

... really solve the
... in the final part
... and direct the
... ideas that the
... on Periphery-
... but also more
... In the second part of this phase, however, it
... processing more
... concretely,
... buy consumers'
... dependency that
... of fundamental
... through conversion from private.

... it does not
... always to try
... and selling,
... an exploitative
... wasteful. It does
... how can we
... rather than what
... technologies through
... absolutely certain
... that we are able
... of private cars?)
... private cars?)
... boycott and
... sanctions are
... autonomous develop-
... ment.

... self-reliance means that one really makes use of one's own resources,
... not that one can make use of own resources.
... these resources will be insufficient -
... natural resources
... natural resource and
... observations.
... is to verti-
... countries
... simply defined
... makes sense,
... the exploitation that
... in other countries
... - and it is
... in regions of the
... to Soviet hegemony)
... themselves from their
... world will witness a
... a decrease in North-South trade, an increase
... North-South trade. This may
... has grown at
... which generally should be welcomed. Nice
... and waste. Needless to
... which handles
... view this issue differently.

... self-reliance and trade
... the logic of self-reliance and Chinese have so con-
... because the structure

...ability with...
...of self-reliance and...
...economic...
...order...
...made - and we now...

...LIBERATION... ACTIVITIES...

...problems inside the... structure...
...themselves, but...
...and...
...control of the... party...
...direct satisfaction of...

...the first and basic strategy...
...and from the bottom up...
...in fact...
...means...
...take...
...the power...
...kind...
...and Portugal -

...to...
...A temporary...
...75%...
...privilege...
...results...
...at the bottom, in the... way of

making them into a class more aware of their own situation than the owners of the land and the means of production. They will be able to make their profits and give them new jobs - even at a time of economic crisis when the private capital class. They would no longer be capable of making profits, but they might even become loyal supporters of a new regime precisely because the structural change was directed against the nature of the - previous job rather than against their personal level of living. The problem may still be, however, whether a Periphery country would be capable of maintaining an elite of that kind, and whether the elite may not simply turn into a 'new class'.

A third point would be the need for a Periphery strategy, usually heavily controlled precisely because that was the only way colonial and neo-colonial powers could run it (usually with the elite based around a harbor, with communication and transportation radiating inward in the country and outward towards the metropolis). This leads to a proliferation of boxes, of district and village autonomy and self-reliance, just as in the Periphery country itself. It also presupposes horizontal connections or networks (not at the same level, particularly at the bottom, with obvious consequences for the road network that would connect peripheral villages and towns with the district capital and from there to the village - a network of some type of local, direct democracy has to be revealed to reveal the possibilities of creativity and development, and this would probably have to be accompanied by some kind of know-how reform, similar to a land reform, where the knowledge is distributed more evenly in the society. This is more than a question of the transmission of knowledge through general education, adult education and vocational training. Like for land reform it is a question of a more even distribution of the kind of producing knowledge, which probably would imply less reliance on the universities and high schools in the centers and more reliance on locally generated knowledge, building on traditional knowledge. Needless to say, the Cultural Revolution in China is the great example here, and it is hard to see how autonomy can be generated in the Periphery, not to mention in the periphery of the Periphery, without some measures of that kind.

A fourth point, and in a sense underlying all of this: a higher level of consciousness in the Periphery about how the present structure works, about alternatives and about the need for destroying structures of dominance and centering structures that would remain dominant. This can only develop as the Periphery develops its own education. The need for a higher level of education is obvious, and the need for a higher level of education is obvious, and the need for a higher level of education is obvious. Much of the Chinese autonomy today derives from the need to create their own marxist theory, to be frank, emphasizing education as a key to the development of the people and education as serving the people. Consequently much of the consciousness-forming that is taking place in the Periphery will take the form of rejection of center-generated thinking, and therefore from the centers of capital and social imperialism would be wise to understand that they will also be rejected or rejected. Westerners, left and right, usually share the assumption that they have the key to Periphery future - an assumption that also may be raised against the present author.

Finally: the need for a much stronger political mobilization in the Periphery. The masses work against tremendous odds, exposed to all means of repression, and are highly manipulable, at or even below subsistence level living. A major need in this situation would be to prepare oneself, gain experience, and make use of the explosive moment. The structure will always produce crises because of the contradictions built into it - these are the moments to be utilized as when the Arab countries made use of the Yom Kippur war to launch their embargoes and price increases. There will be many such situations in the future; the wise tactic would be not to expose oneself unnecessarily to repression as long as the structure is strong, but make use of its contradictions in the moments of weakness.

Changes in the Center countries.

The basic changes that have to take place in Center countries would not, in our mind, necessarily have to be so deep as to warrant the use of the word 'revolutionary'. On the contrary, they may actually be seen as relatively modest - for if 'revolution' were really needed in all the Center countries the prospects would be bleak indeed. More particularly, what is needed can possibly be put into two broad categories: meaning the Center of its dependence on the Periphery, and making the Center keep its hands off the Periphery. Thus, what is seen here as fundamental is not that the Center countries should fulfill their promises to give 1% as technical assistance, or any percentage for that matter, for if a worker works only at 0.2% it is hardly to be expected that he will work much better at 1%. What is needed is not that the Center should give anything, but that it should stop robbing (as when the US got professionals through brain drain with a discounted educational value of 0.3 billion in 1971 alone - the value of technical assistance to the Periphery this year being 0.7 billion) - and that it should stop interfering. The problems cannot be solved with money, they have to be solved through structural change.

Thus, the first and basic strategy inside a Center country would be to prepare for Periphery self-reliance, and this can only happen through increased Center self-reliance. Concretely this means to decrease the dependence on raw materials from the Periphery for the simple reason that they may very soon no longer be available, or only be available at prices the Center will not be willing, or even able, to pay. This is partly a question of getting raw materials from elsewhere, including new sources of energy - but also a question of developing new, less consumptive styles of living in general, and less consumptive of non-renewable sources of energy in particular. Just as the Periphery countries have to raise everybody above a certain floor or minimum level when it comes to food, clothes and shelter, the Center countries have to start thinking and acting in terms of ceilings or maximum levels. Given the limitations of nature it is no longer acceptable that, for instance, the 5% of the world's population living in the US should consume 33% of the oil, partly because it taxes the resources too much, partly because it leads to an inequality gap that much too easily translated into a power differential that is used, for instance, to intervene militarily. At this point it is important to note that this reversion to increasingly restricted what the Center overconsumes resources taken from the Periphery. Tomorrow we may, however, go one step further in our thinking and define certain resources as belonging to mankind as a whole regardless of where in the world they are located.

The best way of using all the money set aside for technical assistance may well be for this purpose: to prepare the Center for times to come by a restructuring of its productive capacity rather than to reinforce Periphery dependence on the Center through continued aid. But much of this is also a question of change of mentality, of building on the yearning for simpler life styles clearly expressed in many Center countries in recent years. It may be objected, though, that this protest is essentially an urban, intellectual youth phenomenon, which may be true - however, such life styles may soon become a necessity as the crisis deepens - wise statesmanship, hence, would be to prepare the population through early warnings, and by building on such currents in Center culture.

A second and equally basic point would be to find some way of dealing with the dependence on the Periphery or of setting structural measures in the Periphery. Quite concretely this means to find some way of controlling the Center machines ready for covertion and military intervention, and the major Center instruments for international imperialism, the transnational corporations. Suffice it here only to mention a few key sectors. Thus, the danger of US, Western European and/or Japanese intervention to retain privileges is considerable - and well proven in the

near ends. To deprive all directions, to make people (just as the intelligence agencies and military forces rely to reveal them), to try to train soldiers to make a sharp distinction between military self-defence and an intervention in Periphery countries when the latter somehow try to create better structural conditions for themselves--all this is basic. But a longer range would also be needed, such as denying the military research character by stigmatizing scientists working for such purposes, by denying them vital supplies, and so on. And the same applies to trans-national corporations: they should be exposed and not only be made more accountable - the worst of them in terms of the structural damage they cause should even be boycotted at places of work. - For the military and secretariat should be published, particularly patents, and particularly patents in the field of fundamental needs, such as pharmaceutical patents. In short: the key contribution the Center can make to Periphery development is negatively, not intervening in any way, rather than anything positive - in our present world.

A third point would be the same for Periphery societies: a certain decentrilization of Center societies. The motivation would be the same: only in smaller, more autonomous units can human beings be made happy to live. In over-sized, centralized countries they become too small. - But there is also an additional motivation seen very clearly, in, for instance, the Indo-China wars: for a poor peasant in that part of the world it would have been a great advantage if the US consisted of fifty disunited states, incapable of producing, say, a J-52. Somehow the Center countries have to disarm not only militarily but structurally, and one way of doing that would be through decentralization.

Fourth: Just as for the Periphery there is a need for new consciousness-formation. It is in the process, and has been for several years, at least from 1953 - after the US war in Indo-China made it more clear to people what the true nature of Western liberal democracy was. - It may be argued, and probably correctly, that had the US seen it differently in 1949-50 as the Soviet Union in Czechoslovakia (or the US in the Communist case, and Dominican Republic), then there would have been no such awakening - that dissent and criticism, even criticism, was born out of defeat and would have been out of the history of some cranks had the US won in Indo-China (after all - who ever questions the Dominican Republic?) But an awakening there was. More important than the awakening was causal origin and its moral character would be a discussion of the war and its scope. Thus, the critique had a tendency to be actor-oriented (in tragic mistake - an unfortunate decision!) rather than to structural analysis of the more lasting characteristics - an analysis that should come easily because the war was about the same even though it passed through the hands of about five official governments. Also, the Watergate episode in actor-oriented analysis, leading to the artificial demise of a president, also serves effectively to block a structural analysis when it was most needed. - And finally - not so many are so aware and conscious of what happened - after all, all of us in the Center, American and out-of-Asia, somehow share the spoils of our imperialistic structure.

The message is now progressively anti-USA and anti-capitalism. Here is one simple proposal. It might help political consciousness. If everybody who sells a product has to declare the price composition - simply stating in writing on the product what percentage of the price the customer pays goes to Periphery countries (to workers, to owners of means of production, to middlemen), what percentage goes to Center countries (to wholesalers, to retailers, to the government in all kinds of ways), and what percentage to financial institutions - and how much of that ends up where). After all, we are used to having the most weird chemical analyses and analyses to do in the soils in which we dig our mineral water - If chemists can do that, economists should be capable of doing similar analyses (if they cannot, we need other types of economists) - if we can burden a product with that information we can certainly print on it politically highly important information. Thus,

... the enormous amount of the price of the goods produced in the producer countries... (turn out of cost only a minor fraction, and the balance, to workers) - we have a right to know such things. Of course, such demands have not unambiguously translated into any action, particularly since the greater proportion might be the part taken by one's own government in various types of taxes. But it could clear the air.

Most important, however, would be availability of sharp analyses revealing in detail how the present structure works - with the avowed purpose of demoralizing the Center, and particularly the concept of the Center. "But all, there is a difference between an exploiter with goals and an exploited - and it is in the worker's interest to increase the proportion of the latter."

Finally, one need for a much stronger political organization in the Center, again, it is not a question of mobilizing people or trying to give more technical assistance; it is a question of mobilizing people of all kinds to help change structures - and as a very minimum to prevent the Center from being the repository of direct and structural violence. This is not going to be easy in the years to come. In general, it is not very likely that the Center will turn its back towards more self-reliance. When the Periphery proceeds via the new economic order towards more self-reliance the chances will not be better, particularly for the more so the less prepared it is. The first to lose the struggle will be the workers, seen very clearly, will be the workers, starting with guest-workers and the unskilled, but these are also the first to be used as soldiers, in a military sense, that will expand, partly because the expansion is also a military sense, partly because the contradiction in the imperialist conflict formation is sharpening. This may create very dangerous situations, for workers would be tremendously useful allies with radical youth, students and others.

1971
1972

Changes in the global system.

The world is not only Center and Periphery and their relations - there is also a global superstructure. Most of this will be discussed in chapters 7 and 8, but in a later section dealing with strategy, a number of important key points should be made already here.

Under the heading of peace there has been a lot of talk. There has been said a lot about the "peace" of the world, but it is a peace of capital and industry from the Center to the periphery, and the peace of, reason to regard those transfers as gifts - they could be taken as reparations, and not only for damage done in the past, and in some cases towards compensation for the continuous damage built into the structures. This type of reasoning, however, is mainly interesting as a way of getting rid of feelings of gratitude; it does not give any answer to three crucial questions: what is the best setting for technical assistance, what should be the content and how can one diminish the asymmetry between donors and recipients?

As to the content the arguments in favor of using UN institutions seem by and large to outweigh the con-arrangements in terms of national bureaucracy and structure. It is not only one UN assistance in some way, but open to manipulation in favor of strong national (US, Soviet, or Arab etc.) or regional (EC, Nordic etc.) interests, but also that the UN in principle can draw on cooperation from the whole world, and that, for example, should not stop at the level of the UN (Specialized Agency) or quarters but be carried into the field. It should take some of the form of Cuban practice to wisely when they invited experts in the same field from several countries, (70) , reserving them not with a Cuban counterpart but a neutral intermediary, drawing in their (often contradictory) advice, but implementing it themselves. Somehow it is important to get away from the idea that one

world, and countries, and regions or the whole world for that matter has the solution and face the contradictory nature of any social situation in an open dialogue, from which, ultimately, all will learn.

As to the content: underlying everything said above is the idea of increased self-reliance, in smaller units. Phrased in different language: the idea of intermediate economic cycles, which is an extension of the concept of intermediate technology. Probably these concepts, full of promise as they are, are now forced to carry too much of the burden of the development of the Periphery - but they are nevertheless pointers to a new nuclear. Here are some of the elements:

-the idea of using local resources as much as possible, trading only in relatively small cycles - cutting down (but not to zero) on the megacycles that span the whole world, and expanding the micro-cycles that only operate within a small village.

-the idea of production without waste, of a shift toward renewable sources of raw materials and energy etc. in order to counter depletion and pollution,

-the need of non-alienating work and non-exploitative work relations, partly through more labor-intensive economics, partly through labor-saving devices and automation. In short: technologies and economic cycles that do not generate exploitative structures, respect the limits of nature and at the same time respect the human nature of human beings.

As to the asymmetry: one should search for the type of technical assistance needed in all countries, and the content just mentioned, the intermediate technology and the socio-economic structure that goes with it, would constitute a good example. Take the field of health: the Center countries have much to learn from the socialist developing countries, such as Cuba and China, when it comes to middle-level health manpower - e.g. the barefoot doctor. But the Periphery has much to learn from Center countries when it comes to intermediate technology in the field of non-formal education - study circles, adult education of various types, and so on. To the extent that the world moves toward a higher level of local self-reliance there will be the new technologies, their implementation will be the new ideas of development, and relevant to most of countries, underdeveloped and overdeveloped alike and these relevant to everybody. We are not suggesting a new agency for intermediate technology, but that the concept should permeate all existing agencies.

Second, globalization of an initial attempt. Essentially what is the old first internationalization (e.g. of establishing some form of jurisdiction) everything not under national jurisdiction (oceans, unclaimed regions of the world, the oceans, the ocean floor and what is below, the air space above the oceans, outer space and celestial bodies) and use it partly to levy taxes on the users (e.g. ships, airplanes, tele-communication) partly to explore and exploit, to process and mine. There are some important points, enough, partly hinted at above, partly to be explored in later chapters. Thus, the UN agencies still mirror the dominance structure of the world, although less so than they used to do. Hence an international agency might easily become like the World Bank, a reflection of certain interests and certain ways of organizing answers to the world's problems. Moreover, there is no built-in guarantee that more resources in the hands of Periphery governments or global agencies would benefit those most in need of these resources. Under their representatives would not fit into any international framework, neither in terms of form nor in terms of the content of their presentations, and the role of the key persons and the world class managements, in general, on the world level, and that of global institutions, only the few that retain some notion of giving people a say over their own affairs - the latter should mainly help

3. Traveling - rights in their own right - not a luxury.

Third, globalization of world production for fundamental needs. Later we shall have occasion to discuss globalization of transnational corporations; here we shall only focus on the production of fundamental needs. The point can be made in one sentence: food (and water), clothes, housing materials, products needed for health and education, probably also for transportation and communication, should not be treated as commodities. They should not be for buying and selling, they should be seen as birthrights of everybody, like the right to be free, not a slave. These products, like paper for textbooks at no cost to schools, should not be seen as something that can be given or withdrawn as the suppliers wish - their availability should be built into the productive system. Above a certain minimum they may be treated as commodities - like the luxury restaurants still available in China - but satisfaction of fundamental needs should be regarded as jealously as the right not to be a slave - after all, it concerns the right to be a human being. Given the global nature of these products today, the best guarantor of these birthrights would probably be some global institutions, control of global budgeting, allocation, even rationing - always giving, first of all, to the most needy - and not using availability and withdrawal for political reasons. It will take time to institutionalize something like this, for one thing because it should also be solidly built into our concepts of human rights - but it will have to come in one form or the other.

So much for key strategies, let us then return to the probable areas again to arrive at some judgment as to the relevance of these approaches.

VIOLENCE. We are here in a somewhat ambivalent position. On the one hand there is hardly much doubt that most of the large-scale violence we have in the world today is related to the structure of dominance, to war of aggression and repression. But from this follows that many of the world's structural evils are likely to increase the amount of direct violence, in a sense converting structural violence into the direct variety. By many this will be used as an argument not to proceed: the Third world should not liberate itself for fear of US-IC-Japan counterattacks, nor should Eastern Europe for fear of violent Soviet reprisal. The answer is that the situation is already violent, only that the violence is of the structural variety - and that the conclusion must be as much as possible to use the means of nonviolent revolution and watchdog strategies and of Center countries to impede their use of counter-revolutionary violence. Even so it is surely to be expected that the curve of violence will, first of all, for a short drop-rammer, be likely to continue rising. The reasons, little or not said, however, will in most cases rest with the Center countries.

POVERTY. Here we are less ambivalent: the structural situation will in all likelihood lead to considerable increase in poverty and social misery. The socialist countries give evidence in that direction, particularly China. But structural change is only the necessary condition for this - it only provides the setting within which new technologies can be said to work. Thus, in the field of food relatively small cycles using human fertilizer instead of depleting and polluting with artificial fertilizer and human waste, three-dimensional agriculture (e.g. by cultivating the seabed with highly extended planes kept vertical through water buoyancy (can also be tied to a buoy at the surface, to be harvested at several levels of altitude), and kinds of new cycles set up (e.g. combining rice paddy with fish ponds) - going all this labor, rather than capital/resource/intensivity. In the field of agriculture, much more use of industrial waste for housing material, more use of age-old housing traditions (improving adobe houses rather than replacing them). In the field of health, developing further traditional medicine, introduction of health technicians in all countries, use of herbs, but above all a return to societies that produce fewer patients (and clients) through stress,

alienation, isolation (all of them possibly related, as cancer for instance). In the field of education, much more use of the highly innovative techniques developed by the Cubans and the uninise of horizontal learning, learning together - deprofessionalizing to a large extent the teaching profession. In the field of communication/transportation: the development of clean nations, e.g. by developing further sailing ships, collective ground transportation based on renewable forms of energy, and so on. The possibilities are many once the structure is changed.

DEPRESSION. There is no illusion that repression would disappear through such measures as we have indicated, but in a world where xenophobia, not only colonialism belongs to the past there would at least not be the repression that stems from that particular international structure, for instance in the form of torture.

There might be intra-national repression, for instance to maintain some internal hegemony - the cities over the villages, the Capital over the rest, the local center over the local periphery. It is also with a view to this that local self-reliance has been stressed so much above, in the Center as well as in the Periphery.

But what about social imperialism. It has been, particularly in the stalinist period, one of the more repressive systems in world history. It also illustrates one basic point: there are needs beyond the fundamental needs. There is the need for freedom to express oneself and to be expressed, through communication and travel; the need for work that permits creative self-expression, not merely jobs; and the need for politics - for some kind of process that permits free consciousness-formation, mobilization, confrontation, fight and at least some limited type of transcendence. All these needs have been left highly unsatisfied in the Moscow-dominated system, through censorship, limited travel (even within the country), taylorism and elite monopolization of politics, which then degenerates to fierce struggle between factions and interest groups at the top.

Such a system cannot last. It generates periphery apathy and consumerism, but also periphery protest that will take nationalistic, religious and highly political forms. Sooner or later the system will develop cracks; one of the elite groups may join the people - even the army against the apparat, for instance. In such moments it is very important that the nations have relatively clear answers to the basic problem of Soviet and Chinese domination: the monopolization of fundamental needs: what? If no socialist countries are left to this question (and they do exist, e.g. in China) the danger might be that the system would develop into some type of nationalism with religious undercurrents, as expressed, for instance, by Solzhenitsyn.

Then there are all the other types of repression in the world, not captured by the formulations 'capitalism and social imperialism.' More particularly, we are thinking of racism, sexism and - to coin an expression - agism (age-ism - the suppression of the young and the old by the middle-aged). These are highly ubiquitous phenomena, and although capitalist imperialism has made use of them in creating a system ruled by white, middle-aged males it does not follow that these repressive structures will disappear with capitalism. And yet 'development' should not be permitted to be conceived of as transfer of power from one group of middle-aged males to another.

The general norm of 'social justice' would direct our attention towards societies with participation more equally shared at all levels between sex and age groups, in the family, at school, at work, in public life - including, just to mention what might look like a very small item, making public transportation in such a way that it does not exclude very young and very old people (simply because they are not able to enter.) And yet - development cannot possibly mean

equal participation of the colored, the women, the very young and the very old, in, say CIA and KGB; in an exploitative multinational corporation making senseless products, or in a repressive university system, however much "social justice" would make us move in that direction. It is very much to be hoped that the energy created by the women and youth revolutions (later on, hopefully, to be followed by the revolution of old people for the right to participate, not be marginalized in old age homes etc.) will make us move more towards more horizontal societies, not only a more egalitarian distribution of the right to exploit others. In saying so the author himself, a white middle-aged male - is painfully aware that such changes will hurt (being a male non-capitalist it is considerably easier to act against capitalism than against male dominance), but also full of hope that other groups could infuse society with other styles of living, less vertical, individualistic and competitive - not only with the desire to conquer the power positions in the society we have created.

POPULATION. Will the measures indicated above contribute to the solution of the 'population problem'? The answer depends on how one defines the problem. If it is taken as axiomatic that the solution consists in reducing the world population (or at least preventing it from increasing much more), then the answer is clearly no. But we have criticized this assumption by pointing to the obvious: in a highly capital- and research-intensive economy with very high productivity in the center the periphery will be increasingly unable to participate, neither as producer, nor as consumer; in a labor-intensive economy their labor would be converted into products at least for their own reproduction, possibly also for a surplus when combined with intermediate technologies. Since this is the gist of what is suggested above - self-reliance, intermediate cycles, lower productivity - there is a built-in solution to the population problem: another economic system, more similar to what is found in China. But the very reference to that country brings out the point that this can at most be one factor in the total picture - for the Chinese themselves practice family planning, even quite rigorously.

Family planning should, in our view, be practiced, but not as a way of relieving the pressure on our resources - at least not at present, only if the population becomes much bigger. The success of the socialist countries in satisfying fundamental needs gives strong evidence to the contention that poor countries are able to support quite adequately even a growing population once some basic structural change has taken place. But there are at least three other, very good, reasons, for limiting the population:

- if parents, particularly the women (giving our conventional division of labor) are to live more fully, realize themselves more completely, there is a limit to how many children they should have.
- if human society is to continue to be innovative, to create new forms, we need space, we cannot overcrowd the whole planet even if we could feed the population adequately.
- sooner or later the outer limits will be reached - it is obvious that we cannot go on multiplying for ever even if we are still far from those limits today (except, possibly, in South Asia.)

We would also be careful in formulating norms. Obviously, the simplest one would be that from two people should come, on the average, two people - but this may be too little for underpopulated regions about to introduce labor-intensive economies (Africa? Latin America?) The norm might make sense in the Center countries, though, but the basic point would be to avoid any norm that singles out any specific group - e.g. the poor in the poor countries as the group that should limit

their number. That this is deterioration can be most clearly seen by arguing the opposite way, asking: who have participated in most wars since 1945? who are on top of most of the institutions that constitute capitalist imperialism? who are on top of the structure where most of today's repression can be found? who are responsible for most of the depletion and pollution in the world - where are the 1% consuming 10% of the world's annual oil output? An institute in New York staffed with Latin American, African and Asian comograners exploring how US people can overcome prejudices against drastic reduction of their numbers might be resisted in the US - and the corresponding resistance against US structures of the same kind (e.g. in New Delhi) was what exploded in the face of the Western delegations to the UN Bucharest conference on population problems in 1978. In short, the argument is not against family planning, but its use as an instrument in the interest of capitalist economics (and to protect those at the top of it by reducing the numbers of those at the bottom.)

DEPLETION/POLLUTION. When it comes to this type of pressure on the environment the package above has a definite structural change, and, we claim, contains much of the solution: the intermediate economic cycle. The necessity of depleting our resources and polluting nature are all of us too clear enough - in principle. In practice it is not very clear when the economic cycle is so world-encompassing that decisions are made in one corner, depletion in another, pollution in the third and consumption in the fourth corner of the world. The solution will be to locate depletion and pollution where there is little or no resistance - either because there are no people or because they are weak. We do know today that only works for a limited time: people, or nature, or both are back. Contrast this with the way farming has been done for ages: a very limited economic cycle with the farmer perfectly well knowing that if he depletes or pollutes his soil he will not survive for long. He can himself, see, feel, smell the consequences of ecological imbalance, and generate his own countermeasures, more or less effectively. But we do not have to go back to family farming to generate this social force, all that is needed would be cycles short enough to generate the necessary social forces against depletion and pollution within a workable autonomous unit - say of the magnitude of 10³-5.

Again, this structural change would be only a necessary, not a sufficient condition (and the optimum would be not so not ever necessary, that we can plan on a global scale so that these will be not avoided - which may be true but only at the expense of a very powerful world dictatorship). There is also the scope for new technologies, or for the improvement of traditional types of recycling. The way the Chinese are practising their slogan of "production without waste" is highly inspiring and would put them very high on the list of technical assistance experts in the field once the structural conditions have been made available.