RIPON FORUM

SEPTEMBER, 1969 VOL. V, No. 9 ONE DOLLAR

Special Issue on Youth

A RIPON SOCIETY STUDY CO-SPONSORED BY SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contributors

Bruce K. Chapman, the senior editor, would like to thank the following who were instrumental in the writing and editing of this manuscript:

Robert Davidson	Geoffrey Keppel
Frank D. Raines	George F. Gilder
Christopher Beal	Meredith Morris
Bink Shorts	Robert Burnham
William J. Kilberg	Reuben S. Brown

The Ripon Society expresses its gratitude for the participation of Senator Howard H. Baker (R.-Tenn.), who has consistently demonstrated his interest in issues of special concern to youth.

This manuscript is a condensed version of a book to be published by Hawthorne Press, New York City.

INTRODUCTION

by Senator Howard H. Baker

I am over thirty. It may be that this stark, for me slightly discomforting, but irrevocable chronological fact means that I should make no effort to invade the world of the young. It is certainly true that I can never fully understand or share its subculture. But, like every other American over thirty, I am fascinated by it.

I reject out of hand the view of those who argue that this generation is no different than younger generations which have preceded it. There are elements, no doubt, that it has in common with those which have gone before — chief among them being the need and the wish to establish its own identity by rejecting some of the values predominant with those in charge — but this generation is wholly unique in ways that portend a great deal about the future of society, not only in this country but in the world.

There are some reasons for this difference that are readily identifiable and that have been identified many times by the proliferating observers of the children's crusade — general affluence, widely expanded higher education, the life and death of John F. Kennedy, the civil rights movement, the global village of electromagnetic communication, the depersonalization of a post-industrial society, the discovery of poverty, a seeming thaw in the cold war, the all-pervasive, all-galvanizing, catalytic war in South Vietnam.

Trying to catalogue these "reasons" can be useful and I do not mean to deprecate such an exercise; if we are honest about them, they can help us to understand what is happening and where it may lead us. But most important of all, I think, for those of us over thirty and, perhaps, particularly for those of us in a position more or less directly to affect public policy, is an effort to make use of many of the very valuable things that some of these young people have found out for themselves. And often with precious little help from us, except perhaps in a negative sort of way.

There is a danger that they will not want to share these good things with us. Some of the brightest and most energetic of the young are strikingly exclusive. "Immersed in the warm fluid of me-ness," as Justice Fortas so nicely put it, there is incipient in some of their adolescent self-righteousness a kind of moral fascism, in which the slightest deviation from their ethical precepts will not be tolerated. Heretics are dealt with accordingly.

It has been observed with some accuracy that Americans view youth with a kind of cult-worship found nowhere else in the modern world. It is true that we love our children, as all people do, and thus for wholly natural reasons there is little danger that we will stop being interested in them. But there are more immediate and pragmatic reasons for our taking a very careful interest in this generation. There are two that seem to me particularly significant. The first is the fact that its members will very shortly be moving into positions of leadership and responsibility. The second is that they are a very powerful social and political force right now, today. Some might put the second reason first, but only those, I think, who feel threatened by the young.

Much is made by social commentators of the almost ritualistic rejection by some young people of the values of the establishment, no matter what those values, simply because they are establishment. Lewis Feuer calls it "the moral deauthorization of the older generation." There is certainly much in the depression-bred, materialistic pragmatism of

our own generation that will give way to the demands of the young. But somehow I sense in their confrontation with the establishment this almost plaintive and even poignant demand: "If there is anything to your values, show us. Demonstrate the value of your beliefs; if you cannot or will not, stand aside."

The Ripon Society is a group for whose work I have a great regard. I have read the analyses and recommendations that make up this report. I do not agree entirely with all of what is set out. In some instances I feel that the authors act too much as advocates for and defenders of certain views held by some young people. This is particularly true in the area of drugs where the young often manifest special intolerance for those who disagree with them — the same intolerance that they accuse the older generation of having. Drugs are a pervasive and highly complex manifestation of the generational conflict. The drug problem somehow represents in the most dramatic possible way, the depth of the cultural disparity between the Protestant ethic of discipline and the defiant neohedonism of some young people. Even if, as I feel they are, today's drug laws are unrealistic and overly harsh with respect to marijuana, it is not constructive to deride the deeply held convictions of the adult middle class if they are something out of the Dark Ages. There is nothing in the Bill of Rights that guarantees to a minor the right to smoke dope. The problem of marijuana is a political and cultural one and must be dealt with accordingly.

In spite of such reservations, I am pleased and proud to associate myself with what is being attempted. Much of the analysis seems sound to me. And more important are the concrete recommendations as to how some public steps might be taken toward fuller utilization of the vision and energy of the young.

I. The Youth Ghetto

An Unrepresented Lobby

It often is forgotten that the United States was founded by the young. Indeed, if there is any whole generation to which the youth of today can look for models, it is their revolutionary and pioneer ancestors of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Among the "Founding Fathers" who signed the Declaration of Independence, twenty were under age 40, nine under age 35, and four under 30. Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the document itself, was 33.

A majority of citizens in the early Republic were under age 30, the last period until our own in which this was true. Largely immigrants, they had consciously broken the past's stratifications. One, Michel de Crevecoeur, announced, "The American is a new man, who acts upon new principles; he must therefore entertain new ideas and form new opinions."

The new principles were tangible freedom and opportunity, derived from an inheritance of land only God had owned before, land that was vast, rich and available. The values were work, fair-dealing and service, for they needed each other; and individualism, for each man counted in the wilderness and was responsible to himself. These were a generation who knew who they were.

Their ideas and new opinions created a community of cordial neighbors and a polity of equals. Along the frontier they were irreverant towards formal authority, especially distant authority, and they were aggressively democratic. They loved to talk and argue things out.

DISMANTLED PRETENSION

In that dynamic era spanning the careers of Jefferson and Jackson, when the population doubled every twenty-four years — dwarfing the "baby boom" after World War II — the young progressively dismantled the pretentions of monied and political position, unceasingly agitated with the problems of social development.

Today's school histories seem to fail in telling the story of the young nation that was young people. There are too many pictures of a powdered-wigged George Washington solemnly presiding at Independence Hall and not enough of the ecstatic, Fourth of July "happening" outside; too much romantic, awe-inspiring heroism in the Westward pioneers, and not enough of their music, gaiety, mischief and mistakes.

In 1831 a 26 year old Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, visited his American counterparts and eulogized their life of commitment. "In some countries," he wrote in *Democracy in America,* "the inhabitants seem unwilling to avail themselves of the political privileges the law gives them; perhaps because they set too high a value upon their time to spend it on the interests of the community. But if an American were condemned to confine his activity to his own affairs, he would be robbed of one half of his existence. He would feel an immense void in the life he is accustomed to lead and his wretchedness would be unbearable."

Society orders many youth today to confine their activities to their own affairs, but the revolutionary generation of their ancestors cries against it. The principles much of youth's protests elevate — of honesty, participatory democracy, "love", voluntarism — are not so different from theirs.

Youth, too, are Americans and it is because they are Americans that they, like Crevecoeur, must be "new men." That challenge is their heritage. Writes Yale sociologist Kenneth Keniston in *The Uncommitted,* "Increasingly, we must achieve — not discover — our identities, and create — not find — our homes."

OTHER PARALLELS

There are other parallels between the first generation of the republic and this latest. We are again a "young" nation. Whereas in the late 1940's — years in which today's youth were born — some 2,300,000 young men and women reached the majority age of 21, today some 3,600,000 are reaching that age. By the late '70's the number will be 4,200,000 turning 21 each year, close to double the number in their parents' yearly age groups. *Life* magazine has debunked the "myth" of a lowering average age in America, pointing out that the birth rate started decreasing in 1958 and is now back to pre-World War II levels, and that in 1990 the average age will be 28.7, actually slightly higher than today.

But *Life* misses the point. The average age will not get lower because the youth revolution has already arrived, and any continuation of an average age of under 30 cannot help but revolutionize all of society. Moreover, the death rate among older people is not decreasing very fast; so, in combination with a lowered birth rate, the bulge of youth age 16-30 is going to be a very much bigger group in America for at least the rest of the century — barring a major war. Indeed *Life*'s projections themselves are not to be overrated, for part of the recent birth rate decline is attributable to the relatively few parents of child-raising age now, themselves the babies of the Depression. As the "baby boom" youth now reaching maturity marry and settle

into the planned child-raising schedules that are characteristic of the new era, the rate is almost sure to go up again.

The housing this generation buys, the kind of transportation its members demand and the ways in which they spend their leisure time cannot help but soon become the commanding force of the economy. Not only are they now the largest age-group within the society, but the likelihood is that they will maintain the predominance into their middle-age and act as a potent voice in social and political change.

They do not have that voice now. Despite their numbers, despite the distinctive outlook and interests that mark them (or stigmatize them) they are frustrated in the American power structure.

Says Mayor John Lindsay on youth and the blacks: "The distance between these groups — educationally, socially — has certain psychological bridges. The frustration of the sophomore alienated from his university by its size and impersonality is not very much different from the resentment of the ghetto youth who is alienated from his city because its opportunities and rewards are foreclosed to him. Both suffer the malady of powerlessness — powerlessness in the face of huge, authoritarian institutions that routinely cause fundamental dislocations in the lives of the people they affect each day."

OUT-GROUP

Youth, then, are in many ways an out-group in this society, and since their distinct problems and views, as well as their lack of years contribute to this condition, the traditional cure for their malady — age — is not to be trusted for a smooth transition. Without stretching the truth, this generation can be called a separate "class" in America. John Stuart Mill, in *On Liberty,* wrote that "There are many interpretations of the word 'class'. It can be men (as opposed to women), the rich, the aristocrats, etc. Prevailing morality is the morality of the prevailing class."

Of course, a sense of powerlessness is not unique to the young or the black. The influences of conformity, specialization and centralization — the vast concern for categories of individuals, but the depersonaliztion of the one individual — have created malaise that affects all of us, old and young, white and black, rich and poor. All are disturbed, but the ghettoized groups most — the young, the black, the poor. For many of them the American Dream seems a ruse and a joke, the sense of the individual's helplessness a keen frustration. How dangerous is such alienation? Dangerous enough already that the nation's cities live in dread of violence by the individuals whose alienation is induced from all three sides: the persons at once poor, black and young.

While many of the problems of youth are common to the society as a whole, however, many of America's social problems afflict particularly or exclusively the younger ranges of society. The draft, the denial of the franchise and other rights, the need for reform on campus, the problems of the social "track system" which leaves young workers with limited horizons, and the paucity of channels for youth to exercise the traditional American voluntaristic impulse, these are all areas of particular concern to young people. And, as we shall attempt to point out, they are areas where easy and inexpensive governmental action can do much to wipe out a backlog of neglect and many of the sources of intergenerational tension.

Up until now, youth has been an interest group without a lobby. In a small way, this report is an effort to change that situation. But, more importantly, for most of the recent past, there have been few signs that the White House, the natural governmental representative of youth's interests, was especially receptive. President Nixon has moved to correct this with his appointment of Bud Wilkinson as a special consultant to the President with special responsibilities in the area of youth affairs. It is in the spirit of constructive response to these encouraging moves from the White House that the Ripon Society submits this special report on youth.

18 as the Age of Maturity

Again and again, the law discriminates against youth, and especially against 18-21-year-olds. The draft system allows 75-year-olds to induct 18-year-olds into service and even forbids anyone under age 30 from serving on a Selective Service Board. In the courts an 18-21-year-old is tried as an adult, but he may not serve on a jury; in practice, few 21-25 year-olds serve on juries either. In California, notes Les Francis of the National Educational Association, one may teach high school civics before he is old enough to vote. Commercial society compounds the prejudice. Soldiers on leave find that lacking local credit they are not allowed to rent cars; moreover, like civilians, they must be 25 in many place to rent a car even with credit. Adult demands are made on youth, but adult rights and privileges often are denied.

The complaint of youth which is key to almost all the others, the primary source of youth's distress, is the exclusion of otherwise adult young people from the democratic process. The vote is society's most conspicuous symbol of adult treatment and adult prestige, and a large share of youth don't have it.

UNREPRESENTED

Hence, despite their implied power of numbers, nearly 12 million American citizens between 18 and 21 lack a political voice in decisions that often vitally effect them. While older youth are enfranchised, their voting strength as an interest bloc is depleted by the absence of the 18-21-year-olds. Perhaps once upon a time it made sense to begin the franchise at 21, but today, when a majority of young people with high school degrees, and some with college degrees, are denied the vote, the situation has become untenable. A 50-year-old functional illiterate is permitted to vote if he finished the sixth grade — considered presumptive evidence of "literacy" — but a 20-year-old political science major is denied his ballot. If his 21st birthday comes, say, in December of an election year he may be 23 before he has a chance to cast his first vote.

Since 1939 the Gallup Poll has surveyed the public (adult) opinion on the 18-year-old vote. In 1939 only 17% of respondents approved; in 1967 it was up to 64%. Two states now have the 18-year-old vote, Georgia and Kentucky. Hawaiians may vote at 20 and Alaskans at 19. In 1968, Hawaii, North Dakota and Nebraska voters narrowly defeated 18-year-old vote referenda. Nonetheless, more young people, mostly moderates seeking to show that the system is receptive to their legitimate claims, are active in pursuing the vote than ever before. Partly thanks to their efforts every state government but Mississippi's had given attention to the 18-year-old vote in the past year. By May 1969, Montana and Wyoming legislatures had passed referenda on to the voters for 1970 decision and Nevada's lawmakers were set to reapprove 18-year-old voting in the 1970 session prior to submitting it to the voters. Other states were expected to follow.

MANY TRIES

Numerous Constitutional Amendments have been introduced to guarantee the 18-year-old vote nationally, most recently Resolution 8, of January 12, 1969, sponsored by both Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) and Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen (R-Ill.), along with other senators. President Truman opposed the 18-year-old vote, but President Eisenhower bluntly stated, "If young men 18 or 19 are old enough to . . . fight their country's battles . . . then they are old enough to take part in the political life of their country and to be full citizens with voting powers." Former President Johnson, former Vice-President Humphrey, Governor Nelson Rockefeller, former Governor George Romney, and Senator Barry Goldwater, all endorse the 18-year-old vote. President Nixon has supported enfranchising 18-year-olds since his early years in Congress. But the implementation of these leaders' views on youth has yet to eventuate.

Shortly after the Korean War the matter was debated in the Senate and fell short of passage by only five votes, but that is as far as it has come. Clearly, as Sen. Jacob Javits observed in *Playboy,* "the prospect of 12,000,000 new, allegedly unpredictable voters being added to the rolls overnight scares the political pants off many of the people whose business is to win local and state elections for themselves and their party."

It is interesting to consider how the age of 21 came to be accepted as the age of majority in America, and, indeed, in most of the Western world. (Eight Communist countries and eight South American nations have the 18-year-old vote.) Since the age 21 was adopted in colonial times, it would seem to derive from Anglo-Saxon tradition, and here a British Parliamentary "Report of the Committee on the Age of Majority"[1] is most illuminating: "Roman historians state that the barbarians reckoned their young were old enough to carry arms and be counted as grown up at 15. And 15 became the general age of majority in Britain and Northern Europe during the 9th, 10th and

11th centuries, though not specifically linked with fighting ability. But by the time of the Norman Conquest there was a change of emphasis. The role of the mounted knight became more and more important, and armour heavier and heavier, and the horses more enormous as time went on. By the time of Magna Carta the age for those holding in knight service had been raised to 21, and there is strong authority for the view that this was directly linked with the ability to hold up a heavy suit of armour and lift a lance or sword at the same time." Interestingly, for many years thereafter the age of majority for "common people" remained 15. Since ability to bear the weight of armor is hardly a significant test of maturity these days, there would seem to be nothing sacred about the age 21 for receiving majority privileges.[2]

INSTITUTIONAL PRECOCITY

Surely, of course, social demands other than physical ability to bear armor have become complex in our polity. But just as good food and medical attention have resulted in a lowering of the age of physical pubescence today (age 10-14, as opposed to 13-16 fifty years ago), so has education lowered the age of maturity, in fact, from the average of 21 to 18.

Some of the arguments posed against the vote, as for other rights of adulthood for 18-21-year-olds are particularly smug and insulting. One is asked to demonstrate that 18-year-olds would be responsible citizens if given the vote, and all other rights. By that token, one might question how many voters in the 50's and 60's can be called "responsible", especially the ones who never participate in any partisan activity and yet are knee-jerk partisans at the polls years after year. The general rule of thumb among politicians is that about a fourth of the electorate falls into this category and straight party voting is most typical of the older voters.

Why, then, 18 and not 19 or 20, or for that matter, 16 or 17? Because 18 has become the natural dividing point in life. By 16 or 17 one may decide for himself whether to stay in school and by 18 he may purchase cigarettes and, in some states, alcoholic beverages. At 18 one is tried in court as an adult. In most states attainment of the age 18 is qualification to marry without parental consent, at least for women. Civil service begins to employ at 18 and in a myriad of other ways the law considers 18 year olds "adults." As a practical political consideration, in regard to voting, age 18 allows high schools to get their recent graduates onto the voting rolls while civics courses are fresh in their minds. Kentucky allows registration at age 17 if one's 18th birthday comes before the November election, and 85% of high school seniors meet that standard.

"It has been my experience in Kentucky," says former U. S. Senator Thruston B. Morton, "that the dropouts, the kids that are sent to reform school and the general deadbeats don't register and don't participate in political activities. The high school graduates, especially those that go on to college, do take advantage of the voting privilege . . . From a standpoint of intelligence and educational background, they are probably better qualified to pass judgment on issues and to assess personalities than the average voter in the State."

SAME OLD STUFF

The charge that 18-year-olds lack the judgment and experience demanded of citizens in a free society is pretty much the same kind of argument raised against the enfranchisement of women 50 years ago and, for that matter, the enfranchisement of freed slaves 100 years ago, and for still another instance, unpropertied persons 150 years ago. All those groups probably were qualified in any case, and merely by being exposed to the responsibility of the ballot, determined to become intelligent participants.

When advocates of the 18-year-old vote are assailed for claiming that the duty to bear arms at 18 qualifies a man to vote, the critics are on somewhat firmer ground. Rep. Emmanuel Celler, in a radio debate some years ago, declared, "To say that he who is old enough to fight is old enough to vote is to draw an utterly fallacious parallel. No such parallel exists. The ability to choose, to separate promise from performance, to evaluate on the basis of facts, are the prerequisities to good voting . . . The thing called for in a soldier is uncritical obedience, and that is not what you want in a voter."[3]

Perhaps, then, the point should not be made that old enough to fight, old enough to vote. Instead it should be that anyone who is vulnerable to a law that can conscript his labor and to a government policy that can send him to a war, should have a role in electing the men who make the laws and policies. There might not be so much draft resistance, fleeing to Canada and burning of draft cards, if young people did not feel impotent to change the government's mind through the normal channels; channels like the Congress, the Presidency, the judiciary and the draft boards where they are now totally without representation. Writes Dr. Henry David Aiken of Brandeis University, "I say . . . that if youth are old enough to go to jail for burning their draft cards, they are old enough to vote. If they are old enough to grasp the nature of mechanized and automated warfare, and to participate in it, they are old enough also to participate in something more than Young Republican and Young Democratic Clubs in their schools and colleges. And if they lack the wisdom which *we*, their parents, are supposed to possess, then they may well be better off without it."[4]

Another objection to the 18-year-old vote is equally out-of-date and out-of-touch. Former Rep. Tom B.

Curtis (R-Mo.), normally an outstanding thinker, is only one of many who worry that the vote would tend to interfere with the role of higher education. "One thing in particular that makes me move slowly," he has said, "is the thought of the political organizations moving into our college campuses, which they would do with a vengeance if the students were voters. I would much prefer to leave the first four years of higher education free from these mundane tangles. There is time enough to get into the struggle."

Time enough for whom? Youth already feel themselves caught up in the struggle, for their very deepest interests are at stake. It would be an enormous plus for the political parties to come onto the campus in force, for they might learn a thing or two. Conversely, students who now feel they must spin off into groups that demonstrate in public in order to be heard might find the regular political apparatus more open to their grievances and needs. That sort of constructive outlet, indeed, is sorely needed. Moreover, colleges nationwide are beginning to realize that students want desperately to break the hold of *in loco parentis* anyhow, and that youth are prepared to accept the responsibilities and liabilities which go with that change. The *Harvard Crimson* is just one important voice of the college generation that has called for an end to the hypocrisy that allows universities to set curfews and job recruitment policies and to put the students in double jeopardy when they break the law, even while the administration washes its hands when students ask protection from government snoopers and Selective Service questionnaires.

CONSISTENCY

Amazingly, some who argue against the 18-year-old vote do so on the grounds of consistency, saying that it is inconsistent to let people vote at 18 when by law they are considered "too young" to perform other responsibilities. Thus, Mr. Curtis has observed, "In most cases a person is not responsible for his contracts until he is twenty-one. A parent is permitted to take a tax deduction for his offspring until they reach twenty-one if he is supporting them. The age at which one has the right to marry without parental consent, although varying in different states, is frequently over eighteen. Certain professions, among them law and medicine, all have age qualifications above eighteen."

Representative Celler echoes this line. "Down there (in Georgia, where one may vote at 18) you have many inconsistencies. They let them vote, but they can't make a contract. They can't have inheritances without guardians. They cannot sell a cow or a mule or a horse; they cannot serve on juries. They cannot do things that we ordinarily have people over 21 do. . . ."

We agree that the law is inconsistent in states with 18 year old voting, but it also is inconsistent elsewhere, as we have shown. "Consistency" will not be served by keeping the voting age at 21. Rather, we should move on to make all adult rights uniform at 18.

In most states marriage is allowed for males at 18 and females at 16 (an unnecessary, invidious distinction) if there is parental consent; and females only may marry at 18 without it. Furthermore, most states also operate a judicial procedure by which a minor may marry without parental consent if the court approves. In practice, hardly anyone in this country is denied the right to marry at age 18, if for no other reason than because parents and courts alike realize the futility of trying to restrain them. Let us note that over one million 18- and 19-year-olds are married in this country today. Obviously, the next step should be to change the marriage law to reflect the reality that already exists.

The same is true of contracts. Most parents and most merchants are willing for 18-year-olds to enter into contracts, and one suspects Rep. Celler is unaware of how many young people in fact do contract (albeit with parental permission) to buy cars. In some states, an 18-year-old may contract for a car even without parental permission if he requires the car for his work. Perhaps if all 18-year-olds could contract independently, some would get into financial difficulty. But presumably most of the same older persons who sign for 18-20-year-olds now would come to their aid then, just as they do now for young people over 21 and for each other. Moreover, can one seriously propose that an 18-year-old who has the legal rights to drive an automobile, with all the life and death responsibilities that entails, should not be deemed responsible enough to buy an automobile?

JURIES, TOO

Similarly, the law should be changed to permit a more adult group of young people to serve on juries. Why not, if they can be tried by them as "adults?" If a particular person of 18 chosen for jury duty is deemed too immature in judgment, the court may dismiss him, just, indeed, as it may dismiss an older person for that or almost any reason now. It would be a significantly healthy matter for youth to be represented on the juries of America. According to survey by pollster Louis Harris,[5] "Older people, as befits their traditional status in life, are less tolerant of nonconformity, more opposed to change, more wedded in the status quo . . . Nearly 50% more young people than older see the right to dissent as critical to our society." Since Supreme Court decisions on matters of civil rights and liberties seem to get better acceptance among the young than the old, doesn't it seem sensible to have persons sensitive to the changed nature of legal interpretations sitting in the jury boxes? And since many of the court decisions vitally affect the interests of youth, shouldn't we be represented by their implementation?

As for the qualifications set by legal, medical and other professions, these are mostly a function of education, not mere age. Most attorneys don't pass the bar until age 24 or 25 anyway (the average may be higher still), but few would argue for that age as a qualification. Doctors normally are still older yet when they complete medical school. One imagines that if the voting age, and other rights, are dropped uniformly to 18, then age requirements, *per se* will drop in the professions too.

The matters of inheritance and tax deductions for support are simply red herrings and ought to be dismissed from the discussion summarily. Some states already allow one to inherit (or to will) at 18. Moreover, in reality, one can leave his money to his children at any age, including ages over 21, or may attach other criteria — marriage, for example, or the birth of grandchildren. Similarly, one may claim deductions for an offspring over the age of 21, if the offspring is dependent on one for over half his income, makes no more than $600 a year or is a student. On the other hand, the age at which an offspring who makes more than $600 and is not a student may no longer be claimed as a deduction is 19, rather than 21.

A great deal of pressure now exists (see Chapter 6) to allow tax deductions for money expended on a child's education at any age, and why not? Granting the vote and other adult rights to 18-year-olds will not affect these conditions and trends in the slightest.

What lowering the age of majority in America will accomplish is the recognition of a new voice in the affairs of the nation, collectively and individually. Once legal age of maturity drops, so will other limitations. We believe the time will come when the Constitution will be revised to eliminate the restrictions that prevent anyone under 35 from running for the Presidency, under 30 from running for the Senate and under 25 from running for the House of Representatives. *If* a person younger than those ages is otherwise qualified for the job, why shouldn't he be able to seek it?

Meanwhile, the President has the moral authority to lead the fight for the vote and other rights for 18-21-year-olds. We hope he will submit legislation to that effect.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION

Further, the President should now consider appointment of a Commission on the Age of Legal Maturity to review all of the inconsistencies in the present federal and state laws and in common practice, and to recommend whatever reforms are indicated. In this report we have only touched the most important features of inconsistency, and then not in the full depth achievable by a more narrowly focused study. Yet to be examined are such questions as the age at which one may consent to medical treatment, to give blood, to maintain a separate domicile, to make a will or to apply for a passport. All these matters need tidying up.

At the least, a Presidential Commission on the Age of Legal Maturity would set an example for states and individuals. At the most, it could provide the President with the outline of historic legislation, including a deepened mandate for the 18-year-old vote he already supports.

We urge that the Presidential Commission be appointed soon, and that as pledge of his concern, the President appoint half of its members from the 18-30 generation.

Legal rights for 18-21-year-olds, especially the vote, probably are essential to healing the breach between the generations. The leaven of new voters, moreover, combined with a registration drive among all youth, could change the nature of American politics, and through it, the national educational, military and other policies that directly concern the disenfranchised millions.

---

[1]Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, July, 1967.
[2]It may be objected that even adults couldn't vote in the 10th century, but this seems a cavil.
[3]The American Forum of the Air, Jan. 31, 1954.
[4]Letter to the **New York Times Magazine**, May 18, 1967.
[5]Column, March 7, 1968, nationally syndicated.

III. The Military

Filling the Platoons -- Now and Later

President Nixon has already acted to institute preliminary reform of the draft system with his proposal to the Congress to draft 19-year-olds first by lottery. The main advantage of the Administration's proposal is that it compresses the three to seven years of uncertainty which currently plague young men into a single year.

The President is to be commended for this long overdue reform. But, as the Ripon Society has maintained since 1966, the ultimate answer to the draft is to end it, or as the Wednesday Group of House Republicans put it "to reduce draft calls to zero," while moving to an all-volunteer army.

Such moves need not wait until the Vietnam war is over. The President already laid the groundwork for further steps with the creation earlier this year of a Commission on the All-Volunteer Force, headed by former Defense Secretary Thomas Gates, to develop plans for moving away from the draft. One can assume that the Gates' Commission when it reports later this year, will offer a thorough defense of the all-volunteer system, and there is little need to state these arguments in this report. But what will it offer for the conversion to that system?

MONEY

The most logical beginning, of course, is a substantial raise in pay. It has been argued (most cogently by the Hubbell Plan report of the Pentagon pay study group chaired by Rear Admiral Lester E. Hubbell) that when one compares the money left over after provision of housing, food, clothing, medical care, and taxes, the draftee has as much or more "residual income" as his counterpart in civilian life. The fallacy of this argument is the incomparability of the quality of food, clothing, and housing, if not medical care, of a civilian living in his own home or apartment, eating home-cooked food and wearing what he wants and the first-term serviceman living in a barracks, eating institutional food, and wearing the same uniforms day after day. Also, there is no comparison between the hours put in by a serviceman and those of a working civilian. Finally, the Hubbell report compares the wages of the average first-termer, aged 18-22, with the overall average of all civilian males of that age. But the civilian males who are working at that age, and on whom a comparison could be made, are at themselves at the bottom of the wage ladder, non-college youths or college students working only part time, or drop outs. It is not a fair comparison.

Truer figures were recently presented by Dr. Walter Oi, in the July, 1968, issue of *Current History*: "An enlisted man on his first tour of duty (roughly three years) earns a monthly income (including the value of room, board, and family allowances) of roughly $210, a figure well below the poverty line and below the minimum wage of $260 per month." The July, 1969 pay raise of 9.1% (across the board, for generals and privates alike), increased the private's earnings by about $10 per month.

To secure that same individual's talents at the civilian rate would cost $350 a month. The $130 difference is, at once, the "hidden tax" the serviceman now pays for his own service and the feasability amount for obtaining him as a volunteer. Over the whole military and assuming the pre-Vietnam force levels, the adjusted pay raises would mean a budgetary increase of $4 billion.

Offsetting the budgetary increase would be a lowered annual turnover of personnel in the services, from some 500-600,000 to 300,000. Another saving would come from the decrease in the number of servicemen performing as trainers; some 80,000 men would be saved there. Then, too, and often overlooked, are the savings in manpower for the civilian economy. Some 300,000 to 400,000 more men in the work force annually represents an enormous economic stimulus to growth of tax revenues.

To be certain of attracting sufficient personnel at the higher skill levels, consideration should be given to raising the rank of these positions in order to pay more, or to providing salary differentials. "A system of limited occupational differentials in enlisted pay for career personnel has in fact been introduced in the past decade with some partial evidence of a successful response," reports Dr. Harold Wool, Director of Procurement Policy for the Pentagon.[1]

MORE MONEY

It probably would be helpful, as the Hubbell Plan suggests, if wages and services provided by the military to the serviceman were in the form of a salary rather than the complex of pay, allowances and payment in kind which now confuses the true income situation of men in the military.

But raising pay is not a sufficient step for a voluntary military *per se*. The plan for a volunteer army must orchestrate a number of reforms.

Another step related to pay that should be considered by the administration is the establishment of two tracks of service, one "Regular" and leading from

military academy or the top ROTC classes to 20 years service and the other "Short-term" leading to retirement to civilian life in eight to twelve years.

According to A. L. Haenni, a part-time military analyst and the author of the idea, a sizable gratuity would be given a man at the end of his term, something in the neighborhood of, an average, $20,000 for short-termers (enlisted men—$30,000 for officers). Pensions would be terminated, and the rest of the money for the gratuities would come out of savings resulting from having fewer older and married men in the service: lower medical costs, fewer dependents to service, fewer moving expenses. Needless to say, the prospect of graduating from the service with an investable nest-egg of $20,000 after eight years in the military would be an important attraction for potential volunteers. Moreover, if invested, the gratuity eventually would return itself to the government in taxes.

Housing is another area where military life can be improved as an attraction for volunteers. At present, we are still afflicted with the attitude that austerity breeds efficiency and that deprivation breeds toughness. In fact, there is no correlation. Attractive surroundings lead to happier workers and happier workers are more efficient. Ugly and impersonal barracks are still buildings and do not prepare a man for foxhole life, in any case; he might as well be comfortable and have some privacy while he can.

Yet housing for military men is seldom more than physically adequate and even for officers is usually aesthetically barren. Occasionally, one finds an attractive base, but generally, housing and environmental conditions for military people must be improved, for such conditions weigh heavily, whether consciously or not, in every man's career decisions.

Another subtle attraction for a volunteer military would be improvements in the prestige of various career positions. The most awkward discrepancy in military tables or organization is between the rank of the senior enlisted men (E-8, E-9), which is still below officers, and their responsibilities, which often are considerable. It would be a common sense step toward greater democratization of the services to promote higher-ranking sergeants into the officer category.

Speeding up the process by which one can assume a higher position also would be a sensible change, particularly in the enlisted ranks. "Time-in-grade" and "time in service" concepts comprise a rigid seniority system which discourages young men with talent from making the military a career, especially in the enlisted ranks.

LEADERS OF MEN

In the officer ranks, new methods also are needed to get additional men. One obvious way is to increase the size of the military academies in order to take all qualified applicants regardless of geographical background. Scholarship aid should be increased for ROTC students, as well, and for medical and dental students. We already offer educational benefits after service. Widening the benefits offered before service would give the military a substantially enlarged attraction for volunteers.

The pay, housing and organizational changes recommended here will take time and considerable money. Undoubtedly, the Commission on the All-Volunteer Force will recommend specific legislation the President can propose to Congress to help effectuate such major steps to a volunteer military. Given the entrenched support for the draft in the Armed Services Committee, it surely will be a difficult struggle, despite the presence on it of such respected military men as Generals Gruenther and Norstad.

But in the meantime, we would like to point to innovations the President himself can make under his own authority, or which he at least can investigate now for later proposal. It is imperative that the move to an all-volunteer system get underway soon, not only to convince the nation's youth that the Government is serious about the change, but because the phasing out of the draft must, if it is to be successful, be orchestrated with the close of the war in Vietnam. The reduction of troops that will occur at that time will enable the Government to cut back draft calls for many months. That will be the moment to have a new program to promote volunteering already into effect and speeding the transition. If changes in current programs are only begun at that time, as the President's previous statements have indicated, a rare opportunity will have been missed.

First, the President should announce that as troops are pulled out of Vietnam and the size of the military cut back accordingly, the savings in salaries will be applied to the salaries of the men remaining, as bonuses if necessary. It is wholly logical to use manpower savings for manpower needs.

RECRUITING

Simultaneously, the military should increase its recruitment effort substantially. More money would be helpful; the United States military currently spends one-sixth as much on recruitment as does the much smaller, but all-professional military of Great Britain. But besides funding, a new quota system for each station needs to be developed. Presently, quotas are assigned at the same time draft calls are sent out. There is no incentive to surpass the quota and thereby obviate the need for any draft call. Instead, draft calls should go out only after the previous month's quota for recruiters has not been filled, while the recruiters should be given bonuses and leave incentives for meeting or surpassing their quotas.

Another way to increase the flow of volunteers

would be to lower the mental qualification level required for volunteers to that required for draftees. It is symptomatic of the attitudes of the past that one has had to be smarter to volunteer than to be drafted.

Moreover, the Department of Defense's "Project 100,000," which rehabilitates mental-test failures, whether draftees or volunteers, should be focused entirely on volunteers.

Similarly, the military should revise its boot camp operation to allow training for would-be volunteers who fail to pass the physical tests. The current standard is that all recruits must be combat-fit, although, as was noted earlier, only 15% of all military personnel are in combat positions. In fact, basic training, which costs $1,000 per head ($300 million total for draftees alone in 1968), is being wasted on the men who will not see combat. The Air Force already has shrunk its boot camp training considerably. According to Robert S. Benson, a former analyst in the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), reducing the basic training period to four weeks for noncombat personnel would save the government $50 million annually.[2]

BIG DRAG

Basic training is one of the negative incentives for volunteering presently found in the military, and the President should consider an overall study of how appropriate its methodology is to our times. One is told that unreason and excess in boot camp are necessary to inculcate unquestioning obedience, a sense of team spirit and self-discipline. Yet a Red Chinese report on the mentality of U. S. prisoners of war concluded that Americans are particularly susceptible to brainwashing, failing "to appreciate the meaning and necessity of military organization and discipline, and (viewing) military service as something unpleasant to be tolerated only briefly."[3] Why? It is possible that in a democratic country, encouraging openness and self-assertion, a six-week shock course is the wrong way to instill respect and cooperative conformity. The present methods may work well enough with a minority of recruits. But since they often encourage as much malingering and bitterness as discipline under the present application, should they not be reconsidered? Improvement in basic training would improve the whole image of military service.

Civilianization of certain manpower positions is an additional policy area worthy of a special Presidential-directed study. So long as pay is low, substitution of civilians for servicemen in some non-combat, stateside positions will be limited and difficult.

Explains Dr. Harold Wool, "The relatively low direct cost of initial enlistees and draftees conditioned many related military personnel management and utilization policies. For example, when viewed in narrow budgetary terms, the direct pay of junior enlisted personnel was substatnially lower than that of Civil Service personnel in comparable grades. This created no fiscal incentive for substitution of civilians."[4]

Yet, even now there is a slight financial gain — about $500 — each time a serviceman's job is civilianized, according to Pentagon figures.[5]

The wages of the serviceman now are low, but the civilian saves the military costs of training, costs of training personnel, the costs of turnover and inefficiency.

RESERVES, TOO

Another long range study should develop a model for a professionalized Reserve force, a true guarantee of flexibility, as the present poorly trained and poorly motivated Reserves are not, for the regular forces. The reservists of the future might be volunteers directly enlisting in the Reserves, supplemented with "retired" short-term professionals.

There are also many steps the President can take in the meantime immediately to modernize the machinery of the selective service system which will have both short and long range benefits. First, the entire Selective Service System should be operated only by civilians, from the national director at the top to each local draft board member, if local boards are to be maintained. Society itself, not the military, should call up its young men for service. Furthermore, the national director should be limited to a six-year term, to be reappointed at the pleasure of the President. Local board members should be limited to five years. Many of the abuse of the present system have come at the hands of Selective Service veterans who come to think of their powers as autocratic.

By Executive Order, and in many places simply by publishing in the Federal Register, the President can make a substantial number of procedural and operational changes in the Selective Service System.

* All local board members should be required to live in the districts they oversee.

* National Headquarters should issue a policy requiring board membership to be racially and economically representative of the board area, within reason.

* The National Appeals Board should be appointed by the President and responsible to him; it should be paid and entirely separate from the National Headquarters.

* National Headquarters should present to each draft registrant a readable booklet explaining his rights and obligations, the way the system works and the procedures of making claims for deferments or exemptions. (The recently announced plan for state youth-advisory boards will be helpful in this regard.)

* The Director should be instructed to revise and condense the presently unwieldy body of Selective Service regulations and each local board should be given to understand clearly what are these policies and why they must be followed. Current court interpretations, not the opinions of the Director, should weigh most heavily in the instructions to the local boards.

* If college deferments are retained, as the President has suggested, who qualifies for such a deferment on the basis of his making "normal progress" at his studies should be determined by the given college rather than by the draft boards. Presently, even a man who must cut back on his course credits by reason of switching colleges or switching majors or because of a prolonged illness may lose his deferment, no matter how understanding the college may be.

* Since present law prohibits a man with a student deferment from obtaining any other deferment later, this fact should be made clear, in large type, on the application for a student deferment.

* Each local board should be required to give written reasons for the classifications it makes. This is to eliminate prejudiced personal judgments and to give registrants the full benefits of the law. Present practice hampers the registrant in seeking a review of the decision within the Selective Service System or the courts.

* Reasons for declaring a draft registrant "delinquent" should be spelled out clearly in a regulation. Presently a man who fails to perform his "duties", which are unspecified, may be declared delinquent and drafted before all other registrants. This vagueness has led to abuses wherein the draft boards seek, for example, to punish draft dissenters for their political views.

* Draft "delinquents" should be given a chance to repair or undo their failure to abide by legal requirements. Present practice, which in effect punishes without a trial, probably is unconstitutional.

* In personal appearances and appeals before his draft board a registrant should have the right of counsel.

* Registrants should have the right to confront adverse witnesses in situations involving classifications.

* Similarly, registrants should have the right to bring their own witnesses to personal appearances.

* Finally, a registrant should have the right to make a recording of one kind or another of the proceedings at a personal appearance.

The fifteen changes proposed above would enable the President, on his own, to make the Selective Service System process more equitable, more in line with established procedures of our democratic government. Further, he should request that Congress, through its authority, require the Selective Service System to submit its policies under the standards of the Administrative Practices Act. In 1967 the Congress made judicial review of draft cases extremely difficult, a regressive and anti-libertarian step which the President should ask to be reversed.

G.I. CIVIL RIGHTS

A final important area in which the President should act now is the whole question of civil rights for military personnel. The judicial procedures prescribed by the Uniform Code of Military Justice are barbarously inadequate to safeguard the rights of the individual and the penalties often absurdly harsh. Even if all the procedures outlined in this chapter were to be put into effect, it is possible that the current military system of justice would give pause to many potential applicants. The President should take the first step towards reform by appointing a Presidential Commission to study the code and suggest a sweeping jurisdictional and procedural reorganization of military justice.

These are a few of the reforms the President can begin now, even while the Vietnam war continues. It bears repeating that war's end will not be as propitious a time to undertake changes as now. A policy that, in practice as well as in theory, encourages volunteering will help reverse the hopeless cycle that creates an artificial need for the draft and a major cause of discontent among the young.

---

[1]Dr. Harold Wool, **The Military Specialist: Skilled Manpower for the Armed Forces,** Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.
[2]Robert S. Benson, "How the Pentagon Can Save $9,000,000,000. **Washington Monthly,** April, 1969.
[3]Lloyd Shearer, "Brainwashing: Could You Stand Up to It?" **Parade,** May 28, 1967.
[4]Wool, **op. cit.**
[5]Quoted in Robert T. Stafford, **et al.'s, How to End the Draft,** National Press, Wash., D.C., 1967.

Time for Something Else

There is no issue that demarcates the generation gap better than the question of the proper role of drugs in modern society. High on the list of "revolutions" (the sex revolution, the fashion revolution, the communications revolution, etc., etc.) must come the drug revolution, and every disinterested sociological study of drug taking in this country must come to the same conclusions: use is rampant, constantly reaching new, primarily youthful segments of society, and rates of increase of use are themselves accelerating.

Indeed, despite the urgent tone of President Nixon's message to Congress last July (". . . the abuse of drugs has grown from essentially a local police problem into a serious national threat to the personal health and safety of millions of Americans . . ."), he probably underestimated the extent of the problem. For example, the President wrote:

"It is doubtful that an American parent can send a son or daughter to college today without exposing the young man or woman to drug abuse. Parents must also be concerned about the availability and use of such drugs in our high schools and junior high schools." In fact, recent surveys in California have shown that marihuana smoking has established itself in the lower grades of elementary schools in some areas of that state.

PROHIBITIONIST THINKING

Marihuana smoking has become the norm in certain age ranges in many places. Consumption of LSD has never been higher, despite the wishful delusion of the medical profession that propaganda about chromosome damage has scared people off. Intravenous use of heroin — down in urban ghettos — is more and more frequent among middle-class white youth. Traffic in illegal sedatives, stimulants, and bizarre intoxicants is at an all-time high. These are facts of American life; anyone who doubts them is kidding himself. And the problem is basically generational not ideological. Drug abuse cuts across all lines of categorization except age: as many Wallace reactionaries smoke marihuana as do McCarthy liberals; as many clean-cut college students have tried LSD as shaggy ones. But far more persons under thirty indulge in drugs than those on the far side of that great divide.

What ought to shock about these statements is not the simple fact of what President Nixon has called "this rising sickness in our land" but rather that it has been rising ever faster in the midst of a massive campaign against it — a campaign conducted under statutes already condemned in many quarters as excessively harsh.

The new anti-drug campaign can be compared to the "Noble Experiment" of Prohibition, which led to an increase in alcohol consumption (because of the bootlegging activities by organized crime) and to the implausible branding of whole segments of the population as "criminal."

Like Prohibition America's present crusade against drug use stems from noble motives. Its proponents seek to preserve America's culture of hard work and morality from the dangers of excesive pleasure and dissipation. They hope to protect the young from chemicals which can abuse their health and endanger their emotional stability. Yet they attempt to do so in ways which, far from curing the sickness of drug abuse, only serve to make it seem a more romantic and exciting form of youthful rebellion.

The thesis of this article, then, is that the drug problem will only be exacerbated by stepping up the crackdown against it. All the measures employed to date have followed a Prohibitionist line of reasoning and all have failed to reduce the problem. Intensification of these measures can only give us more of the same, only worse.

The goverment has waged its battle against drug abuse on three main fronts: research, education, and law enforcement. And in each area it has lost ground badly.

RESEARCH: A SCIENTIFIC DEBACLE

The idea that research on drugs is going to solve the problem is a false hope. It is probably good to investigate drugs, but we should not think that pharmacologists are going to help us settle any policy questions. The trouble is that scientific "facts" about drugs cannot be disentangled from value judgments. The same objective effects of drugs are labeled positive ("psychedelic") from one point of view and negative ("mind-altering") from another. Hence pharmacology becomes political. There are pro-drug researchers and anti-drug researchers. As soon as one study demonstrates "harmful" effects of marihuana, another appears proving its "harmlessness."

It is time to face the realities of drug research. No amount of it is going to prove to anybody's satisfaction that marihuana and LSD are harmless for all people who use them, but neither is it ever likely to prove that marihuana and LSD are harmful for most people who use them. No matter how many studies are done, the data will remain inconclusive, ambiguous,

and essentially political. Therefore policy decisions should not wait for research to come in, and to say they should is a way of avoiding responsibility in making these decisions.

There is a great temptation in government today to sponsor and publicize drug research that comes up with damning information. This is to be avoided at all costs — not only because it seriously compromises the intellectual freedom of scientists but also because it always turns out to be a bad tactical error. The saga of LSD and chromosomes is a case in point. Controlled research (long-overdue) has now shown that no significant relationship exists between LSD consumption and chromosomal damage in humans. Many of the original investigators who postulated such a relationship were motivated by genuine concern about LSD abuse, but their zeal led them to overlook basic scientific safeguards against drawing erroneous conclusions. The alacrity of government officials and the press (both scientific and popular) in seizing upon and disseminating these initial conclusions transformed a scientific blunder into a first-order debacle. Overnight it established a credibility gap between "drug experts" and youth that is probably irreparable. Young drug takers just do not believe what anyone in authority tells them anymore about drugs. Indeed, their own underground newspapers picked up all of the flaws of the LSD and chromosome research long before scientific journals did.

EDUCATION: HOOTS AND GUFFAWS

In the area of drug abuse education, failures have also far outnumbered successes, and it is not hard to see why. At best, anti-drug literature and films are heavy-handed. Even when they pretend to be neutral and objective, their bias is obvious, precisely because of the ambiguity of the scientific data. Young audiences spot the bias immediately and stop listening. Those who have attended showings of the "best" government-sponsored films on drug abuse at urban high schools have seen them literally laughed out of auditoriums, leaving teachers feeling angry, helpless, and beaten. For example, one film, a "neutral, factual" description of marihuana attempts at one point to draw a distinction between overindulgence in alcohol and hemp. The narrator says: "If you drink too much alcohol you will probably lose consciousness, but if you smoke too many joints, you may have a 'bum trip.'" There is then an artist's conception of a "bum trip" in which a teenager, having smoked too many joints, stumbles in front of a mirror to find himself transformed into a Hollywood wolfman. Now it is true that LSD and other hallucinogens can sometimes cause disturbing visual hallucinations (rarely of the horror movie variety), but hallucinations (as opposed to misperceptions) are practically non-existent with marihuana. In fact, if one smokes too many joints, he usually becomes inert and sedate. This is common knowledge to every teenager in the audience who has experience with the drug (usually well over half), and they respond to the scene with jeers, hisses, and laughter. (It is worth noting that whenever anyone has bothered to evaluate the impact of these programs on uninvolved students, the only noticeable effect has been greater interest in trying drugs.)

THE TEACHINGS OF DON JUAN

Because educational efforts to combat drug abuse have been so miserably unsuccessful, it might be worth stepping back a moment to see whether something is fundamentally wrong with the whole approach. The essence of all these efforts is a short-sighted attempt to stop people from trying drugs just because someone in authority says "No." The idea is that drugs are so terrible that we cannot afford to have our young people learn about them by experience and decide for themselves how to use them, if at all. It is significant that there are societies where drugs are freely available yet no problems of drug abuse exist and that in these societies the educational approach to drugs is quite different. These societies are the "primitive" tribes of the Americas, some of which use dozens of intoxicants for ritual and social purposes.

We have an account of some of their instructional methods in *The Teachings of Don Juan* by Carlos Castaneda, a current best-selling book on campuses. Subtitled "A Yaqui Way of Knowledge," it was written as a Ph.D. thesis describing the author's apprenticeship to a Yaqui Indian medicine man from northwestern Mexico. Mr. Castaneda attempted to learn from Don Juan the wisdom of his tribe about, among other things, the ritual use of hallucinogens. Don Juan allowed his student to learn by experience under his guidance. He allowed him to make mistakes and lose his way occasionally, for he knew that only by going wrong does a student ultimately appreciate the desirability of staying right. The process must go on even when mistakes can be very dangerous. Then, the job of the teacher is to keep the student from real harm, always with minimal intervention.

Americans cannot bear to let their children learn for themselves under wise guidance; at every step we cut off their options for experience, thus earning their bitter resentment. And in so doing we create the very problems we wish to avoid, for by saying "No" as loudly and often as possible, we ensure that they will do the things we tell them not to. Left to themselves, without the punitive harrassment of short-sighted authority, even in the absence of wise teachers, most young people learn for themselves that some drugs are to be avoided at all costs, that others can be used safely in certain ways, that all can be abused. This is true learning — learning by experience — and it endures throughout life. But add a motive of rebellion, and

such learning may never take place. Many of the saddest victims of the sickness of drug abuse are actually victims of a system that prevented them from learning how not to become drug abusers.

LAWS: IRRELEVANT BUT VICIOUS

Perhaps the most glaring example of our interference with the natural learning process that has served other societies in our hemisphere so well is our laws against possession of narcotics and dangerous drugs. These laws do nothing to keep people from using drugs. Despite Draconian penalties against possession of marihuana, anyone who wants to smoke it does so. Persons who do not do so usually cite lack of access to the drug or fear of bad effects as their reasons, almost never the laws against possession. But these laws are not without effects: they have ruined the lives of many young persons, have made felons of a very high percentage of our children, and are convincing a whole generation of Americans that Law — not just narcotics law — is hypocritical and unworthy of respect.

In addition, just as with Prohibition of alcohol laws against possession of drugs play right into the hands of organized crime by eliminating legitimate sources of demanded intoxicants; a tremendous flow of money is thus diverted into underworld coffers. Anyone who has followed the marihuana market over the past few years has seen the growing evidence of organized criminal involvement (higher and more uniform prices, standardized packaging, large-scale distribution, etc.) in the midst of stepped-up law-enforcement against users.

Moreover, in the case of "hard drugs" like heroin, the control of supply by organized crime encourages a linkage between drug use and criminal activity. It is the conclusion of crime experts that a significant portion of crimes in urban ghettos are committed by those who need money to support the "habit", and that this well developed "habit" can well cost anywhere between $20 and $100 per day. This linkage can be broken only by driving organized crime out of the drug market, as the British have done by supplying drugs at low cost to registered addicts in government sponsored rehabilitation centers.

We have tried to fight drug abuse time and again by stiffening our laws, and the only change is that the problem is worse. Again, it is time to see whether something is fundamentally wrong with our whole approach.

Unfortunately, this sentiment has become identified with a position called "being soft on drugs." It is a false identification. One can be dedicated to the eradication of drug abuse and legitimately oppose laws against possession of drugs on the grounds that they are both ineffective and socially destructive. This is not to say that laws against traffic in narcotics are also bad laws, but when they are applied to a youth providing his friends with marihuana instead of to a syndicate importing large quantities of hard narcotics, they do the same bad things.

It would seem, then, that the fall of 1969 — a time when the nation's young are returning to their schools and colleges — might be an appropriate moment to reconsider our policies on the Drug Problem in their entirety. The experts of the Justice Department have not taken the opportunity; what they have proposed to Congress is extremely disappointing.

GUARANTEED DISASTER

The new legislation perpetuates the mistaken idea that research is relevant to policymaking and conceals the thought that if we only wait long enough, data supporting our side will come in. In fact, to shorten the wait, the administration proposes delegating a fair amount of authority over drug research to the Justice Department's prospering Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. Law-enforcement agents have no business supporting, supervising, censoring, or having anything to do with drug research. Their meddling will guarantee repetition of disaster and further excavation of the credibility gap between experts and users.

The administration would have the Justice Department get its hands more heavily into drug abuse education as well. Past efforts of the Department in that sphere are not encouraging and do not compare favorably even with the worst of the films and booklets prepared under the aegis of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Jeers and hisses in school auditoriums will reach new high levels if the President has his way.

Finally, the Administration is calling for wider and stiffer laws against possession of dangerous drugs, guaranteeing anew that many young Americans will take drugs rebelliously and never have a chance to learn how not to abuse them; guaranteeing that the conflict of generations will escalate, that criminal control of illegal drug distribution will tighten, that young people, deprived of marihuana by its high price will go on to the amphetamines and other more dangerous substances that can be made in any chemical lab — granting, in sum, that all of the ineffectiveness and destructiveness of our tired way of dealing with the situation will go on.

If Congress were willing to take the opportunity of the fall of 1969, to reconsider things, what might it do?

It might first of all bow to the reality principle and acknowledge that the phenomenon of drug use by large and predominantly young segments of the population has been unaffected by all government efforts against it and according to all indications will continue to spread. Legislators might as well admit that the

popularity of drugs cannot be researched away, propagandized away, or banished from the realm by fiat or the FBI.

The second step is to begin the tremendously difficult task the Administration has avoided: the development of politically and sociologically realistic programs to deal with the drug problem. Here again, the first move is primarily conceptual; making the distinction between drug use and "drug abuse." Properly speaking, a drug is used, as opposed to abused, when it is taken in a manner that either seriously threatens physical or mental health or seriously interferes with social or economic productivity. This definition is not the same as the all-inclusive one promulgated by the medical profession: if a drug is capable of being abused, then anyone taking it without having obtained (and usually paid for) professional direction or advice is automatically abusing it. If drugs, illegal or not, are taken in ways that do not threaten health or compromise productivity, then their use is not abusive and is probably the business of the individual, not of society, just as in the case of alcohol. On the other hand, the use of some drugs like heroin is inherently abusive in terms of the above definition. These hard drugs are also associated with criminal activity, both on the part of suppliers and users. Traffic in these drugs should be regulated by strict law enforcement, but at the same time those who have become addicts should be offered comprehensive and compassionate rehabilitation programs that might include low cost provision of drugs and drug substitutes.

The goals of a rational long-term policy, then, should be to achieve an equilibrium by which American society can peacefully co-exist with drugs, detering their abuse while tolerating their use within the province of the individual.

This does not imply the immediate legalization of all drugs, or even of marihuana. Just as Don Juan's apprentice needed a learning period, American society needs a transition period of learning to develop the maturity and experience which will be necessary to develop a sensible scheme for the availability and distribution of all intoxicants, including alcohol. Just as termination of Prohibition was a step-by-step process, so must be the lifting of drug repression.

'UNILLEGALIZATION'

So what is needed then, is a gradual and careful stepwise process of what might be termed "unillegalization" while society adjusts to the consequences in an orderly manner. Why not, then, do away with laws against the possession of drugs and urge temporary continued enforcement of laws against large-scale traffic while at the same time indicate willingness to consider proposals for sensible drug regulation schemes. This would at once eliminate the most odious side effects of the present laws — making criminals out of harmless drug takers — while not setting off an avalanche of drugs on an unprepared society. Why not stop pouring money into the ineffective Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and instead think about setting up programs for experienced teachers who can give badly needed guidance that youth will trust about the real dangers of certain drugs rather than a Party Line that insults the intelligence of any teenager.

These preliminary suggestions for unillegalization are hardly The Answer to the problem of drug abuse. But they face up to reality and are definite steps, with calculable consequences that Congress could take to pick up the ball that the Adminstration has fumbled. They are a way to begin facing the facts of American life and begin to control the currently unregulated use and abuse of drugs. In short, they are a way for Congress, at long last to give us Something Else.

Responding to the New Challenges

Most Americans are confused and angry about the campus disorders which have increasingly occupied the attention of politicians and the news media. Part of the confusion is traceable to the conflicting currents of the student movement, one major current reformist, the other militant left, with many cross currents and eddies swirling in and out.

After their own Chicago convention earlier this year, and again more recently, Students for a Democratic Society underwent amoebic divisions. From the ashes of SDS have sprung three distinct factions. The largest is the "moderate" wing of the Revolutionary Youth Movement, the non-Maoist wing of what used to be SDS. This moderate wing might best be described as the libertarian left, working for a broad scale reform of American society while abstaining from violent disruption. The left wing of RYM are the so-called Weathermen, who espouse such tactics as raiding buildings, guerilla disruptions in school corridors, and spout the rhetoric of violence. Left of the Weathermen sit the members of the intensely ideological Worker Student Alliance, the Maoist group who denounce the Weathermen as "agents of those who run this country" and sneer at Ho Chi Minh as a sell-out for entering into the Paris negotiations. As Harry Golden might say, "only in America."

ALTERNATING

Though most of the attention is focused on the increasingly bizarre actions of various factions of the New Left, it is by now a cliche to note that the vast majority of students do not consider themselves a part of any of these factions. Many, however, are sympathetic to the need and this basic sympathy leads many moderates to support far more leftist students on particular issues. Thus, the reformists, both in and out of the student movement proper, tend to alternate between alliance and opposition to the militant leftwing spectrum of the movement.

Often, reformers stress that they disagree with the militants "only on tactics," but tactics — concern for the means as well as the ends — are what distinguish a democracy from a totalitarian state. The reformers want a role in running the universities and they want reform in the society generally. The militant revolutionaries anticipate taking over the universities altogether as a home base for revolution.

The militants are to the student movement of the late '60's what the communists were to the labor movement of the '30's. There are ideological overlappings and the militants and reformers might show up in the same student strike. But there is a quiet struggle within the student bodies of American campuses as surely as there is an open struggle for greater role for students generally.

It is important, therefore, that the President, the political parties and the press not mix up the two major strains of activists and that a condemnation of one not blind them to the just claims of the other. For to separate adult authority even further from the cause of the students will only spur the polarizing process so desired by the radical left.

DEMANDS IN PERSPECTIVE

Obviously, the universities should not become political and legal sanctuaries of special privilege in the society or be completely student run, the way, for instance, some universities seem to operate in Latin America. But surely the students do deserve a bigger hand in running colleges and universities than they have had in the recent past. For here again they remind their elders of the ancient ideals of the community of scholarship, where the teacher and the taught decided among themselves what and how they would investigate. For example, student power claims the right of the individual to determine his course of study, for himself, even to the extent of taking no "major" or "field of concentration" as prescribed in the college catelogue, and instead, making up his own course plan. If he fails, he will "fail bravely," to paraphrase St. Paul, and that too is educative. Further, he should not be dismissed from school for his failure, but allowed to try and try again, setting his own pace as well as his own course, for he, not the catalogue, is the *raison d' etre* of college. Are these reforms really so extreme? NO. The specialization of course work and the pressure to succeed at it (or else) are products of the late 19th century, and education before that was much more personally tailored. In proper context, the reformist students' demand for authority over their own work is actually restorationist — and highly responsible.

Indeed, many critics of the student power movement would be surprised to find out just how much support these and others of the movement's proposals have among those educational leaders who have looked carefully into the case; and here, within the community of scholarship, is where the matter hopefully can be resolved. For example, non-academic observers and some on the campus, have been indignant that some students are demanding the right to hire and fire faculty. Carried to an extreme, it is a radical demand, an

impractical one, and a wholly undesirable one for the health of the academic community. After all, most students don't want to be the only judges of their teachers and realize that they lack the experience for being so. Especially in larger institutions, the danger of students hiring faculty would be that the dictum "publish or perish" simply would be replaced by a new one, "be popular or perish." [1]

But to say the student demand is unworkable does not remove the very real grievance it expresses. In many colleges today the students deeply resent their inability to communicate their opinions on the quality of the teaching to which they are subjected, and more than one might suspect, this resentment is occasioned by sympathy with some professor considered outstanding by the students, but not promoted by the administration. The result often has been that students resort to publishing "Student Guides" to college courses in which anonymous writers praise some teachers and gleefully barbeque others. The students have a perfect legal right to do this, but often the guides merely confuse standards of quality and cause hard feelings all around.

How much more sensible is the solution of Yale President Kingman Brewster, Jr., who has decided that administrators do not have to fawn before student opinion to recognize its values and rights. Rather, the Yale administration now solicits written appraisals by certain individual students of the teaching performance of professors. These judgments then become one of many elements — a significant element heretofore ignored — in the total view the university has of its faculty.

A school that has gone even farther is the University of Pennsylvania, which had a "quiet revolution," in the words of President Gaylord P. Harnwell, when students produced a well-reasoned report on student power objectives, and, surprisingly, the report was adopted by the university administration. A University Forum was established, with student and faculty-administration equally represented, to pass on every concern of the students, including curriculum and the qualification of teachers.

Abolition of grades is another common reformist student cause that sounds wildly irresponsible to the older generation, which regards a college record primarily as a guide to future employers. But interestingly enough, even a great number of teachers favor this change, at least under some conditions, for good teaching is undermined when a student cares only whether a particular point will appear in the final exam.

PERNICIOUS EFFECTS

Grades tend to become the "system" of education, and young people, willingly or unwillingly, adapt to it. They simply cannot afford to make learning in itself their prime objective; and so they devise expedient but uneducational ways of dealing with the system —taking easy courses, and cramming at the last minute when facts can be remembered for a short but adequate period. Such subterfuges actually kill curiosity and confine the "grade grubber" to areas of study in which he is already adept.

The graduate schools are as responsible as the job market for the continuing insistence on grades as a measure of progress. But a paper by Dr. Philip Price, published in the *Journal of Medical Education* in 1964, challenges the idea that good marks in college promise a superior professional career later on. Price's study "clearly demonstrates that performance in formal education, as measured by grade-point averages, comes out as a factor almost completely independent of all the factors having to do with performance as a physician." And the same, one suspects, would apply to lawyers, teachers or clergymen.

For several kinds of students, as Harvard psychologist and counselor Dr. Graham B. Blaine, Jr., has observed, the grade system provides the absolute worst motivational framework for study. A student, for example, who is undergoing a period of late adolescent rebellion against his parents (or authority in general) may subconsciously use grades as an instrument of failure that will punish others as well as himself. This rebellion syndrome is common enough, and usually rather transient, but meanwhile it is unfortunate that classwork should be its victim.

ALTERNATIVES

Here again, some colleges already have abandoned grading and others are abolishing grading in certain courses. There may be no perfect resolution of this problem that will be applicable to all students in all institutions. Surely honors students, who have already shown themselves highly competent in the competition game, should be freed of all grading and only judged on a subjective standard. This requires more personal communication among students and teachers, but that is needed anyhow. As for non-honors students, some compromise like the pass-fail system in every fourth course might work out best during a period of gradual transition to an entirely subjective basis of grading. One possibility might be the abolition of all grades but a final one — for the record — with dependence on consultation and written appraisals in the intervening time.

In any case, room for experimentation is imperative in this area. Parents and the public should treat the reformist students' case with respect and not mindless outrage.

Rules governing personal conduct pose another student power issue. Here students alone — not their

teachers — are affected, and students all over the country are demanding an abolition or a considerable weakening of the *in loco parentis* vestiges of the Victorian age. The present system is full of inconsistencies, setting hours of curfew, for example, on women but not on men, though there usually are prescribed hours when men may have women in their dormitory rooms. Silly corollaries are established prescribing as well that doors to rooms be left open — sometimes "the width of a matchbook" is the rule — when men are entertaining women.

Only a few schools seem willing to give up these antiquated social rules. Consequently, they find more and more students asking to live off-campus, even at colleges where dormortories are plush and inexpensive. Such rules, argues former NSA President Ed Schwartz, "are resented not because they are unreasonable — which they are — but because they are disrespectful."

The "ethic of social service" of which Dean Freedman wrote is the newest of changes reformist students seek in their universities. Weaned on the civil rights struggles early in the decade many students want the various institutions of society to turn more of their attention to the needs of the poor and underprivileged of the nation. This presents a difficult problem for universities. As notoriously "poor" institutions, they cannot see how they can help the poor financially. Unable to control the members of their academic community they say they can only encourage individual students and professors to become active in social service.

TOO PAT

To the students this is too pat an answer. They point to the announced plan of the Ford Foundation to channel a portion of its investments into socially useful ventures. They argue that universities can make more scholarship funds available to young people from poor families as well as to develop curricula that will train students to deal with urban problems. Radical and reformist students alike at the University of Chicago, the University of Pennsylvania, Columbia and Harvard protested university expansion into neighboring communities, often racial ghettos. At Columbia and Pennsylvania these efforts resulted in the cancelling of the proposed projects.

While students have demanded that their universities do more about poverty, racism and lack of education, many have been active themselves. Thousands of students volunteer each year to participate in social welfare projects in nearby neighborhoods. Hundreds of students each year volunteer to participate in teaching summer classes at black colleges in the South. Nearly every school has a volunteer tutoring program in which college students give assistance to high school students in various courses. Although they are often poorly organized and usually short of money, these students are dedicating many hours a week to a cause they believe is right. They do not think that they demand too much from their universities.

In fairness, it must be said that some of the issues raised by the radicals have troubled the consciences of even the hard-liners in the administrative hierarchies, considering them apart from their ideological context. The privileged place of ROTC as a course-for-credit is an example. In such cases, where there is at least partial merit to the radicals' charges, the crack-down response to their agitation becomes more difficult.

What does give university administrations *a handle against the radicals is their extreme tactics.* The revolutionary rationale is that whatever situation they have in mind is so morally imperative as to justify any excess, an outlook not unlike the perfervid bellicosity of some Vietnam super-hawks, or the mindset of the radical right. In contrast comes the postulation of the Cox Commission on the Columbia disorders of 1968:

> Resort to violence or physical harassment or obstruction is never an acceptable tactic for influencing decision in a university. This principle does not require notions of property or legality to sustain it. It derives from three considerations. First, force, harassment and physical obstruction contradict the essential postulate that the university is dedicated to the search for truth by reason and civility. Second, resort to such physical coercion tends to set in motion an uncontrollable escalation of violence . . . Third, the survival — literally the survival — of the free university depends upon the entire community's active rejection of disruptive demonstrations.[2]

The report goes on to say that the alternative to using force to end disruption is "for the entire community to reject the tactics of physical disruption with such overwhelming moral disapproval as to make them self-defeating."

What has been the response of the "entire community"? In March, 1969 the Gallup Poll showed that 82 percent of a national sample thought that college students who break laws while participating in college demonstrations should be expelled. Some of the sentiment seems to be seeping onto the campuses too. The *New York Times* of March 23, 1969 reported that as an "indication of a turning tide against campus disruptions, the student newspaper of Franklin and Marshall College called for a national coalition of 'non-revolutionary radicals, liberals and moderates' to isolate the disrupters." Further, at Michigan State University, more than 10,000 students signed petitions condemning "intimidation violence and disruption."

PRE-EMPTIVE STRATEGY

It is quite possible that a sound majority of students already are opposed to the militants on the

campus. But that opposition does not guarantee an end to radical influence; the Students for a Democratic Society care little for the will of the democratic majority. What will thwart them besides peace in Vietnam is the pre-emption of their support by reformers on the campus.

The other great challenge to universities has been to adapt to the new demands of the growing numbers of black college students.

In the past, black students, most of them from the black middle-class, sought to prepare themselves in white schools to deal with a white society. With the emergence of the black power and black-is-beautiful movement, and with an increase in attendance of blacks from the working class (who tend to view the traditional middle class proprieties of college life as implicitly "white racist"), a rejection of the assimilating process became pronounced. Some 300,000 blacks, thanks to a fast jump in recruitment, now attend U.S. colleges, and a strong affirmation of ties with the ghetto has been invoked to develop group solidarity and identity. Where in the past there had been a tendency to become what Professor Charles V. Hamilton derides as "middle class black sambos", the pendulum now swings close to white rejection.

Black Student Unions have demanded that more blacks be admitted to the schools and given extra tutoring assistance if necessary. Some blacks take the position that regular credit be granted to those who must take remedial courses before they can do regular work. At some schools the Unions have demanded the creation of cultural centers devoted to Afro-Americans.

In answer to such demands most universities merely have listed all of the projects in which they are involved already. Some universities have taken the initiative in setting up projects such as Boston's community health facilities. Seattle University is moving ahead with plans to build a gymnasium available to the neighboring black community. For the most part, though, the accomplishments mainly have consisted of delaying or cancelling proposed expansion by urban universities into nearby black communities.

CURRICULA

The proposals for innovative curricula to include black studies have had more success. Harvard and Yale have led the Ivy League in establishing degree granting departments. Berkeley has already added such courses as American Racism, Ethnic and Racial Groups, Sociology of the Black Family, and Psychological Aspects of Black Identity. By the fall of 1969 some 23 schools will be offering full academic majors in black studies.

Black studies programs do raise two important problems. A large number of blacks would prefer the programs to be taught only by black professors and attended only by black students. White professors are believed to be incapable of truly understanding the meaning of the Afro-American experience and likely to distort it with their white interpretations. White students are seen as a "psychologically limiting" factor in the classroom. It is feared that blacks would not feel as free to discuss personal problems caused in part by racism before a group of whites.

These arguments meet strong opposition however. Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has threatened court action against separate facilities on campus. Professor DeVere E. Pentony, a dean at San Francisco State, argues, "If one of the purposes of the black studies program is to tell it as it really is, then the message should go out to students regardless of color, even though it is likely to have a particular additional value to the black student. The college cannot be a place where knowledge is developed and subjects taught in semi-secret."

There is a danger that the white administrators will patronize the black students when they make separatist demands, an expression both of guilt and secret contempt. Even the national Administration has appeared to equivocate on this issue. If unreasonable black demands and violent black behavior, when they occur, are treated differently from the same sort of white demands and behavior, the result in objective observers and perhaps in the blacks will only be a deep sense of disappointment in the standards of the university. Formation of a positive black self-identity does not require the spectacle of groveling whites, nor of whites who show they don't really care what the blacks do in "their" department so long as they leave everyone else alone. Charles Bayard Rustin, "They (administrators) say, 'Well, it's only Negroes behaving this way.' They wouldn't tolerate it from white students."

Reformists, white radicals, and militant blacks all pose a serious challenge to the authority and tranquility of the campus. However, overall, the campus turmoil should be viewed as a hopeful opportunity to restructure the university, both to improve the human quality of its communal life and to strengthen it against internal discord. Moreover, this is an opportunity in which the President and the federal government can be of substantial help to the universities. There is no future in punitive measures designed to bring a kind of martial law to the campus, and those who propose them do everyone a disservice. Rather should government collaborate with those campus elements who stand for constructive, orderly change.

The current strife may cloud the hopeful nature of the situation, but, in fact, though unmentioned in the news, countless quiet efforts already are underway by faculty and students of good will to reorient the uni-

versity to its modern potentialities. The revolutionary element which gets the most attention is also the element least involved in this quiet work. It is also the element that would suffer in a restructured university with reformed legitimacy. The revolutionaries require a widespread sense of the moral illegitimacy of constituted authority. A reform-minded restructuring of the university that gives the majority of students a healthy minority role in governing the community is the surest way to create lines of authority which command respect.

CAMPUS GOVERNMENT

Some call for student-run universities, a proposal as follysome on one side as is continued exclusion of students on the other. We believe that the way to reform is to move from the almost solely consultative role of students today to: 1) elected majority student representation on all boards which decide questions pertaining only to students (e.g., housing, rules) and elected minority representation on boards where other interests of the community are also involved (e.g., faculty, tenure); 2) A new form of university body with overall authority for the university, a three party assembly with students, faculty and administration given equal votes, with trustees — elected by alumni — retained as a veto authority and the external arm of the university; 3) Our preferred proposal: a democratized campus government with the faculty as an upper house of a Congress, the students as a lower house and administrators, chosen by alumni-elected trustees, serving as executives.

It will be protested that the alumni and public pay for the universities and therefore should continue, through regents and trustees and their appointed executives, to run them. But students also pay for a part of their education and will pay for others, later as alumni and "public" themselves. What's more, students are much of the university's ostensible reason for being, and the favor society does them through providing them access to an education is matched by the favor society does itself by investing in their talents. Often it is even brutally frank (and largely unenlightened) about it; consider the National Defense Education Act, clearly directed at buying new scientists rather than helping poor students toward a fruitful career. Is there any reason the subject of this investment process should be limited to a consultative role?

Older persons may be more sympathetic to the proposal of a triumvirate power structure including students if they consider how they would expect colleges to operate if the students were all around 50 years old. The answer is: *just as unions, churches, and almost all other adult organizations are run in society,* with at least minority power — more than a voice — vested in the participants. It has been argued repeatedly here that youth of 18 deserve the full status of adult. If it is acknowledged, then it follows that they should enjoy the status as much as 50 year olds and should demand the same role in colleges that older people would in their place. They pay their dues, they produce for the society, they have obligations — they should also have a say.

NO SPECIAL PROTECTION

Students, if hereforth they are to be considered adults, should not get special protection from the university when they break laws outside the campus gates. Nor should rules within the campus be arbitrarily set aside out of consideration of the students' youth. That is paternalism. But, at the same time, students should have all the legal rights accorded to any other citizen, both within the campus and outside it. College disciplinary rules should be clearly stated, and in disciplinary hearings there should be written notice of charges brought against a student and a hearing held in which the student may state his position and enter evidence. Increasingly the courts are recognizing the necessity to guarantee such procedural rights to students, for the lack of them also is paternalism. It must be emphasized that democratization of the campus would not mean student dominance or special privilege, only a larger student role. But one principle of the change should be irreducible: a vote as well as a voice. From its adoption of this principle will come a policy of mutual respect and a cohesive community, the want of which, more than anything else, has lead to the student uproar of late.

The shift of university power, though limited, will be significant, and its proponents might well wonder what approach they should take toward effecting it. Orgies of destruction are not the way. They are to successful university reform what ghetto riots are to race relations, a means to shake up the power structure, all right, but a means that usually retards the long range cause. A better policy is the much-too-maligned strategy of non-violent action, and strictly followed. Instead of "liberating" college buildings, students should clean up the house of student government, make it meaningful to the purpose of the whole university. It should function as a shadow administration, taking up for debate and resolution the very issues the administrators decide; in short, acting as a part of the triumvirate before its power is formally legitimized. *Then* let the students back their views with demands, peaceful demonstrations, teach-ins and, as a last resort, peaceful student strikes. If these tactics will work anywhere, they will work on a university campus. If they are inadequate, it will be for want of student support.

YOUNG TRUSTEES

Also in the coming transition, university administrators and students alike should seek a fresh and relatively disinterested perspective from outstanding

recent graduates, still steeped in the emerging values of youth and yet also experienced in older society. Let them come back and join the dialogue. For example, we should like to see some college trustees and regents selected while in their twenties.

The question remains, what can the President and the federal government do to improve the climate of university life in America? Much of the current anti-student agitation is neither thoughtful, nor constructive. There is little good, and much potential damage, that the government can do in trying to intervene in the campus struggles, even when they are violent; merely deploring the situation is not of great consequence either. However, there are ample opportunities for government to offer positive assistance to universities in treating the underlying causes of disorder.

An immediate need is for improved communication between the President and the majority of youth, particularly students. Nobody within the federal government attempts to inject the student and youth perspective directly into national decision-making. When most students cannot even vote, the President, at least, should be their tribune.

In particular, we propose establishment of a President's Youth Advisory Council made up of young people 18-30, with an emphasis on students, but including some recent graduates and, to provide a balanced perspective, some working class youth of student age. The Council, with the aid of a small permanent staff, would advise the President of the effect of national policies on the young, prepare recommendations for consideration by the President and report to him on youth's stake in particular legislation under consideration. In turn, the Council would serve as a link between the President and his programs and the youth of the nation, a means of getting the President's views across to the young. The Council, then, would be a responsible national voice *for* youth and a responsive President's voice *to* youth.

It is commendable that the President already has appointed a Special Consultant, with several assistants, to deal with youth problems in the White House. This office should continue, but it should be abetted with the Council, a more direct source of student and youth views. Similarly, the President is to be congratulated for the unprecedented number of young people he has serving in a variety of staff positions. Still, they are not in those posts because they are young, nor, consequently, do they see themselves as youth's representatives. A President's Youth Advisory Council would give students and other youth a tangible tie to "the system."

Another Presidential initiative to open meaningful communication between students and government would be to increase the number of internships available during the summer in Washington. These programs were cut back in recent years. Yet they had provided young people with a chance to learn how the national government operates, and to feel they were making a contribution to it. Earlier, a National Youth Service Foundation was proposed to grant fellowships to enable the poor to participate in intern programs. But first the programs must exist, and on a large scale. The President can reopen the program in the Administration (he has done so in the White House), and recommend to the Congress that it follow his lead.

The President and Congress also can be of direct help to the universities as they try to adapt to student demands for more social service involvment in the neighboring communities and to recruit more students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

In fact, some of the best talent in the housing field is found at the nation's universities. Rather than hiring such talent and bringing it to Washington, the Housing and Urban Development Department could recommend a program of matching grants for universities which use their faculties' and staffs' skills to improve housing conditions in neighboring adjoining campuses. Problems of university expansion, a burning issue at many campuses, could be eased thereby.

ANOTHER NEW PROGRAM

Regarding black and other minority recruiting, the Health, Education and Welfare Department, if backed by the President and Congress, could institute a Disadvantaged Student Education Program to help universities meet the cost of finding, recruiting, and financing talented but underprivileged youth. Money also could be used to develop campus programs for helping such youth adjust to university life once admitted. Pilot projects on the federal level exist in these areas, but need to be expanded.

Finally, it should be the policy of the President and his Administration to seek and accept invitations to the colleges of the country for speeches and seminars, despite the valuable time such activity consumes. Students need to have government policies explained to them. Initially many will be critical; some may be impolite, some even violent. But student suspicions of government need to be worn down. The previous Administration cut itself off from the campuses. The new Administration should not make that mistake.

The complex struggle on the campuses requires careful attention from the university community and government alike. Considerate, skillful handling can make the presently unpleasant developments a constructive exercise in personal growth — for all concerned.

[1] See Lewis S. Feuer, "The Risk Is 'Juvenocracy' ", New York **Times** Magazine, Feb. 18, '66.

[2] Report of the Fact-Finding Commission Appointed to Investigate the Disturbances at Columbia University in April and May, 1968 (Cox Commission Report); Vintage Books, New York, 1968, p. 196.

VI. Education

Planning for the Coming Decade

The educational demands of the youth protest are crucial to integration of the new generation into the greater society. Unless students are respected as responsible individuals and are given the opportunity to learn in a system which values learning more than grades, the educational experience of a great many of the most gifted of them will continue to be a demoralizing exercise in hypocrisy.

The dominant trends in higher education today, however, are directly inimical to this central concern. Most campus administrations are placing increasing emphasis on size, efficiency, impersonality, and governmental involvement. Classes are getting larger, teacher contact rarer, and bureaucracy more pervasive. Colleges attempting to resist the trend suffer an acute financial squeeze.

It will take prompt, decisive, and concerted action to reverse these trends and re-establish the nation's colleges as forums for communication rather than arenas of generational estrangement. Yet the agency most capable of such action — the federal government — also tends to be a vehicle of the most resented developments. This is the crucial dilemma of American education. The federal government must act to liberate education without bureaucratizing it.

To be sure, these emerging problems are by products of outstanding achievement. In 1940, 5.9% of the population group aged 25-29 were college graduates; by 1950, the figure was 7.7% and by 1960 had climbed to 11.0%. And by 1980, it will redouble. Although we are not likely in the near future to reach the day when most Americans are college graduates, we already have reached the point where the majority of young people are getting one or two years of college. This may not seem startling to the youths involved, but it represents progress that would have flabbergasted their parents three decades ago. In 1940, the majority of young people aged 25-49 had not completed their junior year in high school.

Today, then, there are nearly seven million persons in college as compared with 3.5 million in 1960 and a projected nine million in 1980. We are educating about nine times as many college level students per capita as the Russians and 18 times per capita as the Europeans.

But this growth has not come cheaply, nor without serious and potentially unhealthy distortions of our principles of equal opportunity and recognition of merit. College costs have multiplied phenomenally. Whereas a year of private college education cost a student (and his parents) an average of $1,850 in 1957, it had reached a cost of $2,570 by 1967, and is expected by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare analysts to rise to $3,280 by 1977. Similar, though less dramatic, rises are found in the cost of public higher education.[1] Moreover, the burden of costs is not being distributed fairly. The states, which are strapped for funds, carry most of the budgetary load for public colleges, while the federal government, whose revenues are rising by six billion dollars a year, plays a relatively smaller role. Of course, the real burden for public schools is borne by the taxpayers, who in some states actually provide a near total subsidy of students, thereby raising taxes, hitting the poor who ordinarily still do not send their children to college[2] and those middle class parents who must pay what is essentially a double cost if they want to send their child to a private school.

The financial strain on middle class families who decide today to send their children to private institutions is extortionate, and it is compounded by their often having more than one child at a time in college. Private colleges save the public the cost of educating students in state schools; nevertheless with the exception of some aid for students (GI bill, for example) and state help in some places, only those receiving federal research grants are provided support, and these schools have ever more difficulty raising adequate voluntary support from their tax-soaked alumni.

DISTORTED MARKET

As a result, improving *quality* in education is hampered. This is not to suggest that only private colleges are of high quality; indeed, some of our very best schools are state schools. But it is to say that the concept of quality in education, to some degree like quality in commercial products, depends upon competition, and competition depends on differences of approach, of underlying philosophy and, especially, of control. Each citizen should decide for himself what format of higher education suits his concept of desirable quality, but today the choice is distorted by overwhelming financial considerations that militate against private institutions.

The choice is even more prejudiced against undergraduate colleges as opposed to undergraduate schools within universities. The latter get federal research grants that help defray expenses for everything from physical plant to salaries, and can amount to as much as half the institution's total budget. According to a 1961 report by President Nathan Pusey of Harvard, while 80 percent of institutions of higher learning in

America are receiving federal funds, the vast bulk of that money "concentrates in the relatively few institutions with strong graduate and professional programs," especially graduate science programs.

The federal money is not even an unmixed blessing for the fortunate universities that get the lion's share. The controversy over the loyalty oath that until a few years ago was a required aspect of the National Defense Education Act programs, demonstrated one way in which federal funds potentially can compromise academic freedom and threaten the paramount virtue of any university, whether private or public, that is, its intellectual integrity. Also, by providing the universities with ample funds primarily in the science field, the federal government threatens to impair the academic balance within a university.

But if the private and public universities getting substantial federal support must watch after their integrity, small private colleges must watch after their very survival. The composite victim of all the trends just cited, the *small private college,* is in a particularly bad competitive position, one which has led Dr. Jacques Barzun, former Dean of Faculties at Columbia, to predict the demise of the independent liberal arts college in a relatively few years. Tax supported state schools and federally backed universities may simply squeeze it out of the competition.

'CUTTING EDGE' — RMN

Obviously Americans must not, through our government and taxes, help force these schools out of existence. A unique and irreplacable contribution to the flavor and balance of our whole American civilization inheres in the independent private college. Such institutions *tend* to be most ready to experiment; they tend to set the most contagiously high academic standards; and they tend to be the strongest bastions of academic freedom from political intimidation and influence. "They have long provided," said candidate Richard Nixon in 1968, "the cutting edge of progress, pushing ahead with new ideas and new techniques." The close academic relationships whose lack inspires much of the student power movement on big state campuses, in fact, has long been a creative characteristic of the small, private college. Indeed, when we think of the word "college", the image conjured up in our minds is of the Amhersts, Lawrences, Ripons, Grinnells, Kenyons and Whitmans which do not produce specialists in animal husbandry or hotel management, but do prepare generalists with excellent prospects for all around leadership.

One solution to the plight of the private colleges being pursued ever more frequently these days is direct state aid. Already some private colleges in Pennsylvania, for instance, are now "state-related" schools. Surely aid is needed, but it is preferable that such aid should not come in the form of direct state subsidies. First of all, state governments already are overburdened with the costs of education. Also, the private schools of some states draw students from all over the country. Subsidies would mean carrying the burden of other states or matching aid to the proportion of state residents at each college. Secondly, once a private school comes to rely on the subsidies of the state, its independence is necessarily threatened, and it may lose any competitive drive to expand or undertake novel and provocative new policies.

The American concept of quality education, moreover, directs us to protect and expand a wide range of competitive choice. And today to maintain meaningful choice in college level education we must help small schools, private schools and small self-contained colleges, and especially must we help their composite type, the small private colleges. Government at all levels has put them at a competitive disadvantage and should now help to restore the balance.

Working, then, from the principles of equal education opportunity and high educational quality, we should seek not only an expanded higher education apparatus, but a more equitable sharing of its costs; and the widest possible choice in collegiate institutions.

First, it is time America established as official national policy both the objectives of equal higher educational opportunity for all youth and of maximum choice in college selection. Education is still the best hope of the gifted poor child and the rich child alike. Just as all society gained by the extension of free public education to the high school level, we would now benefit socially and economically from using a small corner of our massive federal resources to move toward full public support of costs of tuition, board and room and books for every *qualified* student in a certified college or higher level technical training institute. The money, perhaps a modest start of $500 a student, would be distributed through federal grants returned to the states and then to each individual student in the form of a voucher to apply at the institution of *his* choice: public, private, church or non-church, junior college, college or university anywhere in the country.[3]

RELATED SCHEMES

The federal government does now operate a number of programs to aid students directly — the GI Bill, the National Defense Education Act scholarships, the Work-Study program (which pays the college most of the cost of providing a part-time job) and the direct grant system would not replace these, at least not right away. It might however, absorb them eventually. The Republicans in Congress and Democratic Senator Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.) have adopted alternative proposals that would be close cousins to the one above. Under these plans an out-

right tax credit would be granted to parents for educational expenses. The only trouble with this approach is that it would miss two overlapping student categories. Neither the poor nor students working their own way through college would be able to take full advantage of the credit because they have a small tax load. This is no little group. Students working their way through college, for example, constitute fully 21 percent of the total, and another 22 percent get at least some of their college funds from working.[4]

Perhaps the systems could be combined, and the voucher given working students or those whose parents could not take advantage of the tax credit, though a voucher system alone would just be as fair and much simpler. But the important objective is to assist the student himself rather than the institution. Of course, much of the grant would be eaten up in higher tuitions but not unjustifiably. The colleges need the money; they obviously are not trying to profiteer. The ultimate benefit would still go to the student. Private schools would be helped by having an indirect source for funding more scholarships for indigent students, and for expansion of physical plant and for more competitive salaries. By aiding students, rather than the institutions directly, no problem of church-state conflict or public control would arise. Public institutions would be able to reduce their relative drain on state budgets, using federal money uncontrolled by federal bureaucats. Education would continue as a state responsibility, while the states benefited from the federal income tax with its progressive national impact.

WORKERS' COLLEGE

The poor would be helped not only by the greater availability of choice in education, but through greater support of higher technical schools. Moreover, as something of a side-issue, but an important one, the federal government should provide tax incentives to industries which provide job training and retraining for employees — the workers' equivalent of college.

Our second major proposal enters a more difficult realm, for it involves an attempt at objective appreciation of the rather subjective matter of quality. Quality in education cannot be guaranteed by anyone, and especially not by government, but quality can be encouraged, just as now the financial incentives in our tax system tend to discourage many institutions whose academic quality is widely respected. If we are to give each student the opportunity for an educational experience commensurate with his ability to take advantage of it, we must recognize that for many young people small schools, private schools, and independent colleges answer their needs for high quality.

MANY STUDENTS

The number of students who could take — and would prefer to take maximum advantage of education in our better private colleges is much greater than most people probably realize. Harvard College, for one dramatic example, gets somewhat over six times as many applicants each year as it can admit to its freshman class. Harvard has over 4,500 students now, only a few hundred over what it had a decade ago, and it does not consider it wise to grow much larger. The same story is told by many other colleges, whether linked with a university, like Harvard, or existing alone, like Williams or Reed. The ones that do have university connections do not want to expand their student body size and cannot afford to branch out, and the independent colleges, finding their professors attracted to the universities, are barely able to stay in business and still maintain high standards. The best that prestigious but money-strapped private colleges can do is join together to share some facilities, as is now happening in the Claremont complex in Southern California or in the Berkshires area of Western Massachusetts. But often geography isn't sympathetic to such arrangements.

Meanwhile, some public universities, such as Michigan State, are attempting to compress into one campus dormitory building, called "residential colleges", the vitality of an entire small private school. The traditional Yale "college" and Harvard "house" is the model for these single building colleges, but the 300-400 students in them exist in a hothouse atmosphere separated from any larger community. Several of them grouped together and inter-acting would make a viable college, as at Harvard or Yale. But isolated in the midst of huge public universities and in esthetic and operational variance from the style of life inculcated around them, one such unit may be an interesting feature on the academic landscape, but it probably will not be a commanding one. It will not be an adequate replacement for the well-defined and integrated academic communities which are independent institutions.

Only an inverse snobbery would say the situation described is healthy. The situation, rather, should be radically improved, and, again, since government has put the good private schools into this difficulty, it can and should help them out.

Direct federal grants to colleges for special functions are one answer; the wrong one. In fact, some private colleges have refused to accept federal money even for building construction, and their point — avoidance of federal control — is well taken.

Direct state aid (as opposed to indirect aid via aid to students) is another possibility. The Bundy committee recommended and the New York legislature passed and funded aid to private colleges, including ones which are religious-sponsored, but whose functions are not primarily religious. The argument on federal constitutional grounds seems quite sound, inas-

much as the Supreme Court, in *McGowan vs. Maryland* and other cases, has made the same distinction between aid to institutions which are primarily religious (e.g. a seminary) and those which are only secondarily religious. Since even the Catholic universities are beginning to move towards greater secularization, the danger of conflict of church and state seems slight.

However, the Bundy proposal does not resolve the inherent conflict between government — any government — and private institutions. It even proposes that qualitative standards be applied to the private colleges in order for them to receive aid, the foot-in-the-door for ultimate control. For this reason, the proposal of a direct continuing subsidy seems dangerous.

A better alternative would be to aid private institutions — and all higher education institutions — through a tax *credit* for charitable contributions made by alumni and other concerned individuals. As with service projects (Chapter 9) the present tax *deduction* already accounts for a portion of the aid higher education gets, and a credit would simply do more. (The credit would be for gifts up to, say, $50, with a deduction for money given above that figure.) The aid, however, would come with no strings whatever, leaving aside even a potential threat to the colleges' integrity. Moreover, the whole society would not be forced to bear the cost of support, since only the interested citizenry would contribute.

MODERN MORRILL ACT

But aid to existing private institutions is only one part of the answer; we also need more private institutions, and here we have an instructive precedent in the Morrill Act of 1862, the land grant college act that Lincoln passed and which revolutionized the growth of higher education of America. Most people know that the Morrill Act provided endowments for state schools; but it also endowed private colleges. It gave, and then got out.

Today we need a modern Morrill Act specifically to endow new private colleges and help restore the balance in our educational mix. Initially, a Presidential Commission should hold a competition among the nation's private non-sectarian schools for a limited number of partial endowments for either entirely new colleges or branches of old colleges. The formula of support would be one-half federal government endowment, with states, localities and regional businesses asked to contribute smaller endowments. The balance would be raised from private foundations and individuals.

BRANCHING OUT

What would a new school be like? One of the most sensible undertakings would be for a college now part of a university to expand into a new college branch elsewhere in the country which would be physically separate from its parent, but united in policy, management, and quality. Like its parent — though from a greater distance — it would enjoy an association with the university's graduate schools, the faculty, and, by modern processes of reproduction, its library.

For example, one can imagine a "Harvard West", say in Seattle, Washington, a cosmopolitan, climatically temperate city about the size of Boston, and a city which lacks a major non-sectarian private college. Given a federal-private endowment, Harvard West could take many of the well-qualified applicants Harvard College now must turn down. Moreover, Harvard's over-supply of qualified applicants for teaching positions could be absorbed in part by a branch elsewhere and both students and faculty could participate in some circulation between campuses. With a new branch this great college could go at least part way toward meeting its responsibility to an immensely expanded national population, exposing a greater number of young people to high quality private college education. Harvard West would be experimental and yet tied to hallowed traditions. It would be functional and architecturally innovative, a stimulation and inspiration for the university as a whole and for the entire country. The minor national impact of Harvard innovations such as the house system, and the freshmen seminars, would be magnified through the impact of a complete new college branch.

Of course, Harvard West is nothing more than an example of what might be. Harvard might not be chosen or might not accept the challenge — and maybe Yale would. There could as likely be an Antioch in Denver, a Stanford branch in West Virginia; or perhaps, a great public institution such as the University of Michigan might design and foster an experimental private college in Atlanta or Omaha which would later become totally independent. And if such pilot projects were successful, the economics and educational arguments would be strong for wide scale extension of the formula. It would all hinge on the imagination of American colleges and universities as they competed for the no-strings federal endowment. The excitement and creativity engendered by such competition might usher in a new era of excellence not only for private education on the higher levels.

[1]See Myron Brenton, "The Higher Cost of Higher Education", **N.Y. Times Magazine** April 21, 1968, New York, N.Y.

[2]According to the U.S. Office of Education, "less than 10% of all college students are from low income families."

[3]We believe the originator of this basic approach was Dr. Milton Friedman

[4]A legislative proposal by Rep. Edith Green (D-Ore.) would apply the tax paid by students on wages directly to tuition, but this seems unnecessarily complicated

The Unconsidered Americans

For the media and their audience, and for perhaps a majority of citizens, the word "youth" conjures up a college student as the typical example. Unconsidered are the more numerous young workers; ignored by the opinion makers, ignored by even their own unions in many cases. They produce soldiers for Vietnam and taxes for the public treasury and it is assumed they are stable and content. But they are not. However inarticulate, they are resentful. Continuing to overlook their material and psychological grievances could be dangerous for the society and for the new Administration.

"In 1960," according to Professor Louis Carliner of Rutgers, "there were slightly more than 13 million people in the labor force under 25 (and) by 1970 this figure will have increased to almost 20 million." Each year some three million persons enter the labor force and of these one million go to work as hourly-wage industrial workers, trade union apprentices and low level management personnel.

GERONTOCRATIC UNIONS

But they cannot really be said to enter a labor "movement," at least not in the old sense. All the old external sympathy bestowed upon labor by the liberal and intellectual communities is now directed towards the New Left and the blacks. The old fervor that attached itself to Homestead, Hart, Schaffner & Marx and Flint now finds expression at Berkeley, Columbia and Harvard. Inside the unions, a gerontocracy rules and the young struggle against the admonitions that they are too inexperienced to take part in the real decision-making process.

The truth is that many young workers are suffering discrimination within their unions and within society which is at least as severe at the expressed grievances of students, if not blacks. It is assumed by the educated middle and upper classes that laborers today are well-off, but this opinion errs in regard to the young in the labor force. In 1967 the average, (usually organized) manufacturing worker with three dependents made $101.26 a week in take home pay, a figure which was lower, of course, for the average young worker, and lower yet if he was not in a union. The older worker had the better job, the greater break at over-time pay, less likelihood of being laid off, the longer vacations and the practical use for sick-pay and other benefits.

The younger worker is caught in a squeeze. He pays taxes, unlike the very poor and has all the advertisement-induced wants of the middle class, not the least of which—a better education for his children than he got—is considered a necessity by many. He does all right financially so long as he is single, but when he gets married and has children his standard of living drops. Unlike the older worker whose wife often holds down a job too and helps establish a middle-class economic status, the young worker lacks the extra breadwinner at the very time he has the added expense of growing children.

FALLING BEHIND

He very likely also has a mortgage. Seventy five percent of all union members under the age of 40, according to a 1967 poll by the Committee on Political Education (COPE) of the AFL-CIO, live in the suburbs, and most probably are paying off mortgages with interest rates at over 8 percent. Says Brendan Sexton, a United Auto Workers analyst, "The young married worker 25 or 30 years old will probably make regular monthly payments half again as high as those paid by a worker of 40 or 45 years."[1] Small wonder that the young worker spends more than he earns and goes into debt on the average of more than $100 per year.

If the young worker is in an economic bind, he also is in an emotional bind. He lacks the social prestige of the college students, or, if white, the supporting spirit of the black power movement. He is uncelebrated in song, motion picture, television story or snappy commercial.

In his shop or factory the young worker realizes that his labor is more tedious than that of many other Americans and that it probably will never be any more exciting or challenging than it is now. Nor are there channels of advancement to which he can aspire. Moreover, in his daily routine he has little responsibility for his own work, an alienating factor which may bother him more than it bothered men in earlier eras when one felt lucky to have any work at all.

Finally, in his own union he has much less to say about policy than does his older co-worker. The age gap notable throughout society is especially pronounced in the unions. Because of the low birth rates during the Depression, followed some years later by the post-World War II baby boom, there will be some one million *fewer* persons in the 35-44 age bracket in 1975 than in 1965, but there will be eight and three-quarters million *more* in the 25-34 age bracket. The work force is coming to be composed of the young and the old.

So far, however, the young are relative unrepresented in labor councils. George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO, celebrates his 75th birthday this year,

while even Walter Reuther, the timelessly "younger" labor leader, is in his mid-60's. The gap extends down to most locals and is reflected in policy decisions. The prerogatives of seniority are preached and guarded with a ferocious sense of moral righteousness. If the union leadership choose to press for higher pension payments rather than pay increases in contract negotiations, the young employee has to go along. If organized labor nationally chooses to press Congress for increased Social Security benefits, the cost of the payments, the young worker knows, will come partly out of his pocket.

FRUSTRATION YIELDS MILITANCE

One result of these frustrations has been greater worker militance in seeking higher pay, a condition with which older labor leaders seem unable to deal. One seventh — 14 percent — of all contracts recommended by union negotiators are now meeting rejection in membership votes — up from 8.7 percent in 1964, 10 percent in 1965 and 11.7 percent in 1966. The old timers broke with the Johnson Administration's proposed 3.2 percent guideline only to be told by their young membership that even 15 percent or more is not good enough.

Professor Carliner quotes the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service who explains that, "Many young workers who have grown up in a period of relative affluence have never experienced either a real depression or the early history of union struggles. Moreover, they are not very interested in attempts to acquaint them with these hard facts of earlier years. Many have never experienced a strike of any duration. When these facts are coupled with what may be loosely described as the current disillusionment of youth in other areas of activity, negative ratification votes are not surprising." But the federal official, as Carliner observes, is missing the point of the contemporary reality: the young worker, relative to other workers and to his age-mates elsewhere, is in an economic vice, and further, lacks an adequate voice in his union to do anything about it.

Politically, the young worker — and we are speaking here of the young white worker — also feels impotent. On one hand he sees privileged students who, he feels, have no respect for their country and its military. They seem to be abetted by the courts, the rich, and the know-it-all intellectuals. Because they are the favored pets of society, the students, he feels, can get away with anti-social actions which if he tried would land him in jail.

RESENTMENT

On the other hand, the young white worker notes the special attention given the problems of the blacks, particularly young blacks. He notes special college admittance standards and special job training programs, and concludes that black really are privileged too, rather than deprived. Reports Professor Carliner, "Whites, they say, go looking for jobs, (but) jobs go looking for blacks. Blacks who are not qualified are shoved forward, they say, into desirable white collar or skilled worker jobs at the expense of white workers with qualifications." Needless to say, blacks perceive the situation differently, but the whites' strength of feeling cannot be ignored.

Here, then, is the polarization of perceived grievances which led to the strong support given George Wallace among working people, particularly young working people, in 1968. It is too simple to say that these men were racists, the angle employed by most of the media, whose reporters usually are drawn from the educated middle class. A more perceptive look came, for example, from the *University of Michigan Daily's* Mike Hubbard, who talked with workers in the Wallace stronghold of Flint, Michigan. He wrote, "Certainly these Americans do not identify with red necked racism. . . No one ever taught them Negro History, but they grew up with blacks. . . They don't dislike blacks, they just feel black men shouldn't be given a bigger break than anyone else. The white UAW members as a whole do not believe Wallace is a racist. All they know is what he told them, and he never said he hated blacks. In fact, Wallace could get up to 5 percent of the black vote. . . Even the most militant Negro workers I talked to didn't feel there was large scale prejudice in the Union. They dislike Wallace, but not the men who are voting for him."

Wallace's support among young workers was an expression of populism more than racism. He spoke to their frustrations with the educated, the liberals, government and business, who seemed atuned to the plight of working class blacks, but not to working class white. Robert Kennedy had managed to show concern about both, and he had a great deal of support among both. Wallace, after Kennedy's assassination, was the only politician left who seemed to care. Only when labor leadership successfully impugned Wallace's record of support for the workingman's cause did the Alabamian begin to lost support, primarily to Humphrey.

The sense of young workers alienation—alienation from their work, from their union, from their society—certainly did not resolve itself in the Wallace defeat. In a time when those feeling a grievance are inclined increasingly to resort to dramatic and even illegal means of protest, one cannot expect that the young workers will remain quiescent much longer. Their revolt, justifying itself in the rhetoric and devices employed by the young blacks and students—the most immediate objects of young workers' antagonism—could be exceedingly disruptive and ugly. Whereas the "strikes" and violence of students have upset only the isolated university

community, similar expressed hostility of young workers, directed at the students, the blacks, the government or even their own unions, could upset severely the whole national economy. The specter of young workers' revolt is not raised to frighten. Rather, it is to show the seriousness of dealing with the legitimate claims of this very large segment of society.

Responsibility for meeting the material and psychological needs of young workers rests with the media, academia, business management, unions and the federal government.

Media should take care, as they are only beginning to do with blacks, to divest themselves of the prejudices of the educated middle class when reporting about the working class young. Moreover, greater attention should be given to this group's problems, outlook and aspirations. Artists and writers have a responsibility here, too.

Similarly, in the academic community, more attention should be given the place of the worker in our society. While whole new departments are being established at many universities to examine the black man's place in society, according to Brendan Sexton, only one course dealing with the problems of the worker, "Labor and Society" at New York University, is offered for sociology students anywhere in the country.[3]

Businesses, for their part, can help ameliorate the situation of alienation among employees by adopting labor practices which give the employee greater control over his working environment. For example, Harwood Manufacturing, a Virginia concern making wearing apparel has experimented successfully with turning all work procedures over to the employees themselves. Management is there only in a consulting relationship. As a result of true sharing of responsibilities, annual employee turnover reduced from 18 percent to 4 percent, and absenteeism dropped from 17 percent a year to 4 percent. Another company, Non-Linear Systems, christened itself after its new production methods, in which the entire product is made by a single employee, rather than on an assembly line. Despite the storied glories of specialization, man-hours required to build products dropped to 50 percent. In another company management told employees to draw up their own salary schedules, a rather radical innovation that at first met resistance—but then enthusiasm—from everyone.

Great responsibility for treating young workers' alienation must rest, in addition, with the unions. The efforts here should be directed at helping the financial plight of the young married worker and, secondly, to giving him a better sense of participation in union affairs.

Unions probably could reach agreements with management to provide for special advancement and "super-seniority" for young workers with superior educational backgrounds or as incentives to those who acquire more education. Some unions have pioneered in that direction already. The educational attainment of most workers, according to 1964 figures, is still low, overall, with an average of 8.9 years of schooling for menial laborers to 12.5 years for sales workers. Where a man has special technical training before he enters the work force, it would seem appropriate to reduce his apprentice period or even allow him to advance directly to foreman positions.

Sharing of labor union leadership also is desirable. Very few unions appear ready to grant union posts to men under thirty, but if men at the top wish to have any rapport with the new men coming along, this backward attitude should be revised. The alternative is increasing revolts by the young workers.

Finally, the federal government, under the leadership of the President, should make the concerns of the young working man and his family its concern too. Present efforts, spurred by Housing and Urban Development Secretary George Romney, to develop new methods of constructing inexpensive housing will be of direct help to young workers in the better paying jobs. Plans to remove the working poor—as federally defined—from income tax rolls altogether, if acted upon, will benefit young workers in less well paying jobs. These initiatives deserve support.

In addition, the government should help relax the economic squeeze in which young workers find themselves by providing long term loans for major expenditures. These loans would require only small payments during the difficult early years of a person's working career, leaving the heaviest payments until later in life when his children would be grown up and his income higher. One easy mechanism for such loans would be the FHA, since the biggest expenditure a young worker faces is housing and since a high percentage of young workingmen, at least, are military veterans. It seems only fair, indeed, that veterans such as these, who are not likely to take advantage of the GI Bill to get advanced education, be rewarded for their service in some other fashion.

No single program, however, is going to curb the growing alienation of the young working man from his society. It will take action on all the fronts we have mentioned. It behooves the President, in these circumstances, not only to act through the government, but to prod the nation's labor, business, educational and communications leadership to give this important and neglected segment of our population a more respected hearing.

---

[1]"Middle Class Workers and New Politics," an unpublished paper.

[2]Pete Hamill, "The Revolt of the White Lower Middle Class," **New York,** April 14, 1969.

[3]Sexton, **op. cit.**

Who Shall Man Free Enterprise?

"Cast your whole vote," said Thoreau, "not a strip of paper merely, but your whole influence." Where the generation of the '30's sought security and the generation of the '40's and '50's sought professional advancement, youth today take continuing prosperity for granted and want their work to be an extension of personal commitment to their beliefs, not just the avenue through which they acquire the liberty to support those beliefs in leisure time.

Increasingly, American youth are disenchanted with the careers of their fathers. Partly it is an expression of the rapidity of job obsolescence through automation and the invention of whole new categories of occupations. The majority of men graduating from college now will enter careers that didn't exist twenty five years ago. The Department of Labor's Dictionary of Job Titles grows in size faster than the telephone book, and social critics announce a coming era when the average citizen will pursue as many as three different careers in a lifetime.

But the trend also reflects this generation's disillusionment with the private economic sector, and particularly business, its personnel policies, lack of concern with social problems and supposed lack of excitement. The young men of today — especially the brightest ones — show an increasing preference for governmental or academic careers, a steady interest in the professions and a declining interest in business. As early as 1964 *The Wall Street Journal* reported this trend among college graduates. In 1966 *none* of the top graduating scholars at Harvard entered business, and of the whole class, more graduating students entered the Peace Corps than entered various industries. Today, on prestige university campuses, business school graduate students are treated condescendingly by other students, however well they are regarded elsewhere. When a sample of young people was asked by the Research Institute of America, "What field of endeavor has made the most significant contribution to the cause of a better life in America for all?" only 7% cited business, while 56% cited education, 11% cited religion, 10% cited government, with the balance mentioning private social groups, technology, radical movements (no answer: 5%).

It is true that the Research Institute's study shows that 24% of American youth still see "the most promising opportunities for (themselves)" in business, as opposed to 18% in art and literature, 9% in science, 8% in politics/government, 8% in religion and so on. But one suspects that 24% would have been much higher for earlier generations. Moreover, when asked what they would do with unlimited finances, only 17% said they would build their own businesses.[1] That figure (and the figure of those who would "retire young and enjoy life") was higher in the South and lower in the North and West.

One reason youth has turned away from business is simply that other work in the society has become more competitive, both in terms of satisfaction and financial consideration. Even on a relative scale, academia and government today provide far more secure and even more comfortable livelihoods than they did twenty years ago. What earlier was proposed in this report, that service opportunities be made financially *feasible* for youth — though money should not be made a primary attraction — has already happened to many full-time careers for adults.

Sam Lubell says his surveys of youth opinion indicate that "In choosing careers . . . students *do not want to seem* motivated by the desire to make money. But they do not really share any Bohemian disdain for money."[2] However, it is one thing to want to make money and another to make one's career choice *primarily* on that consideration. To an extent unprecedented in any previous era, a young person reasonably can hope to do what he wants to do and get paid adequately for it. He may compromise and do something slightly different from what he wants to do because the pay is better. The point is that he doesn't go into Dad's business or some other job wholly separated from his primary interests even though it might offer a much larger bundle of cash. For the educated, financial and non-financial goals are close to convergence in today's job market.

Youth's passion for "relevance," for knowable purpose, for some thematic unity in all of life's activities is a hopeful sign for America. It also should be a hopeful sign for business, for the great commercial nations of history — Athens, Venice, Florence, Holland, England — have been notable as well for their sponsorship of great thinkers and artists, and where often the businessman himself was part-time thinker and artist. A society where the imagination of its people finds equal play in commerce and abstract thought is one constantly enhanced and invigorated.

WASHED OUT

But in America today most of the imaginative young are not finding a home in commerce. Recruiters to big universities are "washed out" by lack of appli-

cants. They can't even get to talk to the man they are seeking. An interesting experiment in 1967 by the Harvard Business School and 30 large corporations speaks to the reasons. Student leaders from across the country spent most of a summer in a special business school program, dividing their time between classes and jobs in the business community. After 10 weeks they were asked to summarize in essays their observations. Several themes predominated. The first assertion was that business as a whole has not taken the initiative in treating social problems. This complaint is sustained by a report of the National Industrial Conference which surveyed 1000 corporate executives and found them concerned only about those social questions bearing directly on their businesses. The narrow pragmatism of most businessmen was noted by the students and it disturbed them. Even where they found managers who were concerned they did not see much action.

The second important criticism they most often mentioned concerned the low level of challenge and responsibility afforded by the jobs traditionally offered to young persons starting out in business.

The first complaint was particularly notable among the students unhappy about the state of society generally, while the second was voiced by a broader segment. The second complaint seems to have the longer history while the first is a more recent phenomenon.

Business is said to emphasize efficiency (the old trait of "practicality") to the detriment of imagination. The individual is frustrated, in the common opinion of youth, by the organizational hierarchy and its highly rigid structure. A conservative management often gives over-detailed instructions for each work situation. Moreover, specialization of tasks and other technological values are so celebrated in theory and so forcefully impressed upon the workers and junior executives that they feel lost and fragmented. "Feeling" — as opposed to analytical thought — is frowned upon and employees tend to avoid identification with their tasks for fear that a sense of involvement will only lead to disappointment. "From an employee's point of view," writes Professor Chris Argyris of Yale, "(management policies) mean that he is asked to be more passive than active, more submissive than responsible: to use his shallow, surface abilities and ignore his more complex and deeper abilities."[3]

The result, many youths feel, is that fathers often can't explain their jobs to their children because they don't understand them themselves. If they find satisfaction in their work it is through the microcosmic pleasures of specialization; they can't see the big picture, can't explain *why* their work is making a better world. If they don't find satisfaction in their work they sublimate by do-it-yourself projects at home and even part-time work at some small personal activity.

TUNNEL VISION

Business confirms its bad reputation with the younger generation by its avoidance of politics and social causes. A large Western airplane manufacturing concern held a seminar of "integrative science" where a presentation was made of the need for research and technology to be tied to the whole range of human aspirations. The speaker was hardly through when a vice-president asked, "This is all very interesting, but how will it sell airplanes?" That businessman, most likely, not only avoids long range social problems in his work, but avoids them outside as well. Corporations — with some notable exceptions — do not take an *avant garde* position on such questions as civil rights, the war in Vietnam, or foreign aid. The billboard manufacturer does not speak up on auto safety and air pollution for fear the auto manufacturer will speak up on highway beautification, and the auto maker reciprocates. When such individuals do appear and make an impact it is almost never in anticipating reforms that might cost them money, but rather in fighting reforms proposed by others. Add price fixing scandals, built-in obsolescence, and the suspicions held out the "Military-Industrial Complex's" influence on defense policy, the irresponsible claims of advertising on one's time and credulity, and business, as a whole, in terms of public service, seems to come out a net minus.

Finally, the young deem business less attractive now quite apart from its attitudes and policies simply because business "is not where the action is." Television, that funhouse mirror of public curiosity, has programs showing the glamor of doctors, of entertainers and even of soldiers and political leaders, but businessmen are seen, if at all, as drab and boring.

Business now recognizes this gap between itself and youth and has tried fitfully to bridge it. Some of its efforts merely amuse and annoy youth. "In recent years," writes former NSA President Gene Groves, "businessmen have become more interested than students in solving the 'identity crisis.' Students have little difficulty deciding how they should act; they are concerned with genuine intellectual and human values. Businessmen, though, have begun to ask each other, and to ask students, 'How can we improve our image?' This question is interpreted by students, 'How can we posture to get more money and to attract brighter apprentices?' "

NEITHER DOLLARS NOR FLAK

From Groves' statement, one can see that business is not going to be able to solve its personnel problem with the old tactics of pay raises inspired by supply and demand, nor with the new tactics of public relations. Behind the poor image youth have of business lies much truth and business needs to consider the charges against it very seriously. Government, too, should be

concerned, for the long term question, who mans the free enterprise system, is of interest to it too.

First, if business wants to attract top young talent — and to keep such talent happy — it must identify itself not only with the liberal, humanitarian "image," but lend substance to it. Businessmen should take more time to participate in public affairs and should not fear that their company association will get into the papers. Indeed, companies themselves should take more stands on public questions. The pendulum of involvement has swung so far away from the self-interested manipulation of the late 19th Century "robber-barons" that many businesses today seem to feel they have no political or social role at all, outside of selling their product. Churches are groping for a more political role, and so are universities. One would not suggest that political causes should preoccupy such institutions; only that the causes cannot be ignored. The same is true for business. A factory or law firm has not satisfied its community obligation by providing jobs; it also must help the community channel its growth in constructive, human-centered ways.

For many businesses, concern for socio-political matters should be a *raison d'etre*. If there is a profit to be made in slum building ownership, there also can be reasonable profit in slum rehabilitation. If there is money in milking the poor through credit deals, there also can be money in job recruiting for the poor. If once, in Coolidge's phrase, the business of America was business, the proper business of business today is America. The dynamic private sector potentially can regain its position as chief problem-solver in society, and not just as the exploiter of safe conditions the government guarantees.

At the same time, business should re-examine the style of its operations to see where management policies now inspire invidious politicking and organizational competition, what Professor Argyris calls "effective followership (never go beyond the point the boss can tolerate)" and management by negative incentives of fear and crisis. "Precisely because the U. S. has gone farthest in helping employees fulfill their physical and security needs," says Argyris, "it becomes all the more urgent that the industrial structure be adapted to satisfy their higher needs. Ironically, the problem is just as urgent at the executive and managerial level as it is on the production line."

The qualities of corporate life Argyris and others would encourage are risk-taking, trust, openness and shared responsibility. A study by Yale showed that of 165 top executives in some 10 firms 95% favored these concepts, yet almost all had half-deceiving ways of behaving other than they professed.

Trust and responsibility, however, are the two top qualities for which young people today are seeking in work. Improved summer training programs would encourage such youth and permanent management policies which decentralize decision-making as much as possible would help retain younger personnel. As it is, most executives are secretly too protective of their power to vest much of it in lower level employees and convince themselves that such a propitious gamble actually would be a dangerous one. The old "team" ideal of the 50's must be mitigated by greater respect for eccentricity and individual inspiration.

DECENTRALIZE

A government advisory commission on technology and innovation headed by Robert A. Charpe of Union Carbide reported that a remarkable percentage of modern inventions in America still come from the small company and the individual scientist rather than from the large corporate research tanks. Air conditioning, xerography, the polaroid camera and cellophane are just a few examples.[4] The reason for the productiveness of individuals as opposed to research teams is that genius is still largely personal, expressing a commitment and requiring one far different from that imposed by structured time-schedules and the rules of a corporate bureaucracy. Hence, if the large corporations want to do more innovative research or encourage imagination in any sphere — if they want to break down the silent barriers to cooperation — they either will break their company into a series of semi-autonomous organizations or simply decentralize within one large organization. In every case, the objective should be to give the employee maximum chance to set his own course — and often even his own objectives.

Is the risk worth it? In this connection consider the confession of IBM's Arthur K. Watson: "The disk memory unit, the heart of today's random access computer, is not the logical outcome of a decision made by IBM management. It was developed in one of our laboratories as a bootlegged project — over the stern warning from management that the project had to be dropped because of budget difficulties. A handful of men ignored the difficulties. They broke the rules."

Fortunately, some companies, large and small, are awake to the real reasons for business' sagging popularity with youth — not just to the imagery. If business has much to learn from youth, youth can learn a great deal — and accept leadership — from those businesses which are progressive and innovative.

Large corporations, under the threat of the conglomerate takeover are being forced to streamline their structure and procedures. More attention is being paid to management development and less to rewarding seniority. A trained college graduate still has an opportunity in many companies to make or break himself, assuming he is willing to take risks. Duncan McGregor has gained a significant following among top corpor-

ate executives for the type of management which believes individuals can be motivated best by giving them maximum control over their work environment. Surely there will remain havens for the mediocre in business, as in other fields, but exciting and fulfilling business careers do exist.

SOME EFFORTS

Business can argue also that if its record of involvement in social and political causes is not all it should be, at least there is notable movement in the right direction. Particularly in the profit-making area, some businesses are innovating. The Budd Company has introduced a new commuter train to help alleviate the transportation snarl in America. Aqua Chem Corporation is attacking the problems of water pollution with economical water purification and anti-pollution devices. Westinghouse and International Disposal Corporation both are working on methods of reusing disposable wastes.

Some businesses are getting involved in social problems even though the profit margin may be slight. AVCO Corporation, for example, located one of its new plants in Boston's Roxbury ghetto, training 250 local people for the new jobs. Something similar was undertaken by Aerojet-General in Los Angeles where a subsidiary to manufacture tents — providing 400 jobs — was established in the Watts section. One of the most significant ventures has been the combined efforts at job training for the chronically unemployed through the National Alliance of Businessmen. Their goal, quite outside the profit motive, was to hire and retrain 100,000 hard core unemployables by this summer, a task they have completed. The goal for 1971 is 500,000. The participating industries are performing a social service government has proven incapable of handling.

At this point it is fair to ask, what has all this to do with the government and particularly with the new Administration? What can government do to help business take progressive directions and become more attractive to youth?

First, the Administration should be diligent in its regulation of business abuses, for the excesses of particular concerns and particular industries poison the reputation among youth of business as a whole. This means tougher laws against billboards on public highways, higher rates for "junk mail," and closer control of the honesty and tastefulness of advertising, including packaging. It means fast and convenient recourse to consumers whose products have failed to live up to advertised or warrantied specifications. It means stringent anti-pollution controls to protect against all types of environmental disruption: sound, air, water, land.

Beside the stick of regulation, the Administration can offer the carrot of tax and other incentives for business to become more responsive to the social needs of the economy. Positive incentives should include guarantees and insurance which might lower the cost of borrowed capital just as the FNMA mortgages make money available to borrowers. It means reordering the investment tax credit which stimulated widespread capital spending in the early 1960's to target its appeal to businesses with social service aspects, examples of which we have mentioned. It should mean special preferences for government contracts and franchises to businesses which demonstrate social concern in their operations. And we recommend that the President inaugurate a Business Statesman of the Year award, the recipient selected by a panel of distinguished citizens, to recognize a particular business or individual that has shown outstanding public responsibility and service.

'PRIVATIZATION'

We also believe that the government should help business' constructive role in the society by further experimentation with what Peter F. Drucker call the "privatization" of many government services. In an article in the Winter, 1969 *Daedalus,* Eastern Gas and Fuel's Eli Goldston declares that either our economy will change towards more government control and a further increase in the trend toward socialization or will change away from government control and toward increasing reliance on the private sector. We share with him a confidence in the free enterprise system and in the efficiency of the modern corporation. We also note the inefficiency with which the government is handling such services as the police force, the welfare agencies and the post office. Businesses, guided by the profit motive, and actually competing for contracts to handle specific national public functions and complete management of certain local governmental units, could offer fresh approaches to the problems of declining quality of governmental services.

Professor Edward C. Banfield of Harvard has stated that government is incapable of solving the problems of our cities, in particular. "All of the serious problems of our cities are largely insoluble now," he says, "and will be for the forseeable future." Somehow, the cycle of urban over-growth and decay must be slowed, at least. Hence, to carry our proposals one more step, we recommend that business be given tax breaks to encourage the development of entire new towns. Any corporation or group of corporations which could offer enough jobs to support 1,000 households would be encouraged to negotiate with the federal government for a franchise to develop a new town at a location agreed upon by federal planning agencies and the corporate planning staff. This franchise would give the corporation the right to develop a master plan for the total environment of that community similar to the plans developed at Reston, Virginia or

Columbia, Maryland. Recreation, water, power, law enforcement and city government would be included in the scope of the plan, and the corporation further would be given a free hand to develop the area peripheral to the territory surrounding the original location.

We believe that business, within the present capitalist system, tempered by government regulation and public scrutiny, and spurred by Presidential encouragement, can recover the central place it once held in the aspirations of American youth. The capitalist system, boasting over 24 million stockholders, is still the nation's economic hope. If some businesses also become part of the nation's hope for social reform, they will find all the young talent they need, and the competition will force other businesses into change too. It's the law of supply and demand.

[1]The Younger Generation: "An RIA Survey of College Students." The question and the full answers follow:

If you had unlimited finances, what use would you make of it?

	Male %	Female %	Total %
Devote my life to public service	21	25	22
Retire young and enjoy life	21	12	18
Build my own business	21	8	17
Finance a center for creative people	6	13	8
Set up a foundation for scientific research	6	12	8
Endow a university	6	8	7
Devote my life to contemplation	4	1	3
Use it for political upheaval, social reform	4	2	3
All	1	2	2
No answer	10	17	12

[2]Samuel Lubell, "How Young People Think," **op. cit.**

[3]Chris Agyris, "We Must Make Work More Worthwhile," **Life.**

[4]Donald A. Schon, **Technology and Change,** Delacorte, N.Y., 1967.

Citizen-Initiative Among Youth

President Nixon is already on record with a strong commitment to strengthening the private, non-profit sector of society in its efforts to treat the problems of America. This commendable new concern of the federal government, properly developed, could add considerable luster to the Nixon Presidency and an increased dignity to the individual citizen.

Youth have a natural place in the forefront of the volunteer service cause, and there are a variety of actions the President can take to spur young people's direct constructive involvement in the task of healing America's sores.

TAX INCENTIVES

The first step in returning citizen-initiative to the area of service is an income tax *credit* (as opposed to the present tax *deduction,* which is not very helpful to those with small incomes, such as most youth) for money contributed to charitable or recognized public service organizations.

The second step is another tax credit for contributions to any political party, political committee or semi-political (i.e. civil rights) committee.

The federal government can well afford the shift of money from federal to private giving that would result from these tax credits, limited, as they should be to a small fraction of one's total tax bill (say, $10.00 per person per year). The cost of the Vietnam war, and the resulting cutback in domestic federal spending, have caused many to overlook the fact that federal revenues are growing by some $7 billion dollars a year; at war's end the loss of a few hundred million to the volunteer sector for charitable and public service purposes will be quite feasible, and in the long run would save the government money.

More controversial, however, would be tax credits for political activities. Many in Congress propose that some financial aid be injected directly into the political process, but outright grants inevitably would entail government controls and ignore the essential role in our system of intra-partisan and bi-partisan groups (the Americans for Democratic Action, the Young Americans for Freedom, the Ripon Society, the Committee for an Effective Congress, etc.). These, and small protest parties, would be squeezed out by the two major national parties. The two major parties, meanwhile, would remain just as unresponsive as they are now, but with vast new, centralized power. A small tax credit, again limited to $10.00 for contributions to any political or semi-political group would, on the other hand, leave choice with the individual taxpayer. Though some might give their money to the Black Panthers or to the John Birch Society, just as they give non-deductible money now, others would give their credit's worth to more "respectable" groups, just as they do now. Everyone would be master of his own contribution, and of course could opt to make no contribution and simply pay the money as taxes. Abuses (fake committees and the like) would be investigated by the Internal Revenue Service, just as abuses are in the present system. It would be a subsidy of no one; it would be an incentive for all to participate in decision-making.

The two proposed forms of tax incentives for individuals would help open an enormous flow of volunteer sector vitality. Young people would be especially assisted in acquiring the habit of giving, because their tax bracket is usually so low that present *deduction* incentives do not suffice to induce financial participation in charitable and service projects. The volunteer associations themselves would find a new financial constituency in this generation and be at once aided and influenced by it. The effect would be greatest on youth controlled associations, particularly those concerned with politics. These groups would be enormously invigorated by a tax credit that enabled their members for the first time to give money as well as energy to their causes.

YOUTH SERVICE FOUNDATION

Another way in which a youth lobby might help expand the role of voluntarism would be through creation of a National Foundation for Youth Service, designed to broaden involvement in essentially non-political service and to emphasize the truth that service serves both the served and server. Establishment would come from a one-time only federal endowment, adapted from the formula Lincoln pioneered in founding the land-grant colleges. The endowment principle represents another way the federal government can pump new life into the volunteer sector, to redress the balance it upsets itself, while retaining no management of volunteer programs thereafter. It should get in and get out. Private sources, spurred by the tax incentives recommended earlier, would finance future capital expansion.

This foundation would not operate any service projects of its own, but would complement and assist programs already in operation. Most young Americans are simply unaware of the wide variety of inviting service opportunities available to them. The National Foundation for Youth Service would collect and pub-

lish local, regional and national lists of service positions available, and function as a clearing-house for helping the right person find the right project. This activity would be coordinated with all the nation's high schools and colleges. The foundation also might accumulate and distribute information on paying jobs that have a service aspect to them, such as interning in a mayor's office or counselling at a summer camp. These clearing-house functions would include both summer projects and projects lasting one or two years after one's formal education.

The National Foundation for Youth Service would grant a certain number — hopefully many — service fellowships on a "subsistence-plus" basis, for the millions of young people, especially the poor, who would like to take a meaningful job with service significance, but who would have to have some financial support in order to afford it. The national intern program in Congress and the Executive branch, cut back in recent years, was hardly generous, yet it provided enough money for selected college students to live during a summer while they worked on Capitol Hill. Such service builds confidence, broadens outlook and enhances skills, as well as contributing to the productiveness of Congress and the Administration. Importantly, such government service is (or was) truly open to the rich or poor students alike, which unhapily is not true of many spheres of non-government volunteer activity. Why should only the well-off enjoy the benefits of service? Surely equality of opportunity to *serve* should be enshrined among the other evolving values of this generation.

Such a program to stimulate service, indeed, would anticipate a day when a large majority of students, whether in high school or college could and would give one or more of their summers or possibly one or two years after schooling to a cause appropriate to each individual's interests and abilities. There are thousands of tasks in America and abroad that want doing, with plenty of choice among them for any individual — work in hospitals, work with retarded children, work with children in slum areas, work for the churches or through the churches, scholarly research in the public interest, beautification projects, overseas assistance. In almost every instance a volunteer program already exists. Where one does not, a strengthened volunteer sector always will be more quick, inventive and experimental than the federal government in devising one. All that's needed is to acquire more volunteers.

Since such service is a broadening and educational experience which takes one out of various externally and internally imposed ghettos and helps one to meet one's "other halves." Colleges might well give credit for certain volunteer projects, just as some do already for Peace Corps service.

RIDING THE RAILS

The Foundation should also take action to increase the mobility of service volunteers. A cooperative arrangement with the nation's railroads, airlines and buslines could be sought to provide free transportation for any young person participating in a service project away from his home. In Denmark the national railroad gives every secondary student a round-trip ticket to any place he chooses to travel during summer vacation. In America the tickets could be limited to youths in service projects.

Thus a Harlem student with a summer service opportunity in the Rockies could have a way of getting to it, while, in another case, the ticket would mitigate the loss of alternative earnings for a middle class student in, say, California, who took a teaching job on Chicago's South Side. For those who worked in their own neighborhoods, the trip might come at the end of their work period, as a gift.

Toward the same end, the proposed Foundation for Youth Service might stimulate the youth hostel program in this country. In Europe students and other young persons can visit great cities, parklands and historic sites — coming to know their own country and countrymen personally — for a very little money, while staying at clean and respectable youth hostels run by churches, the government or other non-profit institutions. The hostels usually charge less than a dollar a night for room and board. In America, however the hostel program lacks adequate funding, and young people who travel to large cities and scenic rural areas frequently are faced with a choice of an expensive hotel or a flophouse. A properly financed national system of youth hostels, perhaps operated in connection with our universities and churches, would complement the service scholarship and travel programs and further encourage fellowship among youths of many backgrounds.

Finally, it must be said that a number of worthy programs utilizing volunteers presently are operated by the government itself, and for the sake of diversity, these should be continued. Moreover, we can only agre with the campaign pledge of President Nixon (on the NBC Network, October 16, 1968) to bring these activities together under one independent Youth Service Agency in the Administration. This organization also would contain a Sports and Fitness Section, a World Activity Section and "a young people's ombudsman."

But most of the government's attention should go to encouraging volunteer projects outside the federal system. The ruling guide should be: support the idea of service, but leave it unbound. Above all, give to youth the greatest chance to reassert this ancient American virtue. For them it will be a natural challenge of renewed meaning.

X. Youth International

The World-Wide Union of Youth

No previous generation has been so engaged with the rest of the world as the current one. Partly this is a result of television and newspapers; partly of the educational explosion. Youth grew up watching newscasts that funnel the world into their living rooms. In unprecedented numbers, they study history and foreign affairs in high school and college. Growing up under the shadow of the Bomb, moreover, automatically internationalizes their concerns.

Many of this generation have been sent to war in Southeast Asia and others on policing details to Latin America, and a million of them — even in "peacetime" — are at any moment United States policemen on bases in Europe, Japan and a score of other nations. Peace Corpsmen can be found in 57 countries, and dozens of private organizations such as the American Field Service and the Experiment in International Living send students to live with foreign families throughout the non-communist world. Other thousands of students study and travel independently; and some considerable number have raised the $1400 to finance an air ticket around the world. A good many students, including many in high school, have befriended foreign youth studying here. This fellowship of young Americans and foreigners has quickened youth's interest in the customs and tastes of others.

Youth's opinion of the rest of mankind is also changed, if only by personalizing the clichés concerning a world one-third prosperous and two-thirds deprived. They have seen for themselves that ninety-four percent, the non-Americans, live on one-half the world's income, 80 percent in what we would call sub-standard housing, and 50 percent without minimally adequate diets. No one who has tried to find educated persons to lead literacy projects in an underdeveloped country (one-half of one percent of the rest of the world have a college education), no one who has seen the pathetic demonstrations for democracy in Greece or Argentina or who has tried to find a drink of pure water in an Indian village, can later retain his confidence in the optimistic simplicities that seem to inspire the American view of the world. The American complaints that foreign aid (the exiguous, string-wrapped $2 billion we now give) is bleeding the United States dry seem not only ignorant but immoral. And one begins to discover that the American influence abroad is not the uniquely benevolent force civics teachers teach it is, that the underdeveloped world has often picked up from us only the worst of American commercialism and materialism — but not the wealth for democratic distribution.

The United States, it is said, cannot afford more foreign aid or lowered trade barriers for the less developed nations; but we are told we can afford thirty billion dollars a year for the Vietnam war in order to maintain an international image of strength and compassion. Youth meeting youth abroad are skeptical of such rationalizations. Although American travellers bear passports enjoining them to good behavior, they are embarrassed by their country more often than they embarrass it.

What about the Peace Corps? What indeed. "The generation for which I speak has seen enough of warmongers," said John F. Kennedy, "let our great role in history be that of peacemakers." The Peace Corps was established as an earnest of America's concern for service and building. Today, however, the Peace Corps is under attack from many of its former and current volunteers for alleged bureaucratization and overstaffing, failure to involve natives of host countries in administrative decision-making and for a general willingness to sacrifice true effectiveness for prestige products that will make the program look good back home.

SCANDAL

Disillusionment marred another area where youth had been active internationally when in 1967 the NSA-CIA scandal broke. The National Student Association had been founded after World War II as a voice for American college and graduate students, a means of sharing common campus government techniques and also as an agency of communication and "solidarity" with students around the world. In the middle of the Cold War, the CIA looked to the student group as a mechanism for influencing student opinion around the world. Since America was in the throes of McCarthyism at the time and the NSA had a somewhat liberal tinge, the Congress could not be expected to approve support, the State Department felt similarly constrained, and the job fell to the CIA.

In return for their support, the CIA insisted on okaying the leadership of the national body before it was elected and occasionally laid down other stipulations, such as a watered-down Vietnam statement at one of the NSA Congresses. It all came out eventually when a NSA official leaked the whole story to *Ramparts* magazine.

The CIA-NSA scandal represented a moral dilemma whose proper response only became clear to the student participants after the scandal broke: better no foreign programs at all rather than ones secretly backed by an intelligence agency. But the most telling

lesson of the episode was the government's indifference to youth's need for independence. Even after the scandal, the Administration failed to take this lesson to heart, appointing a committee headed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to find a new formula for subsidizing the "CIA orphans." Most of the committee's ideas involved some sort of subsidy openly given without strings, as if that were possible. But no decisions were made.

Today, NSA is not much interested in overseas activity. Instead, the pendulum of concern has swung to the student power issues at home. But meanwhile American youth have lost a leadership role in the world, surrendering initiative to the Soviet Union, which is propagating anti-U.S. feeling, particularly among the socialist youth of Scandanavia and Southern Europe. In such a fashion was a legitimate and important world role of American youth compromised and then abandoned.

REACHING OUT

Young people cannot be expected alone to reform foreign policy, but they can expect of their government a new approach, working with the same principles of voluntarism, service, tolerance, pluralism and participatory democracy which they hope to advance domestically. As youth meet each other as equals here and assign their generation special tasks, so must they reach out to the youth of the world.

In one sense the youth of the United States and those of the rest of the world face radically different challenges. Most underdeveloped nations have yet to acquire the material abundance that we take for granted — and have found inadequate as an end in itself. The exception, of course, are our deprived youth, particularly blacks, who still aspire to economic security and who, not surprisingly, are well able to understand the rising expectations of the Third World. Many black youth, indeed, have been inspired by the example of the cultural rediscovery occuring in the homelands of their ancestors, just as earlier generations of Irish ancestry took pride in Irish independence, and as many Jews take pride in Israel today.

The communion of most American youth, however, is with the elite youth abroad, either those in industrial societies or those segments of youth in the developing world who have raised themselves enough above subsistence to be concerned intelligently with higher education and political and social affairs.

Indeed, two factors unite the elite youth of the rest of the world with the majority of youth in the United States, and both help explain the growing commonness of youth rebellions around the globe. First, prosperity in the industrial nations and selective prosperity in the developing nations have created whole classes of people who actually can afford to *have* a "youth"; that is, a period clearly set apart from adolescence and full adult obligations when one has the freedom to engage fully in idealistic causes and personal intellectual growth. Given this growing phenomenon, a "youth class" conciousness is emerging all over the world.

Secondly, youth almost everywhere are faced with rapid change as a norm. As changes speed up, respect for tradition and constituted authority comes increasingly into question. Moreover, as Kenneth Keniston writes in *The Young Radicals,* "All youth are linked by their common vulnerability to technological death," and that, too, leads to questioning of the established order.

All youth in industrial nations, in fact, seem to be striving for a greater role in society as their world wide "revolt" demonstrates. Communist countries' youth and Western youth, given a chance, could appreciate each other's courage, for there is something universal in the martyrdom of a Galanskov and a Michael Ferber of the Draft Resistance movement. But they are privileged American youth, hopefully finding their own purpose in service, who are in the best position of all to lead their counterparts in a world-wide economic and educational revolution that will focus not only on domestic reform but on help for the two-thirds of the world where most youth still live in ignorance and physical deprivation.

FIGHTING THE BRAIN DRAIN

This American generation, reaching power, can push forward an educational revolution, employing some of the same tools urged earlier for reform at home. For example, the same principle of endowment for education (promoted in Chapter 6) could lead us to establish whole universities abroad to train teachers and other vitally needed professionals. Currently, thousands of youth from developing nations are sent to the United States and other Western countries for advanced training and are tempted by superior job opportunities to stay after graduation; in fact, according to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, fully 30 percent do.[1] The resulting brain drain counteracts much of the good our teaching does in supplying trained leaders for the Third World. Therefore, a first step in helping other nations to train and *keep* their brightest talent could be accomplished by 1) helping create college and technical facilities in the overseas nations themselves — and on a no-strings basis; and 2) helping finance adequate research and other sophisticated facilities to encourage the talented young to stay in their own countries after being educated.

Another educational tool American youth can easily put in the hands of the developing nations is films/television/radio. Most countries of course already have radio stations and some programming. Many have television, and the United States Informa-

tion Service does provide some assistance, but the help could be greatly expanded. Specifically, the U.S. could aid nations in building whole television networks and educational systems such as we already have in Samoa. USIS further could operate a "Communication Media Bank" of American produced programs, dubbed in a foreign language where necessary, and could produce special films at low cost on request. There are thousands of budding film producers among youth at home who would welcome a job of such humanitarian benefit. Present emphasis is on getting foreigners to use films about the United States; the new approach would offer help to the foreign government in producing film it wanted.

In the field of overseas service America should take the lead in organizing the Peace Corps on an international basis, probably under the aegis of the United Nations. The objective is to bring together the educated youth of industrial nations, join them with the Third World's elite youth, and occupy all of them in peaceful construction of a better world. This personal contact through service would do more than any single current aid program to unite the world in common growth and purpose.

Under this proposal, the International Peace Corps organization would act chiefly as a clearinghouse for matching youth and service positions. Applicants and various institutions in participating nations — rather than governments — would be connected directly. Hiring and work-living agreements also would be reached directly between the applicant and the given institutions abroad. There would be no in-country staff and the volunteers would not be seen as working for the U.S. agency, which would relieve a common burden. Salary would be paid by the host institution, an important psychological point, with reimbursement from the International Peace Corps. However, national embassies might decide to provide workers from their countries certain services such as medical care.

Under the International Peace Corps, volunteers would be trained by a specially established IPC school for languages, informational briefings, and, where necessary, physical fitness. Yet the volunteer would be subject to no ongoing restrictions from the IPC. His arrangements regarding travel, possession of an automobile (long a sticky problem in the Peace Corps) or the right to wear a beard would be made directly with the host institution. He also would agree to abide by local laws and justice.

The upshot, as in the case of the World Bank, would be more effective peacemaking by the United States through the indirect approach and, ultimately, more respect for us too.

Finally, the new Administration also should give fresh consideration to revising all the current and recently cut-back international exchange programs involving youth, including the "CIA orphans." While youth leadership properly may be directed toward student power issues at home, it is equally important that it be encouraged to become engaged in speaking for American youth abroad and in getting to know youth's counterparts overseas.

The kind of official exchanges enjoyed in the past should be re-evaluated. The old formal tour may be outdated. Longer trips in which American youth actually work and live and discuss-in depth with their foreign counterparts may be more useful. If the future leaders of the community of nations are to understand each other, they must come to know each other, and the earlier the better.

But new forms of financing also are needed. The widest possible level of interchange between youth leaders in America and those overseas should be encouraged by the government. However, the most propitious means for handling the situation would be for the President and his Administration to organize a blue ribbon group of American business and professional and union leaders to raise the needed money privately. A fund raising campaign blessed by the President probably would have success where current efforts are inadequate. If the tax credits for non-profit giving recommended in Chapter 5 also could be adopted, youth groups themselves could raise much of the needed funds.

Fulfillment of the American mission of youth requires us to serve mankind as well as ourselves. That is our traditional calling; that is the modern implication we should find in Tocqueville's remark, "I must confess I saw, in America, more than America." There is nothing wrong with this generation's continuing and expanding the American involvement in the rest of the world. But peaceful revolution, not today's uninspired rescuing of the *status quo,* should be the nature of their role. With enlightened programs, the federal government can do much to assure that this indeed is the role chosen by the moderate majority.

[1]Quoted by U.S. Senator Walter Mondale at the Conference on Higher Education and the International Flow of Manpower: **Implications for the Developing World,** University of Minn., Minneapolis, April 14, 1967.

SUMMARY

We asserted early in this report our faith in the continuing validity and vitality of the American democratic system. We propose here to adjust it significantly to grant the youth of the nation a greater say and a more just role in our common destiny: more rights, more responsibility.

No single reform is going to heal the breach between the generations. But a series of constructive changes could make mutual communication and trust much more likely. As a beginning, we have presented such a series of reforms and urge the President to take the lead in promoting them.

Greater and lesser, the reforms include:

OVERSEAS

Federal legislation for the enfranchisement of 18-year-olds.

United States aid in building educational television and film systems abroad.

Internationalization of the Peace Corps under the United Nations.

Reestablishment on a privately financed basis, officially encouraged by the President, of the international youth programs curtailed under the previous Administration.

LEGAL RIGHTS

An immediate Presidential Commission on the Age of Legal Maturity, which would consider proposals for legislation granting "adult" rights uniformly at age 18, and suggest areas of age-discrimination in the federal government which can be eliminated by new laws or Executive Order.

SOCIAL SERVICE

A federal income tax *credit* up to at least $10 for money contributed to charitable or recognized public service organizations.

A federal income tax credit for contributions to any political party, political committee or semi-political (e.g., civil rights) committee.

Federal endowment of a "National Foundation for Youth Service" to act as a clearinghouse for private and public youth service projects and to grant service fellowships to those youth who otherwise could not afford to take a service job. The Foundation also would arrange free or subsidized travel — home to job — for volunteers.

Stimulation of the Youth Hostel program in this country.

Establishment of a Youth Service Agency to bring all government youth activities together.

VOLUNTEER MILITARY

A $130 a month raise in beginning pay for enlisted servicemen, with commensurate raises in the higher ranks.

Higher ranking for skilled personnel in the services to allow more competitive pay.

Shift from a pay and benefits system in the services to a straight salary system.

Establishment of two tracks of career service, one "short term" (8-10 years), one "regular" (20 years) as a way of encouraging volunteers.

Improvement of military housing and community planning.

Commission of senior enlisted men as junior officers.

Increase in the size of military academies and removal of geographical quotas.

Widened educational benefits for ROTC and medical/dental students.

Immediate application to pay raises of money saved through the reduction to troop levels in Vietnam.

Immediate expansion of recruitment campaigns.

Immediate implementation of a draft procedure policy change in which monthly draft quotas will be set only after monthly volunteering quotas at recruitment stations are not met.

Immediate lowering of the mental qualifications for military volunteers to that of draftees.

Focusing military rehabilitation programs on volunteers exclusively rather than on both volunteers and draftees.

Establishment of special basic training for would-be volunteers who fail the military physical examination.

A Presidential and civilian-oriented study of the utility and techniques of basic military training.

Increased civilianization of military positions where possible.

SELECTIVE SERVICE OPERATIONS

Reversal of the draft order of call and institution of a random selection system (already proposed by the President).

Civilianization of the Selective Service System.

Limitation of the Selective Service director to a six-

year term and of local board members to five year terms.
Requirement that all draft board members reside in the district they serve and that all boards be socially and economically representative of their districts.
Separation of the National Selective Service Appeals Board from Selective Service headquarters and placement directly under the President.
Preparation of a readable booklet for each draft registrant explaining his rights, obligations and options.

RIGHTS OF DRAFTEES

A directive to the Selective Service System to revise and condense the Selective Service regulations to a readable length.
A grant to colleges, rather than to the Selective Service System of the right to determine which undergraduate students are making "normal progress" and therefore are entitled to a deferment.
Clarification of the limits on student draft deferments when a man requests one.
Requirement of written reasons for the classification of draft registrants.
Spelling out of "delinquency" reasons in the Selective Service regulations.
A grant to "delinquents" of the right to notice of their status and a chance to undo their failure to abide by the legal requirements.
Grant to draft registrants of the right of counsel, the right to confront witnesses, the right to bring their own witnesses, and the right to make a recording of the procedures.
Requirement of Selective Service System that it submit changes in regulations to Congress in accordance with the Administrative Practices Act.
Presidential directive to courts and prisons on the uniform treatment of convicted draft violators.
Recommendation to Congress of the extension of Conscientious Objector status to Selective Conscientious Objectors, with alternative service required.

STUDENT ROLE

Continuing federal opposition to punitive measures against colleges experiencing student disorders.
Education of the public by the President on the need for a greater student role in university affairs — "a vote as well as a voice."
Establishment of a President's Youth Advisory Council made up of young people 18-30 to advise the President on the effect of national policies on the young, to prepare recommendations for Presidential action, to communicate the President's views to youth and youth's views to the President.
Reinstatement of the widespread federal government summer intern program for students which was curtailed by the previous Administration.
A Housing and Urban Development Department (HUD) program to assist universities which use their facilities and staffs to improve housing conditions in neighborhoods adjoining campuses.
A Disadvantaged Student Education Program, operated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to help universities meet the cost of finding, recruiting and financing talented, but underprivileged, youth.

UNIVERSITY QUALITY

Establishment of two equally important national policy objectives: equal higher educational opportunity and maximum choice in college selection.
The Friedman voucher proposals for direct federal aid to all college and technical school students (as opposed to greater aid to institutions and to tax credits.)
A limited tax credit (in addition to the current tax *deduction*) for financial gifts to non-public higher educational institutions (or alternatively, to all higher educational institutions).
Federal matching endowments of new private colleges, in the spirit of the Morrill Act of 1862; preferably branches of noted quality institutions now in existence, with a planning competition held by the federal government.

BUSINESS

Stricter federal legislation regulating pollution, billboards, and honesty in advertising, and higher rates for junk mail, with one of the objectives being the improvement of the image of free enterprise in the eyes of youth.
Tax incentives for businesses which meet social problems.
A Presidential Business and Labor Statesman of the Year award.
Increased "privatization" of government services such as the Post Office to improve youth's opinion of both business and government.
Tax incentive for businesses developing "New Towns."

YOUNG WORKERS

Continuing Presidential concern for the problems of young workers; e.g., the need for inexpensive housing and lower taxes for the working poor.
Financial aid to struggling young workers through guarantees of long term loans tied to the Federal Housing Administration.

Order Form for Ripon Publications

BOOKS

65-1 **Election '64** — Report on the style, strategy and issues of the 1964 Campaign and state by state analysis of the results, with recommendations. 124 pp. January 1965. Out of print. Xerox copies $7.00 each.

66-1 **From Disaster to Distinction: The Rebirth of the Republican Party** — Ripon Society paperback; 127pp. September, 1966. Unit price: $1.00 (quantity discounts available for more than ten copies).

68-1 **The Realities of Vietnam** — A Ripon Society appraisal. Edited by Christopher W. Beal. Essays by Senator Mark O. Hatfield, Congressman Paul Findley, Josiah Lee Auspitz, Christopher W. Beal, Roger Fisher, I. Milton Sacks, Fred C. Ikle, Congressman John R. Dellenback, Douglas L. Bailey, William I. Cowin, Charles A. Stevenson, William F. Parham, Lee W. Huebner. 186 pp hardbark. Public Affairs Press. $5.00.

68-4 **Our Unfair and Obsolete Draft** — by Bruce K. Chapman. 1968. Unit price: $0.75.

69-1 **The Republican Papers** — Leading House Republicans and academic experts define the problems of the domestic crisis and offer solutions. Edited by Melvin Laird. $1.55.

69-2 **The Lessons of Victory** — by the Ripon Society. 400 pages. Paperback $1.95. Hardback $5.50.

69-3 **Who's Who at Convention '68 & Southern Republicanism and the New South** — SPECIAL COMBINED PRICE, $5.00.

PAPERS

P64-1 **A Call To Excellence in Leadership** — An open letter to the new generation of Republicans. 9pp mimeograph. first printing, January 1964, second printing, July, 1967. Unit price: $0.50.

P64-2 **The Idea for the Ripon Society** — 3pp mimeograph. June 1964. Unit price: $0.25.

P64-3 **A Declaration of Conscience** — A call for return to basic Republican principles; 4pp mimeograph. July 1964. Unit price: $0.25.

P64-4 **A New Republican Mandate** — Preliminary analysis of the 1964 elections; 9pp mimeograph. November 1964. Unit price: $0.50.

P64-5 **The Republican Governors Association; the Case for a Third Force** — 20pp mimeograph. December 1964. Unit price: $0.75.

P66-1 **China '66: Containment and Contact** — a Ripon policy statement. 7pp mimeograph. April 1966. Unit price: $0.50.

P66-2 **Government for Tomorrow** — A proposal for the unconditional sharing of Federal tax revenue with State and Local Governments. A research paper issued jointly by the Republican Governors Association and the Ripon Society. 18pp mimeograph. First printing, July, 1965; Second printing, November, 1966. Unit price: $0.75.

P66-3 **The Potential to Govern** — Ripon statement on the 1966 elections; 4pp printed. November, 1966. Unit price: $0.50.

P66-4 **Politics and Conscription** — A Ripon proposal to replace the draft; 6pp printed. December 1966. Out of print. Available in P68-5 only.

P67-2 **The Negative Income Tax** — A Republican proposal to help the poor; report and recommendations for Congressional action; 6pp printed. April, 1967. Unit price: $0.50. Bulk rate: $0.30 each for ten or more or $10.00 per hundred.

P67-3 **Overkill at Omaha** — analysis of the Young Republican National Federation 1967 Convention at Omaha, Nebraska. 8pp mimeograph. June 1967. Unit price: $0.50.

P68-1 **Multilateral Foreign Aid** — A better way to foster development. 9 pp printed. January, 1968. Unit price: $0.50. Bulk rate: $0.30 for ten or more or $10.00 per hundred.

P68-2 **Here's the Rest of Him** — A report on Ronald Reagan. 24pp printed. June, 1968. Unit price $1.00. Bulk rate: $50.00 per hundred.

P68-3 **The SMIC Boondoggle** — The FORUM'S trailblazing report on the Southwestern Military-Industrial Complex under President Johnson. Copies $0.50 each.

P68-4 **Urban Papers** — Six Ripon position papers on urban financing, neighborhood information centers, welfare, jobs, education and housing. With charts, maps and a special editorial statement. 28 pp. printed. Unit price: $1.00. Bulk: $50.00 per hundred.

P68-5 **Two Position Papers on the Draft** — Unit Price: $1.00, Bulk: $50.00 per hundred.

P68-6 **Ripon FORUM Cumulative Alphabetical Index** — Volume I, Number 1 Through Vol. IV, No. 11. December 1968. 17 pages. Unit price: $0.50.

number	quantity	price
.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....

$10.00 FORUM subscription .....
($5.00 for students, military, Peace Corps and VISTA)

Back Issues of the Ripon FORUM

Single copies: $1.00 .....

Consecutive set: July '65 - June '68 — $30.00 .....

Sub-total .....

3% Sales tax for Mass. residents only .....

Handling charge for orders under $2.00 $0.25

TOTAL .....

Name .....

Address .....

.....

Zip code .....

☐ Check enclosed payable to:

The Ripon Society
14a Eliot Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

(This order form is enclosed for your convenience. If you do not wish to mutiliate your FORUM, a letter will do as well. Just include number, quantity and price in a decipherable form).