiliar faces;

boots on a white road show  
their teeth; a corporal on his back  
plays with a puppy and a stick.

'Robert, what'll you do

when the war is over?'  
The third eye, lifted in a mute  
rejoinder to the gun's salute,  
blinks at the mirror

before the concussion  
succeeds the flash. 'I cover  
a war that will never  
be lost, never be won.'

John Stallworthy

With carrot and stick, the U.S. now offers the underdeveloped world a chance—perhaps its last—to borrow U.S. techniques and reach for the same nourishing reward."

You might think it a bit unfair of me to quote such absurdities. Unfortunately, they are not untypical of what many people, even in high places, are thinking, saying, and doing. Just think of it: thirty thousand dollars per farm worker in India or Nigeria—so that he will then be able to feed 37 people, who will thereupon, no doubt, migrate into the big towns where they will find workplaces costing twenty thousand dollars each. This is their "last chance". In India alone some 200 million such workplaces will be needed, and at an average of twenty-five thousand dollars a piece, this will cost the trifling sum of five thousand milliard dollars—roughly 10,000 times as much as the yearly aid India is currently receiving from the United States. Marie Antoinette acquired an unenviable reputation for asking, on a certain occasion: "Why do these people shout for bread? Why don't they eat cake?" In comparison with these modern pundits, she must rank as an eminently sensible woman.

### Agricultural Renaissance

No doubt the poor must be given help, but within the harsh framework set by their poverty. No doubt the poor need technological aid, but at a level that is appropriate to their actual conditions. The fundamental cause of hunger and misery in the developing countries, and particularly in South East Asia, is not their backwardness but the condition of decay into which they have fallen. Not being an historian I shall not attempt to analyse the historical causes. To-day, the decay is there for all to see. We speak of decay when people are doing badly that which they used to do well. Decay is not overcome by enticing them to do something entirely different, which they will do even more badly. It is not a matter of rejecting anything that is good, and even the most modern, most highly industrialised, and most sophisticated farming methods may have their occasional applicability in developing countries (assuming these methods are really sound in themselves). But there is a time scale which must not be overlooked. If we are thinking of the next thirty years, the period during which, according to authoritative estimates, world food production must treble if widespread hunger is to be avoided, it is certain that these ultra-modern methods will be merely a fringe phenomenon in the developing countries and that the question of Hunger will continue to be decided by hundreds of millions of humble peasants working their land along traditional lines. It is *their* decay that has to be overcome: it is *their* methods that have to be in some way upgraded and rationalised: it is they who have to be given a chance of using their labour power more fully and to better purpose, both in agricultural and in non-agricultural pursuits. The only way to fight hunger in the hungry countries is to involve the entire rural population in a kind of agricultural renaissance, in a process of true growth in which education and economic development go hand in hand.

Assume for a moment some sort of world government had at its disposal some twenty-five milliard dollars a year of aid funds, that is, perhaps three times the amount of aid currently being made available. At \$25,000 a workplace, this aid could

purchase a million new workplaces a year, whether in agriculture or industry. But at \$250 per workplace, one hundred million workplaces could be newly created or substantially upgraded, and then we would start talking sense. For this is the relevant order of magnitude: a hundred million, not one million. In discussing the problem of world hunger we must talk of things capable of affecting hundreds of millions of peasants, otherwise we are wasting our time.

If, therefore, the capital endowment per workplace is screwed up to the level of modern technology, even the biggest conceivable aid programmes will not really touch the masses of peasants, the custodians of the soil on whose efforts everything depends. It follows that the real question is this: How can workplaces be upgraded, or newly created, with a capital expenditure of, say, \$250 per workplace?

The twenty-five thousand dollar technology of the rich countries is readily available for anyone who is already rich; it is totally out of reach and therefore totally irrelevant for the poor peasants of this world. A two hundred and fifty dollar technology would mean something to them—in the context of aid, and it could reach a sufficient number of them to matter. Such a technology, which I have named "Intermediate Technology" would be immensely more productive and more viable than the decayed traditional technology of those countries. It would, moreover, have the right educational impact, which is essential, for unless education and economic development go together there can be no genuine development at all.

The appropriate Intermediate Technologies already exist all over the world, even in the most highly developed countries; but they exist in an obscure and scattered way, so that the people who need them cannot find them. The whole process of aid tends to bypass them; it tends to offer the poor—with carrot and stick, as "Time" put it—the tools of the rich, which means that the poor get nothing at all and those already rich—who also exist in the poor countries—grow even richer. Officials, of course, tend to favour the glamorous technology, which is photogenic and something to boast about and raises no awkward questions of how to obtain the active participation of millions of people. But the price of this preference is a heavy one: a lack of real development and the prospect of world hunger.

Think of it—that in this year 1966 the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations tells us that the food availability per head in the developing countries is no greater today than it was in the 1930's, that food output has barely kept pace with the growth of population. But in the process the number of destitute people has vastly increased, while a wealthy minority has profited. Can this be called development? Is this the outcome of aid? Is it conceivable that human nature in the developing countries is so inadequate that this meagre result would not have been obtained even in the absence of aid? Is it possible that the aid giving has been largely futile? I do not know. Much of the aid effort has certainly been misconceived, which is not surprising, considering how difficult it is for the rich to understand the conditions of the poor. It is a tragic story, because there has been no lack of goodwill and genuine concern.

However that may be, even if we cannot solve the psychological problems, we can inject some new thinking into the debate on World Hunger and



Economic Development by insisting that the technologies offered to the poor must be appropriate to the actual conditions of poverty, if they are to be of help. They must be Intermediate Technologies.

To promote these ideas—and to do something towards their implementation—a private, non-profit organisation has recently been set up in London under the name of Intermediate Technology Development Group Limited at 9 King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C.2. One of the main purposes of the Group is to keep in intimate contact with industry, consulting engineers, and, of course, all aid giving agencies. The response from industry has been magnificent and that from the developing countries, overwhelming. In all matters the Group tries to develop the “basic approach”. Its slogans are ‘Tools for Progress’ and ‘Education for Self-Help’. Now, what is the basic approach in agriculture?

In many developing countries, the most basic agricultural problem is water. In the aid field, most of the thinking about water has been in terms of enormous dams and irrigation projects, costing millions of pounds. But the water is most needed exactly where it falls as rain, at the peasant's doorstep. If the peasant has to trek many miles to reach water, his position remains one of unalterable misery. The real task is to catch the water where it falls, in rainwater catchment tanks so designed that water will remain cool and protected and will neither seep away nor evaporate under the hot sun. A suitable technique has been devised by Mr. Michael Ionides by brilliantly combining the most ancient technique of water conservation practiced in the Sudan, with modern knowledge and materials. The result is a method which exactly fits the conditions of poor villagers who lack purchasing power but have a fairly ample supply of local labour. Every village should now be able to obtain a protected water supply, mainly by applying their own labour power.

The proper method has thus been developed; but to make it really available to the poor and needy, who are counted in hundreds of millions, two further steps, in my opinion, have to be taken. The method needs to be reduced, as it were, to a do-it-yourself-kit, containing all required materials and the necessary instructions in a form which simple villagers can understand, and so proportioned that it easily fits on to a Land Rover. And there must be a big educational effort throughout the needy countries, using the existing primary school systems for the purpose. This would really be “basic education,” that is, an education designed to fit the pupil to live successfully in the actual conditions of his own country. It is only when these additional two steps are taken—two steps beyond the development of the method itself—that a real contribution to the problems of World Hunger and World Development will be made.

Let me give another example, very simple and down-to-earth. In many semi-arid regions the main occupation is cattle raising. The productivity—both per acre and per man—can be enormously increased by controlled grazing, which however normally requires extensive fencing. What is the cost of fencing in Africa? People open a drawer full of quotations from the developed countries, and the answer is “£100 a mile”. At this cost, it is obvious, extensive fencing is utterly beyond the reach of poor villagers. This problem still awaits its Michael Ionides. I hope the Intermediate Technology Dev-

elopment Group will tackle it. We need a really low-cost method of fencing, with a maximum use of local labour and a minimum use of in-bought materials, and that method “reduced” to a do-it-yourself-kit to fit on to a Land Rover. And then everybody who needs it must somehow be told about it and have a chance of acquiring the know-how.

Countless other examples could be given. High on the priority list must be the problem of crop storage. It is a matter of pretty well established fact that the poorest countries suffer the greatest losses—often thirty to forty percent of the harvest—because of lack of proper storage. Yet I doubt that there is an insufficiency of knowledge and experience on how to store safely. Only, the existing knowledge does not reach those who need it most; it has not been “reduced” to a do-it-yourself-kit and has not been introduced into the primary school curriculum—if you will allow me this slightly symbolical way of expressing myself. The same basic approach has to be applied to every form of building, bridging, transport, and processing and other production in rural areas, with the invariable objective of minimising the need for inbought materials and thus enabling the poor peasants to utilise their one major asset, their own labour power, but on a much higher level of productivity and viability than is common at present.

I believe that the problem of World Hunger can be solved along these lines and *along these lines only*. At the risk of repeating myself I emphasise that the poor peasants are the custodians of the soil in the hungry countries and that it is the poor peasants and no one else who will, or will not, double and treble the productivity of their acres, as is required if famine is to be avoided. Food is produced in rural areas, not in the big cities. Food surpluses from the rural areas are needed to feed the ever-growing cities. The central economic task of mankind, at this juncture, is to build up an efficient and satisfactory way of life in the rural areas, to achieve an agro-industrial structure which conquers un-employment, stops rural decay, and arrests the seemingly irresistible drift of destitute people from the countryside into the big cities, already overcrowded and rapidly becoming unmanageable.

The world food problem is not primarily a *scientific* problem. It is a problem of mass mobilisation, of mass education towards “the next step”, of making available the appropriate technologies to hundreds of millions of peasants. Needless to say, in many countries it is also a political problem—but this aspect goes beyond my present terms of reference.

It should be abundantly clear from what I have said that Factory Farming can have no relevance whatever to the question of avoiding famine in the hungry countries. What happens in the Factory Farm is not primary production, but secondary production: a process of conversion, like turning coal into electricity. No one, surely, makes the mistake of the dear old lady who after seeing a film about the tough life of coal miners exclaimed: “I shall never again burn coal, but immediately switch over to electricity!” When coal is burned to make electricity, about seventy percent of the calories contained in the coal are lost. When feeding stuffs are turned into poultry or veal in Factory Farms, some eighty to eighty-five percent of the calories contained in the feeding stuffs are lost. This conversion, therefore, can have nothing to do with feeding the hungry.

It is also easy to see that the main *raison d'être* of Factory Farming is to save human labour. Whether it ultimately achieves even this, may be doubtful; I am not qualified to judge it. What is certain is that the impulsion towards labour-saving does not reasonably exist in the hungry countries, which suffer from a surplus of labour and a shortage of capital.

A final point about Factory Farming in the developing countries is worth making. Perhaps the greatest problem of these countries is the problem of alienation, of being faced with so much that is strange and incomprehensible and incompatible with tradition that the ordinary people become bewildered and timid, while the educated lose contact with the ordinary people. And what more terrible method of alienation could be devised than a type of farming that alienated even the animals from their natural life and induced man to treat them in a manner utterly irreconcilable with the simplest teachings of religion?

For a man to put himself into a wrongful relationship with animals and particularly those long domesticated by him, has always been considered a horrible and infinitely dangerous thing to do. There have been no holy men in our history or in anybody else's history who were cruel to animals, and innumerable are the stories and legends which link sanctity with a loving kindness towards lower creation. In *Proverbs* we read that the just man takes care of his beast, but the heart of the wicked is merciless, and St. Thomas Aquinas wrote: “It is evident that if a man practises a compassionate affection for animals, he is all the more disposed to feel compassion for his fellow men”. And I might also quote Pope Pius XII who said: “The animal world, as all creation, is a manifestation of God's power, his wisdom, and his goodness, and

as such deserves man's respect and consideration. Any reckless desire to kill off animals, all unnecessary harshness and callous cruelty toward them is to be condemned. Such conduct, moreover, is baneful to a healthy human sentiment and only tends to brutalise it.”

### Non Violent Methods

Have the sayings of the saints and sages anything to do with the practical problem of feeding the hungry? Yes. Man does not live by bread alone and if he thinks he can disregard this truth and can allow the “human sentiment” to become brutalised, he does not lose his technical intelligence but his power of sound judgment, with the result that even the bread fails him—in one way or another. Another way of putting the same thing is this: Man's greatest single task today is to develop in himself the power of non-violence. Everything he does violently, for instance in agriculture, could also be done relatively non-violently, that is, gently, organically, patiently adapted to the rhythms of life. The true task of all further research and development is surely to devise non-violent methods of reaching the results which man requires for his existence on earth. The violent methods always seem to produce bigger results more quickly; in fact, they lead to the accumulation of insoluble problems, particularly with the World Food Problem. But there is a way, a non-violent way. It is based on a true compassion for hundreds of millions of humble peasants throughout the world and an effort of the imagination to recognise the boundaries of their poverty. It leads to policies that truly help them to help themselves. This is the way we must seek. It is humane, democratic and, I can assure you, surprisingly cheap.

## International Peace Diary

Available with either one page for every day, or one week over two pages. Improved layout and completely revised 64 pp. World Directory of organisations, etc., 16 pp. World Maps and many other useful features. Attractively bound in assorted colours.

Week-to-two-pages edition 5/- (post 6d.)

Six for 45/-, post free.

Page-a-day edition 8/6 (post 8d.)

Six for 25/-, post free.

Christmas List of Cards, Books, Calendars, Diaries, etc., especially selected for peaceniks. Please send s.a.e.

**HOUSMANS, 5 Caledonian Road, King's Cross, N.1**



# Quotes . . .

*"From a detached point of view, expansion in the output of many goods is not easily accorded a social purpose. More cigarettes cause more cancer. More alcohol causes more cirrhosis. More automobiles cause more accidents, maiming and death; also more pre-emption of space for highways and parking; also more pollution of the air and the countryside. What is called a high standard of living consists, in considerable measure, in arrangements for avoiding muscular energy, increasing sensual pleasure and for enhancing caloric intake above any conceivable nutritional requirement. Nonetheless, the belief that increased production is a worthy social goal is very nearly absolute . . ."*

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH.

*"The New Industrial State" 1967.*

*"The enormity of the danger of extinction of our species is dulled by the frequency with which it is stated, as if a familiar threat of catastrophe were no threat at all. We seem to feel somehow that because the hydrogen bomb has not killed us yet, it is never going to kill us. This is a dangerous assumption because it encourages the retention of traditional attitudes about world politics."*

SENATOR J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

*"The Arrogance of Power."*

*"We don't know how to live from our own labour. And as for the fuss they're making now about the dawn of some sort of public opinion has it so suddenly dropped from Heaven without any warning? How is it they don't understand that before we can have an opinion of our own we must have work, our own work, our own initiative in things, our own experience."*

DOSTOIEVSKY.

*"The Possessed."*

*"No real revolution has ever taken place—whether in America in 1776, France in 1789, Russia in 1917, China in 1949—without ad hoc popular institutions improvised from below simply beginning to administer power in place of the institutions previously recognized as legitimate. That is what a revolution is. Anything else is only another version of the welfare state."*

STAUGHTON LYND.

*"Decentralization: A Road to Power?"  
—Liberation, May-June 67*

*"What socialists set out originally to remedy were essentially the twin evils of war and poverty arising out of inequitable economic distribution. What socialists rarely (if ever) adequately realized was that those evils themselves arose out of the dominance and power of the few over the lives of the many. They thus fell into the trap of seeking to remedy the effects of power by themselves seeking power. This cannot be done in the final analysis, if only because the creation of an effective alternative power structure will itself inevitably act as a magnet for the most single-minded power seekers who will under pressure obey the logic not of equality and integrity, but of power."*

RONALD SAMPSON.

*Peace News—Sept. 29th, 1967.  
"The Labour Government and Disarmament"*



# Go Ahead and Live!

We want new programs! Some of us want to build that new and better world. We don't need more analysis or exposé of what's wrong. Nor do we need thousands of daily reports in the mass media of horrible current events. We've had our fill of centralization—we want new directions and new tools. We call ourselves decentralists.

The voice for decentralism was raised in the 30's, and has been quietly persistent ever since. But in its early years it was largely overwhelmed by the strident voice of the New Deal and government propaganda. The centralist trend was supported and abetted by educators, mass media, laws and statutes. Result: centralization has grown apace—government, cities, industries, universities — and alas, wars—have all grown larger.

But now in the 60's, the tide may be turning. A New Generation rebels and drops out; riots and violence tear our cities; educators are discouraged and ineffective; business men are frightened; government officials are confused. Public debt skyrockets, war continually escalates, and 52,000 horrendous nuclear bombs threaten us. World-renowned physicist, Linus Pauling, says that each of these bombs is more powerful than—not just one Hiroshima bomb—but a thousand times more powerful than all the bombs used in six years of World War II! If one were exploded each day, capable of wiping out New York City, London, Tokyo or Moscow, killing five to ten million persons, it would take 146 years to exhaust the 1967 world's supply of nuclear weapons.

Most of us agree today that destructiveness is the outcome of un-lived life. We know that the Modern Centralized scene frustrates the drive for life at so many points, that today's deep and wholesale destruction is its inevitable result.

So youth rebels and the disaffected riot. And journals and papers go underground to expose the power structure, publicize protests and describe harassment of the military-industrial complex. But this is not enough. It doesn't give us the help we want—solid, human, constructive programs, in which men can be men, women—women, and children—children again.

Some of us feel that we have found such programs—at least the base for them—in the School of Living. It offers programs that first of all satisfy our need for close human association, in *small* groups. We are tired of big organisations—big corporations, big factories, big universities, big governments, big cities. We want to handle our own affairs in face-to-face encounter with people we know. We want to make our own decisions on matters important to us—our work, our mating, our children, our education, our health. We want activity responsive to our own personal direction.

For many of us this means setting up functioning, loving families—extended families, with members approaching a “tribe” or primary group—not just parents and two children. We're tired of just peer groups; we want to live with children, adolescents, and with wise and skilled older

people. (There are still some left!) It means a revival of small—often intentional—communities on the land, where we set our own cultural patterns, create our own trades, jobs and professions, our own co-operative and regional inter-change.

Second it means programs in association with Nature—with land, trees, water, wind and sun. We're tired of concrete and steel, blaring lights and continuous noise, dirt and disorder. We want the feel of the earth beneath our feet and in our hands. We want to till and plant, to tend and harvest, to rise with the sun and rest with the dark. We're tired of packaged, devitalized food; we want to grow our own. We're tired of being told how to dress and what to wear; we want to design, weave and sew our clothes. We're tired of living in tenements, ranch- and pent-houses. We want to build our own functional, esthetic shelter.

Third, we work at programs that come realistically to grips with the power structure. We're not just drop-outs, escaping to a doubtful hedonism or unreal decentralism. We understand the roots of economic exploitation—particularly the usury of land-lordism and money-lending. We want non-violently and strategically to undercut the twin evils of government-granted privilege in land and banking. We support action which eliminates land speculation; we are in groups that hold land in trust, instead of as private property. We support and take part in groups which co-operate in granting low-cost credit, and which issue money honestly.

We withdraw from violence and legal coercion. We refuse the draft, income and war-taxes, and keep our cash-incomes below taxable level. We are anti-statist. We form voluntary associations to “do for ourselves” instead of accepting, or turning to government help. We do not favor a “guaranteed” income from government—we seek rather to correct the maladjustments which now divert unearned income to some persons, from those who produced it. When the source leaks are stopped, there will be enough for all, in freedom, without the interception of authoritarian “guaranteed” incomes.

Fourth, we want good health. We want to be strong and vigorous; loving and rational; full of zest for living to a ripe old age. We are tired of being tired—of being listless, flabby, sick and neurotic. We are ashamed that mono-nucleosis is the “college students' disease.” That 90,000 high schoolers in London need to wear dentures. We are ashamed that ten million women in the U.S. are anemic; that with \$250,000,000 spent annually on cancer research, the incidence of cancer has gone up 300 per cent since 1900! We want a way of life that prevents all this.

We're tired of government health programs—of compulsory shots, drugs and injections. We're not satisfied with more doctors, hospitals and Medicare. We want programs that help us understand, and assume responsibility for, our own health. We seek healthful work, proper rest, creat-

ive recreation; clean, pure water; whole nutritious food. We want rational eugenics, creative sex, a birth-rate in balance with the productive resources of our area.

We want time for art and meditation, yes. But we want more that our daily life shall be both esthetic and contemplative. We want to create our own festivals and rituals, our own poetry, music, dance and drama. We want to create functional, beautiful objects — dishes, clothes, furnishings, homes, gardens, homesteads, communities. We reflect on and ponder the living processes and relationships all about us—the inanimate, plant, animal, human and cosmic.

Fifth, we want a new education. We are through with schools that increasingly take over our time, energy and lives, and those of our children—assuming more and more that they (the schools) “must solve people's problems” as they see them. Many of us want and are prepared to teach our own children at home or in private schools. We set up experimental and self-regulative schools in our communities; we organize free universities and adult education in universal problems of living. Our goal is an education that helps us live to our fullest in every area of living. More than that, we want our actual lives—and those of our children—to be so full, so creative, so responsible that Life itself is our best educator.

The School of Living is both a learning and an action program, which grew out of the thinking and efforts of Ralph Borsodi. In 1928, Harpers published *This Ugly Civilisation*. Borsodi's critique of modern technologized, centralized society. In 1933, they issued his action program, *Flight from The City*, describing his family adventure in modern productive living. In 1936 the School of Living was organized for research in how to live, and became a center for home and community building. In the thirties and forties, seven other land-based communities developed in the United States from the School's pattern, including some of its significant land-holding and credit institutions.

Through the years Mr. Borsodi and the School of Living (from Lane's End Homestead, Brookville, Ohio) continued their emphasis on decentralism, modern homesteading, intentional communities and social reform. A small university was set up to train leaders; Mr. Borsodi wrote and published thirteen books, travelled widely in Mexico and Asia, seeking a region that would initiate or maintain a decentralist culture. Two journals, *The Green Revolution* and *A Way Out*, have been issued regularly since 1945. Borsodi has formed an International Foundation for Independence, a decentralist credit-money system for the restoration of producers and farmers in undeveloped countries. This is actively supported by J. P. Narayan, director of the Gandhian Institute, and other world leaders. Currently a new School of Living center and community is being developed at Heathcote, Freeland, Maryland.

The centralist world is falling apart. Green Revolutionists offer a way out. All who love life are invited to share and to help develop decentralist programs. Using the title of a recent popular School of Living book, they are encouraged to *Go Ahead and Live!*

## Correspondence

### CONGO

I have just seen your editorial on the Congo, and think that the part of it deploring ‘the failure of the peace movement to formulate a political as well as a moral philosophy of peace’ deserves to be writ large, and hung in a hundred rooms and lecture halls throughout the country.

ROGER MOODY.

1 Grove Lodge,  
Hampstead Lane,  
London, N.6.

### SELECTIVE IDEALISTS

Most people (including many readers of *Resurgence*) who advocate and claim to practice, peace, non-violence, harmlessness, anarchism and total revolution need a clarification or qualification of their positions inasmuch as they are fundamentally dishonest because selective. A significant proportion of peace activists limit the actual expression of their humane concern mainly to one animal species, their own. Individual human idiosyncrasy, cultural habits and current ideas largely determine which creatures escape direct abuse, which are made extinct and which are found servicable and are therefore controlled and preserved for pre-determined exploitation.

The ancient awareness or understanding that no part of nature functions in isolation and that man is but one part of a vast tapestry is increasingly ignored. The certain realization of an essential balance, a pervading interaction, fusion and harmonic interweaving of the cosmic flow is largely forgotten. An irrational, destructive Jewish tribal notion that nature is primarily intended to be selfishly exploited by its most powerfully evolved member still holds sway. A perverted and degrading normality, as opposed to naturalism, and the depressing disastrous findings of serious ecological research are the inevitable results of many centuries of environmental misuse.

Many human limitations and failings are obviously motivated by ignorance, delusion, conditioning, thoughtlessness, stupidity and as such are perfectly understandable and forgivable. This scarcely applies to the open-minded, intelligent, thinking majority on the revolutionary peace scene. Selfishness, unconcern, hypocrisy, barely suppressed, rather than effectively transcended, instinctive cruelty or a remarkable talent for ignoring unpleasant realities is more probably an explanation for their revolting eating habits and the terrible suffering such indulgences necessitate.

There is a scarcity of responsible scientific or medical evidence in favour of flesh diet. There is alternatively a prodigious volume suggesting flesh-meat consumption to be extremely harmful to the human system. Man has evolved as a vegetarian animal by developing a vegetarian physiology. With no real medical, scientific, health, economic, problematic or ethical excuses available to justify flesh-meat addiction it is tempting to simplify a complex relatively uncharted psychological area and fall back on such trite generalisations as primeval echoes or vibrations. Yet it is reasonable to assume



that the species degenerated into fleshfood consumption habits during the Ice Age, when it was perhaps essential for physical survival, initiating a regressive evolutionary impetus which has presently ossified into static tradition. Other theories also deserve consideration. Human evolution did not necessarily effect by one route alone. There are possibly men amongst us who are by nature more carnivorous than most.

Nonetheless to articulate or practice a solidarity, brotherhood, love, peace, harmlessness and compassion which does not embrace all living creatures is at best extremely limited and at worst hardly worthy of its name.

DAVE CUNLIFFE.

11 Clematis Street,  
Blackburn, Lancs.

## EVOLUTION

Professor Leopold Kohr's praise for small nations, in his challenging book, "The Breakdown of Nations" (1957), reviewed in your issue of September/October, 1967, has had support from an eminent anthropologist. Sir Arthur Keith, at the end of his interesting book, "Essays on Human Evolution" (1946) wrote (page 214):

"What of the other nations which have been ravaged, despoiled, and oppressed by the might of Germany—particularly the small nations? The future of small nations is too large a subject to embark on at the end of an essay already too long. In another series of essays, in which the evolution of nationality will be traced, I shall have much to say in favour of small nations: they come nearest to what I think an evolutionary unit should be in an ideal world. Economists have stigmatized small nations as "out of date," as anachronisms, and as anomalies. In very truth, it is not small nations, but the great ones, which are anomalous; they have been created in a fierce struggle for power and ever more power. Small nations have succeeded in maintaining their independence and their sovereignty, not because of their power, but because of the strength and resolution of their national spirit."

R. B. CARNAGHAN.

21 Harford Drive,  
Watford,  
Herts.

## CIVIL LIBERTIES

The Minister of Health ("I do think at this stage persuasion and voluntary action are the best ways to proceed," reported Feb. 14, 1966) is trying to make local authorities impose fluoridation of public water supplies on their populations, even where this has been previously rejected. Some consider the threat of legislation to make fluoridation compulsory is not a remote possibility.

At a meeting in London last November, Dr. G. L. Waldbolt (author of "A Struggle with Titans," a valuable book which gives some of the history of fluoridation, which might well be studied with "Compulsory Mass Medication" by P. Clavell Blorint, also on fluoridation) besides showing the fallacies in studies purporting to indicate that fluoridation was safe, and giving other evidence, including professional bans on data unfavourable to

fluoridation; he stated that the new head of the American Food and Drug Administration had been appraised of serious damage to new-born children by fluoride tablets and fluoride drugs, and added that as fluoride tablets were less toxic than fluoridated water, a ban on the latter was bound to come sooner or later. The A.F.D. Administration has now banned the sale of certain fluoride drugs for expectant mothers.

In Britain in December 1962 the Minister of Health made the claim, clearly untrue, "There has been no authoritative criticism of fluoridation," and a subsequent Minister of Health said about three years later: "Everyone agrees that there is no danger in its use." Apart from condemnation of fluoridation from official bodies, there is a growing number of professional persons (in medicine, dentistry, biology, etc.), who are individually declaring themselves against this practice which is not only an undemocratic measure, but represents a menace to health and a misleading distraction from advancing sound measures of dental hygiene.

Further information may be obtained from London Anti-Fluoridation Campaign, 36 Station Road, Thames Ditton, Surrey.

Yours sincerely,

JEFFREY R. J. BOND.

8 Fairhaven Road,  
Bristol 6.

## INFORMATION PLEASE

I am preparing an essay on the theme "War and Peace in World Literature," and I want to contact pacifists throughout the world interested in the same subject, or persons possessing documentation about peace literature. I am especially interested in anthologies of peace literature (poetry and prose), newspaper-cuttings about contemporary writers of peace literature and iconographic material (photos or reproductions of sculpture, paintings, etc.) on the same theme.

L. VAND DEN BRIELE.

Postbus 673,  
Brussels 1,  
Belgium.

## 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 FOURTH WORLD

Biafra in the news, and Anguilla out of it barely hang on to their new independence. Whatever the immediate outcome of the present tragic war, Biafra is now a reality. Connor Cruise O'Brien, as Dag Hammarskjöld's special representative, helped the U.N. to prevent the secession of Katanga from the Congo. Recently, however, after visiting Biafra, he reported to the Observer (Oct. 8th, 1967) as follows:

"It is possible that the State of Biafra may be crushed out of existence by the numerically superior and better-armed Federal troops . . . What is certain, however, is that a nation has been born and will in some form endure. There is a reality about the birth of Biafra, in blood and confusion, that there never was about all those ceremonial haulings-down of flags, in which the colonial authorities handed over symbols of power to selected orators and other dignitaries."

Meanwhile, Quebec still smolders as reports that the Nationalists really mean business are followed by quick denials. An article in *The New Scientist* shortly after De Gaulle's visit, showed quite clearly that Quebec has the infrastructure for building a viable independent nation. Similarly, recent business articles have pointed out that Scotland might be a more prosperous region if it were not dragged down by economic ties with England, a viewpoint dramatically emphasised by the Scottish Nationalist victory at Hamilton announced just as *Resurgence* goes to press.

The *Manx Tynwald* seems to be temporarily quiescent but reports from the *Channel Islands* indicate strong dissatisfaction there—especially in Jersey—with ties to Britain that may drag them along into Europe's Common Market. The goings-on in *Brittany*, as the Common Market's grip tightens and begins to hurt, can be doing little to reassure the nearby "British" islands.

Even within the English part of our (dis-)United Kingdom we are hearing more about distressed areas as Mr. Wilson attempts to patch up sore spots already worsened by his conservative economic remedies. As an economist commented in a recent book,

"A poor region within a nation state is in many ways worse off than a poor nation state in the sense that it is more restricted in the policies that it can follow to correct a falling level of regional income. A region within a country cannot prevent capital funds flowing out across the regional frontier, nor can it impose restrictions on inter-regional trade, nor can it follow an independent monetary and fiscal policy."\*

But far from increasing regional autonomy, "the central government [shows a] reluctance to delegate greater budgetary powers to the regions, rather like a broody hen with ducklings terrified of committing her charges to unfamiliar elements"†. It is small

\*M. J. Pullen, Univ. of Leicester, in "Planning and Growth in Rich and Poor Countries," edit. Birmingham and Ford, 1966; p.111.

†Glyn Davies, Univ. of Strathclyde, in *Sunday Times*, Oct. 8th, 1967; p.55.

consolation that some poorer regions of Europe, such as Brittany and Southern Italy suffer far more brazen neglect than any English region.

Externally, however, where Britain "protects" its remaining colonies from greedy neighbours, as in *British Honduras* and *Gibraltar*, there is hope that new small independent states will eventually emerge. At least one published letter from a Gibraltarian has pointed out that the referendum there failed to allow for the best option of all—independence. It is reported that *Cypriot* leaders are having second thoughts about *enosis*—and with good reason! *The Observer* (Oct. 8th, 1967) published a letter in which a visitor to Cyprus concluded, after a five week stay that "What they (the people of Cyprus) now indicate to be seriously after is a sovereign State . . . Their hope and wish, though not publicly expressed, is that both the Greek and Turkish armies should be withdrawn from Cyprus, and the freedom and sovereignty of their country guaranteed by international treaty under the United Nations. The *Naga* leaders in London are now expressing renewed anxiety about the fate of their people at the hands of the Indian Government.

Islands that go-it-alone make natural members of The Fourth World and there are reports from the Caribbean that the *British Virgin Islands* may be heading for an Anguilla-like UDI. And now the Australian Government has announced that the tiny Pacific Island of NAURA will become independent on January 31st, 1968. The island has an area of eight square miles, and a population of approximately 4,500.

Monitored and prepared by Roger Franklin.

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

RESURGENCE. Articles, poems, short stories and other items for publication in *Resurgence* are welcomed. Reprints of our "Statement of Intent" which appeared in the May/June 1966 issue (*Resurgence* 1) are obtainable from 94 Priory Road, London, N.W.6, on receipt of a stamped addressed foolscap envelope.



# REVIEWS

## Enzo Sereni. A Hero of Our Times

By Clara Urquhart and Peter Ludwig Brent. (Robert Hale Ltd. 25/-).

No Jew, no pacifist, surely no human being can read this book and remain unmoved, even though the authors seem to have done much at the outset to frustrate their own admirable purpose. The Foreword by Ezekiel Mphahlele of Nairobi, and the Preface by Clara Urquhart, instead of acting as an introduction, have the effect of obscuring the story by attempting to establish an analogy between the centuries-old persecution of the Jews and the oppressive anti-apartheid laws in South Africa today, this argument is disputable and becomes a hindrance, and has in any case little direct bearing on the subject of the book.

By far the most illuminating and inspiring words are Sereni's own, taken from his diaries and letters, and perhaps it would have been better to let him speak entirely for himself. As it is it is hard at times to follow the order of events.

Enzo Sereni was Italian born, but he was a Jew who came to believe, in spite of an Italian intellectual and cultural background, that there was only one nationality for a Jew—not Italian, not German, not British, not American, but Jewish. This is, perhaps pure Zionism, but has little to do with the political party known by that name to-day. The fact that he was a pacifist, a man who refused to take up arms at the height of the pre-war Arab-Jewish struggle in Palestine, who had insisted instead on maintaining contact with the Arabs, who preached that hatred towards men must always be wrong and that no man of whom one makes a friend can at the same time be an enemy, makes it clear that his desire for a Jewish state and Jewish nationality is not the same as the objectives of Zionism today.

His early years in the country of his birth are of interest only because of the urgent need to know how a Jew who went to Palestine out of a complete conviction that this was the way to combat Diaspora (dispersal) and bring about the resurrection of the Hebrew nation in the land of Israel, came to die in the concentration camp of Dachau.

The shadow of Hitler's fascism had not yet fallen upon the world and yet this young, Italian Zionist seemed to foresee that the answer lay in taking up the shovel, the pick, the hammer and with plough, seed and devotion "make the land of his forefathers fertile and ready for that day. Once he had come to this conclusion there was nothing for it but "to live the answer, to go himself and add his sweat to the sweat of the thousands already there."

He started the Group Givat Brenner, which is now the largest of the Ein Harod group of kibbutzim. He worked there then, and later, "not like a man possessed, but like a man released, for he had solved the paradox and burden of dispersal; he knew that here, on these slopes and plains, the very fact of what it meant to be a Jew would be re-defined for ever." His wife, his mother and sister and his children all lived there, only his younger brother, Emilio resisted, and the exchange of letters, which doubtless today would be called a "dialogue" puts the arguments for both sides of

this tragic conflict of belief clearly and without sentiment.

In the early thirties the threatened apocalypse brought him back to Europe. Mission succeeded mission; he wrote and spoke in Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Iraq and Egypt, France and Italy, but more especially in Germany. He hoped that this time at least he would find ready listeners, men anxious now surely to step out of a country in which the professions had been closed against Jews, in which universities barred their doors, in which cafés, swimming pools and restaurants refused them entry, and in which no Jew could marry a non-Jew. *But they did not listen.* Delusion has deep roots; nothing, they said, would be done against Germans who had fought in the last war, who wore its medals, pillars of German culture; the laws were not aimed at "good Germans—Germans like us".

So Sereni took on a new role; he joined an underground movement; he risked arrest again and again, and when he left Germany he had helped the emigration of some 15,000 young Jews to Palestine. His home-comings to Givat Brenner after these trips were great events: "Enzo will speak to-night" would run through the kibbutz like a man with a flaming torch.

And now comes the great change, the awful soul-searching abandonment of his long held belief that the killing of one's fellow human beings could never be the right solution. The war somehow made Enzo Sereni, who believed in love, accept the apparatus of hatred. He felt that Germany's determination to put an end to Jewry left him no alternative; so, Sereni, sadly and in grief, put pacifism aside, not seeing that the Jews were not being saved by the war; a war that was not in fact being fought, and never had been undertaken on behalf of the Jews. If there had been no war, millions of Jews now dead might be alive today; this point is made very clear by the authors when they describe how, as defeat became more and more certain the Nazis were forced to kill each and every witness to their callous cruelty.

Once his decision was taken Sereni joined the R.A.F. and became a parachutist. It is insufficiently explained how he came to be one of those chosen by the Allies to be dropped into Europe, there to rally and lead the Jewish Resistance. Many efforts were made to persuade him to return to Palestine but he was strongly convinced of his mission and his final letter is deeply poignant and strangely reassuring. "Arrivederci," it ended.

But a pilot lost his way; Enzo jumped and it seems clear that he must have been captured at once. He arrived in Mühldorf and it is said that the very sound of his name sent a thrill of hope to all who heard it; he was moved from one camp to another and there are many "ghosts of stories" about him, and of the light that he seemed to shed even in Dachau. It is told that each camp he left suffered a sense of loss, yet the determination he inspired lingered.

He entered Dachau on 9th October 1944, was taken to a special punishment cell for interrogation on 17th November, died on 18th November, aged 39. The war against Hitlerism could not save him.

His last message to Ben Gurion was a plea to those who remained to settle differences in a spirit of love and friendship.

Where this book fails is that it falls so short of the man's own inspiration. What was it that made this man like a shining light, bringing comfort and strength to all with whom he worked and suffered?

What is the explanation of his inspired courage and martyrdom?

Who will dare to say that this was a wasted life and that no ripple from it will disturb the pool of the world's complacency. Yet millions of people never heard of Enzo Sereni; I was one of them, and now even though I feel it should be read, I want to know so much more than this book gives me.

SYBIL MORRISON.

## 20 Letters to a friend

By Svetlana Alliluyeva. (Hutchinson 1967. 30/-).

Svetlana Stalin has written a book which takes one into the ante-chamber of the most colossal despot history has ever known. Occasionally, tantalisingly, and sometimes with a maddening casualness, she takes the reader into the presence itself, but no sooner do we get our bearings and begin to frame questions than she whisks us outside again to the accompaniment of a kind of moralising patter which rarely rises above the level of Patience Strong.

And yet she has written an important book, an achievement, given her own identity and that of her father, it would doubtless have been a trifle difficult not to have realised. She makes it clear that Stalin was a boor as well as a bully, and that his mental processes were almost devoid of originality or polish. He was a peasant. He lived in one room like a peasant, he talked (and swore) like one, he acted, he thought and he drank like one. It has been said that Trotsky and Lenin both underrated his intelligence, but the fact is they merely underrated his peasant cunning, the readily suspicious peasant craftiness battling with forces whose true nature his own primitive powers of reasoning made it impossible for him to comprehend. He seems to have had scant knowledge or respect for any of the arts, and indeed a quite minimal acquaintance with anything beyond the purview of scheming to grab political power and keeping it. Perhaps only a man of such limited sympathies, such narrow perceptions and with such a total disregard for human suffering could have survived in office as long as he did.

Stalin's father was killed in a drunken brawl, he himself drank frequently to excess, and his eldest son died in an alcoholic's ward in his early forties. What about Stalin's wife? His daughter makes it clear that her mother was a quite exceptional woman; in this account she is rescued from the shadows and what emerges is a woman of deep concern for public affairs and with an almost adolescent quality of idealism in her hopes for the revolution. This was not a simple hausfrau content to support her husband with a well ordered domestic life and with little concern for his public work. She was far more a revolutionary than he and was equally concerned with the leading questions of the day.

We don't know what scenes passed between Stalin and his wife as the second civil war, the civil war when collectivised farming was being brutally imposed on the peasantry, was being fought. We do know that more people died than in the revolution that brought the Bolsheviks to power. Nor do we know the details of her reproaches to Stalin as the purges began to get under way and even her own friends began to be arrested. We can only guess. Late in 1932, this gifted woman who had married the 40-year-old Stalin when still a girl of 18, and who in 1934, had written asking permission to join the communist party with the

same kind of fervour a catholic girl might seek to make her first communion, committed suicide.

There are always depths below depths in human conduct, and she could not have known that her death was to be but a prelude to the massacre or imprisonment of nearly all her relatives. One by one the familiar figures of the Stalin household whom his daughter had known as aunts or uncles, were shot or put away, or banished from the presence.

By then, clearly, Stalin was personally deteriorating. History now was to be written not by the cannons of Marxist orthodoxy, but by the laws of psychopathology, and the purges that mounted to their horrible climax were the products not, not even, of political necessity, but of paranoid obsession. The leader of the Socialist Sixth of the World was mad.

It is probable the war saved his sanity from total collapse, but even so, the arrests and shootings did not cease entirely, and when "peace" was restored, a new climax of bloodletting was under way, and was only halted by his fortunate demise.

No historian seeking an explanation for the horrors of his reign is likely to omit a consideration of the possibility that perhaps after all Stalin, the supreme man of power, was no more in real control of the machine he ruled than his housekeeper. And so, from his daughter's book, it proves. Once the revolution was firmly in the saddle, its leaders found they could relax their grip on power only to lose it. Since they felt inspired with a mission they opted for the only alternative open to them. Instead of relaxing their grip and allowing free political discussion which would have destroyed their power, they tightened it. They went on tightening it through three decades. The terror was spasmodic, remorseless and obsessive, and to this day its full meaning has received no adequate elucidation.

It was as though a group of men, having seized power by military revolt, found themselves chained to forces they could neither comprehend nor control. The power was seemingly in their grasp, but when it came to directing it, they found it was they who were really being pushed around and that the power had a life of its own.

Partly this was because they took over from capitalism crude quantitative concepts of economics which left them no room to grasp that any revolution worth the candle needs to be concerned with qualitative factors arising from human situations. This is a common and cardinal socialist error, which is why its propaganda is so obsessed with statistics.

Their inevitable failures led them to look for enemies, and they found them everywhere. First it was Trotskyists, then Kulaks, and then 'enemies of the people', millions of them, to which were added 'spies,' 'saboteurs' and 'wreckers'. As the list lengthened it would have been surprising if the great despot's own family circle had escaped, and of course, it did not. There was one occasion when Stalin turned to his daughter and announced that even she was sometimes guilty of anti-Soviet utterances. In every way he was more and more isolated from the world and alienated from those family and personal contacts which might have given his mind some hold on reality.

A relative would be arrested on some trumped-up suspicion and after a bleak spell in one of the jails of the secret police would obligingly sign a 'confession' of seemingly limitless incriminatory im-



port. This document would be presented by Beria to Stalin, who would accept it at its face value and as a complete vindication of the 'suspicions' that led to the unfortunate relative's arrest.

It is part of the contagious intellectual phobias of our time that we tend to follow Stalin and accept the pretensions of the prevailing political power groups at their face value. We assume that the communist and capitalist powers that dominate the world will continue on their present course for evermore, when in reality they are all exceedingly unstable shams. The fact is that during the next decade or so, just as we are likely to see the emergence of some form of militarised fascism in the United States if some powerful decentralising tendencies are not soon set in motion, so there will either be a trend to outright military government, or the emergence of some combined form of capitalism and regionalism in Russia.

The communist straight-jacket achieved its reputation for invulnerability at a time when its leaders had implicit confidence in the canons of their own ideology. They also had a certain reputation for omniscience. Today they have neither. The Sino-Soviet quarrel has resulted in the destruction of communist orthodoxy on both sides. The leaders are no longer infallible, and the people are no longer quite so gullible. What next?

This is the question all observers are asking about the Soviet scene, but it is the main question the Soviet leaders are asking themselves, and manifestly they are quite without any meaningful answers. Their aimlessness is strikingly exemplified in the way they have recently imposed long sentences of imprisonment with hard labour on two of their most gifted writers, Sinyavski and Daniel, ostensibly for the crime of 'slandering' the Soviet Union. Politically the trial of these two men is far more important than any other event in Russia today and the transcript of the proceedings\* makes it apparent that fifty years after the revolution the Russian Empire is still trying to control the thought processes of its peoples in ways most of the rest of Europe abandoned more than 300 years ago.

Not all the propaganda, and not all the large scale exercises in technology, can conceal the fact that the mainspring of the revolution is shattered and that by devious and indirect means some return to 'Capitalism' is now inevitable. This is not only because the predatory instinct in commerce is too deep and generalised to be abolished even by a revolution, but because on a small scale there is an important relationship between market and political freedom. Ultimately it will return because it is what many people want. Clearly the beast cannot be destroyed, but the basic problem is still as far from a solution as ever; how is it to be tamed?

Svetlana's book makes clear how cruelly the Soviet Revolution failed to achieve its real objectives, and why the noisy anniversary celebrations today are receiving so little answering echo. If the revolution is rejected by the despot's own daughter, the despot who for decades was the embodiment of its orthodoxy, who then shall it win?

JOHN PAPWORTH.

\*These proceedings, with some useful and important supplementary material has been published under the title 'On Trial' by Collins & Marvill Press, London, 1967. The work, which includes verbatim exchanges in the court proceedings, and which read uncannily like a mediaeval heresy trial, is required reading for anyone seeking an understanding of the real nature of Russian life today.

## Direct Democracy

By John Morris (Housman's, 38pp. 1/-).

This pamphlet defines and defends the concept that people must be sovereign. It describes quite graphically the paramount defect of representative democracy—the formation of governing elites, which permits the people to vote periodically for politicians or for parties, but never for policies. For its proper functioning, its author argues, democracy must not be diluted by a separation of the decision-makers from those who carry out the decisions.

He pleads in effect, that if control is to be restored to the people, there must be an inversion of the centralized hierarchy that is now common in most forms of democracy. There can still be a central governing body that plans, persuades and co-ordinates, but its decisions must always be ratified and modified by local communities. The local, and finally sovereign communities must be small enough to be run by direct democratic discussion amongst all the people, with leadership widely shared.

The author suggests that this pattern has been pioneered in a small way by the Factories for Peace, and there are experiments on a larger scale in Yugoslavia. If the direct, decentralized democracy of these examples were to become widespread, there might well be little outward change in the structure of democratic societies as we see them today: local governments would still be co-ordinated through central "authorities". But, under direct democracy, the final decisions, the real power on national as well as on local issues, would remain with the local communities, and thus with the people. This would mean that counties and towns would be able to decide not to "join the Common Market" or not to go to war, even when national governments recommended such excesses.

The pamphlet is largely the product of a discussion group initiated at the War Resister's International in Rome in 1966. The author urges readers to join the discussion and promises to produce further material.

ROGER FRANKLIN.

## HELP!

Help Resurgence.  
Help yourself with your seasonal gift problem.  
Help your friends to get with it.  
Give one year's subscription to Resurgence at our special gift rate of 15/-.  
\$2.50.

Simply fill in the subscription form, write your own name on the back and send to the Business Manager, 94, Priory Road, London, N.W.6, and leave the rest to us. We will despatch the current issue in good time for Christmas with a greetings card bearing your name.

## narcissus

In Europe

under the stone mass of Rome's ghost  
lies Adam's corpse.

A cry, hardly to be heard,  
is stifled by high priests of the New World  
and incantations are said  
as preludes to exorcising the ghost.

But Christ is sold for small considerations—  
political scapegoats are called in  
to save us just in time,  
and reconciliation awaits the demolition  
of walls within ourselves.

A creature called man inherits the earth  
and death takes him in the skull;  
worms writhe in vacant orbits of the sun  
who runs out of time to stagger  
down the years  
Eclipsed totally by grand erections of the mind  
he leaves Narcissus poised in darkness  
on the brink of recognition.

David Kuhrt



## Polaris Notebook

Barrow-in-Furness is a modest seaport on the north-west coast of England. Along its length is a stretch of land called Walney Island and here, for several generations the firm of Vickers has built ships, mostly warships, and its shipyards still constitute the economic mainstay of the town.

It is a town of red brick and slate roofs, and streets of tiny terraced houses are laid out on the hillsides which, on their upper slopes, yield remarkable views of the docks and the Irish Sea beyond.

The British Government has spent no less than £55 million on the latest addition to its Polaris fleet which was due to be launched here on the occasion of our demo, a coincidence which was not of course accidental. It was to be christened, with a naval addiction for strong-arm names, 'The Repulse,' but a glance at its capacity for creating death and destruction (16 nuclear warheads, each 20 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb and capable of wiping out a city of 3 million inhabitants) suggests the name 'Repulsive' as surely more appropriate. It ought to be noted in passing that this degree of concentration of destructive power rules out its use for military targets, for no conceivable concentration of military might could possibly be amassed to justify (on military grounds) the use of even one of its warheads.

Their only use is in fact for the destruction, wholesale and total, of large cities. Polaris is a floating arsenal of genocidal weaponry. It has no other meaning.

On the way from the station, with brilliant sunlight filling a blue November sky, I passed the first signs of peace activity. The C.N.D. marchers were assembled with their posters. I had caught sight of Sheila Oakes, the newly elected Chairman of C.N.D., on the train and asked her if she was joining our sitdown. Sheila, who has parliamentary ambitions of the Labour persuasion, firmly shook her head—"You will march all over the town," I said, "and nobody will take a blind bit of notice." "Nobody" she rejoined, "will take any notice of your sitdown."

We grimaced, friendly fashion.

As I walked towards the dock entrance, the people looking prosperous and well-dressed and the shops full of the usual mass-produced rubbish that is held to denote affluence, I wondered about this distinction between the Committee of 100 and C.N.D. Its origins are not so much in a difference of principle as in a blazing row between Cannon Collins and Bertrand Russell at a time when most of the present members of both organisations were still wearing short trousers. Except when it is spontaneous, civil disobedience is not generally a good tactic on a mass-scale, it is much better practised by small groups, who can more easily bring the necessary degree of self-discipline to bear. The difference is really one of timing and personal inclination, but to have two major organisations observing a ritualistic distinction of principle here is really rather absurd. Fortunately the members of both organisations show much more common

sense and join each other's demos. with no sense of inconsistency at all.

Nearer the docks, after passing an imposing town hall whose late 19th century builders had clearly drawn their inspiration from a Chinese pagoda, I caught up with some of the Committee supporters. The local people were clearly hostile to this invasion of their town by our small band of peacenicks and projected pursed lips, and gleaming eyes of virtuous indignation at our ragged jeans, our long hair and the occasional strapped bedroll hung over one shoulder. Some of them could not have looked more outraged if we had been sighting nuclear warheads at them.

Here the police were more numerous too, and at the main dock entrance they appeared to outnumber our threescore or so demonstrators who stood around on three corners of a crossroads. The fourth seemed to be reserved for the locals, for the most part elderly men who had come to watch the fun. No doubt they were pensioners from the shipyard and when I spoke to them they were full of easily amused contempt for what we were doing. "Daft lot of boogers," said one in the sharply defined accent of these parts.

I think it was our appearance rather than our cause that aroused their ribaldry. In many ways this is a rather isolated part of the world and even the young people were given to staring and giggling at our clothes or haircuts which in London arouse no comment.

But their amusement was a measure of our failure to get our message across. Why indeed were we so few? There must be hundreds, perhaps thousands of pacifists, Quakers and ban-the-bomb types living within an hour's travelling distance of the town. Where were they all on this key occasion? And if they could not see it as a key occasion what hope is there that the rest of the people, the vast uncommitted multitude of Saturday morning shoppers and their families, will ever be aroused to such an awareness?

Perhaps this reasoning is wrong. But I wonder what the effect on Britain, and indeed the world would be, if a mere thousand people gave up every other consideration in their lives; jobs, families, paying the rent, gardening, television and whatever and lived and worked for nothing else but stopping the downward drift of Western society to war and social disolution? Just one thousand!

We stood around in casual fashion, greeting newly arrived friends and laughing and chatting the while, which is not to say there were not one or two faces that looked taut and furrowed with apprehension. We were a mixed bunch, the bulk of us being from the Committee; some sported the red and black anarchist badge, there were several Young Liberals, a number wore Maoist badges, and one group tackled me regarding some complimentary comments I had made about the Russian communists in Trafalgar Square at a previous demo.

These groups are not of course mutually exclusive. Besides the Committee of 100 (itself having a

very loose definition of membership) I know several individuals who are members of two or more of them.

I spent the time selling *Resurgence*, uphill business at a street scene for a journal priced at half-a-crown. Occasionally people told me they had not enough money to buy it, but I now have a standard ploy for this situation; I thrust a copy at the victim and tell him to send me the money later. He frequently produces the cash from somewhere on the dot, but my post also contains a trickle of half-crowns for weeks afterwards.

As we waited I wondered what would happen when the time came for action. In London when large crowds gather for a demo, it is impossible to ensure they will be non-violent. Invariably there is a lot of bawling and rowdyism, if not an outright punchup. But this time our numbers were smaller and an excellent 'Briefing and Legal Notes' document had been put out by a group in Liverpool and this had contained a direct appeal to people who could not agree to remaining non-violent to stay away.

In the event all was well. Towards midday we saw big cars beginning to approach and in one body we moved into the middle of the road and sat down. It was impressive. There was no noise or fuss, just a quiet group determined to obstruct the launching of one of the most horrendous and destructive devices of modern war. I had scarcely sat down when I felt a thump on the side of my head; an elderly woman, her face white with passion and her lips screaming abuse, was laying about her with her handbag as hard as she could go. She was having a marvellous time and when the police finally led her away to the pavement she must have felt she had done a good day's work. At first there were no arrests, people were carried limp to the pavement, but they immediately returned to sit in the roadway. Somebody almost sat in my lap, it was Laurens, the recently appointed Secretary of the London Committee of 100 on a return visit to the roadway. A police inspector spoke rather uncertainly, "Look, if you don't leave the roadway..." he paused, as if suddenly aware of the ineffectuality of the threat he was about to utter. He looked around somewhat bewildered, a decent type caught up in something beyond his experience, "you will all be arrested" he concluded lamely.

The ground cleared rapidly as people were carried off. Laurens went, and then I found myself grabbed. I just had time to note Bob, a Peace News Editor, helping to obstruct a large car carrying the lady who was to launch the navy's latest nuclear blunder, before I was thrown into the back of a paddy waggon along with about six others.

As the van drove off I tried to sell a copy of *Resurgence* to the policeman sitting at the front. He declined with the kind of courtesy which so takes our foreign visitors, and which is all the more genuine for being quite unconscious. At the police station I made more sales attempts but again there were no takers. "Well," I enquired of one policeman, "how long do you suppose civilisation can survive the continuance of these polaris launchings?"

Despite the surroundings I was dead serious—I wanted to start a dialogue. But I don't suppose such a question had ever floated across the charge-room of Barrow-in-Furness police station before, and besides perhaps cops are not the world's most natural political philosophers.

"I don't know about that Sir" (he called me

Sir!) said the sergeant, "we've got our job to do."

"That's just what the guards argued at Belsen," I replied unfairly.

Meanwhile others were being brought in and I caught a glimpse of Laurens, who was operating total non-resistance, being carried in. Indeed, for the next half hour I seemed to see Laurens being carried by two or three sweating cops from one part of the police station to another wherever I looked. They took away my tie and my belt, but let me keep some food my wife had stuffed into my pockets. They also let me keep my papers and a volume of poetry, then I was locked in a cell. It was a square room, perhaps eight or nine feet each way. The door was situated diagonally across one corner with an open frame in the middle nearly big enough for a man's head. There was a loo in a recess and along one wall was a wooden platform about two inches off the concrete floor, on which were a couple of gray blankets.

I spread out my remaining copies of *Resurgence*, plus the day's *Guardian*, to brighten up the place, and began to read an excellent article on Vietnam by Mary MacCarthy in the current *Peace News*. Outside, the others were locked in the corridor and occasionally one would stop by for a natter.

"Why are you inside there by yourself" enquired Andrew who happens to be my namesake.

"Ah, I ordered a single room," I replied airily. Then Bob, the *Peace News* Editor came over to the door and told me what had happened after I had been carted off. It appeared they had stopped the car long enough to tell the titled lady who was on her way to launch the ship that her projected action was wicked. Bob said her eyes seemed to glaze over on hearing this view of her task, as well they might.

The fact that the lady was a person of no particular political consequence in the power game struck me as interesting. Normally a ship of this importance would be sent off the slipway by royalty at least, even if only minor royalty. The last one had been launched by a cabinet minister's wife who should have known better, but this lady, who was she? Nobody appeared to know. Is there a shortage of top rank volunteers for the job?

Later I was joined by four others. The first was Ron, a small lad of sixteen from Manchester who asked me very worriedly, "Would you describe me as having a pale complexion?" As a matter of fact I think right then I would, but to cheer him up I said "not really". "Well," he said, full of anxiety, "that is how he put me down on the paper". To take his mind off things I asked him about his badges, one of which was a gold bust of Chairman Mao on a red background, and another an inscription in Chinese. He told me he thought Mao was the man to follow because the Russians were all revisionists.

We were joined by two London anarchists, Alan (17) and Edward (18) and then David from Birmingham C.N.D. who was 23. I felt a trifle ancient with these youngsters and found myself envying their sense of certitude about the rightness of what they believed. During the three or four hours that followed they sang songs and, surprisingly, some rather sentimental hymns, they shouted slogans sucked sweets, flipped through the copies of *Resurgence* without apparently reading anything, and except Ron, they smoked. My God, how they smoked! The room was full of sunlight and blue smoke but when I turned to open the window, it



was, like so many things in modern life, merely masquerading as something it wasn't. It was in fact simply a wall made of solid glass bricks. I put out my food and it vanished between cigarettes as it were, and then, as time wore on they quietened down.

One curled up in the corner and slept and the others suddenly asked me to read them some poetry. I read Wilfred Owen's 'Strange Meeting' and his 'Anthem for Doomed Youth'. They liked the last line of that especially, and indeed who wouldn't.

The police station now began to sound as if it were deserted, which in fact it largely was, the cops having gone off for their midday meal. The man holding the fort, a red-faced, benevolent looking sergeant, must have been bored, or possibly sympathetic, for he came over to our door hatch for a chat. He and Alan had a verbal set-to on the subject of Alan's trousers which had been torn when he was grabbed. The cop beamed tolerantly as Alan put on a near convincing display of moral indignation about the other's failure to provide him with sewing materials.

"Eee lad," said the cop, "We'd much rather see these cells empty than full of you people."

Said Alan smartly, "And we'd much rather see your shipyards here empty of Polaris submarines."

But the cop said he didn't know about that and went away smiling.

Time dragged by and suddenly David, who is fairly highly strung I think, began to evince signs of irritation at being cooped up in a confined place for so long. He began to shout some minor request through the hatch and, receiving no reply, started kicking at the door. The only result was that a cop came over and closed the hatch, which did not improve the ventilation problem.

Later a discussion began on the real nature of anarchism, a subject that has always left me stranded on the outskirts, but then we heard our friends in the other cells being taken off to the courtroom and our own turn came soon enough.

We had been charged earlier with activities liable to cause a breach of the peace. An easy one that, and when cautioned that anything I said would be taken down and might be used in evidence against me, I enquired of the Inspector if he could conceive a more terrible way of disturbing the peace than by launching a polaris submarine. He had the grace to blush a bright pink.

Did they feel embarrassed by this obvious riposte? Or were they in a lenient mood? I don't know, but in the courtroom the charge had been replaced by the less serious one of obstruction. Each of us pleaded guilty and my four cellmates each explained briefly that they did not feel in conscience that they could refrain from some form of protest during the polaris launching. Five or six comfortable looking, elderly magistrates sat on the bench with each a curious expression, a compound of non-involvement and of professional presence. Throughout the proceedings none of them said a word except for one interjection from the presiding lady who told me when I was trying to speak to 'be quiet!'

The phrases those boys used, hackneyed though they were, were shot through with sincerity, and I wondered about those magistrates. They must be used enough to having drunks and delinquents on trial before them. But what import for them that young people should be pleading their consciences?

Did not one of them feel the least twitch of unease?

For my part I had merely time to urge that such acts as the Polaris launching must surely wipe out the respect for all law and authority which condoned it, when the Court Clerk told me that what I was saying was not relevant. I went on talking in this vein nonetheless until I became aware that I was interrupting David, whom the Clerk had asked to speak next.

Before being sentenced a police inspector read out a list of my former convictions. He had completed his task and the Clerk of the Court was giving the sentence before my bewilderment at the length of the list was resolved by a realisation that the cop had been reading the legal history of my namesake. It seemed unfair to Andrew to make any objection so I kept quiet, but in the event it did not affect the outcome.

We were all fined £2 and given time to pay. This was the maximum sentence (next year it is being raised to £50 by our far-sighted socialist government).

Outside the courthouse a middling crowd had gathered and some grey-haired women were abusive. None of us, it seemed, had ever known what it was to be half starving and on the dole for years, at least the men got decent wages at the shipyard and they knew what it was to love their country, which was more than we scruffy boogers did and why didn't we get a wash and so on.

I don't go along with the idea that we should explain to these people how they could be building luxury liners for their own use rather than harbingers of death for other people's children. I think we should stick to the moral argument and explain quite simply that what they are doing is wrong. I think we are all corrupted beyond measure by meretricious appeals to have first regard for our own immediate self-interest, appeals which are the normal sensory diet of Western man. Secretly I think we are all sick of such stuff and to wrap it up as peace propaganda is a psychological blunder. But clearly, at present, we are getting no worthwhile message across at all.

But I don't think there was real malice behind the abuse, they laughed too easily when I teased them for that, and they really can recall some harrowing times in all conscience.

In the tea room at Preston station, where I sat after deciding to catch a later train in order to write these notes, I caught sight of Frank Allaun, one of our few pacifist M.P.'s I asked him what he thought of the Scottish Nationalist victory during the week, and he said he had been trying to warn his party colleagues about such dangers to Labour for a long time.

## NEXT ISSUE

Leopold Kohr on "Optimum Social Size"

E. F. Schumacher on "Buddhist Economics"

"But Frank, it's not enough to warn," I said "Some of you people in Parliament really must stick your necks out more if you want to make any impact".

"What do you think I have been doing today?" he asked in a tone of righteous bewilderment.

Now I knew he had been leading the seven hundred strong C.N.D. march and that he had made a characteristically high-principled speech that day, but the idea that this constituted 'sticking his neck out' was a mortifyingly vivid glimpse of another scale of values. "But what about some civil disobedience?" I asked; but the train came in and I had to run.

Afterwards it seemed brash to tell another man that what he is doing is not enough. Frank is a decent chap, but I don't think he appreciates the extent to which history is marching way beyond the considerations that hold his mind.

From the window of the train to London one

*Continued from page 6.*

**RESISTANCE** Journal of National Committee of 100. Monthly 1/-. Editor Peter Neville, Birmingham Peace Action Centre, Factory Road, Birmingham 19.

**RESISTANCE SHALL GROW** Journal of London Committee of 100. Editor Laurens Otter. 1/- monthly from 13 Goodwin St., N.4.

**INHERITED** Trendy graphics, poems, drawings, mock-ups and cockups with good selection from current new poets and others. 5/- (or 1 dollar) for next 4 issues from Editor Peter Hoida, 7 Evesham Rd., Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, England.

**PAUNCH** (C.F. Sancho Panza) radically Romantic literary and social criticism. £1. (2.50 dollars) for 3 issues per year from Editor Arthur Efron, College of Art, State University of New York at Buffalo, N.Y. 14214, U.S.A.

## ARTS LABORATORY

182 Drury Lane, London W.C.2  
Telephone 01 - 405 0512

*A new non-profit enterprise to add colour and zip to the London scene.*

The "Lab" contains a small open space free-form theatre (seating approximately 120), a cinema and concert area, an art and environmental area, a book-shop, office and dressing rooms, a restaurant and also a home for a film production unit.

We will concentrate on finding and encouraging new playwrights and film-makers, and we plan to have colour television, video-tapes, tape-concerts, readings, happenings, lectures and exhibitions.

### MEMBERSHIP RATES—

Student Members ... £1 per year.  
Full Members ..... £2 per year.  
Founder Members ... £50

*Cheques payable to "Arts Laboratory," should be crossed and sent to:*

**The Secretary,  
Arts Laboratory,  
182 Drury Lane,  
Covent Garden W.C.2**

could see bonfires all the way, with occasional fireworks flashing across the sky as the Guy Fawkes rituals were observed. I begin to think we shall be lucky, the way things are going, if we see no brighter flames, nor hear no louder bangs than that.

In the Great Wen there were newspaper headlines about our arrest and a beautiful announcement that the newly launched 'Repulse' had been repulsed by the tide and was stranded in the mud—£55 million worth of endeavour stuck on a mud-flat! What a wonderfully symbolic raspberry to all those high-powered experts who had conceived such a monstrosity. And when I read that the boat had missed the tide because the launching party had been delayed for a vital ten minutes by a group of demonstrators outside the dock gates, I felt imbued with a quite irrational spirit of elation.

JOHN PAPWORTH.

## PUBLICATIONS

**THE COMMONWEAL COLLECTION** Free postal library of important books on peacemaking, non-violent and social change. Details—David Hogget, 112 Winchcombe St., Cheltenham, Gloucs.

**GROG** Digs the Salford scene. A serious political, in-group news sheet which has the rare distinction of trying to be witty and succeeding. 6d. monthly (possibly) from the Supreme Authority, Graham Ivan Redfern, 6 Symons Street, Salford 7, Lancs.

**CAMELS HUMP** Poetry newsletter. Send a dollar or two to get on the mailing list to Editor Richard Morris, Box 8161. State Univ. Reno, Nevada 89507. The next issue will not appear until we get some money.

**SARVODAYA COMMUNITIES NEWSLETTER** The journal of an experimental, non-violent group living project. Good stuff. Obtainable from 24a Payton Street, Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwickshire.

**CATHOLIC WORKER** Organ of Catholic Worker Movement; radical, libertarian, catholic reportage, poems, articles and features. Not subsidised by C.I.A. or the Vatican. Price One penny (one cent)! from Dorothy Day, 175 Christie Street, New York, N.Y. 10002, U.S.A.

**JOURNAL** Discussion and exchange of views on war/peace issues from Joan Baez's Institute for the Study of Non-Violence Box 5535, Carmel, California, U.S.A.

**NEW LIFE** Experimental, communitarian living projects from 15, Camden Hill Road, London, S.E.19.

**A WAY OUT** Bi-monthly political and social comment from homesteading angle. Price 3/6 (40 cents) from the School of Living, Brookville, Ohio, U.S.A.

**UNDERGROUND** On the ball (bomb) comment, articles, poems and quotes by Youth C.N.D. Price 6d. (6 cents) monthly from Editor Tony Hetherington, 5 Caledonian Road, London, N.1.

**UNDERDOG** Marvellous poems by good contemporary poets. Published now and then at 2/6 (30 cents) from Editor Brian Patten, 22 Soho Street, Liverpool 3.

**POETMEAT** Book reviews, art and literary criticism, drawings and photos, but mainly very good poetry. A veritable 'must'. Price 3/- (75 cents) from Editors Dave Cunliffe and Tina Morris, Screeches Publications, 11 Clematis Street, Blackburn, Lancs.

**BE a BO HEEM E Um** Offerings from the new poets 1/6 (20 cents) quarterly from Editor Thomas a. Clark, 3 Minerva Lane, Greenock, Scotland.

**SMALL PRESS REVIEW** Features, scenes, book reviews and a dictionary of the little mags. Price 7/- (1 dollar) quarterly from European Editor Cavan McCarthy, Location Press, 4 Hornby Street, Blackburn, Lancs.

**AMBIT** Poems, dialogues, features, criticism and fiction. A real classy job this. Price 1/- from Editor Michael Allaby Esq., 154 Kings Road, Chelsea, London, S.W.3.