

Saturday Review



Editor - Norman Cousins

Publisher - William D. Patterson

Associate Editors
Irving Kolodin • Horace Sutton

Associate Publisher - Richard L. Tobin

Managing Editor
Roland Gelatt

Science Editor
John Lear
Book Review Editor
Rochelle Girson

Travel Editor
David Butwin

Copy Editor
Peter Nichols

Education Editor
James Cass

Poetry Editor
John Ciardi

Art Editor
Katharine Kuh

General Editor
Hallowell Bowser

Layout & Production
Pearl S. Sullivan

Editors-at-Large
Cleveland Amory • Henry Brandon
Harrison Brown • Charles Frankel
Frank G. Jennings • Joseph Wood Krutch
Elmo Roper • Peter Schrag
Theodore C. Sorensen • Paul Woodring

Contributing Editors
Goodman Ace • Hollis Alpert • Jerome Beatty, Jr.
Henry Hewes • Arthur Knight
Martin Levin • Rollene W. Saal
Robert Lewis Shayon • Zena Sutherland
Walter Terry • Margaret R. Weiss
John T. Winterich

Businessmen and Operation Bootstrap

Wherever one looks at the underdeveloped areas of our earth, one must come to a conclusion common to every sensitive person—that hunger and poverty are the great headlines of our day, and that all else is secondary. Even war, by itself, is less of a threat to the human race than continued neglect in the poorer nations. The majority of the world's people go to bed hungry each night; the United Nations also tells us that this frightening statistic and world illiteracy are actually increasing despite unprecedented prosperity in the capitalistic West. These people have cried out and we haven't listened to them, even in the most basic terms of helping them to help themselves.

The Committee for Economic Development is composed of 200 leading businessmen and educators and could by no stretch of the imagination be considered socialistic or sob-sister in its structure or objectives. The CED is supported chiefly by voluntary contributions from U.S. industry and business, as well as from foundations and individuals; it is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and nonpolitical. When, therefore, the CED recommends an immediate rise in the assistance the West should give low-income countries toward their own development, we must listen seriously to what they say and believe that their reasoning arises out of self-enlightened logic rather than political emotionalism.

A recent CED report states point-blank that "a critical phase in the history of the low-income countries has been reached." Yet, the American pro-

gram of assistance has now been reduced to a point where it is utterly inadequate to the needs, tasks, and opportunities that present themselves to such countries. The Foreign Assistance Act became law in 1962 and U.S. commitments under it are at the lowest level in its history, despite growing needs for economic development in these low-income areas.

What formula should we use to suggest our capacity for contributing to the development of these areas? The CED believes that a good basis for planning the future annual flow of private and official assistance by the advanced countries, including the U.S., would be 1 per cent of the national income at first and ultimately 1 per cent of the Gross National Product. At present the advanced countries of the West come nowhere near meeting this target.

Assisting development in low-income countries comes about in three principal ways. First, by providing additional resources for investment over and above local capital available. In the more important aid-receiving countries, such external investment resources have amounted on an average to 20 per cent of total investment. Second, the high-income nations can help to alleviate the shortage of foreign exchange through loan funds in their own currencies, thereby providing a supplement to the export earnings of low-income countries. Third, and probably most important of all, we in the West can help increase the efficiency of resource use through technical assistance and improved domestic eco-

nomie policies in areas unaccustomed to the ways of capitalism.

In order to achieve more flexible terms of lending—that is to say, low interest and soft terms where necessary, and higher interest and harder terms where appropriate—the CED recommends a reduction of the prescribed interest rates of 2 per cent during the "grace period" and 3 per cent thereafter, and substitution of an average interest so flexible and liberal that even the poorest underdeveloped areas will be able to come for aid.

As the CED report points out, rising incomes and more rapid growth in the low-income countries will not necessarily win the U.S. allies and friends, or insure stability and peace. On the contrary, we will know we are making real progress when these low-income countries break with the past and begin often highly volatile political and social changes within their boundaries. But, the CED adds, "profound changes are already under way in the less developed world regardless of what the United States does or does not do. The long-term political rationale for aid, therefore, rests on the calculated risk that accelerating the modernization process, and reducing the sacrifice required to achieve it, will enhance the odds in favor of an earlier evolution of responsible and independent states in the low-income regions of the world. By the same token, the risk of involvement by the great powers in crises and power vacuums abroad will thereby be reduced."

Technical assistance by the American government was first proposed in President Truman's Inaugural Address of January 20, 1949, under what he called the "Point Four Program." The idea was that the U.S. would offer underdeveloped nations the capital, equipment, technical skills, knowledge, and professional men to help the poorer nations help themselves. Most poorer nations, President Truman pointed out, need, and normally do not have available to them, sufficient capital to develop their own agriculture, industries, education, health programs, or even public administration.

In this twentieth anniversary year, therefore, it is essential that the American legislative family do far more than it has to date and, at the very minimum, follow the basic recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development, those hard-headed businessmen and industrial leaders who know full well that assisting development in low-income countries is at the least enlightened self-interest and at best the only thing that makes sense in an increasingly chaotic and warlike world family.

—RICHARD L. TOBIN.

Letters to the Editor

Progress at Lambaréné

N.C.'s "LAMBARÉNE REVISITED" [SR, Oct. 4] was an especially refreshing editorial since it brought the world up to date with a jungle tradition that most people lost interest in with the passing of its glamorous overlord four years ago.

Abraham Lincoln once remarked that "the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present and as our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew." Well, it's too bad progress had to stifle a certain amount of Schweitzer's romanticism, but it is nice to know that N.C. feels Schweitzer's death came at the right time and at a time when progress was necessary. Even though the article seemed particularly contemptuous of the doctor's critics with "constricted vision," I am glad that it agreed with the critics on the subject of progress at Lambaréné.

I advise anyone interested in the perpetuation of Albert Schweitzer's ideals to write: The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship, 866 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y.

JEFFREY HALL,
Livingston, N.J.

THE CAPTION to one of the pictures accompanying the editorial claims that Dr. Albert Schweitzer wrote in his diary that he received Governor Stevenson "and his son, Adlai Stevenson, Junior, and his lovely wife."

Dr. Schweitzer actually wrote: "... *et son fils Adlai Stevenson junior et sa belle-fille.*" Although *belle-fille* may sound like "beautiful girl," it means daughter-in-law.

JOHN MAASS,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Doing Their Thing with Destiny

CHESTER BOWLES's article "America's Next Rendezvous With Destiny" [SR, Sept. 6] makes seven excellent suggestions for curing America's ills. I think his diagnosis and recommendations for treatment are sound. I do not, however, agree with his optimistic prognosis.

Ambassador Bowles places the burden of redirecting America's priorities on the political leaders of the "emerging new generation," and says that they must be willing to "work with like-minded groups toward common objectives." First, in an administration that forced through the ABM, reversed itself on the appointment of John Knowles, slashed the Job Corps, suggested "preventive detention," chose to ignore the appointment of a "get-tough" cabinet in Saigon, and that is changing the tone of the Supreme Court, I am hard-pressed to find the "like-minded groups" among the executive branch.

Mr. Bowles points out that other nations have fallen when "the old order attempted to ignore the new forces, while others sought to stifle them by violence and oppression." It seems safe to say that the new administration is ignoring the "new forces." And there are at least some indications that John Mitchell, with his

new license to wiretap such groups as the Black Panthers and the SDS, his green light on the Chicago conspiracy case, and his defusing of the Miranda decision, intends to do some stifling by oppression if not by violence.

On the contrary, Mr. Bowles, it is not up to the young people. They are "doing their thing." Lyndon Johnson listened and stepped aside. Now Richard Nixon must listen, for 1972 will be too late.

FRAN WATKINS,
Fountain, Colo.

CHESTER BOWLES credits many leaders of the new generation as having "toppled a President who had been elected by the greatest majority in our history." A leading newspaper's recent editorial section made some speculation about a replacement for Ho Chi Minh, with an assessment of his accomplishments that included: "And he fought the United States to a standstill—toppling in the process an American President voted into the White House with one of the biggest majorities ever." Heretofore, others have insisted that Eugene McCarthy or Robert Kennedy caused the President to step down.

With all contradictions and credibility gaps aside, the only discernible fact is that the war continues in power, but Lyndon B. Johnson and Ho Chi Minh do not. Obvious? One would think, yet hundreds of writers and statesmen have

used thousands of words that tend to cover rather than reveal it. In the meantime, hundreds of people are still being killed each week in Vietnam. When will we stop citing reasons with vindictiveness toward personalities or people, and direct human resources toward weeding out the causes of war? Are we too immune to life to see the disaster in our collective destiny unless we do?

RONALD B. BARTLETT,
Kansas City, Mo.

Another Woodstock Lover

DAVID BUTWIN's "The Other Woodstock" [BOOKED FOR TRAVEL, Oct. 11] took me back to one of the nicest days I've ever spent. Two years ago my son and I were in Woodstock and did just what Mr. Butwin did. It's a town I fell in love with.

First, the martinis at The Bear. When we ordered them before lunch, the waiter took one look at us and called out, "Two American martinis." They were delivered speedily, ice cold and dry.

Walking through Blenheim is an experience I'll never forget. I almost didn't make it, because there was so much beautiful China, furniture, rugs, and art to see; we walked through the village streets to see Winston Churchill's grave. It was the perfect end to a lovely afternoon. The plain flat marker, which he would have liked, held a single little yellow rosebud that someone had picked and laid there, and the birds sang. Yes, is there anything left to say?

MRS. DURAND CRUTCHER,
Louisville, Ky.



"Do people hate us because we dress this way,
or do we dress this way because people hate us?"