

TECHNOLOGY AND GOVERNMENT

VOLUME 12, NO. 4

APRIL 1969

WORLDVIEW is published monthly [except for a combined July-August issue] by the Council on National and International Affairs. Subscription: \$4.00 for one year; \$7.00 for two years; \$9.00 for three years.

Address: 170 East 64th Street, New York,
New York 10021. TE 8-4120

EDITORIAL BOARD

James Finn, Editor

John R. Inman

A. Willem Loos

Editorial Assistant, Susan Woolson

CONTENTS

In the Magazines	2
Technology and Government	3
Editorial	3
Soviet Technological Man Speaks: The Energy Is Everywhere	6
Victor G. Farkas	6
The "New Nationalism"	9
George C. Denney, Jr.	9
Intervention: A Two-Way Street	14
Wilson Carey McWilliams	14
BOOKS	
The State of Israel in the Modern World	19
Monika Hellwig	19
Of Religious Communities and Political Action	21
Verna Scott	21

Requests are welcome that **Worldview** welcome correspondence from our readers. It may be specific comments on an article or general topics of interest. We do not publish anonymous letters or those that contain personal attacks or threats.

Comments that are submitted will be read by the editors and if they are deemed appropriate will be published. Requests for publication of a letter or article must be accompanied by a self-addressed envelope and postage.

"It boasts an armed force of 3.5 million. It has 6,000 military bases within its borders. Ten per cent of its labor force is involved in either military or defense-related employment. Some 22,000 of its biggest manufacturers are prime military contractors, while more than 100,000 firms contribute some type of output to defense productions."

What is it? The United States, of course, in a partial description by Guy Halverson, a staff correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor*. Mr. Halverson continues: "The United States is the world's largest exporter of munitions. And its total expenditure for welfare, education, and poverty programs is less than the amount spent on defense."

Such descriptions have become quite familiar during the last decade and the more familiar they have become the more easily they have been dismissed. It may not be the least significant feature of the present anti-ballistic missile (A.B.M.) debate that it has thrown open the question of our military-industrial complex in terms that can be readily grasped. Unlike a number of phrases with frightening and critical implications the term "military-industrial complex" was given legitimacy with its birth on January 17, 1961 when President Eisenhower said that "this conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in American experience" and warned that its "total influence, economic, political, even spiritual, is felt in every city, statehouse, every office of the federal government." Yet many people have not only denied the legitimacy of the expression but the existence of the complex. Not surprisingly, many of the strongest denials come from military and industrial spokesmen, whose objectivity, fairly or not, has been called into question. To adopt a comment made in another context, their testimony amounted to an assertion that "there is no military-industrial complex; it only looks like that from the outside."

In spite of formidable and significant criticisms of the concept and the implications that have been drawn from it—criticisms that should not be dismissed without consideration—the evidence of the complex and its pervasive influence continues to grow. The recent Secretary of Defense, Clark Clifford, said when he was in office:

"We now have a military-industrial team with unique resources of experience, engineering talent, management and problem-solving capacities, a team that must be used to help find the answers to complex problems as it has found the answers to complex weapons systems. These answers can be put to good use by our cities and our states, by our schools, by large and small business alike."

Whether the military-industrial team that now exists *should* be called upon to solve our domestic problems is questionable, whether it *could* is more questionable, whether it *would* is yet more questionable. But the existence of the team seems safe from doubt.

One more bit of evidence for Thomases who still doubt was provided by Senator Stuart Symington, for many years a strong and informed supporter of defense measures. Speaking directly to the issue of the A.B.M. system Senator Symington said that he didn't think it would work, but that even if it did "I don't feel it is essential to the defense of the United States." When he was asked why there was such heavy pressure for the A.B.M. system and whether the military-industrial complex was involved, the Senator said that the shifting arguments made by the proponents of the system made him more apprehensive about the military-industrial complex than anything that had happened during his term in office.

But certainly the complex, which has grown mightily in recent years, will be cut back when the war in Vietnam is ended. Not so. Not if present trends continue and authoritative spokesmen for defense industries are correct in their predication. Of a Federal budget of \$156 billion voted by Congress in 1968 about \$80 billion was allocated to military activities. And the projection for the future is up not down.

There are a number of reasons to account for the projected increase. Senator Henry Jackson, for example, who supports a modified A.B.M. system and is critical of much of the debate that has swirled around it, says that it is essentially "a nuts-and-bolts argument . . . The main issue is: What kind of an adversary do we face? If it is dangerous we must take extra precautions." And he pointed out that on questions such as the A.B.M. the President must make the decision on the basis of advice tendered to him by experts who are privy to information not disclosed to the ordinary citizen.

Senator Jackson's position is not only legitimate but conventional. But that this position can be given a somewhat different twist is clear from the following statement by a vice president of an aerospace company. Speaking of the increased orders he anticipates this spokesman said:

"It's basic. Its selling appeal is defense of the home. This is one of the greatest appeals the

politicians have to adjust the system. If you're the President and you need a control factor in the economy, and you need to sell this factor, you can't sell Harlem and Watts but you can sell self-preservation, a new environment. We're going to increase defense budgets as long as those bastards in Russia are ahead of us. The American people understand this."

•

What a number of American citizens increasingly believe is that sound reasons are being twisted to support dubious proposals. This may be nothing new, of course, but when the proposals involve a massive proportion of the nation's resources and when their effects would be so pervasive, the situation is new and demands a new response from all of us. For the greatest fear does not derive from a belief that we are subject to a system we cannot change nor is the most incisive criticism directed at particular men in high positions. Those who write most cogently about the military-industrial complex in this country see it as only a symptom of what unguided technology can lead to. They do not call for utopia or cry that we should "throw the rascals out." They call instead for a cool examination of our situation and the subsequent application of the human wisdom that has been granted us. As Victor Ferkiss writes elsewhere in this issue,

"Any serious student of the contemporary human condition must [recognize] that our problems are twofold: the immediate and urgent life or death one posed by nuclear weapons in the hands of rival imperialist powers—problems exaggerated by the lack of internal political and intellectual freedom in the Soviet Union; and the longer range but no less urgent and mortal ones posed by world poverty, over-population and the destruction of man's natural environment by uncontrolled technology. Our ability to deal with the latter is in large measure threatened by our preoccupation with the former—as when nuclear fallout poisons the air we breathe—and we can resolve our crisis as a species only through joint action of the great powers whose political contention has done much to aggravate them. Only by transcending the East-West conflict through coexistence can we resolve the deeper human crisis created by technological progress."

We are here far from a nuts-and-bolts argument and deep into what can properly be called political and moral issues of the gravest import.

J. F.