

Saturday Review

Editor: NORMAN COUSINS

Publisher: J. R. COMINSKY

Associate Editors: HARRISON SMITH, IRVING KOLODIN, HORACE SUTTON

Associate Publisher

W. D. PATTERSON

Science Editor

JOHN LEAR

Poetry Editor

JOHN CIARDI

Managing Editor

RICHARD L. TOBIN

Education Editor

PAUL WOODRING

Production Manager

PEARL S. SULLIVAN

Book Review Editor

ROCHELLE GIRON

General Editor

HALLOWELL BOWSER

Feature Editor

JAMES F. FIXX

Editors-at-Large

CLEVELAND AMORY
HARRISON BROWN
JOHN MASON BROWN
FRANK G. JENNINGS
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH
T. S. MATTHEWS
WALTER MILLIS
ELMO ROPER
JOHN STEINBECK



Contributing Editors

HOLLIS ALPERT
ALICE DALGLIESH
HENRY HEWES
GRANVILLE HICKS
ARTHUR KNIGHT
KATHARINE KUH
MARTIN LEVIN
ROBERT LEWIS SHAYON
MARGARET R. WEISS
JOHN T. WINTERICH

Planning for Prosperity

THE OWNER of a small delicatessen in Brooklyn, New York, received prominent newspaper attention last week when he told his Congressman and the press of the severe hardships that would be imposed as a result of the government's decision to shut down the Brooklyn Navy Yard. His cry of pain was only one of many thousands throughout the country in response to the order suspending operations at obsolete or marginal military installations. Meanwhile, Congressmen and other officials of the affected areas registered their protests with the Department of Defense. It might be noted in passing that in the recent election campaign many Senators and Representatives sought to make political capital out of their ability to obtain, save, or prolong defense spending in their areas. Even Senators who have a reputation for opposing large military budgets have made strenuous efforts, often successfully, to retain or restore defense plants in their states.

The plight of the Brooklyn delicatessen owner, and others like him, was real enough. But that is beside the point. The point is that the most powerful lobby in American history is now at work in behalf of what is in many respects a multi-billion-dollar boondoggle. It makes little difference if a defense plant is manufacturing equipment for which there is no longer practical use, or if the march of military technology has outmoded particular weapons and their integral parts. All that matters, apparently, is that arms spending means jobs or improved business.

After the First World War, writers like Philip Noel-Baker and Frank C. Hani-ghen* attracted widespread attention and provoked popular indignation with their contention that the war was brought on, at least in part, because of private concerns that lobbied for and profited in arms. The principal lobby today behind the arms race comes not just from the military or from manufacturers but from everyday people, labor unions, small shop owners, and Congressional and local officials who are supremely vulnerable to economic and political pressure.

It is important to identify this lobby not just for historical purposes but as a matter of accurate contemporary labeling. No local storm is as great as the one that is stirred up by a report that defense spending in that area is about to be reduced. And those who recognize a specific danger in the mounting arms race will be misdirecting their energies if they address themselves solely to the military establishment. Indeed, for efficiency purposes alone, the military would like to discontinue many outmoded and cumbersome installations but are virtually forced to keep them going because of Congressional pressure.

We are not arguing here that the hardships imposed by military shutdowns are not real. The laborer or the shopkeeper whose income is cut off cannot be expected to exult or do a victory dance, whatever the nature of his work.

*Philip Noel-Baker, M.P., *The Private Manufacture of Armaments*, Oxford University Press, 1937, \$3.75; H. C. Engelbrecht and F. C. Hani-ghen, *Merchants of Death*, Dodd, Mead, 1934, \$2.50.

It is natural to expect that a man who has been wedded to a job for twenty years will fight to keep that job. But at least let us correctly identify this situation, if only to be in a better position to address ourselves to the human side of the problem.

OVER the past twenty years, the occupants of the White House, whether Democratic or Republican, have frequently spoken of the opportunity offered by a cutback in military expenditures. For example, it would be pointed out that the cost of a single bomber, if saved, could build a school or a hospital or a community center or so many miles of new road. Also, experts like Seymour Melman of Columbia University have demonstrated how armament plants can be converted into essential non-military production. And public officials like Senator George McGovern of South Dakota have developed detailed plans for re-conversion.

The time has come to put these re-conversion plans into operation. We assume that the concept of peacetime equivalents was seriously advanced; very well, let it now be applied. When factory orders are discontinued or sharply reduced, new products can be adopted, in line with the detailed recommendations advanced by reversion task forces. When the government decides to shut down a military installation, let it also make available the resultant savings for new prospects in the area affected.

It may be argued that the government lacks authority for applying economic equivalents—despite all the oratory about the need to apply military savings for peacetime purposes. True enough. But this would seem to make it imperative that proper authority be provided. We should suppose that many of the Senators and Congressmen who are doing their utmost to protect their areas against economic dislocation would recognize the need for legislation to empower the government to undertake reversion or assist communities in such useful projects as will sustain and possibly even expand the area economy.

What we are trying to suggest is that a situation the nation has been hoping for these past two decades may be eventuating sooner than most people think. Increasingly, the nation may be in a position to take energies and resources now going into armaments and put them into the making of a better America. Instead of lamenting the shutdowns, we ought to be hailing them—both for the improved peace prospects they symbolize and for the economic opportunities they offer. In any case, we ought to be able to find something better to do with empty hands than to turn them to the manufacture of mass murder weapons.

—N.C.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Visit with Khrushchev

I WOULD LIKE to express my thanks to N.C. for his article on former Chairman Khrushchev [SR, Nov. 7]. He has given his readers a glimpse of a side of Mr. Khrushchev that has been little discussed.

At the same time, the article has ably described some of the basic differences that continue to separate East from West. The reader cannot help but have a better understanding of the causes and forces that helped mold policies and developments in the world during Mr. Khrushchev's years of power.

RICHARD HAHN.

Chicago, Ill.

I THOUGHT THE ARTICLE on Khrushchev one of the most interesting and enlightening I've ever read. The insight I got from N.C.'s story parallels my own experience with nationals of other countries in that they, like Americans, also have pride. Mr. Khrushchev's explanation of not wanting to return to his group of leaders with a U.S. demand for a change in the nuclear inspections is understandable. The President of the U.S. would not like to return to Congress with hat in hand to say he was cowed by Russia.

Perhaps, more than it might seem, the U.S. was responsible in great measure for Mr. Khrushchev's downfall. In time, the U.S. may rue the loss of him. Now that Johnson is in office on his own, perhaps the U.S. will (or should) take a firm, honest stand. It would be a closer step toward peace to cut out the diplomatic doubletalk of ours everywhere in the world.

LARRY AULDRIDGE.

Cleveland, O.

THE ARTICLE ON KHRUSHCHEV is outstanding. It should be read by all Americans, if for no other reason than that it gives us a glimpse of a government that affects our country and lives.

What a shame that it wasn't possible for the article to have been published before this. We need to explore every possibility of obtaining a nuclear test ban, which would be of benefit to all the world.

MRS. RUTH LITTAU.

Meadow Vista, Calif.

A College for the Sixties

HAROLD TAYLOR'S ARTICLE "The Idea of a World College" [SR, Nov. 14] is an excellent one. As he suggests, the "idea" is not new, but the concrete plans to get such a college into operation are very new—and very exciting. The experimental program headed by Dr. Taylor in the summer of 1963 was a big success. It would be misleading, however, to leave the readers of *Saturday Review* with the impression that this kind of international educational effort is unique with the newly formed Friends World College.

The Society of Friends, who are initiating the Friends World College, have experimented successfully in international education for many years. Earlham, Haverford,



"Well, if you think that's top secret wait'll you hear this."

Swarthmore, Bryn Mawr, Whittier—all of them Quaker colleges—have been sending their students abroad for part of their education for a long time.

Perhaps the most exciting program, however, is Quaker International Seminars, developed by the American Friends Service Committee during the past fifteen years. Centers for this unique program are in Geneva, Togo, New Delhi, Tokyo, London, and Philadelphia. A dozen residential seminars are held each year in a dozen different countries. Each has thirty or forty participants in their twenties and half a dozen "resource people" from as many countries. Completely democratic and self-governing, they have been held with success—but not without problems—in countries ruled by dictators as well as in democracies.

What happens in these international educational experiences described by Dr. Taylor is graphically summed up by an American girl writing about her participation in a Quaker International Seminar in Leningrad in 1963: "Early in the seminar, nationality was the most obvious and most important distinguishing characteristic for the participants. This was followed by sex, and attitudes, in that order. Halfway through the seminar, however, people's ideas had become the most important. This was followed by nationality, attitudes, and sex. At the end of the three-week seminar, everyone agreed that the most important thing about a person was his attitude. Next came

his ideas. Sex came in third—and a person's nationality was considered the least important distinguishing characteristic about him."

Friends World College in another stage in the evolution of education for a world of diverse peoples, cultures, and governments, rapid-fire transportation and communications, nation-to-nation TV, space flights, and incredible military destructive capabilities. A world college is long overdue; a hearty cheer for its arrival!

NORVAL D. REECE.

Philadelphia, Pa.

CONGRATULATIONS TO Harold Taylor and *Saturday Review* for his article. I am sure many people will hail the idea as being of great importance. Now let us hope for some philanthropist to donate enough to start the project, create a governing board, find a location, and get it into operation. An idea so badly needed should not die on the vine.

A. R. MEAD.

Gainesville, Fla.

Boring Bard

IS IT BECAUSE John Ciardi is your poetry editor that he published his poem "The King Who Saved Himself from Being Saved"? What a bore!

EDITH KURIS.

Flushing, N.Y.