

RIPON FORUM

WITH SENATORS
JACOB JAVITS
and
HUGH SCOTT

JULY, 1969

VOL. V, No. 7

ONE DOLLAR

Whatever Happened to Black Capitalism?

VISTA: Part of the Problem?

U. S. Arms Sales: Getting it for Everybody Wholesale

Plus: THE PERSECUTION AND ASSASSINATION OF FULBRIGHT-HAYS AS PERFORMED BY THE INMATES OF D. O. S. AND THE WHITE HOUSE UNDER THE DIRECTION OF CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL —3

POLITICAL NOTES

Devoted this month to an appraisal of the Oregon Legislative session, whose successes and failures will have important consequences for Republicans in the coming elections. —4

GUEST EDITORIAL

This month Senator Hugh Scott explains his position on the Voting Rights Bill — and why it differs from the Administration's. —5

PUBLICATIONS ORDER FORM —6

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

A Ripon paper prepared by the New York Chapter detailing six specific steps the Administration can take to rescue the doldrum-mired minority enterprise program and make good on its campaign promises to foster black capitalism. —7

QUOTES OF THE MONTH

Rene Dubos is a very distinguished ecologist who does not think the human race can last another 100 years if it continues to poison the planet at the present rate. He has other interesting observations as well, some of which he has confided to assistant FORUM editor Sue van den Wymelenberg. —9

REPUBLICANISM ON CAMPUS

On some campuses, Republicans are as popular as narcotics agents. But at the University of Colorado last year, student Republicans organized themselves into a powerful moderate force which successfully resolved a number of

issues that threatened to catalyze a "confrontation." Steve Berkshire, one of the moving spirits of the University Republicans, describes the genesis and accomplishments of the organization. —10

VISTA — PART OF THE PROBLEM?

A growing number of VISTA volunteers are disenchanted not only with their program, but also the very concepts that underlie it. One of them tells why and reports on some of the battles in what seems to be a growing civil war in the organization. —11

AN ARMS DISTRIBUTION PRIMER

One of the ways to get rid of all the extra military hardware we have is to mount a high pressure sales campaign facilitated by E-Z credit terms. That's what the U.S. has been doing for quite some time. One of the results is that countries regularly fight wars with US-supplied weapons, El Salvador and Honduras being the latest examples. Theodore Moran explains how it all works. —15

FULBRIGHT-HAYS IN TROUBLE

Everybody knows about the prestigious Fulbright-Hays fellowship program, but fewer know that it is in very serious danger of financial asphyxiation. Frank Samuel, Ripon Secretary and former Fulbright tells the dispiriting tale. —19

14a ELIOT STREET —23

THE NEXT 1200 DAYS

Senator Jacob K. Javits gives his assessment of how the President has been doing in his first couple of hundred days, and what circumstances demand he do during the next 1200. —24

THE RIPON SOCIETY, INC. is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are young business, academic and professional men and women. It has national headquarters in Cambridge, Massachusetts, chapters in seven cities, National Associate members throughout the fifty states, and several affiliated groups of sub-chapter status. The Society is supported by chapter dues, individual contributions, and revenues from its publications and contract work. The Society offers the following options for annual contribution: Contributor \$25 or more; Sustainer \$100 or more; Founder \$1000 or more. Inquiries about membership and chapter organization should be addressed to the National Executive Director.

NATIONAL GOVERNING BOARD

Officers

- *Peter J. Wallison, Chairman of the Board
- *Christopher T. Bayley, Chairman of the Executive Committee
- *Howard F. Gillette, Jr., Vice President
- *Robert L. Beal, Treasurer
- *Frank E. Samuel, Jr., Secretary

Cambridge

- *Terry A. Barnett
- Howard L. Reiter
- Sam Sherer

Chicago

- *George H. Walker
- John A. Bross, Jr.
- Benjamin C. Duster

Dallas

- *Neil D. Anderson
- Howard L. Abramson
- Robert A. Wilson

Hartford

- *Nicholas Norton
- Alvin Dozeman
- William S. Glazier II

Los Angeles

- *Melvin H. Bernstein
- Edward H. McAniff
- Richard J. Ward, Jr.

New Haven

- *William E. Craig
- Paul C. Capra
- William H. Jeffress, Jr.

Ex-Officio At Large

- Robert D. Behn, Research Director
- Michael F. Brewer, Political Director
- Bruce K. Chapman, National Director
- Clair W. Rodgers, Jr., Executive Director
- A. Douglas Matthews, Editor of the Ripon FORUM
- * National Executive Committee member
- ** Past President or Chairman of the Board

New York

- *J. Eugene Marans
- Robert L. Musser
- Judah C. Sommer

Seattle

- *Thomas A. Alberg
- Camden Hall
- William Rodgers

Washington

- *Patricia A. Goldman
- Stephen E. Herbits
- Linda K. Lee

At Large

- Christopher W. Beal
- Richard E. Boeman
- Thomas A. Brown
- Richard M. Conley
- Richard G. Ford
- Emil H. Frankel
- **Lee W. Huebner
- Phillip C. Johnson
- Robert C. Kirkwood, Jr.
- Martin A. Linsky
- W. Stuart Parsons
- Thomas E. Petri
- **John R. Price, Jr.
- **John S. Saloma III

THE RIPON INTELLIGENCE UNIT provides political research on Republican office holders and candidates and to non-partisan community leaders. All inquiries are kept strictly confidential. Write the National Research Director.

THE RIPON FORUM is published monthly by the Ripon Society, Inc., 14a Eliot Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Second class postage rates paid at Boston, Massachusetts. Contents are copyrighted © 1969 by the Ripon Society, Inc. Correspondence addressed to the Editor is welcomed.

In publishing this magazine the Ripon Society seeks to provide a forum for fresh ideas, well-researched proposals and for a spirit of criticism, innovation, and independent thinking within the Republican Party. Articles do not necessarily represent the opinion of the National Governing Board or the Editorial Board of the Ripon Society, unless they are explicitly so labeled.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES are \$10 a year, \$5 for students, servicemen, and for Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas air mail, \$10 extra. Advertising rates on request.

Editor: A. Douglas Matthews

Associate Editor: Evelyn Ellis

Assistant Editors: Janet Beal, Nancy G. Keim, Suzanne van den Wymelenberg

Technical Editor: Janet Beal

Contributors: Christopher W. Beal, Duncan K. Foley, Robert W. Gordon, Peter Iseman, Phillip C. Johnson, John McClaughry, William D. Phelan, Jr., Howard L. Reiter, Paul Szep, Andrew T. Weil.

Correspondents

- Mrs. Barbara Mooney, Connecticut
- Maggie Nichols, California
- Robert J. Radway, N. California
- Mrs. Anne C. Johns, Delaware
- James F. McCollum, Jr., Florida
- Cullen Hammond, Georgia
- Michael McCrery, Idaho
- Blaine Edwards, Idaho
- Hinky Dink Kenna, Illinois
- J. Kenneth Doka, Indiana
- Burton Southard, Indiana
- Terrence Dwyer, Iowa
- Gary Scott Nunley, Kansas
- William A. Merrill, Massachusetts
- Don Fowler, Maine
- Richard Ober, Jr., Maryland
- Terrence Dwyer, Michigan
- Douglas C. Watson, Minnesota
- James L. Robertson, Mississippi
- John Evans, Missouri
- Arthur F. McClure II, Missouri
- William Harding, Nebraska
- Charles O. Ingraham, New York
- Johnson Howard, North Carolina
- William K. Woods, Ohio
- Eric R. Blackledge, Oregon
- Donato Andre D'Andrea, Rhode Island
- Bruce M. Selya, Rhode Island
- William H. Linder, South Carolina
- Stanford M. Adelstein, South Dakota
- T. William Porter, Texas
- Robert R. Murdoch, Virginia
- W. Stuart Parsons, Wisconsin
- John R. Lazarek, Southern States

EDITORIAL

AS the focus debate on the Nixon Safeguard system shifts from the floor of the U.S. Senate to talks with the Russians, the American people will be reminded acutely of the legacy of the last few months.

Symbolically, the battle over ABM represented, as Senator Javits puts it, the "critical phase of the struggle for the soul of the Nixon Administration." The Administration was asked whether it would place primary emphasis on military programs or give greater consideration to domestic needs.

But the Senate debate represented much more than the question of weighing national priorities. Critics of Safeguard challenged more than the wisdom of hurrying deployment of a technically unproved system in light of pressing domestic needs. For the first time in years they gave long-range questions about the future of the arms race a public forum.

First, they brought into the public domain the question of whether U.S. strategic weapons policy contributes to a self-fulfilling prophecy. They argued that the Pentagon's insistence on an ABM system, coupled with the decision to test multiple independently guided re-entry vehicles (MIRV), would so threaten the Soviet deterrent that the Russians would be forced to build the very weapons that we said necessitated a build-up of our own deterrent. America, they said, found itself in the uneasy position of buying the two weapons systems it presumably hopes to persuade the Soviet Union not to build in the strategic talks.

Secondly, critics of the ABM insisted that national security be served only by the best possible weapons systems. Supporters of the Cooper-Hart amendment to authorize further research and development without deployment argued with telling effect that if a clear need for the system should arise after the beginning of arms negotiations, the President's hand would be strengthened by the commitment of Congress to find a system free of the technical difficulties now envisioned.

From the beginning it was clear moderates on both sides of the aisle would determine the fate of

the Safeguard proposal. Most Senate liberals lined up quickly against ABM, while many conservatives in both parties rushed to Safeguard's defense. The President failed to grasp the importance of bringing the moderate centrist coalition into his corner. His absurd speech at the Air Force Academy calling critics of the military, including opponents of the ABM, "neo-isolationists" hardly encouraged conciliation. His insistence on his original recommendation, even at the risk of splitting the Senate, ignored the importance, as Senator Aiken said, of entering arms talks with a united nation behind him.

The President can restore his position of leadership first by seeking a joint Soviet-American suspension of MIRV flight testing. As Senator Brooke said in introducing such a resolution June 17, the MIRVing of missiles will encourage a quantum jump in the arms race. Present surveillance techniques, able to pinpoint the number and position of missiles, eliminate a fundamental pressure to over-produce weapons by informing each side of its opponent's land-based capacity. However, once MIRV is installed, nothing short of on-site inspection, considered unacceptable by both sides, will reveal the number of warheads installed. Both sides will have to assume the worst, enlarging greatly the level at which the military balance rests.

Second, the President can set goals for arms talks, which would be generally acceptable to the centrist Senate coalition, as well as those who support him now on ABM. These might include proposals, conditioned by the response of the Russians, such as ultimate elimination of all land-based missiles or some acceptable deployment of thin ABM systems on both sides to protect against a possible suicidal Chinese offensive. Whatever the details of these goals, a commitment must be made to avoid the action-reaction syndrome that has fueled the arms race in the past.

By delaying deployment of ABM and halting the testing of MIRV the President would enter arms negotiations from a position of strength. Not only would the United States make in the clearest possible way its commitment to arms limitations at an

Political Notes:

OREGON: sweeping reforms but with some loose ends

Oregon's 55th Legislative Assembly will go on record as the most productive of recent sessions, but it was mixed with disappointment. The transfer of executive power from a three man — often conflicting — Board of Control, to the Governor, and a reorganization of state agencies and boards under the executive branch, should increase both the efficiency and accountability of state government. In the judicial branch, an Oregon Court of Appeal was formed to relieve the State's overworked Supreme Court.

Urban problems have received more attention in recent sessions, and this year's passage of measures consolidating metropolitan service districts will promote urban self help. Further consolidation of the maze of service districts, and solutions for other urban problems, will be major issues for the next session to consider.

After several years of argument and negotiation, the Legislature also referred to the people a revised Constitution. Although the new Constitution removes the mass of dead verbiage that stifled the old document, almost all significant amendments were deleted in order to get legislative agreement. Later sessions will have to consider more significant changes in specific amendments. Agreement was also reached on measures submitting a 19-year-old vote to the people, and strengthening public rights of ownership and access to the State's beaches. The major failure of the session was in the area of tax reform. The Republican majority in the House introduced and backed a 3% sales tax that was to be used for reducing property taxes. The state Senate

which was weakly controlled by a coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats was unable to stop the regular Democrats from pushing through amendments making the bill less acceptable to the voters. The nine to one margin by which the sales tax proposal was eventually defeated in a June special election is attributable to general dislike for the sales tax concept, ineffective support for the measure, and the handicaps placed in it by the Democrats.

Oregon tax revolt is becoming more general and the percentage of personal income going to State taxation has remained constant for several years, moving Oregon's percentage from one of the highest to one of the lowest in the western states. More school budget increases are being defeated and drastic cuts are being made in school programs, even in cities that have traditionally given their schools strong support.

Where the State will turn for new tax money is uncertain. The defeat of the sales tax will only result in higher property taxes. A special session, though originally contemplated, will not be called unless some of the state's schools are forced to close. The Republican leadership is now looking toward increasing taxes on liquor, cigarettes and a reform of the state income tax. The Democrats seem to favor an increase in the state's already high income tax while many Republicans seem to prefer a form of gross receipt tax, more similar in impact to the sales tax.

Unless the Republican legislators can develop attractive proposals for the next session and do a much better than usual job of selling them, their ranks seem likely to decline. Although he has been offered other very attractive positions, Governor McCall appears ready to run for re-election in 1970, probably against State Treasurer Robert Straub or former congressman Robert Duncan. Oregon's former Senator Wayne Morse also appears to be leading into a race against Republican Congressman John Dellenback. The 1970 elections will be a critical test of the future for moderate Republicans in Oregon.

acceptable level, but would remove, in full view of world opinion, the immediate cause for stepped-up Soviet deployment of missiles to counter our own projected defense improvements. Should the Soviets persist in deployment and testing, the President would retain the option of matching their increases in offensive weapons with similar increases in America or of renewing his proposal for an ABM.

The most significant legacy of the debate on ABM then, is the establishment of a mood within

which the President must work. Moderates in the Senate helped fashion that mood—one in which a commitment is made to maintaining national security, but avoiding, if possible, the introduction of new weapons systems which would raise the current nuclear balance between nations to an unacceptable level of terror. No one questions the President's good intentions to reach an arms agreement. But notice has been served on the President that the means to arms control are as important as the ends.

Keep the Voting Rights Act

The Senate Whip for the President's Party has an opportunity for service which I have found distinctly rewarding. The job, however, is not without its difficult moments. One such moment arose recently when the Attorney General and I took different positions on the issue of voting legislation.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act expires next year. I have urged its simple extension. When the Attorney General offered a different proposal, which I opposed, some people asked me why I disagreed with the country's chief legal officer, a member of my own party.

GUEST EDITORIAL

Senator Scott of Pennsylvania, the minority whip, has long been a leader in civil rights legislation. Here, he explains why he opposed the administration proposed alteration of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

I have the highest personal regard for the Attorney General and I consider him one of the ablest men in public life. He and I are lawyers who disagree on the timeliness and certain provisions of proposed legislation. It is not unusual for lawyers to disagree.

I co-sponsored and fought for passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965. I believed this landmark legislation was the least we could do to prevent the exclusion of Negroes from the voting rolls in the South. The Act was specifically designed to pinpoint conspiracies that serve to maintain "whites-only" registration. Literacy tests, for example, are prohibited when they are used for the purpose of discriminating. If the effect of the law has been regional, that is only because the pattern of discrimination has been regional.

The Attorney General, however, has proposed new legislation which, among other provisions, would abolish literacy tests in all states and do away with state residency bans. I approve of those features and will vote for them if they are considered as separate legislation *after* the Voting Rights Act is extended. My present opposition to these provisions is a matter of timing.

There is a danger that the present Voting Rights Act could expire by default. Twenty states now have literacy tests—many of them for non-

discriminatory reasons. Only in the deep South have they been used to exclude Negroes. But any attempt to change the laws of all twenty states would provoke extended debate in Congress and it might prove impossible to get the new law passed before the Voting Rights Act expires. All the progress we have made would go down the drain, as non-complying areas would hasten to exploit the expiration of the Act.

However, there are also other parts of the proposed new law which I would have to oppose, no matter what the timing.

Under the 1965 Voting Rights Act county officials in the South can no longer resort to the kind of tricks which used to keep Negroes from voting. Some areas, for example, had laws which required would-be voters to "interpret the Constitution." Of course, such tests seldom kept whites out of the voting booth. The present Act suspends such devices until the offending counties can *prove* that they have not been used to discriminate for five full years. We put "teeth" into the law so that no state could get around the Fifteenth Amendment's mandate that the right to vote shall not be denied because of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Unfortunately, the proposed new law would scrap the system under which states now affected must clear with Washington changes in state and local election laws. This would take the heat off states which discriminate by giving the Federal Government a much heavier burden of proof. The Justice Department might have to rush lawyers into every suspect county just before election day trying to protect black voters' rights.

Besides the obvious waste of tax dollars, this procedure would allow county officials to stall the Government with legal maneuvers until the elections were over. That is a step backward. I do not want to endanger what Lord Coke called the "knowne certaintie of the law" when that law has worked extremely well. Therefore, I expect to do whatever is necessary to lead the fight, if I am asked to do it, for the extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

My position is influenced heavily by a deep personal commitment which has been consistent throughout my years in Congress. The extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act is quite simply a matter of human rights. That guarantees my strongest efforts on the floor of the United States Senate.

An Open Letter to the President On Minority Enterprise

During his campaign, President Nixon promised the development of a minority enterprise program designed to do the "specific practical things . . . that can be done *now* to get private enterprise into the ghetto and the people of the ghetto into private enterprise." During the first six months of the Administration, performance in minority enterprise development has fallen far short of that promise. The rate of Small Business Administration lending had fallen off during the spring and red tape continues to plague loan applications. On July 18, 1969, in an open letter to the President, the Ripon Society outlined the specific steps that can be taken now.

Recently, some steps have been taken. The resignation of Philip Pruitt, acting assistant director of SBA, appears to have been engineered by the Administration in an attempt to remove a bottleneck in the minority enterprise program. Two of the recommendations made below have been accepted by the Administration but have not yet been publicly announced. The rest of the program is needed now, together with a firm statement of commitment to minority enterprise from the President.

Respectfully, therefore, we submit the following recommendations for simple and straightforward steps we believe the Administration could take in the next few weeks to give minority enterprises the boost they need:

1. *Prestige and Power* — The offices that you have created in the White House and Commerce Department to develop minority enterprise need more prestige and power than you have given them so far. The Office of Minority Enterprise in the Commerce Department is off to a slow start. It has enjoyed nearly five months to attract a staff and build its capacity; but only in the last few weeks has it shown some effectiveness in convening other agencies and developing a coherent minority enterprise policy for the Government. Your White House Special Assistant in this area, Bob Brown, has worked diligently in this direction but by necessity has limited power and staff. To assure that the Commerce Department can accomplish your goals, we suggest two immediate steps:

● *First*, if the Office of Minority Enterprise is to have a leading role in the Administration's black capitalism program, everyone concerned in and out of

government should know that the President's prestige and power are fully behind it. It is not enough to set up an office like this in a controversial and untried area. The success of the Office will depend in large measure in how much follow-up attention it is accorded by you and the rest of the Administration. The head of the Office of Minority Enterprise might be made chairman of a special subcommittee of the White House Urban Affairs Council and given a clear, well-publicized mandate to convene the top officers of all involved federal agencies and direct some of their efforts toward building minority enterprise.

● *Second*, you could move quickly to appoint the members of the Advisory Council of the Office of Minority Enterprise (as provided by the Executive Order creating the Office). It is essential, we think, that the President be able to recruit as chairman of the Council an executive with the stature of a Donald Kendall, who successfully focuses national attention on the National Alliance of Businessmen. The Office of Minority Enterprise needs the resources of a Council to attract the necessary support from the top levels of America's business community. The sooner it is appointed and in operation, the better.

2. *New Momentum at the Small Business Administration* — We hardly need add our voices to the chorus suggesting that Hilary Sandoval be replaced as Administrator of the SBA. Whatever the merits of the Black Advisory Council controversy, it is clear that Mr. Sandoval no longer commands the respect of the black and white communities with whom he is to deal. Replacement of Mr. Sandoval by an outstanding business leader would be a great help in restoring the SBA's momentum in the minority enterprise area. With proper leadership and support from other government agencies, we are convinced that the SBA can do much more with its present powers:

● *Small Loans* — Arranging small loans for minority enterprise must be accelerated whether the program is called "Project Own" or has a new name. Whatever can be said about former SBA Administrator Howard Samuels' projections for this program, significant acceleration had been achieved in lining up small loans under Project Own by last January.

● *Expedited Procedures* — The SBA must develop expedited procedures for processing of small loan ap-

plications. Unnecessary bureaucratic delay by the SBA has been a major hurdle to minority business. It is exactly the kind of bureaucratic bottleneck we think the Nixon Administration can overcome. The SBA could help in critical areas such as New York, for example, by putting in special forces where their staffs are undermanned. Serious consideration should be given to phasing the SBA out of the credit check business which consumes inordinate amounts of time. The banks are willing to process the loans, as they do for the Federal Housing Administration, and banks are at least as qualified as the SBA to do this work. The SBA's role could be limited mainly to providing guarantees for the loans.

● *Implementation of Section 8(a)* — The implementation of Section 8(a) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to sublet federal contracts to minority businesses should be given increased attention. Under this program, as you know, the SBA has legal authority to become prime contractor for federal contracts. The SBA then can sublet pieces of the contract to small businesses at a price high enough for them to make a profit. We know that the experience with Section 8(a) contracts so far (e.g., Watts Manufacturing Company in Los Angeles) has been mixed; there is a need for intensive technical assistance (planning and training) by the SBA to help build Section 8(a) contractors into healthy, continuing businesses.

Successful implementation of Section 8(a) is a real challenge for the SBA. The federal purchasing power exceeds \$50 billion per year; yet less than \$1 million of these Federal contracts, for example went to minority enterprises in New York City in 1968.

3. *Domestic Development Bank and Development Corporations*—The Domestic Development Bank was one of your most promising campaign proposals. The Bank would be comparable in concept to the World Bank and other international financial institutions, with the private sector putting up a substantial part of the loan money. As you know, detailed plans for the Bank and related development corporations have already been drawn up by prominent Republican legislators, such as Senator Javits. Hubert Humphrey proposed a similar Urban Development Bank in his presidential campaign last year. The concept has proven itself for close to 25 years, with the success of the World Bank, the International Development Association and similar quasi-public institutions. Such organizations could have remarkable influence in generating other entities such as regional cooperative banks and community development corporations.

Of course, the establishment of such institutions may take several years (the Asian Development Bank was formed in 1966, but did not make its first loans until 1968), but the time to start building is now. There would be immediate benefits in just getting

staffed and into the field to make surveys and start processing loan applications and appraising equity opportunities. We believe the Treasury Department could produce an adequate legislative proposal for such an institution within a fortnight.

(As a variation in current proposals, perhaps each of the States could become members of the Bank under an interstate compact; the Federal government might pick up part of their initial paid-in capital contributions as a first step in a revenue-sharing plan.)

4. *Management Training Institute* — We suggest the establishment of a national Management Training Institute to provide a "total immersion" experience for minority entrepreneurs combining intensive management education and on-the-job business experience in particular areas (e.g., food services, dry cleaning, automobile sales and repair). The Institute could train 2,000 minority group members a year. This would not be a graduate school M.B.A. program and would not be appropriate for the hard-core unemployed with no basic education. The purpose of the Institute would be to develop minority leadership for substantial businesses that employ 25 or more people and have gross sales of \$500,000 to \$5,000,000. Objective analysis of existing volunteer programs to provide *ad hoc* management assistance to minority businesses clearly demonstrates that such assistance is ineffective on a widespread scale, whether performed by retired executives or bright young executives. Systematic training is essential to develop effective talent to manage substantial businesses.

In addition, we recommend that the Administration develop special loan and scholarship programs to enable members of minority groups to obtain business educations at existing colleges and universities. These loans and scholarships could be similar to those under the National Defense Education Act, Navy ROTC, or half dozen other existing programs.

● *Local Development Corporation* — Local development corporations could be used effectively in metropolitan areas to build minority enterprises. Under Section 502 of the Small Business Investment Act, the SBA has the authority to assist small businesses in purchasing land, buildings, machinery and equipment. For every \$1.00 which the minority community can raise through Local Development Corporations, the SBA can loan \$9.00 to a minority. The Section 502 program has created or preserved 100,000 jobs, mainly in rural areas, over the last ten years. Only 4% of these jobs have been created in cities. Urban job specialists believe that up to 100,000 jobs *per year* could be created in urban areas under this program. The legislation is on the books; the leadership must come from you and the SBA.

5. *Tax Incentives* — The tax incentives that you urged in your May 2, 1968 radio address now appear

dormant. There is no sign that tax incentive proposals for minority enterprise are receiving serious top-level consideration anywhere in the Administration. It may be that Congressional wariness has dampened enthusiasm for certain tax credit proposals, but there may be many other avenues worth study, e.g., increased tax deductions (as much as 150 or 180%) for bad debts incurred under SBA minority business loans, or a special tax credit equal to a percentage of defaults on loans to minority enterprises or equal to a percentage of an institution's outstanding portfolio of minority enterprise loans. The Treasury Department's promptness in producing comprehensive tax reform proposals last spring was commendable. Why cannot as much be done so quickly for minority enterprise tax incentives?

* * * * *

Mr. President, the minority enterprise program desperately needs continuing personal leadership and

inspiration from you. The display of your interest in recruiting top business talent for the program (such as for the Minority Enterprise Advisory Council) will be a key factor in your Administration's efforts. Your giving minority enterprise an effective champion in the Administration will help restore the faith of the black and the poor that you still care.

Your radio messages of last year at this time had the spark of a crusade. You concluded in one:

"It's time . . . to face our challenges not in despair, but with zest — not with a heavy heart, not bowing sullenly to duty, but as an *opportunity* for America to redeem and enrich its heritage."

We earnestly hope, Mr. President, that the impact of your leadership will raise those heavy in heart, uncertain of duty and opportunity, and bring early success to this great effort.

— THE RIPON SOCIETY

Quotes of the Month

Man and His Terracidal Impulses

Earlier this month, Rene Dubos, professor of Environmental Biomedicine at Rockefeller University and winner of a Pulitzer Prize in 1968 for his writings on ecology, came to Boston to address the World Health Organization assembly. FORUM Assistant Editor Suzanne van den Wymelenberg attended the address and spoke with him afterwards. Below are a few excerpts from his speech and their conversation.

"In our day human ecology is undergoing an almost universal crisis because man has not yet adapted, and probably never will be able to adapt, either to the form that biological impoverishment has taken in the very poor countries, or to certain environmental influences which the second Industrial Revolution has introduced into the rich countries.

"Industrial technology has introduced into modern life a range of substances and situations that man has never known in his biological past . . . the toxic effects of chemical pollution and of certain synthetic products; the physiological and mental difficulties caused by lack of physical effort; the mechanization of life; the presence of a wide variety of artificial stimulants.

"The remarkable tolerance in man for conditions so different from those in which he has evolved has given rise to the myth that through technological

and social progress, he should be able to modify his way of life and his environment indefinitely and without risk. That is simply not true. . . . Modern man can only adapt himself to the extent that the mechanisms of adaptation are present in potential form in his genetic code. . . . It is certain that in many cases the apparant facility of man's biological, social and cultural adaptation to new or unfavorable conditions constitutes, paradoxically a threat to individual well-being and even to the future of the human race. . . . Physicians in some countries already are reporting degenerative disease in youngsters under 20. Certain demographic studies show that the expectation of life beyond age 35 has appreciably lessened the last few years in the big cities of the United States. . . .

"Our wealthiest suburbs are so impoverished in the stimuli which they give to their children — the stimuli are so narrow, so objectionable — that these children will never develop their full potential.

"Civilization may have decided that it is willing to pay the price for its technological progress. However . . . it is the children who are being born today who will show the effects . . . (I have decided) to use the few years of life I have left to convince young women to organize themselves. The future of their children is at stake."

Republicanism on Campus

The Colorado UR's: spreading sweet reason and garnering a reputation

A recent Gallop Poll (released July 19) shows that the percentage of American voters who identify themselves as Republicans (28%) still lags behind both those who profess to be Democrats (42%) and those who call themselves Independents (30%). In 1968, the figures were: Republican, 27%; Democrats, 46%; and Independents, 27%. In 1960 the figures were 30 ; 47%; and 23%.

If the GOP is to regain anything approaching majority status, the GOP has got to seem like a more viable alternative to young people, as the Ripon Society never tires of pointing out. To our delight, a very significant Republican organization has arisen on the University of Colorado campus. Undergraduate Steven D. Berkshire, one of the prime movers in the University Republicans, tells all about it.

The University Republicans were founded in early August 1968 at the University of Colorado in Boulder to provide a new and fresh approach to solving the problems on the campus and in the community. The UR's are a group of concerned students, faculty, and administrators who see the college campus as the solving ground for the injustices and the ills of the academic world and of the social sphere. They want to solve the problems "radically" but not in the current usage of the term; rather in responsible research, dialogue, and constructive rational reasoning.

The group tackles problems head-on through the idea of the task force, which is a semi-independent committee that concerns itself solely with one issue and completely studies it. The task force does not merely pass a resolution or present a report restating what already has been said but actually attempts to solve the issue — one that is reasonable, constructive, and practical. The solution is aimed at long range planning rather than aimed at traditional stop-gap measures which can only increase the internal violence of the situation.

EARLIER FAILURES

The University Republican movement recognizes that most social problems today are results of earlier attempts to slow down protest without really solving the problem. This is why the struggle and disquietude on the nation's campuses is so complex and misunderstood, and why there are no simple immediate answers. The problems are part

of a much deeper intellectual and emotional feeling among the younger adults of America.

The task force effort has greatly increased the University Republican and the Republican efforts to take the initiative on campus, forcing action rather than reaction to campus, state, or national controversy.

For example, at the beginning of the academic year 1968-69 the UR's spent much time to settle problems concerning student conflict over racial discrimination and conflict over increased payment for football admissions and seats in the stadium. Both of these moves to take the initiative successfully deprived the Students for a Democratic Society a standard around which to gather support. A few weeks later the UR's tackled the problems arising from the new rules for the University as set up by the Board of Regents. The University Republicans were again successful, considering the Regents adopted several of their proposals including the participation by students and faculty in the selection of a new University President. Other actions by the University Republicans have been several concerning the new role Republicans should play in using this new awareness to improve the social-political community rather than destroy it. Recently the UR's have published reports concerning campus unrest and the reflections many professors had on the new restlessness among many students.

BEYOND CAMPUS

The UR's have also extended their activities beyond the University of Colorado campus and the city of Boulder to inject a new spirit in the Colorado Republican Party and attempts at greater vitality in the national GOP. The group did research on electoral reform, for example, and put its support behind the popular vote proposal. Members of the University Republicans were highly active in the November elections often in leadership positions — giving their ideas and talents to the campaign efforts of various hopefuls. One result of the election is an idea to form a President's Academic Coordinating Committee to represent all campus positions and to give the President suggestions and opinions on proposals and generally open good lines of communication. The idea has received favorable comment from Herbert G. Klein and Harry Fleming both

-Please turn to Page 21

Can a VISTA Find Happiness Attacking Elephants with a Pea Shooter?

(From our special correspondent)

"If you're not part of the solution . . . you're part of the problem."
—VISTA recruiting ad

Commonly known as the domestic Peace Corps, VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) is beginning to emerge from the shadow of its better known overseas counterpart, and its applicants now actually outnumber those for the Peace Corps.

The prestige of VISTA as well is on the rise in the public mind, largely thanks to the general image suggested by the recruiting ads, "public information officers," and sympathetic journalistic treatment. (How can you knock a program which touches on some of the noblest traditions of American culture: voluntary involvement, idealism, social concern, and personal sacrifice?)

Well, you can participate in it, for one. Obscured by the apparent success of numbers and reputation VISTA enjoys is a spreading brushfire of frustration and bitterness among a growing segment of volunteers and ex-volunteers over the VISTA experience.

To them, the above ad quote, cribbed from Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver, now in political exile in Cuba over a controversial parole breaking charge, is especially grating and ironic. For many VISTA's are beginning to turn the slogan back on the mother organization, contending that VISTA itself is symptomatic, if not part of, the problem.

Perhaps this syndrome stems from lack of character on the part of the afflicted and is merely an elementary Freudian transferral of anger at not having their fantasies of fostering change instantly gratified. Could be, but the typical trajectory of the VISTA experience leads more convincingly to another explanation.

A typical VISTA volunteer enters the three-to-six week training program which precedes project assignment with a genuine energy, enthusiasm, a desire to "help" someone, and in most cases at least a textbook-New-York-Times-second-front-page awareness of what poverty is supposed to be like. Many young VV's appear with pasty faces and big ears — the result of having shaved off prized long hair and beards to become acceptable for VISTA training. But nothing in his background or training is likely to prepare him for

THE AUTHOR

Our special correspondent, who must remain anonymous, knows whereof he speaks. The FORUM of course welcomes comments on the opinions and judgments expressed in this article.

the conditions he encounters surrounding the people he is being sent in to "help."

'BROADENING EXPERIENCE'

An assignee to an urban project heads for the ghetto, anticipating a broadening experience about how the other half lives. He learns that as a nation we tolerate cities where hospitals literally overflow, where lines of pregnant women *stand* for hours at clinic doors; where masses of people with rotten teeth, faulty eyesight, and the ravages of malnutrition cannot receive medical treatment; where little old ladies live their lives of quiet isolated desperation; where thousands of black families wait endlessly for the Godot of "relocation" after "urban renewal" has destroyed their neighborhoods; where underpaid police soon learn that society prizes order above law and does not particularly concern itself how that order is imposed on "slums": where the courts are packed with Dickensian political judges who evict tenants and protect slum landlords.

He learns that they live in cities where millions of exorbitantly-priced apartments are unfit for even the rats and roaches which inhabit them; where junkies terrorize the streets to feed their habit — and it is of course "politically impossible" to put them on maintenance therapy. He sees welfare departments run like concentration camps, public schools like prisons, and public payrolls that make the WPA look like a model of efficiency.

If he gets a rural assignment (e.g., Appalachia, an Indian Reservation, or a migrant labor camp), the specifics vary but the conditions are typically just as bad, the culture shock even greater.

ANOTHER TACK

The reaction is to start in on the new assignments by performing personal services for individuals to get the lay of the land and build community trust in him. But even if he manages to get the welfare mother a bigger check to feed her undernourished children, that will do nothing to prevent her daughter and her daughter's daughter from ending up on the welfare rolls, nor does it do anything to change the degrading welfare system itself. And the sparks of interest ignited in a pre-school tutoring project cannot hope to kindle a flame that will survive the following year's school experience.

Many VISTA's therefore, react by abandoning the social worker approach and embrace "community or-

ganization" as a way of generating some kind of "impact." But if a white middle class volunteer can surmount the odds and generate a movement in a black community, nothing lasting is accomplished. The VISTA tenant organizer rushes about morning and night, talking to tenants, lawyers, bureaucrats, setting up meetings and going to court. A year's work nets an organization of five buildings on one block, two others on scattered blocks, all belonging to different landlords. Through rent strikes, picketing, and other forms of pressure, all the buildings are repaired and two of the landlords actually forced out of business. Our volunteer goes away, proud to have accomplished his part.

But the tenants and the building remain in the same slum. Soon, the antiquated plumbing and heating systems break down again, the paint starts peeling, plaster falls, and the building is back to normal. The new landlords have no better intentions or capacities than the old ones.

To VV's who have watched or come through these sorts of experience, the lesson is clear: the function of VISTA is not to solve problems but to joust with them. That is, the mere act of attack, rather than the results of battle, becomes the measure of progress. It is as if an elephant hunter armed himself with a peashooter and marked success by the number of peas which bounced off the attacking beast.

MISSTEP

Of course, apologists concede that programs like VISTA are "only a step," but at least, they argue, a step in the right direction. But are they? For many volunteers, the only step is to stop diddling around with pea shooters and begin a genuine commitment to filling the nation's real needs. A housing commitment on a massive scale, the complete overhaul of public education, a decent guaranteed income, a large-scale reduction of unemployment in the ghettos, a genuine reversal of priorities from fueling a war machine to fulfilling crucial social needs might do for starters.

At any rate, it is becoming apparent that increasing numbers of VISTA's view the program as a hypocritical and fraudulent holding action to avoid explosions in the ghettos — and reform of ghetto conditions. In past years, those who felt this way suffered from powerlessness in relative silence. But in the past 18 months or so, more vocal reaction has developed. And in some parts of the country it is now nearing the level of open revolt.

The first signs began to appear back in January of 1968, when more than 150 volunteers signed an open letter to the President announcing they could no longer remain silent as participants in the "pacification program in the war on the poor" while the nation's treasure was squandered in the war in Vietnam. Since VISTA regulations (and controversy-shy VISTA bureaucrats) bar many forms of free expression by

volunteers, the resultant flap was an important object lesson for VISTA's disillusioned with the direction of the War on Poverty. While the intervention of some liberal Senators prevented mass termination of all the signers, the so-called "ring-leaders" were disciplined, and later terminated for other "political involvement."

THE UNDERGROUND

As a consequence, dissident VISTA's have since gone "underground," but they have stepped up their activities to try and reach as many volunteers and potential volunteers as possible with their message. Last Fall, "Part of the Problem" an underground newsletter began appearing in the New York area and caused fits in the VISTA regional office with a devastating (and, beneath the somewhat agitprop rhetoric, accurate) analysis of why VISTA "fails" (or why it was never intended to "succeed"). Simultaneously, both volunteers and some VISTA staff members began to put pressure on VISTA/Washington to permit greater flexibility, the involvement of white volunteers in white communities (like the suburbs) and the recruitment of large numbers of indigenous minority group volunteers for service in their own communities (the latter a policy to which VISTA had been paying lip service but which had been repeatedly and systematically derailed).

VISTA/Washington managed to ignore most of these trouble signs in their early stages. And of course it was not in the interest of any regional staff personnel to admit to Washington that they were unable to control their VISTA's. But when the Nixon Administration took office in January, VISTA's Johnson hold-overs prudently decided (from Acting Director Padraic Kennedy on down) to demonstrate that they ran a tight ship. The result was a crackdown and an attempt to purge all potential "trouble-makers," whether on staff or in the field. Thus began an extended bureaucratic civil war within VISTA which is still going on.

In San Francisco, Detroit, Boston, New York and other cities, there are indications of VISTA morale reaching new lows. In Phoenix, about half of the 40 volunteers assigned there were terminated for opposing the dismissal of their local sponsor supervisor, and criticizing the local poverty program. The Southeast Regional VISTA office is cracking down on facial hair and "morality of a questionable nature." In New Mexico, sixty volunteers have been reported considering mass resignations to protest VISTA policies.

In Del Rio, Texas, 20 volunteers were ordered home after a dispute with courthouse officials. Controversy in West Virginia and Kentucky have ended many Appalachian projects.

NORTHEAST CIRCUS

But the prize goes to the Northeast Region, which has been the scene of an absolute circus. Back in Feb-

- Please turn to Page 14

Notes from the VISTA Underground

("Part of the Problem" is an underground mimeo paper that appeared in the Northeast Region early this year. The following excerpt expresses the opinions of at least a significant minority of volunteers.)

Most poverty programs soon get known by other names. War ON the Poor, Operation Falsestart, *et al.*, reveal how they are perceived by the communities they supposedly serve. VISTA has no nickname; it is itself damning enough.

The Volunteers know this: it is a truism among VV's that the government doesn't even "Give a Damn." VISTA's are improperly trained, in inadequately supervised, and then, like boy scouts trying for a merit badge, dropped off in the dark depths of our cities to find their way. We receive junk mail telling us how well everyone else is doing, and occasionally in subways find that there are 7,000 of us, together "gambling on the future." We have no organization, no ongoing training, no internal education. And we get together on Friday nights in bars to talk about how it all shits.

Yet the VISTA program is considered a huge success, and the program is now being examined as a model for proposed National Service Programs. It is the contention of this article that this is *not* a contradiction. We have failed; therefore, VISTA has succeeded.

First, we should note that most VV's will either drop out within the first four months or wind up in a second year. The first weeks in the field (whether we realize it or not) are usually periods of intensive growth, often in a hostile, or at least new environment. Neighborhoods or cities are first explored. Rats and roaches are first encountered as living companions. The cynicism in our offices is first discovered (What in the hell do these people *do* all day?) and then adapted to (I'll do your building search; get off my back!). The foods we eat, the clothes we wear, the patterns of speech and behavior are all changed. Throughout this period, the changes are all internal; we have reacted to the new environment, we have not yet tried to change it.

FIRST REALIZATION

VV's attempts at change start with the recognition that the sponsoring agencies we are assigned to do nothing. Hence we boycott our own sponsors (rarely pausing to consider why VISTA persists in sending us to worthless groups). We try to attach ourselves to other activities in the neighborhood or, driven by the VISTA myth of the rugged volunteer, plunge into the task on our own, making contacts through service type projects.

This plateau, for most, is dictated not by preference or principle (at least not ours) but by inherent limitations and problems of what middle-class VV's

trying to organize in predominantly black lower-class neighborhoods. Our first goals are to become known and trusted, to be established as useful parts of the community, to make contact with as many people as possible. We attempt to overcome some of the deeper psychological barriers in people who all their lives have been beaten and battered by the system and by whites. By initiating programs involving the community, about immediate reformist service programs, we try to mitigate the individual sense of inadequacy by bringing people together. We try to implant the idea of the potential strength of a cooperative community.

And we are liars. The mute resistance of those eloquent welfare mothers who fall silent at the sight of a Center, the fear of tenants to make demands of their landlords, the refusal to attack the schools despite the daily brutalities inflicted on ghetto children, are lessons about our own role, and statements about power, which we refuse to learn. Most of us begin for the first time to understand the apathy of the ghetto as our own disillusionment sets in. The large ideas about change that brought us into V., the possibilities of alternatives, fade into the background. The tiny increments of change are minutely examined; the sweeping radical aim is lost and ignored. We adapt an existential, not a political criteria: to survive is enough. We not only *feel* the vibrations of the neighborhood, we settle into them.

AN ADJUSTMENT

As the result of disparity between our hopes and our achievements—we, above all, become uncritical. Dealing only with our own position as isolated individuals, we can find no way out. Only by measuring the scope of the problem, by defining the whole, can we begin to see our relation to the part.

VISTA is a government program. It must justify itself to that government: it must aid the maintenance and consolidation of power; it must serve the dominant interests in this country. What are VISTA's functions: what does it do?

VISTA, OEO, etc. are responses to ghetto uprisings. We are there to cool the colonies. But this is not enough; it is no help in understanding the mechanics, and little help in understanding our own malaise.

We help welfare recipients, run service centers, fight minor bureaucratic battles, etc., and can honestly and openly say that we help people lead better lives. No direct threat to any militant groups within the ghetto, for the most part we support the efforts of black militants and radicals, realizing that we have no roles within those organizations. We feel at cross-purposes to government attempts to repress. Uneasy with the awareness that we ourselves are taken by ghetto residents as proof of the government's concern

and integrity, we can nonetheless feel respect and even some pride in our modest achievements.

Our weakness, however, is the failure to recognize that the volunteers are absolutely marginal to VISTA's function. Volunteers are accepted so that VISTA may mount a publicity campaign, not the other way around. It is no accident that we are in effect discarded (think about it) as soon as we get out of "training." Pacification consists in buying off emerging leaders and mollifying discontent with minimal reforms and the illusion of meaningful activity (VISTA). All the VV's in N.Y.C. do less in this respect than the ubiquitous ads in buses and subways. Whom do you know who has joined VISTA because of a subway ad. Who reads these, and what function do they serve? The medium is the message; VISTA is splashed throughout the city, saying more clearly than we ever could: "Cool it. Don't rush things, the government is fighting the problems."

The white middle class knows problems exist in this society. More importantly, it insists that its elected officials attempt to do something about them. The labor/minority/intellectual Democratic coalition has been repeatedly returned to the White House on its liberal platform; the Nixon victory is a backlash

against the *failure* of liberals to deliver the goods, not their *attempt* to do so. VISTA at once appeals to the demand that the government initiate *some kind* of remedial programs, and the traditional American penchant for attacking social problems by means of voluntary associations. (Hence, we are not government employees, but "volunteers.") We are slaves to the middle class conscience, a living reminder that things are "being done." Dig it: by going into VISTA we affect more people at home than we ever reach as volunteers. Parents, family, friends, teachers, all are mobilized; we become immediately the focus of campus rumors and home-town gossip. We are the embodiment of middle class romantic ego-projections — youthful, adventurous, courageous, self-sacrificing and dedicated to the highest principles. And . . . we are solving the "race problem" the only way possible — "person to person" a living rejoinder to those bad mouthing street niggers and their deluded white allies. We both secure the allegiance of the white middle class to the system by making reforms and allowing them to act out their ego-fantasies, and at the same time defect and discredit more radical and substantive efforts. In case anyone misses us, VISTA maintains a Hometown News Service which sends out stories on our exploits to set the ball rolling.

VISTA - from page 12

ruary, Acting Director Kennedy (no relation to the Senator) apparently intending to nip things in the bud, sent a new Program Manager up to the New York office. With a mandate from Kennedy, he immediately fired one of the most popular and effective regional staffers (with five-minutes notice and no stated grounds — see April 1969 FORUM) who had made the mistake of urging basic changes in VISTA policies. In the months that followed, 20 other members of the regional staff were either fired or resigned (including the last few who had any sympathy with the volunteers in the field) and programs were brought to an almost complete halt. Many volunteers had their projects put on "administrative hold" indefinitely, and two Rochester, N. Y. VISTA's were disciplined (one forced to resign and the other on probation) for engaging in "counter-recruiting" — namely showing up at VISTA recruiting tables to tell potential applicants how VISTA *really* is. (Volunteers have an open invitation from VISTA to assist in recruiting. Assistance like that, however, VISTA could understandably do without.)

In April, a contingent of sixty volunteers, fed up with the new "Reign of Terror" and angered by the wave of firings and repression, descended on the Regional Office — not so much to "confront" the bureau-

crats as to "*epater* their bourgeois minds," as one of them put it. With hats, whistles and balloons — no violence, no damage — they appeared and informed the Regional Administrator and Program Manager that their authority was no longer acknowledged. Then they left, and that was that. Following the bureaucratic secession, the Program Manager was recalled to Washington, and the Regional Administrator finally resigned (as of this writing, he is yet to be replaced). There is little or no policy or direction coming from the Regional office, no contact with the volunteers in the field and the charade goes on.

AN ANSWER

VISTA has an answer to these developments. Recent interviews with Kennedy indicate that he is trying to move VISTA in a "new direction." He is stressing the upsurge in "young professionals" (law and business school graduates), and the increased maturity they will bring to their experience. The assumption is that this new class of volunteer will be more amenable to the VISTA treadmill. He also claims that by the end of the year, another 20% of the volunteers will come from the ranks of the poor.

But this all has the overtones of an elaborate shell game. As long as VISTA's policies and priorities come from Washington down instead of up from the people

-Please turn to Page 21

A Primer On U.S. Arms Sales Around the World

Current debate on whether "the civilian" still controls "the military" in the United States, or whether they are so intermeshed as to prevent any control whatsoever has a way of slipping away into ideological jargon. Yet the issue of control is in fact an extremely practical question — and, especially at levels of policy decision below ABM or the size of the military budget, it deserves more attention than it has gotten. During the past two Administrations military appropriations not connected with Vietnam or National Security grew virtually unsupervised at rates matching the sharp post-Eisenhower military budget as a whole. One of the fastest growing areas of government support was in the field of "grants" and sales of arms to the underdeveloped countries.

Military sales abroad in the 1960's ran nearly 600% ahead of the levels of the 1950's at the height of the Cold War and Mr. Dulles's global alliances.¹ This policy was initiated with the rationale of improving the US balance of payments — largely, as we shall see, on paper only — while little attention was given as to how the sale of weapons would be supervised or controlled.

PATTONS VS. SHERMANS

It has frequently been pointed out that direct military *grants* go to needy countries almost irrespective of the form of government of the recipients — the gifts of our Defense Department to the military dictatorships of Greece, Brazil, Argentina, and Spain come most quickly to mind. And the largesse of the Defense Department often underpins both sides of local military conflicts — perhaps most notorious was the case of the Pakistan-India war of 1965; equally as infamous but less widely known is the fact that the Defense Department supplied arms to Israel and three Arab countries

THE AUTHOR

Theodore Moran, 26, is a doctoral Graduate Prize Fellow. He is currently also associated with the Law Faculty of the University of Chile and finishing his dissertation, on "The Multinational Corporation and the Politics of Development in Chile", for Harvard.

almost to the eve of the Six-Day War and still trains the pilots of both sides; least known of all is that we have been supplying both sides of the civil wars in Mozambique and Angola.² It is not reassuring about our grant system when we can watch one side fly to the front in C-130B *Hercules* planes and fight in *Patton* tanks against another side which flies to the front in C-119's and C-47's and fights in *Sherman* tanks, as happened in the Pakistan-India War.

The most recent example occurred just this month in Central America where Honduras and El Salvador bombed and attacked each other with U.S.-supplied equipment. Had the generals on either side bothered to procure more ammo the fight might still be raging. Meanwhile, on the other side of the world, dealers are already making plans to sell military supplies left behind in Viet Nam to Burma, India, and Pakistan.

Still, in the case of government grants, which are theoretically given at least cursory congressional inspection, the semblance of supervision has surprisingly been maintained. With the great growth of arms *sales*, however, as the Defense Department financed or guaranteed commercial operations of any US corporation that could find customers, there has seemed to be almost no restraint on arms shipments.

How, then, are arms sales to the underdeveloped countries carried out? And why are there so few political or strategic restraints on who gets arms, or how much they get? We shall examine these questions in some detail, and then suggest practical ways to bring the international flow of arms back under some civilian control and congressional supervision.

MAPPING THE CHANNELS

It is understandably difficult to gather accurate, reliable data on arms grants and sales to the underdeveloped countries. This is because the Defense Department submits no consolidated standard statement of shipments, because many commercial shipments financed by the Defense Department (e.g. to NATO) are then reshipped openly but unofficially to underdeveloped regions and not recorded, and because De-

fense Appropriations bills, even if untangled, do not tell the whole story. Defense appropriations generally do not include the portion of counterpart funds generated in local currency by sales of the Food for Peace (PL 480) Program, which is required by law to be used for military expenditures. Nor do they include the growing sums of money being allocated to the military, police, and intelligence of poor nations through the "Public Safety Program" of AID. Nor, needless to say, do they include CIA expenditures.

Still, the evidence about the "Free World" suppliers of arms seems to indicate a vigorous competition for the top six positions. Who are the contenders? They are: first, the US military establishment through direct grants and sales of US arms; second, US commercial companies backed, guaranteed, and usually financed by the US military establishment; third, the US military establishment, selling US equipment by way of NATO allies, especially West Germany; fourth, US and some foreign commercial firms located in NATO countries selling US equipment, again primarily through West Germany; fifth, the French selling French equipment; sixth, the British selling British equipment. And so on.*

THE KUSS CORPS

There is no doubt that the United States holds the first position, and perhaps the first four. How does this work? The primary agency for coordinating arms sales from the United States is the International Logistics Negotiations Office (ILN), established in 1961 as a separate office in the Defense Department, under the vigorous direction of Henry J. Kuss. Mr. Kuss has publicly "pledged" himself to a goal of \$1.5 billion per year in arms sales and arranged his sales force of 21 professional military officers into four teams — red, white, blue, and grey (to appease Dixie sentiment) — each charged with particular areas of responsibility.⁴ So successful was Mr. Kuss in boosting military sales, irrespective of where the arms end up, that in 1964 the Johnson administration promoted him to the rank of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Recently, General Robert H. Warren took over the organization built by Mr. Kuss, but whether the General will continue in the ILN tradition is unclear. Just this month, however, the U.S. and West Germany reached a two-year agreement for fiscal 1970 and 1971, under which Germany will purchase a total of \$800 million in military equipment from the U.S.

It would only be fair to describe the ILN's ap-

*Exactly where the Communists would fit into this picture is unclear — they certainly push arms grants and sales of their own, although Paul C. Warnke, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security admitted that from 1955-1967 their military exports were only one half of ours. A more recent estimate has put it at one fourth.³ About 95% of this is from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Interestingly a large percentage of the Soviet aid to Indonesia and Africa has been to block Chinese penetration.

proach as alert, dynamic, and aggressive. It would also be fair to say that, enthused with the idea of improving our balance of payments and anxious to show high-pressure salesmanship, there was no real attempt to supervise arms sales in line with US political and strategic objectives. Mr. Kuss's office engaged the cooperation of the industrial and financial community through the Military Export Committee of the Defense Industrial Advisory Council in trying to expand overseas military sales. The Defense Department has appealed to the US armament industry to "go international." In a speech to the American Ordnance Association in October 1966 Mr. Kuss chastised companies who were dragging their heels:

"This tendency of American companies to refrain from entering into the international arms market is a serious one and affects our entire posture in a military, economic, and political way. . . . From the political point of view international trade is the 'staff of life' of a peaceful world. With it comes understanding; the lack of it eliminates communications and creates misunderstandings."⁵

In addition, the Defense Department has been organizing symposia throughout the United States which will try to convince the smaller arms manufacturers, the "non-bigs" as they are called, that they too can enjoy the profits and the guarantees of the larger companies if they enter the military export market. Conservative estimates suggest that \$500,000 to over a million dollars of taxpayers' money is used by the Defense Department just for sales promotion in an effort to bring buyers and sellers of weapons together. And Defense is aided in this by the Small Business Administration and the Commerce Department.

How do the underdeveloped countries get so many arms? If they are so poor, how can they afford them? And does the process of military aid really help the US balance of payments?

E-Z NON PAYMENT PLAN

The key to the growth of US arms sales has been the expansion of US credit assistance. For example, in addition to direct grants, gifts, and training, the Defense Department sold in fiscal year roughly \$56 million in arms to Latin America. Of this, only \$8 million was for cash. It has been suggested that this 7 to 1 ratio of US credit to cash is probably common throughout the underdeveloped world.⁶ These liberal credit arrangements do in fact enable the underdeveloped countries to buy more arms than they would otherwise be able to, and in this sense it helps the US balance of payments. But the appearance of helping our balance of payments is largely on paper only — the poor countries sink deeper into debt and the

probability that they will someday suddenly pay back all the accumulated principal of the debt is small indeed.

The Defense Department's generous refunding arrangements for arms debt, handled as we shall see entirely internally, will probably insure this appearance for some time to come. But even the debt service (interest) on loans to the underdeveloped world is by itself becoming too great for many countries to bear. The United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, for example, has recently figured that the external debt of Latin America has doubled since 1960 and that 36% of all the continent's export income must now go each year to foreign investors or lenders, largely in the form of interest.⁷ To expect that these countries will suddenly pay back the accumulated principal and thereby really help our balance of payments is not very realistic.

PENTAGON REVOLVING FUND

The process by which these credit arrangements are worked out is fascinating in itself. Again, the International Logistics Negotiations office in the Defense Department — not the State Department, AID, or the Congress — acquired under the last Administration the sole responsibility for negotiating the terms of credit extended for military purposes. There was in 1957 an initial authorization of \$15 million for credit assistance. But it was in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (sec. 508) that the Military Credit Assistance Account of the ILN became a "revolving account" — that is, new allocations, interest, and repayments of loans were accumulated in the account and were required by law to be used for further financing of military supplies. Thus, although yearly appropriations ranged from a mere \$21 million to \$81 million per year in the 1960's, the account has grown to over \$300 million.

As if this were not good enough, in 1964 the Johnson Administration requested, and got, a measure giving Defense the authority to guarantee 100% of the credit extended by US banks for private arms sales while obligating only 25% of the amount as a reserve to back up the guarantee. In other words, the \$300 million-plus in the ever-increasing "revolving account" allows the Department of Defense to put the full guarantee of the US government behind over a billion dollars in military credits. Between 1963 and 1967 military sales to underdeveloped countries increased thirteenfold by this means.⁸ And this account to finance arms sales kept growing under the Democrats by an amount four times its yearly appropriation every year. Finally, in the Foreign Military Sales Bill of 1968, the "revolving account" of the Defense Department and the credit guarantees of the Ex-Im Bank were formally stabilized with the explicit understand-

ing that the annual flow of arms would be frozen at the 1967 high of \$1.5 billion.

At the same time, in a practice which became a *cause celebre* in 1967, the Defense Department has been getting money to give out in loans from the Export-Import Bank through what are called "country-x loans." Here, the Ex-Im Bank does not have any knowledge where the vast sums of money go — the Department of Defense arranges the loans on its own terms with whomever it wants and then goes through the formality of guaranteeing the country-x loans to the Ex-Im Bank. The process did come under criticism when the President of the Bank, Harold Linder, admitted that he had no idea where all this money went, or what it was used for, or what the political beliefs (let alone the credit-rating) of the recipients were. The Senate passed a resolution to repeal the Defense Department's authority to guarantee commercial sales, but the House would not allow the repeal of this authority.

PRIVATE BANKS HELP

Finally, as has been suggested, private US banking facilities play a large role in financing American military exports. According to the *Military Export Reporter*, a trade journal for US contractors in the arms business, about 36% of all arms sales 1962-1965 were financed by private banks. Naturally, private banks do not participate in such loans, especially with regard to the underdeveloped countries, without full guarantee of repayment. Again, it is the Department of Defense that makes this guarantee. In this process the International Logistics Negotiations office can mix its own easy credit terms with the higher commercial rates. Thus a "package loan" to the military dictatorship in Brazil, for example, which would include Defense Department, Export-Import Bank, and commercial bank credit terms, can be arranged at very low overall interest rates, while the private banks, on their share, get the higher commercial rates.

It has been occasionally suggested that arms merchants are in a highly speculative business. That may have been true in the last century. But now the truth is that arms loans are the first paid, the last reneged-on, and the easiest re-funded. ITT has been expropriated in Rio Grande do Sul, but no Brazilian general has ever dreamed of refusing to pay back the debt service on arms loans. Coups and countercoups give the politics of the underdeveloped countries an air of instability, but commercial loans for arms always get paid. Engaging in arms sales with a government guarantee to almost anybody is one of the safest businesses there is.

Still, it does not seem that there should be any inherent reason why sales of arms to underdeveloped countries cannot be supervised and controlled in line

with our political and strategic interests. But supervision and control are very difficult. And one of the main reasons is that the Defense Department, in its pressure and encouragement to get US firms to "go international", has been largely negligent in looking into the effects of reshipment. Here the NATO countries, especially West Germany, have played a crucial role.

WEST GERMAN CONDUIT

The United States insisted that the West Germans buy approximately \$800 million per year in arms (instead of giving us a cash sum) in order to offset the cost of maintaining US troops in the Federal Republic. Increasing amounts of these arms, through German governmental and private commercial channels, apparently are being sold in a "two-step" process to whomever wants to buy them among the underdeveloped countries. In fact there are doubts that this is even a "two-step" process — no official figures exist, of course, but there is much evidence to suggest that formal entries appear in the West German accounts but shipments are made from the US. Other arrangements are even more complex — for example, the American F-86's which Venezuela bought from West Germany a few years ago were manufactured in Italy under a US licensing arrangement.

Thus the situation has grown more complex, and seemingly almost unmanageable, under the last two Democratic Administrations. Still, there are simple and practical steps that can be taken to bring the area back under "civilian" control and more in line with, and responsive to, our national security interests. Currently, as we have said, the Defense Department submits no composite reports to Congress on what it sells abroad, or even on how the military assistance account of the ILN is used; and the Department seems to take very little interest in where the arms end up, despite some "end use" agreements with West Germany. The first requirement for reasonable supervision, then, would be a requirement for detailed, standardized, composite reports, which can be collated and compared year by year. These should be submitted to the legislative branch with a classified appendix if necessary and then, as far as possible, made public. This would be a start toward controlling more closely the military half of the "military-industrial complex."

Second, there must be more careful arrangements to limit where commercial arms shipments go. The Mutual Security Act of 1954, under President Eisenhower, gave the Department of State and the Treasury Department joint responsibility for establishing policy and enforcing regulations over the sale of military arms. It set up an Office of Munitions Control to issue export licenses on military items, but since 1962 this office has not issued a report on just what commercial

military items were exported. In 1961 the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was given the responsibility by Congress for controlling the flow of arms abroad. But the Democratic Administrations showed no interest in actually letting these agencies carry out their responsibilities. It is important now to let either the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency or the Office of Munitions Control, under the Secretary of State and with the consent of Congress, assume the supervision of civilian arms sales to the underdeveloped countries.

It is occasionally argued that if the United States does not dominate military sales to the underdeveloped areas, other countries such as France or Great Britain will simply step in and sop up the profits. This argument is largely spurious. The British and French efforts are purely commercial operations, with high interest rates and short pay-back periods. They are very expensive in foreign exchange in comparison with US "packages." In those cases where poor nations have hard, ready cash, US arms salesmen will in fact have to be competitive in quality and price — and occasionally they may lose contracts. But in general, in selling our old and almost useless (to us) military surpluses we can, for better or for worse, continue to dominate the market with artificially low prices. And we can continue to dictate the pace at which local arms races continue. A strategy of cutting back on soft credit sales while offering consciously cut-priced surpluses will automatically slow the pace of the arms races in the underdeveloped areas, continue our domination of the arms market, and not do much damage to our balance of payments in real terms.

But most important is a new effort to supervise and control where US military shipments go and what effect they have. Just as Mr. Nixon has shown concern and determination for more careful scrutinizing of military procurement in this country, so also he must act now to get military exports back in line with the best national security policy.

—THEODORE MORAN

¹ *Arms Sales and Foreign Policy*, Staff Study prepared for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, January 25, 1967, p. 3.

² George Thayer, *The War Business*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969, pp. 163, 215, 233.

³ *Hearings on Foreign Military Sales*, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, June 20, 1968, p. 20, and George Thayer, *The War Business*, *op. cit.*, pp. 325, 337.

⁴ John L. Sutton and Geoffrey Kemp, *Arms to Developing Countries 1945-1965*, London: The Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelphi Paper no. 28, October, 1966, pp. 1, 28.

⁵ Speech before the American Ordnance Association on October 20, 1966.

⁶ *Arms Sales and Foreign Policy*, US Senate, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁷ *The New York Times*, April 20, 1969.

⁸ *Arms Sales and Foreign Policy*, US Senate, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-7; and *The New York Times*, July 19-21, 26, 28, 30, 1967.

The Slow Asphyxiation of Fulbright - Hays

For many years, the exchange of university scholars, students, and school teachers between the U. S. and dozens of foreign countries, financed under the Fulbright Act of 1946, has been widely accepted as one of the most far-sighted and successful U. S. government programs. Under that original Act, the U. S. agreed to use the foreign currencies resulting from sales of its surplus military equipment to help pay for an educational and cultural exchange program.

That program expanded steadily after 1946, and its authorizing legislation was strengthened in 1961 under the leadership of the original sponsor, Arkansas Senator J. William Fulbright, and Ohio Congressman Wayne Hays. One of the notable features in its growth was the partnership between the government and U. S. universities. In the current year the latter gave over \$5 million to support, for example, the academic expenses in the U. S. of foreign Fulbright grantees (such expenses are not paid by the U. S. government). But growth and success apparently have not convinced some key government officials that educational and cultural exchange is worth their attention.

Frank Samuel, Secretary of the Ripon Society and a former Fulbright Fellow, details the hard times the program has fallen upon and what can be done to revive it.

Suffering from ill usage under the Johnson administration, the Fulbright-Hays program is languishing further from inattention under President Nixon. In spite of oft-proclaimed support for creative partnerships between the government and private institutions and individuals, the new administration has so far ignored the vigorous and prestigious partnership embodied in Fulbright-Hays activities.

The background of the current situation is briefly this: Under the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, appropriations for educational and cultural exchange — of which the Fulbright-Hays program is the bulk — rose gradually from \$19.5 million in Fiscal 1954 to \$42.8 million in Fiscal 1964, and then to the high of \$53 million in Fiscal 1966. In Fiscal 1967 the decline began; first to \$46.5 million for that year and then to \$43.8 million in 1968. But these reductions, discouraging as they were, were mild in comparison to the drastic cutback made last year when Congress appropriated just \$31 million for Fiscal 1969.

The Fiscal 1969 cutback has resulted in an overall reduction of approximately 67% in the number of American Fulbright-Hays grantees going overseas, and close to 33% decrease in the number of foreign students and scholars coming to the U. S. The overall

percentages are grim enough; specific examples are even more alarming.

For example, in Great Britain, where in recent years there have been about 200 Fulbright students, professors, and secondary school teachers, there will be in 1969-1970 (the academic year affected by the 1969 cut) *no* Fulbright students and *no* Fulbright professors. In Holland, where the Fulbright group totalled around thirty, there will be *no* Fulbright teachers, *no* Fulbright students, and only *one* full time professor. In the Philippines, only four of eleven planned Fulbright grants survive. In Japan, the program is funded at the lowest level in its seventeen-year history. No new grants will be available for students or professors in Norway, Korea, and Singapore.

NOT A WAR CASUALTY

A sorry pass indeed for a program with nearly 100,000 "graduates" (35,000 of them Americans), a twenty-two year history, a reputation for exceptional quality, and the strong support of academic, governmental and business leaders both here and abroad. Vietnam budget squeeze? A petulant Congress? Contemporary irrelevance? All of these have been advanced as the basic explanation for the calamity which

has engulfed the program. None is accurate. The key factor is poor administration leadership, first under LBJ, and now, it seems, under President Nixon.

The crucial hearings on the 1969 exchange budget were held before Congressman John Rooney, irascible Brooklyn Democrat, in May 1968. Just a few days before these hearings, the Johnson administration's new Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs took office. He was Edward Domenic Re, law professor and Kennedy appointee as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. He hailed, not merely coincidentally some thought, from Brooklyn. Whatever his other qualifications, Dr. Re appeared at least mildly qualified for the U. S. government's major cultural affairs post. At any rate, Chairman Rooney treated Re in the opening minutes of the hearing roughly enough to establish firmly that the road to cultural affairs appropriations did not lie through the heart of Brooklyn.

STATE TO THE NON-RESCUE

Whatever were Chairman Rooney's views on educational exchange — and one can assume they were not wildly enthusiastic—he got no argument from the Department of State. Out of his subcommittee came a \$15 million cut (even he later said on the House floor that \$15 million was too much). The State Department, with the fervor and dedication (so often its trademark,) requested the Senate to restore only \$5 million. The Senate appropriations subcommittee, chaired by John McClellan, restored \$3 million; the conference committee finally compromised on a \$1 million restoration.

Throughout the hearings, the State Department's defense of the program was hardly forceful. For example, when Capitol Hill bleated about overseas spending, the State Department did not mention that the President's then-new balance-of-payments program was drawn to minimize its impact on students and teachers. And in the McClellan hearings the strongest support for educational exchange came not from Dean Rusk, not from Idar Rimestad (State's Deputy Undersecretary for Administration), not from Edward Re, but from Wyoming Democrat Gale McGee. In short, the Johnson administration made little more than token gestures of disappointment while Fulbright appropriations were decimated.

But the Nixon administration has yet to improve on this sad performance. In spite of an extended and urgent plea for the Fulbright-Hays program in the report of the President's pre-inauguration task force on education, the new administration has done little to respond. It was not until late May that it finally got around to nominating a successor to Re as Assistant Secretary. (He is John Richardson, New York lawyer and investment banker and past director of Radio Free Europe.) No person on Henry Kissinger's fulsome White House staff is known to have any responsibility

or interest in educational exchange. The education task force report, if it has got beyond the White House at all, has made no noticeable impression on the State Department. Both Secretary of State Rogers and Undersecretary Richardson reportedly look upon the program with personal favor, but that attitude has not been supplemented by visible Departmental action.

For Fiscal 1970, LBJ's budget requested only a token increase, to \$35.4 million. Hearings on that request have already been held — as usual, in closed sessions—by the House Appropriations Subcommittee. No word is authoritatively available on those hearings, but it is doubtful that the subcommittee has become less conservative since last year. California Democrat John Tunney has submitted a \$15 million request for additional appropriations but has scant chances of gaining approval for it. The Nixon budget review cut \$5 million from the State Department total and it is possible that a disproportionate share of that reduction will eventually be levied on the educational and cultural exchange budget, particularly if expenditure ceilings are enacted. Thus, the Fiscal 1970 outlook is bleak indeed.

MEANWHILE THE FAMINE

Meantime, the Fulbright-Hays programs in foreign countries face two years of famine in U. S. government funds. Foreign governments, with the notable — but temporary — exception of West Germany, are cutting down their substantial contributions to Fulbright-Hays activities. The reputation of the U. S. in foreign education and government circles suffers. Substantial numbers of American and foreign professors, teachers, and students are losing the opportunities of foreign study. Above all, the U. S. is reducing reservoirs of good will and understanding abroad and at home upon which it must draw in the conduct of national policy.

Reversing the slide to an unheralded demise is not an easy matter. All eyes turn automatically to Senator Fulbright, but the program cannot depend on one senator for its salvation, and should expire if it must. No signs of self-generated initiatives are noticeable within the executive branch. The two appropriations subcommittees — the loci of Congressional power on this issue — are not known for creativity. The wider educational exchange constituency — the 35,000 U. S. Fulbright alumni and others with experience and interest — is for the most part unaware that the Fulbright-Hays program is dying of neglect.

It is quite justifiable to maintain, as many do, that educational exchange needs a long, hard look and perhaps an overhaul. Should the Fulbright-Hays program be continued as a State Department program or should it be shifted to HEW or USIA? Or should a governmentally-established foundation be established to administer Fulbright grants as well as to provide quite openly the clandestine institutional support for inter-

national activities discovered in the CIA a few years ago. And what of substantive issues: Wherein do the differences in the international scene between the late 1940's and today suggest changes in educational exchange programs? What is the proper role of government programs when foreign travel is a commonplace for many of today's youth and their teachers? Can some of the virtues of foreign study be provided through better international programs on American campuses? These questions have received some attention in academe and are beginning to receive some Congressional thought. Senator Javits and others, for example, are consulting with a group of leading educators and public figures on the issues. No complementary interest by the administration has surfaced.

In any event, these philosophical and administrative problems can only have long-term answers. Meanwhile, the world-renowned Fulbright-Hays program languishes ignominiously in a Nixon pigeon hole. It deserves a better fate.

—FRANK E. SAMUEL, JR.

Republicanism on Campus - from page 10

Presidential aides and assistants. Mr. Klein stated shortly after the election that:

In keeping with President-elect Nixon's desire to conduct an 'Open Presidency' and to establish meaningful 'open' communications with the young people in our nation and with the academic community, a committee such as the President's Academic Coordinating Committee at the University of Colorado will serve a most useful purpose.

All actions of the University Republicans have been received with interest and acclaim from college administrators, state and national Republicans, the Board of Regents at the University of Colorado, and by fellow students, a collection of groups that seldom agree. So impressive was the effort of the founding members that internationally known economist Kenneth E. Boulding became the group's faculty adviser. Professor Boulding joined the movement because — in his own words:

Politics is not a mechanical transcription of the will of the people; it is a process by which that will can both be freely expressed and can also be transformed. Conflict *within* a party, however, is more apt to result in *creative* transformations of the political will than is conflict *between* parties. I am sponsoring the University Republicans precisely because I hope it will result in *creative* conflict.

The University Republicans consciously tried to live up to these expectations: but as in all groups attempting to find true and responsible change there is much yet to be done and much to evaluate about the group's first year. Lone public appraisal appeared in the *Colorado Daily's Retrospect*, which called the UR's "the most active and to a very real extent the most

effective campus political organization," a considerable accolade from that tough-minded newspaper considered friendly to the New Left. Signs would point to a repeat performance in the coming years with research going on concerning rent procedures in student rental rates, greater participation by students and faculty in the academic affairs of the University, and what *can* be done about "injustice" within the campus judicial practices.

Don Marturano, former President of the Associated Students of the University of Colorado, sums up the impression the community has of the new Republican spirit that is growing rapidly in Colorado:

Until now, the University community has been without an effective organization that can represent the responsible students interested in solving the problems of our changing University and society.

In that society, there has existed a critical need for a dialogue at many levels: between the political right and the political left, between whites and non-whites, between faculty and administration, between students and faculty, and between students themselves.

I sincerely believe that the University Republicans can provide these dialogues — especially needed during this time of tension at our University and in our nation.

So there is a new Republican spirit growing in Colorado. It is the University Republican movement — hopefully the voice of the 70's.

—STEVEN BERKSHIRE

VISTA - from page 14

being "helped," as long as politicians have access to pressure points to crack down on volunteers whose efforts threaten their positions, and as long as the VISTA staff's first loyalty must be to the parent institution rather than to the poor — as long as these conditions exist, volunteers will continue to realize their impotence and powerlessness to have any impact within VISTA. And as long as they see their assigned function not as the eradication of poverty, but rather as making poverty bearable for those so afflicted, then the VISTA resistance will grow. Just as many Peace Corps volunteers began realizing over the past few years, VISTA's are coming to see that the value of their service is solely to themselves — a bearable state of affairs only until perceived by the volunteer. Constructive alternative? Stop fooling around with pea shooters.

Where will it end? That remains to be seen. But in the battle over control and direction of VISTA policies, certainly one group with no stake in the outcome is the poor people themselves. For if anyone knows of the uselessness of VISTA it is they — and they must be watching all these irrelevant heated skirmishes with philosophic amusement.

The next 1200 Days - from page 24

acterize the New Deal and Great Society approaches to eliminating poverty. We Republicans can make new promises that the solutions lie in tax incentives to the business community, in revenue-sharing to promote local initiative and in new programs that stress voluntarism by the private sector and self-help and participatory democracy by the poor. But it is quite another thing again to come up with the programs and the substantial funds that will be required to make even these enlightened concepts work.

WELFARE CHANGES

The first step in the difficult transitional process of moving away from the present inequitable and degrading welfare system—and the Administration shows signs of moving in this direction—is for the Federal government to adopt minimum standards of welfare throughout the nation and to pay a share of the resulting higher payments in states that cannot afford them. Such reform would go a long way toward ending the exodus of the poor from rural areas where welfare payments are shockingly low to the cities where assistance to the poor is generally maintained at more enlightened levels.

The new Administration must be bold enough—and generous enough—to overcome the vicious and degrading stereotypes of poverty. It must, for example, require that assistance programs be available to all impoverished families including those that have a man in the house. No longer should able-bodied men be encouraged or compelled to abandon their families so that their wives and children can qualify for welfare assistance. No longer should families be disqualified from receiving assistance if the man or the woman of the house is able to find work and yet is unable to maintain the family at a subsistence level. I do not preclude the possibility of a system that moves toward a guaranteed family income, either through a reverse income tax or income maintenance by family allowances—but always with incentives to work, to educate oneself, to lift oneself out of the degradation and hopelessness of poverty.

But in the meanwhile, where are the funds needed to implement the present programs? The poor are told that they are to participate in their own flight from poverty. But the funds sought by this and the previous Administration for local initiative through OEO's community action programs came to less than what was requested to cover operating expenses of the Coast Guard.

Ghetto residents are told that they will be helped to establish themselves in small businesses. But blacks, who comprise 10 per cent of the population, still own less than one per cent of the businesses. Loans from the Economic Opportunity Loan Program, which were

promised to aspiring ghetto businessmen at the rate of 10,000 a year by the Johnson Administration, totaled only 1,700 last year. Not only must the Administration take bold steps to give life to this program, it should reverse any tendency within the Small Business Administration toward cutting back on its prior commitment of bolstering minority entrepreneurship through technical and financial assistance.

TICKING TIME BOMBS

Time bombs of frustration, despair and anger among our urban poor continue to tick away. What a tragedy it would be if more explosions came this summer because we failed to heed in time demands for action by the tenants of those slums that *someday* are to be renovated or replaced; by the students in the schools that *someday* are to receive suburban-quality facilities and instruction; by the disadvantaged sick who *someday* are to get first-class treatment and hospital care; by the malnourished who *someday* are to feel the full bellies promised by the President's food program; by the hardcore unemployed who *someday* will receive the vocational training and the equal opportunities now promised by Federal law?

The children of the poor are also entitled to the same educational opportunities as those who can afford the spiraling costs of a college education. And yet, the Administration's budget proposals include a cutback of about a quarter from the amount appropriated last year under the National Defense Education Act's student loan program, and eliminate altogether Federal grant programs for the construction of college buildings and the stocking of elementary and secondary school libraries.

HEW VIGILANCE

True equality of education is unapproachable on a national scale without the end of segregation in nearly 800 school districts largely in the South. A deadline for compliance of September 1969 seems little to ask in view of the fact that the Supreme Court ordered desegregation *15 years ago* and Congress passed Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 *five years ago*. There should be no lessening in HEW's enforcement of the law or in any Department's efforts in the area of civil rights.

In the field of health care, I see a promising and constructive role for Government in cooperation with the individual and the private sector. But in the "Knowles affair" we faced a danger of a reversal in present national health policies. For, the key question was what the controlling influences would be with this Administration in the field of health—that is, to what extent would the AMA be a dominant factor, and to what extent would opinion opposed to participation by government in the health care of the people be a dominant factor. The appointment of Dr. Harold

Egeberg as Assistant Secretary for Health puts many of these fears to rest because he has made clear his dedication to the principle of adequate health care for all and has asserted his independence from undue influence by the AMA.

ABM CRITICAL

Those as concerned as I about reordering national priorities would be more reassured if it were clear that we are pointed in the direction of early disengagement from the Vietnam conflict and deescalation of the arms race so that we can devote major attention to relieving the nation's domestic ills. This concern has contributed to much of the opposition to the development of the Safeguard ABM system which has become a symbol in the debate over national priorities. I think the Safeguard debate stands out as a critical phase of the struggle for the soul of the Nixon Administration. With his decision to deploy the ABM the President has shown that his military advisors continue to carry great weight with him. In their minds military hardware is to have the first claim on national resources. I submit that the rich and varied tapestry of American society as we have always known it may not survive the excessive cost of another major escalation in the arms race. Indeed, at the risk of sounding like an Old Testament prophet, I believe that the diversion of resources necessitated by the \$8-billion deployment of Safeguard—combined with continuation of the Vietnam war and no progress on further disarmament—could touch off such a maelstrom of protest from our disadvantaged citizens and disenfranchised youth as to jeopardize the life of our free institutions.

It is at the threshold to such a potentially tragic future that we now stand. But, the spectre of inexcusable poverty and domestic unrest provides the President with an opportunity as well as a challenge. It is an opportunity of politics as well as of history. By moving boldly in the direction of uplifting the poor into the mainstream of American society, by seeking to reconcile the alienated, by achieving a new synthesis of the public interest and sound business practices in his domestic programs, by ending the war in Vietnam, by progressing further in disarmament—President Nixon, who was elected by a minority of the people, may yet transform the Republican Party to the Party of the majority.

GOP OPPORTUNITY

I have always believed that the Republican Party could be the vehicle for truly progressive action in our society. I have always believed that the private sector has the capacity to operate in the public interest to solve such vital problems as urban decay, rural poverty and unemployment. It is now for President Nixon to bring this lesson home to the majority of the American peo-

ple by utilizing traditional confidence of the business community in the Republican Party wherever possible and by bringing the full effect of government power, funding and partnership to bear on the problems that do not lend themselves to solution by the private sector alone.

But overreliance on non-governmental approaches to dealing with our nation's domestic ills could produce a new generation of unkept promises not at all dissimilar to those that have been the legacy of the Roosevelt and Johnson years. The difference is that such a set of broken promises could provide the match to ignite the flames of violent social upheaval that, with some tragic exceptions, has thus far been generally contained.

The sense of crisis that pervades our nation today is a crisis of inaction, not of impotence. It is a crisis of not doing, rather than a crisis of not knowing what to do. And therein lies our hope for the future—the immediate future—so far as President Nixon is concerned. The great hope in the Nixon Administration is that it will lead the nation to taking action in time. Its greatest tragedy would be if history reveals that our nation could have prevailed over the social ills that now afflict it, except that we failed to act in time.

—SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS

14a ELIOT STREET

● In "The Nation" section of *Time Magazine's* July 18, 1969 issue, **John S. Saloma III**, associate professor of political science at M.I.T. and former president of the Ripon Society evaluates the first six months of the Nixon Administration. Saloma said that the Administration very accurately reflects a part of America, that of the "Middle American," but "it moves further and further away from other parts of it." He said that the danger lies in the Administration's failure to cause the "longer-haired people and the black and the eggheads" to interact with the "Middle American." "What is bad about this is that you have these two moralities that are not speaking to each other."

● **Robert D. Behn**, Ripon's research director and editor of the Society's 1968 election analysis, **The Lessons of Victory**, was interviewed on Channel 56 WKBG TV on July 20 by a group of Boston *Globe* reporters. Behn discussed the election book and the work of the Society.

● Ripon members **Francis W. Hatch** and **William L. Saltonstall** are running against each other for the Massachusetts Sixth Congressional District seat formerly held by **William Henry Bates**.

● The New York Chapter, in conjunction with **Capital Formation**, a New York foundation working in the field of minority group and economic development, held a symposium on black capitalism on the evening of June 25. Those invited to participate included representatives from the White House, city government, civic organizations, and members of minority groups developing businesses in the New York City area. Recently, the group also held a luncheon with **Jerrold Fuchs**, of the Fund for New Priorities in America. Fuchs spoke about the objective of the Fund, which is to create a public recognition of increasing militarization of American society caused by large defense spending.

The Next 1200 Days

Our nation is facing a crisis of purpose which will determine its destiny for the rest of this century—a crisis which demands an immediate and highly visible response. The response that is needed, at the very least, is the establishment of goals and the means to implement them which will bring this nation to grips with the crisis of the cities and the closely related hopelessness of its rural poor. What is needed is the re-ordering of our national priorities away from the building of "limitless" military power—without any sacrifice of national security—and toward the restoration of "domestic tranquility."

Up to this point, with one exception, the Nixon Administration has not yet moved on the nation's problems of poverty and alienation with the resources and speed so vitally needed. The one substantive exception has been on the problem of hunger—an exception which I hope will clearly mark the route the President will follow, and which could be noted with great profit by some of the President's advisors.

In a dramatic and humanitarian gesture, the President announced—apparently overruling even some of his own advisors—that he planned to wage an aggressive campaign against hunger, a campaign that would cost an additional \$1 billion annually. This was a thrilling moment in my political career because I am the ranking minority member of the so-called Hunger Committee. It pointed up how an issue illuminated in the public forum that sears the conscience of the nation can be translated into immediate, meaningful political action.

HOPE AMIDST DOUBT

There is some doubt that the additional \$1 billion per year the President plans to spend will be adequate to expand and improve the Federal food stamp and food distribution programs sufficiently so that every family, no matter how modest its means, will be guaranteed a diet that meets the minimum Federal nutritional standards. But one thing is no longer in doubt: if the President has the will, then I feel we have a right to expect that he will find the means to finance the new

THE AUTHOR

Senator Javits who looks at the Presidency from the vantage of eight years in the House and 13 in the Senate, assesses the first couple of hundred days and points out some imperatives which will structure the next 1200.

forward-looking programs that are required to help our poor. And I might add that the President has given every indication that these funds can be found even within his pared-down budget for fiscal 1970 without diverting the nation from the anti-inflationary course he has charted.

Inflation is the nation's most *immediate* pressing problem. But while the Administration must act to curb inflation, it can ill-afford to downgrade attention to our urgent social problems. The action to reduce federal spending should have cut deeper into military spending—especially into the outlays for overseas bases and for research and development—and should have left the funds available for domestic programs substantially intact or enhanced by transferred military funds. There is still time to revise these priorities.

In his domestic message to Congress, the President indicated that once inflation had been brought under control through short-term budget cuts, "we must be prepared to increase substantially our dollar investment in America's future as soon as resources become available."

TRIM DOD BUDGET

I submit that the resources are now available, even with the present need for Federal austerity to offset the legacy of inflation left by the folly of President Johnson's "guns and butter" policy. Those resources—of say \$5 billion—can be found today in the "guns" portion of the national budget because I am convinced that much fat can be trimmed from the nearly \$80-billion defense budget at no real danger to our nation's security. And those deferrable or unneeded military dollars are sorely needed on the domestic side of the ledger to offer better housing, schools, health care, transportation, job training and a decent diet to the millions of our nation's poor. Indeed, there is every indication that the President himself already sees this and plans to dip into the Defense budget to find the extra funds he needs for the enlarged food assistance program he has announced in the coming year.

Yet, desirable as it is, the President's program to feed the hungry is but a jetty against an ocean of poverty and racial tension that is pounding against the underpinnings of our society. The President and other Republicans, including myself, can speak properly of the unkept promises, of the massive spending programs and the muddled bureaucracy that have come to char-

-Please turn to Page 22