

that we can build a world government if we choose. What about famine? This is the question that is of immediate concern to FAO. This ancient adversary of the human race is the one that FAO is commissioned to combat. We know that we can conquer famine too, but this operation may call for even more patience and tact than either of the other two".

Choice, however, in Dr. Toynbee's view, is complicated by the fact that it entails the establishment of rational and humane control over the course of human affairs; to persuade even just two people to work in concert is hard; the difficulty of achieving harmony increases in geometrical progression with every addition to the number of the people that have to be induced to come into line. Stating this in practical terms, he observed that there is a difference in kind between rational measures for human welfare that can be carried out more or less effectively if there is agreement and co-operation between governments, and other measures that require personal decisions by private individuals in their hundreds of thousands. Governmental action, he pointed out, has been conspicuously effective in the field of preventive medicine — for the simple reason that this is not a controversial subject. Consequently, the measures of preventive medicine that have been adopted within the last hundred years have produced great efforts within a short time, and if the improvement of public health depended on preventive medicine only, its progress would be assured. But in Dr. Toynbee's view, preventive medicine is negative, as its very name implies. While it can liberate mankind from the toll that disease has taken in the past, it cannot provide the positive constituents of human health and strength. "Health", he said, "requires the marriage of effective preventive medicine with adequate nutrition; and this means eating the right kinds of food, not only in sufficient quantities, but in the right proportions . . . In the field of preventive medicine, the human race behaves today more or less like a single family. The combating of disease is conducted on a world-wide scale. Ideally, the production and distribution of the world's food ought to be organized on the same world-wide basis — indeed, it will have to be before long, if the world's rapidly increasing population is to continue to be fed. Yet, actually, for this purpose, the world is still divided into local units, each pursuing a rather narrowly self-interested policy. What food-stuffs shall be grown in each country, and what foreign food-stuffs its government shall allow to be imported, are still matters of political controversy and conflict. In this point, the humane objective of providing adequate nutrition for the whole human race is obstructed by the same kind of difficulty as the humane objective of abolishing war. There is a political difficulty in both cases."

This political difficulty, Dr. Toynbee was quick to point out, is not the most formidable one to overcome, however. While a government has it in its power to remove restrictions on the import of foodstuffs, while it has a very large voice in deciding what foodstuffs, in what relative quantities, its own country shall produce, it cannot decide what its own subjects shall eat, or what diet parents shall give to their children. Choices on these decisions, which will make all the