

helpless anonymity before a distant central authority is just as real here as in the Soviet Union or Britain. Ronald Reagan has wisely hitched his political wagon to this rising star. Some future adjustment of the American borders, though unlikely, is not impossible. Puerto Rico may yet go its own way, and in recent years the environment-minded Oregon state government has made ominous noises about controlling immigration and land development. The return of federal lands to the states has been mooted, and Indian reservations enjoy a special status not unlike that of the South African Bantustans. Some years ago a book, *Ecotopia*, postulated an independent environmentalists' paradise in Washington, Oregon and northern California. In their recent novel *Warday*, Whitley Strieber and James Kunetka portrayed a post-nuclear-holocaust United States broken into warring republics, including one for chicanos. Such a scenario is unlikely at best. But the authors did not manufacture it out of whole cloth; they merely exaggerated and extrapolated distrusts and regional jealousies that already exist today. Their "destructuralists," rejecting all but the most local authority, are not so far-fetched.

There can be no question that the general world trend is now toward devolution, indeed has been for most of this century. The recent failures of several unification efforts throw this into sharp relief. The creation of a pan-Arab state is a perennial will-o'-the-wisp, but in every decade, it seems, a fanatic arises to take on the challenge. Gamal Abdel Nasser's various "United Arab Republics" were an embarrassment to everyone involved. Today Muammar Qaddafi dreams the ancient dream, but has been able to realize nothing more than a bizarre and unconsummated marriage with Morocco. The case of the Arabs shows that an ethnic identity of people in various nations is not enough cause for political union. Jordan, for example, has little reason for existence, historically, geographically or ethnically. Yet it does exist, many of its people fiercely loyal to the Hashemite dynasty, and has survived a great influx of Palestinians and the blandishments of neighboring states that would like to absorb it. To Israelis the pan-Arab dream is a nightmare, but they really don't have much to worry about.

What of the future? Devolutionism in the 1980s is beginning to produce some interesting offspring. The racist government of South Africa, in a transparent effort to convince the world it is doing something about *apartheid*, had carved four "black homelands" out of its own territory, and plans to create half a dozen more. The "Bantustans," as their critics have dubbed them, are little more than dumping grounds for undesirable blacks. For the most part their land is very poor; their independence has been recognized by no one; and they may never be economically free of a smaller but much wealthier white South Africa. But the "homelands" idea may turn out to be a good one in the long run. The proud tribes of the region are still culturally intact, and are hungering for a chance at self-determination. If they can achieve genuine independence, the black republics may yet take a secure place in the growing family of nations. And perhaps similarly downtrodden peoples like the American Indians will take a cue from them.

Every year one or two new sovereign states come into being. There is no reason to suppose that this trend will reverse itself in the twenty-first century. At the same time many of the ancient prerogatives of state sovereignty will be surrendered to the new international order. We should encourage what Edmund Burke feared when he surveyed revolutionary France in 1790: that the state would "crumble away, be disconnected into the dust and powder of individuality." The crumbling has already started, thanks in part to the United Nations, which has forged dozens of agreements that undermine the classic notions of sovereignty. The Universal Postal Union, the International Telecommunications Union, and the International Atomic Energy Agency may be the forerunners of a new order that will govern matters of global concern while leaving internal government to individual states.

In the forty-one years since the United Nations was created,

THE THEOLOGY OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural theology has one central, undeviating theme. It is that somehow, sometime, the farmer should be returned to the free market. The free market should prevail; those who do not agree are incapable of appreciating the deeper, sterner rules and moralities of economic life, especially as they apply to other people.

The reality is that no industrial country — not the United States, not Canada, not the countries of the EEC, not free enterprise Switzerland, not, we all know, Japan — leaves its farmers to the free market. None. Those who affirm the beneficence of the free market for agriculture are, as regards the industrially developed countries, speaking of something that does not exist.

It does not exist because left to market forces, agriculture has a relentless, wholly normal tendency to overproduce... The individual farmer is one among thousands and tens of thousands responding to a market price an situation on which not even the production decisions of the largest individual operator have any appreciable effect.

As long as we do not recognize the realities of agricultural production and markets, we will continue to do badly at high public cost what with intelligent supply management we could do well at much lower cost.

From a speech by John Kenneth Galbraith before the National Governors Conference last July

FREE TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

We will be glad to send a free trial subscription to those you think might be interested. Just send their names on a card or a piece of paper.

REVIEW INDEX

We have indexes available of major articles in the DC Gazette and Progressive Review for the periods indicated. Send check or money order to the Progressive Review, 1739 Conn. Ave NW DC 20009:

- 1969-72 DC Gazette \$4.00
- 1984-86 Review/Gazette \$2.50

international law has been codified and clarified, and virtually all governments defer to it most of the time. Eventually that law may be recognized by all as sovereign. The world's economy has already shifted away from a national to an international emphasis; thousands of corporations do business across frontiers, as do economic unions like the Common Market and ECOWAS. The United States and the Soviet Union have launched joint enterprises involving Occidental Petroleum, Coca Cola, Monsanto, and Archers-Daniel Midland; at least fifteen more are currently planned. In the future the non-aligned movement, the Organization of African Unity, the OAS and the Arab League will all carry more clout. Smaller and more numerous nations will not be able to maintain economic and technological independence; free trade and co-operation will become a matter of survival for all as they are already for Singapore and Taiwan.

The coming century may see a kind of global feudalism, a unity-in-multiplicity like that of Europe in the Dark Ages, when only the Catholic Church provided a semblance of international order for hundreds of tiny principalities and duchies. But this time there will be no Dark Age. Devolutionism raises no barrier to the continuing expansion of communications, education, trade and cultural exchange. But it creates an insuperable barrier to the maintenance of large military machines and all the other trappings of the age of the superpower. That age is passing, and will be mourned only by the increasingly isolated power elites who benefit from it.

Thomas Martin teaches history at Antioch College. He is the author of Minds and Hearts: The American Revolution as a Philosophical Crisis (1984).

Feminization of power: turning back the clock?

Julianne Malveaux

After its 1987 annual meeting, the National Organization for Women (NOW) identified the "feminization of power" as its new initiative -- committing itself to putting women in highly visible positions of power.

This seems to turn the clock back for the women's movement, back to the days when the organization was for the few and not the many, when more were concerned with the status of professional women than their clerical sisters, when women who did not hold paid jobs said so with averted eyes, when housewife was a dirty word.

While more and more Americans are being marginalized, NOW is seeking the inside track. Women who want the "feminization of power" talk less about changing the rules that lock them out than about bending those rules to let them in. Why else the emphasis on raising millions of dollars for women's campaigns, not on changing campaign laws so running for office will cost less? Or the emphasis on more women office holders, not on the issues these office holders should focus on?

The women's movement has spent too much energy and capital chasing one power position for one woman and then hoping for the trickle down to work. Too many articles are written about women's "networking," about women learning old-boy rules. Too many women trip over their own heels while they race for power, turning into "old boys" in skirts.

In many ways, the same gap between the haves and have-nots among women exists in society today as existed 20 years ago, when the women's movement was just starting. Then President Lyndon Johnson's all-white Women's Commission was concerned with freeing housewives from domestic chores so they could pursue careers. What was needed, they decided, was more domestic help. So the federal government spent millions of dollars training women, mostly women of color, to be maids. For this they were paid the minimum wage or less.

Fewer black women are maids today than 20 years ago, but now they clean hospitals instead.

The power the women's movement has gained means little or nothing