

## CONTENTS

2. **The Sky Darkens over India**  
Geoffrey Ashe
4. **Open Letter to India**  
Satish Kumar
4. **JP: New Values**  
Edward Goldsmith
6. **JP: Total Revolution**  
J.D. Sethi
8. **JP: Beginnings in Bihar**  
Amiya Rao
10. **The Herald**  
Dharmavir Bharati
11. **The Party is over**  
E.F. Schumacher
12. **Et le Larzac**  
Roger Rawlinson
15. **Handbook on Hunger**  
Roger Moody
23. **Nettles**  
John Merlin Morgan
24. **Bread**  
Roger Franklin
- Books**
26. Peter Abbs, Leopold Kohr, Guy  
Dauncey, William Bloom, John  
Hatt, Frances Howard-Gordon,  
Helen Sachs, Graham Carey,  
P. Carter, R. Sheppard,  
Cathy Joans, John Seymour

Layout: Mike Phillips and Peter Bonnici

Cover: Carol Burns

Editor: Satish Kumar

Editorial Group: Peter Abbs, William Bloom,  
Tony Colbert, Geoffrey Cooper, Stephen  
Horne, Steve Lambert, Thomas Land, June  
Mitchell, Terry Sharman, Anne Vogel

Associate Editors: Ernest Bader, Danilo  
Dolci, David Kingsley, Leopold Kohr, Jaya  
PraKash Narayan, John Papworth, E.F.  
Schumacher

Publisher: Hugh Sharman

Printer: Graham Andrews, Webb Offset,  
Reading

Annual Subscription: £2.50  
Overseas \$7.00 Airmail \$10.00

ERRATUM — Last issue this column read  
Vol. 6 no. 2 it should have read Vol. 6  
no. 3, July-August 1975.

# FEED BACK

## Contradictions in Resurgence

Dear Editor, I think *Resurgence* might well have another look at where it is going. The rebuke from Yehudi Menuhin in the last issue was merited and its gentle wording should not be an excuse for its neglect. The same issue contained two articles that quite contradict each other. If it was over a minor matter it would not be of consequence but it is not a minor matter. Stephen Horne wrote: "The sovereignty *Resurgence* stands for is the only kind worth having, the sovereignty of each parish." Then, elsewhere, Dr Schumacher wrote: "On a small scale people's power can be mobilised but when the scale becomes too large people's power becomes frustrated and ineffective. What precisely is the right scale I cannot say. We should experiment to find out. I could imagine an arrangement whereby in this country, say, 20/25 units would be constituted, with an average of something like 2/2.5 million people each."

It is not possible to have it both ways. In my view Dr Schumacher is, in principle, quite right and Stephen Horne quite wrong, and a decision should be taken either way; otherwise the journal will be lost in a constitutional directionless, the very sickness of the Establishment itself.

The question we have to ask and answer is: What is sovereignty for? The solution to that is also provided by Dr Schumacher when he writes of his regions: "All but a small per cent of the taxes raised in these units would be returned to them, to use as they saw fit." The area within which taxes are levied, collected and spent defines the human and geographical boundaries of sovereignty. At present that area is the nation-state and we are, I take it, agreed that that is breaking down and beyond repair.

Ever since Anglo-Saxon days England has been governed by and through the shire, restyled the county by the Normans; and from the thirteenth century the chartered towns have provided a parallel sovereignty. In the nineteenth century the towns finally took over from the counties and the biggest of them were designated county boroughs. England today is divided into some forty-three units of local government and this is the basis, willy-nilly, from which we start. Can these regions be recast so as to become sovereign? — that is the critical question.

The parish and the local community are important for personal and social reasons but they never have been, and never will be, the essential units of political sovereignty.

Victory over the heresy of size will only be accorded to those who define and discover a *workable* alternative.  
Yours sincerely, Peter Cadogan,  
1 Hampstead Hill Gardens, London NW3  
15.7.75.

## Thinkers have given up

Dear Resurgence, I was concerned to read David Holbrook's letter in the latest issue. Pompous though it may be, I think he has a point, and wonder what was the

reason for the rejection of his review. I can surmise it might have been due to his advocating censorship, as he has done in previous issues, but, right or not, it leads me into a general criticism which is particularly provoked by the piece on Teilhard de Chardin

David Holbrook's position is the product of a coherent intellectual process, while Teilhard's is anything but. His thought has been demolished with far more wit and erudition than I can command by Sir Peter Medawar in "The Hope of Progress", and Lewis Mumford has pointed out that one would have expected Teilhard's training as a Jesuit to put him, above all, on guard against his own power fantasies, no matter how projected into cosmology. The popularity of his theories is an indication that many thinkers have, in fact, given up thinking.

The erosion of dogmatic religion over the past century by half-baked and half-digested popularised "science" has resulted in the loss of the pressures that maintain form in thought as much as in art, and *Resurgence*, for all its advocacy of radical political solutions, is really part of the amorphous dollop of vage humane sentiment that today passes for a philosophy. There is, as the Welsh say, no shape to it.

Yours sincerely, Michael North, Foel  
Uchaf, Brynamman, Dyfed. 9.7.75

## Newspaper Straw

Dear Resurgence, Readers of your backyard dairy article (*Resurgence* vol 6 no 3) might be interested to try *Shredded Newspaper as a substitute for straw for bedding livestock*.



A Devon farmer used the paper last spring when he ran out of straw, and is so pleased with it that he will continue next winter.

He gets his in 1/2 cwt. bales from J. H. Rowe, Ltd., Marsh Barton, Exeter, and as it goes twice as far as straw, is equivalent to straw at £16 per ton — which will be cheap next winter after the drought. It is moreover available at any time which makes a large stock unnecessary. Rowe's have applied for a patent but I assume there is nothing to prevent a group of smallholders collecting paper, buying a shredding machine (£400+) and adapting a baler, to prepare their own. It is non-toxic (provided *no coloured* paper is used), dust- and insect-free, more absorbent than straw, easier to handle, and results in a product more like deep-litter manure from a poultry-house.

It could be a pleasant small village enterprise.  
Lexie Sumner, Ederline, Coram Avenue,  
Lyme Regis, Dorset DT7 3LB