

INSIDE:
WHO IS GEORGE BUSH?

\$1.50

RIPON

forum

VOL. XXVII NO. 3

JULY 1991

AMERICAN POLITICS

AN ENDANGERED SPECIES?

**E.J. DIONNE ON
WHY AMERICANS
HATE POLITICS**



EDITOR'S COLUMN

Has American politics gone sour? Or has our system always been dominated by problems equal in scope to today's polarizing rhetoric, special interest power and divided government?

"Perhaps" is the short answer to that question. But the roots of our current frustration — as witnessed to by anti-incumbent movements — are traced by **Washington Post** reporter E.J. Dionne, Jr. in his excellent new book, "Why Americans Hate Politics." As Dionne states in his **Forum** interview: "the cultural civil war of the 1960s" split the nation on issues of race and gender. Since then our politics has been "dominated" by the "false choices" of liberalism and conservatism. Dionne argues that we need the creation of a "new vital center."

A **Forum** editorial agrees with his assessment and shows how a "smart-government" ethic is guiding parts of the GOP. As an example, Ripon President Donald Bliss lends a sense of practicality to transportation issues with his piece on the nation's aviation system. And new Ripon Chairman Sherwood Boehlert provides several alternatives for a key domestic issue: health care. In a review of George Bush's presidency, I also examine whether or not his administration is leading us closer to the political center.

Perhaps this is an appropriate spot to interject that I have been privileged to edit this magazine of "progressive Republicanism" for the last ten years. At the end of this month, however, I will return to Texas to assume responsibilities as an editorial writer and columnist for **The Dallas Morning News**. While that undertaking will also be exciting, I do not move along without a sense of loss. Assembling this magazine over the last decade with our team of **Ripon Forum** editorial board members has produced a real sense of joy. And hearing from you, our readers, has created an important connection. For all of this I am indebted, and I know we all look forward to this magazine's growth as a voice within American politics.

—Bill McKenzie

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITOR'S COLUMN	2
PROFILES AND PERSPECTIVES:	
A Conversation with E.J. Dionne, Jr.	3
THE NEW WORLD ORDER: New Hope For U.S. Weapons Procurement Reform	
Judyth L. Twigg	7
EDITORIALS:	
Moving Away From False Choices	8
IS GEORGE BUSH A PROGRESSIVE REPUBLICAN?	
William P. McKenzie	10
RIPON FORUM SURVEY	13
REVIEWS:	
Fortunate Son: Lewis B. Puller, Jr. Alfred W. Tate	16
A CHALLENGE TO U.S. AVIATION LEADERSHIP: Launching the New Era of Global Aviation	
Donald T. Bliss, Jr.	18
THE CHAIRMAN'S CORNER:	
The Issue of the '90s: National Health Care Sherwood Boehlert	20
709 Second Street	23

RIPON *forum*

Editor: William P. McKenzie

Production Director: Bradley E. Kendall

Editorial Board:

David A. Fuscus Peter Smith
Stephen A. Messinger Mariann Kurtz
Alfred W. Tate Steven Klinsky
Jean Hayes Terrence M. O'Sullivan

Design Consultant: R.J. Matson

Editorial Assistants: Paul Castronovo, Chuck Visconsi, George Kaye

THE RIPON FORUM (ISSN 0035-5526) is published bi-monthly in 1991 by The Ripon Society. Contents are copyrighted 1991 by the Ripon Society, Inc., 709 Second St., N.E., Ste., 100, Washington, D.C. 20002. In the publication the Society hopes to provide a forum for fresh ideas, well researched proposals, and a spirit of creative criticism and innovation in the Republican

Party. Manuscripts and photographs are solicited, but do not represent the views of the Society unless so stated.

Second class postage and fees paid at Washington, D.C. and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to Ripon Forum, 709 Second St., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.

Subscription rates: \$30 per year, \$17.50 for students, servicemen, Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas, please add \$6. Please allow five weeks for address change.

The Ripon Society Inc., Donald T. Bliss, Jr., president, is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are business, academic, and professional men and women. It is headquartered in Washington, D.C., with National Associate members throughout the United States. Ripon is supported by chapter dues, individual contributions, and revenues from its publications.

PROFILES AND PERSPECTIVES

A Conversation with E.J. Dionne, Jr.



E.J. Dionne, Jr.

*E.J. Dionne's journalistic career has included stints in Paris, Rome and Beirut. But it is this nation's governing process which is the focus of **The Washington Post** reporter's new book, "Why Americans Hate Politics."*

*Dionne contends that neither left nor right is capable of providing the "basics" American voters want from their political leaders. As he tells **Forum** editor Bill McKenzie in this interview, Americans want "moderation among various values." According to the Harvard and Oxford graduate, a "new center can be recreated around the strong consensus in our society that believes in tolerance and also believes certain values must be encouraged, not coerced, by government."*

In addition, Dionne discusses George Bush's grasp of the GOP and Richard Nixon's presidency, which he describes as "modern Republicanism's last, best hope."

Not all is lost for Riponers, whose progressivism has often been equated with the term "modern Republicanism." Dionne writes in his book that Ripon members "turned out to be an unusually creative bunch" and that the Society's impact has often gone beyond its numbers. About the future of progressive Republicanism, he says that the chance for a "governing moderate-to-liberal Republicanism are dim, but moderate-to-liberal Republicans will be essential to the whole governing process."

Ripon Forum: The thesis of your book, as you put it, is that "liberalism and conservatism are framing political issues as false choices." What's the basis of your argument?

Dionne: Our politics has been dominated for two decades by the cultural civil war of the 1960s, which divided the country on a number of issues, notably those having to do with race, gender and sexuality. Yet most Americans have actually settled the cultural civil war for themselves, and, if they haven't, the kind of discussion they're looking for is not the kind we're now getting.

For example, most Americans accept the entry of women into the workforce and believe that women and men are equal. At the same time, most Americans are uneasy about how the new work arrangements affect children. What they're looking for is a world which treats the sexes equally and children well. The debate we're having which casts feminism as the enemy of the "traditional family" really doesn't help at all.

On racial issues, we have a similar polarization and Americans are very uncomfortable with it. The debate over the civil rights bill is very unhealthy. Most white Americans accept that black Americans have operated under unfair burdens for a long time and they are prepared to do something. Yet both blacks and whites know that affirmative action itself is not enough to solve the problems of injustice.

There are a great many within the black community who are stuck at the bottom of our class structure who are not even in a position to take advantage of affirmative action. There are also some whites of low-to-moderate income who acknowledge the racial unfairness experienced by blacks, yet who

want to know what, dear government, are you going to do for me?

That's a legitimate question, and this civil rights debate is not dealing with it in a way which will provide racial peace. This debate is following a path that is making the problem worse.

Ripon Forum: In listening to you now, and in reading your book, it seems that we want everything. For instance, you write: "Americans believe in social concern and self-reliance; they want to match rights with obligations; they think public moral standards should exist but are skeptical of too much meddling in the private affairs of others."

Dionne: I don't think we want everything; we want moderation. People understand the distinction between using the government in a very coercive way and using government to promote things without coercion.

In my book, I talk about when government spends billions of dollars in various ways, it invariably affects the shape of our society, including our values. Depending upon how they are structured, for example, welfare programs will contain either strong or weak incentives for work or strong or weak incentives for keeping families together.

Polls show that people hate welfare and yet they also want to help the poor. I don't think that's contradictory. People are looking for a system of helping the poor that will encourage the poor back into the workforce.

I don't think we want everything. It's a question of wanting moderation among various values.

Ripon Forum: The path you present for achieving this moderation is the creation of a "new vital center." Could you elaborate upon that?

Dionne: The premise of the book is that our politics has gotten very nasty because what Arthur Schlesinger described in the late 1940s as the “vital center,” imploded or exploded in the 1960s. We haven’t been the same since.

That old vital center did a reasonably good job of providing what Americans were looking for in government. Yet the vital center was blown up in the 1960s for some good reasons. It was essentially a liberal center, and liberals got somewhat arrogant and complacent in their management of government.

Our politics has been dominated for two decades by the cultural civil war of the 1960s, which divided the country on a number of issues, notably those having to do with race, gender and sexuality.

This unleashed a rebellion on both the left and right. The “Buckley right” and the “new left” were both uneasy with the complacent center. The “new left” attacked “establishment liberals” and the Buckley people attacked the “liberal establishment.”

The center was also challenged by blacks, who rightly said that they had been kept out of it. Women later said the same thing.

We needed the debate that followed the explosion of the vital center. What I am arguing is that we are at a point where we can now try to recreate it, and that is a worthy task.

In a lot of ways, the new vital center would be more liberal than the old one, certainly on issues of race and gender. On the other hand, it would embody some of the more conservative critique of the 1980s. Everyone has more respect for markets and everyone also understands that socially conservative values, like the two-parent family, are much more socially functional than we were prepared to say.

I think the new center can be recreated around the strong consensus in our society that believes in tolerance and also believes that certain values must be encouraged, not coerced, by government.

Ripon Forum: You seem to think this will mostly be done by liberals. For instance, you write that “If a new center is created, it will be created by liberals. Liberals are in a better position to make peace with the 1960s.” Why just liberals?

Dionne: Liberals have no ideological hang-up on using government for various purposes, nor do they have an ideological approach to taxation.

In an odd way, because liberals have been very clear in being pro-feminist and in favor of civil rights, they can make the argument in favor of the social utility of traditional values better than conservatives. Let me add that we are seeing a rise in pragmatism on the right. Not an unprincipled pragmatism, but a problem-solving pragmatism. The Heritage Foundation and people like [Secretary of Housing and Urban Development] Jack Kemp and [Secretary of Education] Lamar Alexander are trying to see how government can be used to address problems, within the context of a conservative worldview.

These are good developments, but conservatives have to admit that if they are serious about using government to solve problems, they must accept tax rates to pay for that. I joke with Jim Pinkerton of the White House domestic policy staff that he needs [Office of Management and Budget Director] Richard Darman’s taxes to pay for Pinkerton’s programs.

Ripon Forum: Let’s take the issue of abortion. How would a new vital center resolve an issue that seems so intractable?

Dionne: The honest answer is, I don’t know. Abortion may be the hardest issue we confront. It is so easy to see why people who feel so strongly about it, feel the way they do. It is going to be a hard one for us to figure out.

On the other hand, polls clearly show that most Americans are very ambivalent about abortion. Some polls even show majorities favoring legal abortion, but within the same group of people a majority say abortion is murder.

I would like to see social policy used to address that popular ambivalence. Both sides, for example, could agree

that we could make adoption easier. I personally think the pro-choice movement ought to accept certain non-onerous restrictions, such as a parental consent law with a real escape clause for girls or young women who genuinely fear their parents’ reaction. In principle, I find it hard for people to make a good case against parental consent, if we care about parenting at all.

Ripon Forum: Much of your section on modern Republicanism focuses on Richard Nixon. Could you explain that? There are going to be some moderates who don’t see him in that light, especially since the term “modern Republicanism” gained currency under Eisenhower, who attempted to place a more progressive stamp on the GOP.

We needed the debate that followed the explosion of the vital center. What I am arguing is that we are at a point where we can now try to recreate it, and that is a worthy task.

Dionne: I argue that Richard Nixon was modern Republicanism’s last, best hope for achieving dominance within the Republican Party. Yet you can’t talk about Richard Nixon without the frequent use of the words “irony” and “paradox.”

If you look at the Nixon record, two things were going on simultaneously. On the one hand, his domestic achievements were quite formidable. He may have been going with the Democratic Congress occasionally, but he still signed the bills. OSHA [Occupational Safety and Health Administration] and EPA [Environmental Protection Agency] were created under Nixon, and the Family Assistance Plan was proposed, if not passed. Social Security was also indexed for inflation, and John Connally’s economic program, whether you were for it or against it, was the most energetic effort of government’s tinkering with the economy. It may have even made FDR blush.

At the same time, you have Nixon making a strategic decision which, according to his memoirs, grew out of Pat

Buchanan's reading of Richard Scammon's and Ben Wattenberg's "The Real Majority." They argued that Democrats could win if they could finesse the "social issue" by emphasizing economic issues. What Nixon and Buchanan understood is that you trumped Democratic economic issues with the "social issues:" race, busing, permissiveness.

Nixon made a political calculation that gave his whole administration a right-wing cast. Further, his calculation encouraged what William Safire has termed the "us against them" syndrome that affected the Nixon administration and may have ultimately helped lead Nixon to Watergate.

I argue that Richard Nixon was modern Republicanism's last, best hope for achieving dominance within the Republican Party. Yet you can't talk about Richard Nixon without the frequent use of the words "irony" and "paradox."

In the end, Nixon gave a moderate-to-liberal record a conservative cast. We remember Nixon much more for continuing the Vietnam War, for Watergate and for what the administration termed "positive polarization."

Ripon Forum: In your estimation, Nixon had a very good grasp of the GOP's factions. How would you compare his ability to "work" the Republican Party to George Bush's efforts in 1988?

Dionne: I say in the book that Nixon and Bush may have been uniquely gifted in the post-war era for understanding the Republican Party in all its diversity. Nixon understood his strength as a broker.

George Bush has a lot of the same characteristics. Look at the 1988 campaign. How many candidates could have gotten early endorsements from Bob Dornan and Jim Leach, as George Bush did? Bush had a lot of old

friendships among Republican moderates and liberals, and cultivated the right with great skill and energy, pushed by Lee Atwater. Atwater realized, as he once put it, that the conservative wing of the GOP had become the "nominating wing." Bush played all the factions within the party with some brilliance and pulled away enough of the conservative wing to leave poor Jack Kemp, Pat Robertson and Pete DuPont out in the cold.

Ripon Forum: Do you think George Bush's experience with Richard Nixon in the early '70s taught him how to do that?

Dionne: It's no great secret that George Bush is not a terribly ideological person, so therefore this kind of politics would come naturally to him. Gauging from history, he and Nixon were close and they must have had something in common in their non-ideological approach to Republican politics.

Both Nixon and Bush also have realized the importance of the conservative wing of the party. In Nixon's quest for the 1968 nomination, he moved very early on, much like George Bush in his 1988 campaign, to cultivate the Republican right.

Ripon Forum: Does the Republican Party function as a coalition of interests today, as opposed to, say, the political science model of a church with one doctrine?

Dionne: The problem is the Republican Party's presidential coalition, which is obviously powerful, includes an awful lot of people who still don't consider themselves Republicans and who are not much represented in Republican primaries. They have very little voice in the direction of the party.

That could be an advantage for Republicans because it keeps them a smaller church and makes for a little less internal strife. But in fact conservatism has become so big that there is enormous strife within it. In my book, I talk about conservatism's contradictory strains, notably the libertarian strain against the traditionalist strain, which is associated with, but not confined to, the religious right.

Nixon and Bush may have been uniquely gifted in the post-war era for understanding the Republican Party in all its diversity. Nixon understood his strength as a broker. George Bush has a lot of the same characteristics.

You also have a strain between anti-government conservatives and big-government conservatives. If you look at some of the documents put out by the Heritage Foundation or Jack Kemp's office, they sound positively Ripon-like in their willingness to use government to solve social problems.

That's a healthy development because it means that, after all this time in power, conservatives have to acknowledge that they are in government, that they are trying to use government and that you can't fight against government forever if you are going to run the place.

From Ripon's point of view, this provides interesting opportunities. Whatever moderate Republicanism is today, its very different from what it was in the 1950s and 1960s. The struggle for Riponers is to figure out how people who are socially tolerant and believe in modestly energetic government find a place in this new debate now occurring among people to their right.

Ripon Forum: Let's get back to George Bush. Is he a modern Republican?

Dionne: I find George Bush very hard to pigeonhole. I can't figure out the animating philosophy of his presidency. In some ways, he is like a classic Tory often alluded to by [British Conservative journalist] Peregrine Worsthorne in that he believes the "right people" should be in power and their main task should be to manage the affairs of this country, which are largely defined as foreign affairs. This kind of Tory views domestic policy purely as an instrumental vehicle for the purposes of keeping the "right people" in power.

Like his father, George Bush could neatly have fit into the Eisenhower administration. But I must admit that I'm stumped as to what George Bush's personal philosophy really is.

Ripon Forum: One of your most interesting chapters is about the role religious values play in our political debate. You write that: "Understanding [Jimmy] Carter's experience is central to understanding both the extent and limits of evangelical revival." Do we have a good grasp of the role religion plays in our political life? It does indeed seem that many of our elites often treat religion as an antiquated phenomenon.

Dionne: I completely agree with that. One of the reasons I have such a long chapter on the religious right is that the sorts of people who'll likely read this book don't know much or care much about the religious right.

The key to understanding the rise of the religious right in the '70s and '80s lies in a point made by [sociologist] Nathan Glazer some years ago. He argued that its rise must be understood as a "defensive-offensive."

The evangelical Protestant community in America had been on the defensive since the Scopes trial and the failure of Prohibition. Evangelical Protestantism effectively went underground in the '30s and '40s, even though evangelical Protestants had a number of radio shows. They were not prominent in the broad culture, and certainly not prominent in the elite culture. That history, combined with the cultural wars of the 1960s, created a reaction in this very large community of religious people and it helped create the religious right.

The paradox of the 1990s is that an awful lot of people who supported the religious right electorally were never interested in establishing the theocracy that all the religious right's enemies and some of its leaders suggested was the movement's primary goal. I think most of the people were simply looking for a certain respect and attention to a substantial group in American society. In their most sophisticated analyses, they were also trying to argue that the kinds of conservative values they were pushing, such as the importance of the two-parent family, were much more socially useful than a lot of liberals were ready to admit.

Whatever moderate Republicanism is today, it's very different than what it was in the 1950s and 1960s. The struggle for Riponers is to figure out how people who are socially tolerant and believe modestly in energetic government find a place in this new debate now occurring among people to their right.

The paradox of the religious right is that it is declining because it has gained just enough to satisfy the moderates within the movement, even though these gains don't satisfy Pat Robertson. The accomplishments are enough to satisfy what [columnist] Terry Eastland calls "religious America."

Ripon Forum: I was taken with your section on Jimmy Carter, where you argue that during his administration the Democratic Party missed an opportunity to recapture the "vital center." What is the relevance of the Carter years to today's Democratic Party, which seems to be going back and forth between its traditional liberal wing and its more reform-minded members?

Dionne: Maybe Jimmy Carter could have been the best Democratic president Ripon ever had. [Laughter]

What happened to Carter is that he did not appreciate the extent to which he depended upon a version of the New Deal coalition for his survival, and liberals did not understand the unique contribution Carter could have made to their survival. The genius of his 1976 campaign lay in the fact that he embraced most of the important liberal positions having to do with tolerance, but he also embodied a fairly conservative set of values that resonated among those Democrats we now call "Reagan Democrats." Carter made those people feel comfortable again in the Democratic Party in a way that George McGovern certainly didn't.

The problem Carter had — outside of 22 percent interest rates and the hostages in Iran — is that I think he never understood he had to deliver concrete benefits to that working class base of the Democratic Party, which was crucial to his survival. Liberals, in the meantime, were not fully happy with Carter, partly because he didn't deliver on the economic front and partly because he was so culturally conservative.

In the 1990s, the Democrats could recreate the same problem if they want to. But since 1980, an awful lot of liberal Democrats have accepted that, at least in functional terms, conservative values are not as dangerous as they imagined. To recreate a populist coalition, which is probably the only kind of coalition that can elect a Democrat, will require respectful attention to the conservative values of many low-income people and some energetic use of government to solve problems.

Ripon Forum: So a moderate-conservative Democrat would not be condemned like Carter?

Dionne: I'm uncomfortable with labels, but there is room in the Democratic Party for someone who gives respectful attention to conservative values without selling out the Democrats' tradition of using government to solve problems.

My book is essentially pessimistic, however, about the prospects of a moderate-to-liberal Republicanism. It's important to add one caveat, which has been dramatized by the debate within the Republican Party about the civil rights bill.

While moderate-to-liberal Republicans have an awfully hard time at the national level, they often do quite well in state elections and in Senate campaigns. Achieving any sort of reasonable compromise in Congress often depends upon some sort of alliance between a substantial bloc of Democrats and moderate-to-liberal Republicans. To that extent, while the prospects for a governing moderate-to-liberal Republicanism are dim, moderate-to-liberal Republicans will be essential to the whole governing process. ■

The "New World Order": New Hope for U.S. Weapons Procurement Reform?

by Judyth L. Twigg

Since the end of the Second World War, innumerable attempts have been made to reform the process by which America buys its weapons. Unfortunately, these efforts have largely consisted of commission studies or lists of initiatives, generated with much fanfare but inevitably doomed to lukewarm implementation and eventual oblivion.

The Bush administration must undergo the painful process of adjusting the flow of weapons through the acquisition pipeline to the level of funding it is likely to receive. The first change that will have to take place is a curb in the number of new system starts.

The harsh reality of defense politics is that the Pentagon sees a little waste and inefficiency as a small price to pay for the generation of high-quality, high-tech weaponry, and that Congress is unwilling to crack down on the Pentagon when the consequences might entail loss of income or jobs for its constituents.

Judyth L. Twigg is a recipient of a Ripon Educational Fund Mark O. Hatfield Scholarship and is currently a Ph.D. candidate in the Defense and Arms Control Program at M.I.T. This article is excerpted from her longer analysis of weapons procurement reform.

Much-heralded commissions and initiatives are therefore intended to sooth the ruffled feathers of the defense reformers and journalists alarmed over \$600 toilet seats, and are easily swept under the rug when the fuss dies down and some other issue has taken their place in the headlines.

The time has come when this pattern can no longer be repeated. The combination of a mammoth federal budget deficit and the perception of a reduced Soviet military threat may finally generate a political climate amenable to meaningful weapons procurement reform. The Defense Department has explicitly acknowledged the waning of Soviet military capability (see **Soviet Military Power**, 1990) and Congress has already planned how it will spend the "peace dividend" several times over. It seems inevitable that the defense budget will at best remain stable over the coming years, and will more likely decline substantially. Under a regime of dramatically constrained resources, the agencies allocating and spending defense dollars now have a vital interest in stretching those dollars as carefully and pragmatically as possible.

This article proposes a series of measures that the United States might now realistically take to reshape its weapons acquisition process. It focuses on three major goals of reform:

- (1) to draft a coherent military strategy, and to build weapons that are congruent with it;
- (2) to heal the "disconnect" between resource decisions and acquisition decisions;
- (3) to formulate a source selection process appropriate for today's budgetary and strategic environment.

Presidential commissions and congressional panels have proposed, and formally adopted, reforms many times over; the political will to follow through with their implementation is what has been notably absent.

After analyzing each of these hypothesized reform principles, I will illustrate their potential utility for one particular weapon system—Brilliant Pebbles, the space-based component for the Phase I Strategic Defense System.

Matching Strategy to Weaponry

Changes in the global international security environment have given rise to calls for a more coherent American national security strategy. Congress has been continually critical of the Bush administration for its failure to articulate a long-range vision of U.S. defense goals that takes into account the changing European landscape and other shifts in world events. A particular fear has been the possibility of the four military services simply walking through their own isolated budget-cutting drills without achieving a sense of congruence.

Times of great change may also prove to be times of great opportunity. As long as the strategic environment was relatively stable, as it had been until recently, there was little strategic risk to an ac-

Continued on page 14

EDITORIALS

Moving Away From False Choices

EJ. Dionne will not likely win the Nobel Prize for Literature this year — political books don't really qualify for such awards. But the title of *The Washington Post* reporter's new book, which is the subject of this issue's interview, certainly should be given consideration: "Why Americans Hate Politics."

Now, be honest. Don't you wish you had dreamed up that title? Of course you do. But unfortunately, Dionne has beaten you — and everyone else — to the punch. (To be more precise, Dionne says that his fiancée came up with the title.)

The political reporter's thesis is less than humorous, however. His deadly serious point is one that presidential candidates as well as congressional contenders would do well to consider: Americans are tired of the "false choices" offered by conservatives and liberals.

Those "choices" are wound up in the moralistic debate over which decade was worse: the 1960s or 1980s. Instead of rehashing those two periods, one of which reflects liberalism and the other conservatism, Dionne argues that: "The country wants to make peace in the cultural civil war unleashed during the 1960s by accepting the greater tolerance that was the era's greatest achievement and by tempering '60s values with a dose of old-fashioned civic virtue."

According to the Harvard and Oxford grad, whose passionate interest in politics began as an adolescent, Americans want their problems solved, not ideologies debated. It's significant, he says, that one of the most well-received lines from George Bush's Inaugural address was this comment to Congress: "They didn't send us here to bicker."

So is there hope for renewed "civic virtue?" Yes, according to Dionne. Look at the compromise reached over the 1990 child care bill. The legislation included expanded benefits and an earned income tax credit. In other

E.J. Dionne's deadly serious point is one that presidential candidates as well as congressional contenders would do well to consider: Americans are tired of the "false choices" offered by conservatives and liberals.

words, it provided greater government support for working mothers while also offering a strong financial incentive to the working poor.

Another example of rejuvenated civic virtue is last January's congressional debate over whether or not to send American troops to war in the Persian Gulf. The moment was indeed rare in American politics: no staff-prepared remarks, no p.r. orientation. As Dionne writes, "Congress, with seriousness, conviction and moments of eloquence, debated whether our country should go to war."

RENEWING "CIVIC VIRTUE" AT THE STATE LEVEL

One could perhaps argue that such new governors as Massachusetts' William Weld and California's Pete Wilson are similarly promoting problem-solving over ideology in their approach to state affairs. While both Weld and Wilson are currently embroiled in funding disputes over the level of state social services, each new governor thinks in terms of "preventive" or "entrepreneurial" government.

Weld, for instance, spoke recently of "an entrepreneurial government that serves as a catalyst for private investment while also setting an example of public stewardship." To Weld, public stewardship means increasing funding for such initiatives as the Women, In-

fants and Children program, pre-natal and peri-natal care and teen pregnancy prevention.

Yet Weld also believes that creating a climate for private investment dictates, among other things, abolishing state regulations which require a Massachusetts landowner to obtain a state permit before cleaning up hazardous wastes on his or her property.

Likewise, Weld contends that promoting private investment extends to education reform. He suggests that the state government should "identify a pool of high-risk, high-need kids, and then invite schools in both public and private sectors to serve those kids, with clearly identified outcomes specified in the contract."

Pete Wilson has pursued a similar problem-solving course by emphasizing "preventive" government. Among the new California governor's initiatives is an aim to provide pre-natal care to every California mother.

Wilson has additionally proposed a \$20 million "Healthy Start" program to integrate health and social services into local schools. Such services should be available, Wilson says, since "schools [are] where our kids spend most of their waking hours."

The former U.S. senator has also proposed an increase to California's Office of Family Planning. Says Wilson: "Family planning education and contraceptive services are among the most sensible and humane investments we can make in our strategy of prevention."

Yet Wilson is no trendy liberal. The Republican governor has taken on California's education establishment by attempting to suspend Proposition 98, a 1988 initiative that requires 40 percent of all state revenue be spent on education.

Wilson argues against this measure since the governor and legislature now have control over only 10 percent of state expenditures. Suspending Proposition 98 would give them more flexibility in reducing \$12.6 billion deficit.

SOCIAL SERVICE INTEGRATION

A problem-solving ethic also exists within pockets of the federal establishment. Martin Gerry, the assistant secretary for planning and evaluation at the Department of Health and Human Services, speaks of focusing efforts to assist the needy on "services," not "programs."

The difference may sound like one of semantics, but Gerry argues that the emphasis goes directly to the heart of the growing divide within American society between rich and poor, black and white, young and old. As he puts it, "programs create a divisive structure" and are "restricted in terms of their response."

Put another way, by definition some people are "entitled" to government programs while others are not. The unintended consequence is that individuals are separated according to class, race, income and gender.

Instead of separating people, Gerry claims, we must develop a "funding stream to serve anyone who needs a service." Consider the Maternal and Child Health block grant program, he says. It should be restructured to provide universal access. In part, this could be achieved through locating health services in schools. There, *all* children

If political leaders are going to turn the American mind in the direction it must go, which means towards creative problem solving, reflexive answers and excessive moralism must be forsaken.

could be screened, diagnosed or, when needed, provided pre-natal care. While such services would be offered all students in a school, wealthier students could be required to pick up a portion of their treatment costs.

Success has already been realized in some cities which base social services in schools. The New York State Education Department, for instance, funds 14 elementary schools in economically-strapped areas which now serve as centers for community needs.

Gerry claims that "integrating services" is essential to improving the lives of America's poor. In a paper he and William Morrill of the Mattech Corporation recently delivered to a Department of Education conference, he writes that "the segmentation and fragmentation of social and health-related ser-

vices within the schools, and, indeed, the community at large can present serious problems, if not potential disasters for at risk students in disadvantaged settings."

SMART CHOICES

To be sure, the new "smart-government" ethic practiced by Gerry, Weld and Wilson transcends party lines. Washington, D.C.'s new Democratic mayor, Sharon Pratt Dixon, campaigned last fall on cleaning out the city's bloated bureaucracy, firing 2,000 managers and keeping taxes in line. Her six-month administration has certainly focused on some of these aims.

But, yes, Dionne is right. "False choices" dominate too much of the modern debate. If political leaders are going to turn the American mind in the direction it must go, which means towards creative problem solving, reflexive answers and excessive moralism must be forsaken. One hopes that participants in Campaign '92 will, as Dionne puts it, "turn politics back to basics." A debate about how to deliver services efficiently and meaningfully — and one that will help individuals break out of the cycle of poverty — will surely serve the American people better than rhetorical excess. ■

CLARENCE THOMAS AND THE SUPREME COURT

George Bush's nomination of Clarence Thomas, a conservative black jurist, to the U.S. Supreme Court seat held by Thurgood Marshall, a liberal black jurist, is not so surprising. The former head of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission from 1982—1990, Thomas was viewed by many court-watchers as an eventual successor to Marshall.

More information about Thomas' thinking will emerge over the next few weeks. But what *is* known about him is that this Georgia native, who was raised by sharecropper grandparents under conditions of poverty and racism, possesses a keen belief in the important values of hard work, self-reliance and intellectual pursuit. About his upbringing, he once told the Heritage Foundation: "God was central. School, dis-

cipline, hard work and 'right-from-wrong' were of the highest priority."

The problem with Thomas' line of thought, however, as with that of other opponents of affirmative action, is that even if one maintains excellent personal habits, individual drive alone cannot always overcome racial hurdles. Larger societal obstacles, like pervasive discrimination, may stand in the way. Government efforts to redress racial wrongs, such as through employing affirmative action, are often essential to achieving progress and mobility.

Thomas does not agree with that assessment, of course. It's well-known that the former Missouri Republican activist opposes preferential treatment for minority groups.

That's too bad, because, while race-conscious legal devices should not be viewed as a permanent fixture, who can realistically argue that color is no longer a factor in hiring, promotion or educa-

tional decisions? So why should certain measures like affirmative action, which President Bush himself favors, be stopped? Why not keep all paths open to individuals who seek to escape the limits of poverty?

In many regards, Clarence Thomas' background could offer a unique perspective for the high court. His is an essential American story; few know so well all aspects of American society.

If confirmed, Thomas would do well to apply the sensitivity he must have acquired to the larger issues the Supreme Court will soon face: race, crime and abortion. If the Warren Court took us too far in one direction, the country will not be well served by the Rehnquist Court taking us in an opposite extreme. One hopes that Clarence Thomas' path will enable him to provide the present Court needed creativity and balance. If he assumes the Marshall seat, that will be his most important legacy. ■

Is George Bush A Progressive Republican?

by William P. McKenzie

George Bush seems to have had several political "fathers," but the living political figure with perhaps the most impact on his career, Richard Nixon, recently described his "offspring" to *TIME* Magazine in quite matter-of-fact terms. Said Nixon of the current White House occupant, whom he appointed U.S. ambassador to the United Nations in 1971 and chair of the Republican Party in 1973: "I consider him to be a progressive Republican."

Those words, of course, are just what the Republican far-right has always dreaded to hear about George Bush. The right's interpretation of that term usually assumes one of two things: George Bush is either a closet liberal, or his eastern establishment upbringing has left him with little understanding of the common man.

But as much as "movement conservatives" would like to pigeonhole George Bush in this manner — and let's be honest, so, too, would some of the eastern press on the latter issue — the president does not fit either stereotype really well. First, George Bush is hardly a closet liberal, as defined by the more-government-must-be-better-approach of modern liberalism.

And second, as far as the president's "regular" guy status goes, his background is certainly not hardscrabble. Yet I would venture to say that he has been exposed to more "real life" moments than many young people on the right — or in the eastern press — have ever experienced. The dusty oil fields of 1948 Texas, where fortunes could be as easily lost as won, were hardly the carpeted halls of the Heritage Foundation,

William P. McKenzie has served as editor of the Ripon Forum since February 1981. At the end of July he will assume new responsibilities as an editorial writer and columnist for The Dallas Morning News.

Richard Nixon recently said he considers George Bush a "progressive Republican." Indeed the president manifests some essential characteristics of modern Republicanism.

or, for that matter, the sanctity of the CBS executive suite.

But, if I may stand the argument on its head, perhaps George Bush does manifest some essential characteristics of progressive Republicanism, or what E.J. Dionne terms elsewhere in this issue "modern Republicanism." First, however, what is a progressive or modern Republican?

Maybe the best way to define this term is to offer two historical examples: the administrations of Theodore Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower. What's common about their presidencies is that the sum of their policies could always be found in or near the political center. The aims of those two presidencies focused on developing a tough, yet internationalist foreign policy, creating economic opportunity and practicing managerial government over ideological politics.

Much like George Bush, Dwight Eisenhower and Theodore Roosevelt also brought to politics a belief in such notions as public service, social fairness, economic common sense and environmental stewardship.

INTERNATIONALISM

Of course, the problem of residing in the center, where coalitions are assembled, is that life there is less volatile — and thus less eye-catching — than it is on either the left or right wings of American politics. Excluding others, which means drawing a hard

line, is always more dramatic than working with diverse groups, which means appreciating other's views.

Yet it's the latter approach that allowed George Bush to build the successful international coalition against Saddam Hussein. And that coalition did not develop overnight. President Bush's constant working of the telephones during his first two years in office — as well as the numerous summits and mini-summits he participated in — enabled him to maintain strong relationships with world leaders and develop global support.

A more concrete example of the president's internationalist bent can be found in the premium he placed upon recruiting the support of the United Nations during the Persian Gulf crisis. The administration's efforts to gain the U.N.'s backing do not appear to be some sort of goofy belief in a one-world utopia, but rather an understanding of the world's shared problems. That awareness stands in stark contrast to Ronald Reagan's go-it-alone approach in foreign and military affairs.

Similarly, the administration's internationalist orientation is evident in the emphasis now being placed on creating a regional consensus for the Middle East. During Secretary of State James A. Baker's post-War travels to the Mideast, for example, he has repeatedly stressed the need for regional support of a Mideast peace initiative. And the administration took great pride when eight Arab nations lined up behind its early efforts to create a broad regional framework.

In a different geopolitical sphere, the close relationship between Jim Baker and his former Soviet counterpart, one-time Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, represents a sharp distinction from the first five years of the Reagan administration. Recall, for instance, the chilly relationship that dominated so much of the Reagan administration's original dealings with

the Soviet Union.

Likewise, the relationship between George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev reflects a practical decision by this administration to engage the Soviets in redirecting their system of government into greater openness and to encourage them to participate wisely in the world arena. As one unnamed Bush official told **The Washington Post** before last July's Western alliance summit: "The basic message the West wants to get across to the Soviets is that we no longer look at them as adversaries but as partners in security." No dart-throwing, evil empire speeches here.

Yet don't be confused. The active diplomacy of the Bush administration should not be misconstrued as wimpishness, to employ a phrase much overused about this White House.

Much like George Bush, Dwight Eisenhower and Theodore Roosevelt also brought to politics a belief in such notions as public service, social fairness, economic common sense and environmental stewardship.

Recall again the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, who was hardly a wimpish figure. As Roosevelt historian Frederick W. Marks several years ago told the **Ripon Forum**: "[Roosevelt] never believed that peace could be had by sitting impassively behind a wall of battleships. On the contrary. One had to exhaust the full range of expedients, all the way from international tribunals to multilateral conferences, to the subtlest and most adroit diplomacy on a one-to-one basis."

"Adroit diplomacy," of course, will be essential to structuring the "new world order" George Bush so fondly — and sometimes only abstractly — speaks of. Constructing and maintaining international frameworks which simultaneously recognize compelling national interests will demand serious patience and cajoling.

Consider the ongoing General Agreement on Trade and Tariff talks. While many European nations claim a nation-

al interest in extending particular farm subsidies, American representatives argue that these supports only prohibit the free flow of agricultural goods. Working to resolve such differences with a "new" and independent European Community, which comprises a trading bloc of more than 300 million people, will demand real diplomatic skill.

THE BUSH RIGHTS RECORD

Of course, on the domestic front there certainly *is* much to wonder about, particularly George Bush's curious lack of fire. Does the president not perceive America's very real social problems? If he doesn't, that's strange because the president seems to genuinely enjoy people of all stripes. So why doesn't he get it, particularly the primary problem of America's underclass, where education, a topic George Bush has championed, is the key to mobility?

But before we get off onto that, let's first look at the administration's rights record. Despite the very ill-advised veto of the Civil Rights Act of 1990, and the administration's wrongful handling of this year's civil rights legislation, the Bush record contains some not-to-be-overlooked achievements.

The recently-passed Americans with Disabilities Act is an example. Candidate Bush pledged in his 1988 acceptance speech that "I'm going to do whatever it takes to make sure the disabled are included in the mainstream. For too long they've been left out, but they are not going to be left out any more."

Less than two years later, that promise turned into action and the most influential piece of rights legislation since the 1964 Civil Rights Act passed the House and Senate. As **The Washington Post** put it, the Act is "the world's strongest civil rights protection for the disabled."

Among other initiatives, the Americans with Disabilities Act ensures that disabled individuals will be provided access to shops, museums, restaurants and theaters; be protected in hiring and promotion decisions, so long as they are able to perform "essential services;" be provided "reasonable accommodations" to perform their work, so long as such accommodations do not create "undue hardship" for employers;

On the domestic front, there certainly is much to wonder about, particularly George Bush's curious lack of fire. Does the president not perceive America's very real social problems?

and be given access to newly constructed or renovated buildings.

The Act also requires telephone companies to provide relay services for people with speech and hearing impediments. And, importantly, new buses, subways and commuter trains must provide access for the disabled.

Now certainly, Democratic Senators Thomas Harkin and Edward Kennedy also played a role in formulating this legislation. But the contribution of the Bush administration *cannot* be minimized.

If you're looking for another positive sign of the Bush administration's rights record, especially when seen as a contrast to the preceding administration's, consider the selection by the Bush administration of John Dunne to head the Justice Department's civil rights division. While flak accompanied the New York state senator's 1989 appointment — he had not been a civil rights lawyer — even New York's Democratic Governor Mario Cuomo and black Democratic leader Representative Charles Rangel took to Dunne's defense. These Democrats specifically testified before Congress about Dunne's commitment to the disadvantaged.

Indeed, the New York insurance attorney's reputation in the state Senate was that of an independent Republican; he fought for such social measures as liberalized AIDS benefits, for example. And since his arrival at Justice, Dunne's shop has discontinued the prior administration's systematic dismantling of historic civil rights precedents. More recently, he has taken a strong stand on behalf of voting rights.

The lack of judicial challenges to such doctrines as affirmative action stands in distinct contrast to the ideological crusade of conservative theorist Wil-

liam Bradford Reynolds. Recall that as head of the civil rights division under Ronald Reagan, Reynolds repeatedly tried to overturn many significant civil rights laws.

But all right, all right, you're correct. President Bush's record is certainly mixed on the civil rights front.

His veto of the Civil Rights Act of 1990 occurred even though such moderate Republicans as former Ford administration Transportation Secretary William Coleman attempted to talk the White House out of it. But the president's lawyers, notably White House Counsel C. Boyden Grey, would have none of it. Hence no compromise was brooked, and President Bush vetoed the legislation, claiming it would lead to hiring-by-quota schemes.

Despite the very ill-advised veto of the Civil Rights Act of 1990, and the administration's wrongful handling of this year's civil rights legislation, the Bush rights record contains some not-to-be-overlooked achievements.

The veto was a mistake, just as his emphasis on quotas in this year's bill is misleading. Both bills have dealt with the quota issue, and the legislation would primarily restore a set of legal precedents that previously did not lead to massive quota schemes.

The president's real problem on domestic issues is larger than the civil rights bill, however, and stems from his much-heralded obsession with foreign issues. This problem has afflicted many modern presidents, including John Kennedy and Richard Nixon. Nicholas Lemann writes in "The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration And How It Changed America" that: "[John Kennedy's] heart was in the great struggle with the Soviet Union, and he didn't conceive of race relations in the United States as a problem of similar magnitude and complexity."

Here George Bush could take a cue from his mentor Richard Nixon, who, despite his own foreign orientation,

launched the radical Family Assistance Plan in the early 1970s. Lemann writes that "Nixon instinctively disliked the war on poverty," but the Republican president also surprised many people with his new social scheme.

The brainchild of then-Nixon advisor Daniel Patrick Moynihan, this program offered a guaranteed income over a guaranteed job. In Moynihan's eyes, the plan offered an "incomes strategy" over a "social service" policy to address the problems of America's poor. In 1971 America, that near-socialist idea was as startling as Richard Nixon's later trip was to Red China.

A DOMESTIC FRAMEWORK

George Bush can take heart, however, because he doesn't need to look too far for a domestic framework. Elements are already in place for defining a new direction.

Consider the "New Paradigm" outlined last year by White House Policy Planning Director James Pinkerton. The paradigm, or model, Pinkerton offers emphasizes decentralized decision-making, individual empowerment, market forces, personal choice and pragmatism.

In a speech to the Reason Foundation, Pinkerton argued that the application of private sector principles to larger social problems provides a more relevant framework for solving social problems. The public sector, bureaucratic orientation of the New Deal-Great Society paradigm is "one-size-fits-all, whether you like it or not," in Pinkerton's words.

The president's approach to education particularly fits this model. While Education Secretary Lamar Alexander introduced several new education initiatives in April, most of which focus on accountability and efficiency, the president is largely banking his aim of becoming the "education president" on the idea of "parental choice." This concept relies upon the involvement of parents, teachers and principals in defining a particular school's mission. The aim of "parental choice" plans is to provide competitive schooling, personal involvement and local decision-making.

Likewise, the president's public housing policies focus on the notion of "empowering" individuals to purchase their own housing units. Promoted by Housing and Urban Development Secretary

George Bush could take a cue from his mentor Richard Nixon, who, despite his own foreign orientation, launched the radical Family Assistance Plan in the early 1970s.

Jack Kemp, tenant possession or management of public housing is rooted in the belief that ownership of private property enhances self-esteem and individual responsibility. It also is dedicated to the idea that owning property is essential to providing minority groups economic power.

Unfortunately, congressional politics has stalled appropriation of the \$210 million authorization for fiscal year 1991, which would have assisted tenants with their purchases. But the administration's objectives in Project HOPE, or "Homeownership for People Everywhere," are not too different from Abraham Lincoln's aim in establishing the Land Grant Act. Both initiatives are attempts to provide more Americans with a stake in the system.

Another set of domestic policies which fit into the Pinkerton model is the administration's environmental strategy. A key part of the Bush aim is to provide economic incentives *not* to pollute.

For instance, a company will now be assigned—or will buy from the government—a certain amount of "pollutant permits." (The company's figure will be based on its historic emissions levels.) If a company discharges over its allotted amount, it can purchase permits from another company. Conversely, if it discharges less than the prescribed limit, the extra portion will be sold off. This approach provides incentives for companies to reduce pollution—and at less cost.

Council on Environmental Quality Chairman Michael DeLand said recently that inclusion of the private sector "heralds the future of the environmental movement." As he puts it, the emphasis must change from "what comes out of the pipe into what goes into the pipe."

*Administration
policy-makers would be
mistaken to assume that
power-sharing,
self-reliance and local
decision-making alone can
provide domestic progress.*

THE LIMITS OF POWER-SHARING

Yet problems exist with the administration's domestic approach. The first is relatively simple: more ideas, like promoting for-profit neighborhood economic development corporations, are needed. One can't define a domestic policy with only a handful of proposals.

The second problem is one of philosophy. The administration's "New Paradigm" is rooted in the long-held Republican belief about the primacy of the individual and in a distrust of big institutions and overly-centralized authority.

But administration policy-makers would be mistaken to assume that power-sharing, self-reliance and local decision-making alone can provide domestic progress. Political scientist C. Everett Ladd addressed this issue well when he wrote that those who argued for

states' rights during the 1950s and 1960s "failed to appreciate the need for central organization to address needs of the entire nation — where the fulfillment of individualism requires things that political and economic individualism is unable by itself to achieve."

An example of the need for central organization — and federal financing — is the nation's transportation policy. So far, the administration has identified highway repair and airport renovation as key national transportation problems.

Yet the administration transfers financial responsibility for many improvements to already-distraught state and local governments. The Bush plan also asks individuals to assume a larger burden for infrastructure repair by proposing increased "user fees," such as highway tolls and airline ticket taxes.

Unfortunately, with America's infrastructure needs estimated to be in the tens of billions, such approaches are not complete. To borrow — and reverse — a phrase from George Bush's Inaugural address, more wallet than will must be found. (If an example is needed, the president could remember that Dwight Eisenhower, the creator of the modern interstate highway system, understood the need for federal responsibility in developing a national transportation system.)

CONCLUSION

To be sure, George Bush probably doesn't care whether or not he is labeled a "progressive Republican." In fact, he told a Ripon Society audience in 1985 that he is a conservative, always has been and always will be.

Yet on issues of foreign policy, social responsibility, practical government, environmental stewardship and economics, George Bush has distinctly defined his own course. And his aims do not always coincide so neatly with the Reagan administration's go-it-alone foreign approach; its cold shoulder toward social fairness; its ideological government; and its environmental neglect. Like many modern Republicans, the sum of George Bush's policies can be found closer to the center of the spectrum.

The question is, will George Bush move from being a steward on domestic issues to a social reformer like his self-proclaimed hero Theodore Roosevelt? **The New Republic's** Sidney Blumenthal raised this question recently, and it is unclear whether George Bush will apply his considerable energy to the domestic agenda. With social tensions mounting in cities like New York, Dallas, Washington and Los Angeles, with medical costs increasing at a scary pace and with the federal budget out-of-whack, the problem is not just his. It's ours as well. ■

RIPON FORUM SURVEY

We are asking Ripon members to help us identify moderate Republicans at the state and local level who best exemplify the goals and principles of the Ripon Society. So will you help us with this task by filling out the following form and returning it to: Brad Kendall, The Ripon Society, 709 Second Street N.E., Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20002.

I. State Executive Officials

II. State Legislative Leaders

III. Local Elected Officials

quisition process which responded to service and other parochial interests outside the bounds of an integrated national security strategy. Now that threats to our security have changed so dramatically, the opportunity has emerged to draft a coherent long-term security agenda—and to build weapons in accordance with it. If serious, visionary thinking is devoted to this problem, billions of dollars can be saved by procuring only those weapons that will conceivably be needed. If a muddle-through approach responding only to the latest crisis or political whim is continued, then the United States risks not only dollars but lives as it chances being unprepared for whatever security challenges lie ahead.

Buying What We Can Afford

The architects of the Reagan defense program proceeded under the assumption that the build-up would continue well into the 1990s. When budgetary pressures escalated toward the end of Reagan's tenure, the problem of tight resources was deferred by stretching out programs rather than bringing about cancellations. The result of the Reagan stretchouts was that President Bush and Defense Secretary Cheney inherited a \$400 billion defense program, but only a \$300 billion defense budget. The Bush administration must undergo the painful process of adjusting the flow of weapons through the acquisition pipeline to the level of funding it is likely to receive.

The first change that will have to take place is a curb in the number of new system starts. Affordability concerns must be addressed at every phase in the development of a weapons system and should be considered as important as performance and absolute cost decisions. The question concerning cost should not be merely, "Is this a reasonable price for this weapon?" but also, "Can we afford that price? Do other alternatives or trade-offs exist to fulfill this mission?"

Some will contend that new starts cannot be curtailed if the United States is to continue to enjoy its most potent comparative military advantage: technological superiority. The response to this argument is that a technological ad-

Of the three general characteristics of a weapons system proposal — cost, schedule and technical performance — the element generally given the most weight is technical performance. In an era of reduced defense budgets and diminished Soviet threat, costs assume a higher priority.

vantage can be maintained by relatively cheaply upgrading existing systems rather than investing in new ones immediately.

Concerns that such an acquisition strategy dangerously mortgages America's future for the sake of present financial difficulties are probably misplaced. The Soviet military research and development base is currently in shambles, and should not be able to generate a substantial threat from new-in-principle weapons for at least the next generation of procurement; the coalition victory in the Persian Gulf should make American defense planners confident in their ability to effectively counter threats from any other source for the foreseeable future. In addition, the tactic of replacing new starts with upgrades may make sense not only fiscally, but technologically, since it entails holding off the production and deployment of complex technologies until all the bugs are ironed out.

Finally, no matter how politically tortuous such choices may be, the only legitimate answer to the Reagan procurement "bow wave" is to cancel some of the programs now in development. The main problem in this regard is bringing the Pentagon and Congress into agreement on what systems to cancel. The new strategic and budgetary environment may finally inspire—or force—the Pentagon and Congress to make some of these tough decisions.

Congress' objections to outright cancellation of weapons programs generally have to do with its constituents' jobs. Not surprisingly, for congressmen and senators in whose districts defense con-

tractors are concentrated, votes tend to be cast with an eye toward reelection. This age-old phenomenon might be overcome through federally-sponsored programs for economic recovery in areas particularly hurt by defense plant shutdowns. The fact is that the Pentagon frequently proposes the cancellation of programs which are no longer militarily needed, only to have them put back in the budget by legislators.

If the Pentagon were to package readjustment programs along with its cancellation proposals, then Congress might become more amenable to efficient and sensible defense spending. The cost of such readjustment programs would most certainly be small in comparison with the savings in defense programs cancelled.

Improving the Source Selection Process

The debate over the proper degree of concurrency — the overlap between development and production — in system development has been a prominent one in discussions of procurement reform. The arguments for high concurrency have traditionally revolved around the shortened time required to get the system in the field, perhaps enabling military forces to meet a perceived threat sooner or to establish a technical advantage considered important to national security.

The risks of concurrency, however, are substantial. After production has begun, problems may be uncovered that require major redesign and production changes, significantly increasing costs and delaying deployment. Should such technical problems occur, the entire objective of high concurrency, meeting tight performance and schedule objectives, may not be met.

Now that a more relaxed international security environment exists, and particularly since the Soviet military technological threat has been shown to be less the menace it was once considered, the rationale for concurrent production strategies wanes considerably. A recent Senate Armed Services Committee panel, for example, contends that the reduced threat "means that Department of Defense does not have to rush to buy a weapon in order to meet an arbitrary fielding deadline."

Another element of source selection has to do with the factors given priority when a bid to develop or produce a system is evaluated. Of the three general characteristics of a weapons system proposal—cost, schedule and technical performance—the element generally given the most weight is technical performance. In an era of reduced defense budgets and diminished Soviet threat, costs assume a higher priority.

Frequently, 95 percent of a system's technical capability is easily procured for 50 percent of its cost, and the last half of the cost is spent procuring that marginal five percent of technical capability. For example, General Accounting Office interviews with a former under secretary of defense for research and engineering confirm that one of the F-15's performance goals was that the aircraft fly at Mach 2.5. When the airplane was first delivered, it had a top speed of Mach 2.4. The program manager insisted that the higher speed be achieved, and several hundred million dollars in development costs were spent to meet that goal and get the additional Mach 0.1 speed. Trade-off analysis would certainly have been beneficial in this case.

An Example: Brilliant Pebbles

Two years ago, President Bush directed the Department of Defense to provide him by 1993 with sufficient information to make an informed decision on the future of strategic defense. He requested that particular emphasis be placed on Brilliant Pebbles, a space-based weapon system concept consisting of several thousand interceptors orbiting the earth with the ability to detect and destroy targets by smashing steel pellets into them at high speed.

The initial research program, with a current estimated four-year price tag of \$55.3 billion, consists of two major components. The first, located at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, involves a series of flight and underground tests to demonstrate the feasibility of Brilliant Pebbles' ability to intercept ballistic missiles and survive in wartime conditions. The flight test portion of this program component began in 1990 and is scheduled to be completed in February of 1993. The other element of the program—

concept definition and pre-full-scale development — will compete and select contractors to develop and test their versions of the weapon system. This contractor involvement began in June 1990 and is scheduled to be completed in June 1993. The Brilliant Pebbles acquisition philosophy illustrates two of the problems outlined here: the need to take strategy into consideration before money is spent, and the dangers of high degrees of concurrency in technologically risky programs.

The testing and development phases of Brilliant Pebbles are being accelerated in tandem primarily for the sake of achieving results within a time frame which might be convenient politically, but simply not feasible technologically.

As far as strategy is concerned, an allocation of \$50 billion to the development of this system seems misplaced, given that no political consensus has been formed on strategic defenses, particularly in light of the changing U.S.-Soviet relationship. Congress may never go along with a space-based ballistic missile program, at least in the foreseeable future. A much more limited research effort would certainly be in order, but the president has ordered compressed development of Brilliant Pebbles with an eye toward a decision for near-term deployment. The experience of the Persian Gulf conflict has demonstrated the real danger of nuclear proliferation, but it is much more likely that strategic and political considerations will point the way toward ground-based defenses. Scarce defense dollars are certainly more sensibly invested in this direction instead.

The concurrency problem has to do with the inefficient manner in which the money allocated to the program is being spent. The testing and development phases of Brilliant Pebbles are being accelerated in tandem primarily for the sake of achieving results within a time frame which might be convenient politi-

cally, but simply not feasible technologically. According to the GAO, Livermore's test program will almost certainly not be completed by the target date because of the minimal time allotted to accommodate the future problems that will inevitably occur. The test program has already slipped by ten months, and the first flight test did not achieve all its objectives. These testing delays will only exacerbate the difficulties the contractors will have in developing design concepts that Livermore has not yet fully defined. The risk is that money spent on pre-full-scale development will be wasted if the testing program fails to confirm that the Brilliant Pebbles concept works. A more rational procurement strategy, given the presence of so much new-in-principle technology, would demand full demonstration and validation of technical feasibility before proceeding into development and testing.

Conclusion: Political Will

To be sure, none of these reforms are necessarily new. Presidential commissions and congressional panels have proposed, and formally adopted, reforms many times over; the political will to follow through with their implementation is what has been notably absent.

The proper confluence of events may finally have emerged to see through a meaningful program of weapons procurement reform, should political leaders decide to jump at the opportunity. The president currently enjoys considerable persuasive power, borne of his success in prosecuting the war in the Persian Gulf. The opposition party in Congress needs to sink its teeth into powerful domestic issues in order to reassert its legitimacy. The combination of a relaxed Soviet military threat and enhanced federal budgetary concerns could bring these players together in a bipartisan effort, at long last, to make the way America buys its weapons more efficient and cost-effective. ■

What's Ahead in the Ripon Forum?

- Campaign '92
- Human Rights Policy
- The Break-up of Yugoslavia

REVIEWS

And War Will Be A Pleasure

"Fortunate Son" by
Lewis B. Puller, Jr., New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1991.

by Alfred W. Tate

One of the sillier developments in America of late has been the emergence of a so-called "men's movement." Across the country, we are told, men are meeting in primitive settings to "bond," beat on drums, share their feelings and, in general, overcome an alienation from their essential "maleness." The movement's gurus say it is motivated by a deep "father-hunger" and the contemporary individual's need to get back in touch with the "warrior" that is part of every man's psyche.

The previous generation needed no such help. The vast majority of our fathers served in World War II. If they were fortunate enough to come home, for better or worse they stayed married to our mothers and participated in the raising of their sons and daughters with the same decidedly mixed results all achieve.

THE LEGEND OF "CHESTY" PULLER

Even if these fathers had not been warriors themselves, they had known real ones, and they told us about them and then took us to see John Wayne playing Sergeant John Stryker in "The Sands of Iwo Jima" to show us what they meant.

So it was from my father that I first heard of General Burwell Puller, United States Marine Corps. "Pop" had been an enlisted Marine in the South Pacific during the waning days of "the big war." He emerged from this experience as living proof of the adage "once a Marine, always a Marine," and for him

Alfred W. Tate is a member of the Ripon Forum editorial board and a veteran of the Vietnam War.

and countless others, "Chesty" Puller epitomized what being a Marine meant.

As a midshipman, I learned the legendary general had earned the first two of his five Navy Crosses — the highest award for bravery in combat the naval service can bestow, and second only to the Congressional Medal of Honor — in Nicaragua fighting the guerilla forces of Augusto Sandino. He earned two more in fighting against the Japanese at Guadalcanal and Cape Gloucester and won his fifth as the commander of the regiment which covered the Marine's retreat from the Chosin Reservoir during the Korean War.

Puller's legacy is captured by a saying attributed to him by a classmate of mine at Annapolis: "Harass the troops in time of peace, and war will be a pleasure." Although perhaps apocryphal and certainly offensive to refined sensibilities, this seemed to sum up the wisdom we fledging warriors were in the process of inheriting from the Olympian generation of the likes of Puller and Admiral "Bull" Halsey.

The adage points to a hard truth that history repeatedly confirms: war, not peace, is humanity's more natural condition. More importantly, it says to those who would be leaders that they can adequately discharge their responsibilities only by imposing on themselves and their subordinates the most rigorous discipline and training. It was the only way we would be able to prepare ourselves and our troops to survive in combat.

The war in which we got to apply this wisdom turned out to be Vietnam, and now that conflict has produced yet another book reflecting on its outcome, Lewis B. Puller, Jr.'s "Fortunate Son." This one is special, however, not just because its author is "Chesty" Puller's son, but because of the accomplishment it represents.

AN HONEST TELLING

The book's title is borrowed from an anti-war song recorded by Creedence Clearwater Revival in 1969, but it is used without a hint of irony. Although the destiny his paternity imposed on him cost him some forty percent of his body, Puller gives every indication of believing himself to be indeed fortunate to be the son of a famous father. This makes for an intensely personal and brutally honest book, and what saves it from solipsism is that Puller is as unsparing of himself as he is of everyone else.

He also tells his story without artifice, and this gives the account of his early life growing up with his mother and father, twin sister Martha, and older sister Virginia the semblance of looking through a family album. Images of pets, efforts to master first bicycles and the inevitable moves a military family must endure pass by like snapshots.

The account begins to take on destiny and texture when Puller enters Marine Officer Candidate School at Quantico, Virginia, shortly after graduating from the College of William and Mary. Here he encounters for the first time the burden that being his father's son entails. Here, as well, he meets, falls in love with and marries his remarkable wife "Toddy."

By the time Puller reaches the point in his story at which he arrives in Vietnam in the summer of 1968 to take command of the third platoon of Golf Company, Second Battalion of the First Regiment of the First Marine Division, he has found the voice that will be an immediate presence through the rest of the book. His descriptions of the terrain his unit fought over, first along the Cua Viet River near the DMZ and then south of Danang near Marble Mountain, of the Vietnamese civilians and military he

encountered and worked with, and of the somehow random and yet utterly predictable deadly engagements with the enemy his platoon endured, all ring absolutely true.

The book's dust cover pictures the author sitting in a wheelchair in front of the Vietnam Memorial so his wounding cannot come as a surprise. Yet he does not foreshadow the event. As a result, his description is stunning in its matter-of-factness and implication. After a thunderous boom and being airborne for what seemed like forever, he writes, "I had no idea that the pink mist that engulfed me had been caused by the vaporization of most of my right and left legs." But he then observes "that my right thumb and little finger were missing as was most of my left hand."

As awful as his maiming is, however, the account of the event and of those leading up to it is really only the preamble of Puller's story. It is the healing process that is his real concern, and it is a long and, I suspect, ongoing one.

It begins with two years of hospitalization and pain so consuming that it left him at times "reduced to the level of a snarling animal." It includes a seemingly endless series of operations aimed at restoring some measure of function to his ruined hands, excruciating hours in physical therapy and acceptance of the fact that there was so little of his legs left that even with prostheses he would never walk again.

There were victories as well. His son, Lewis B. Puller, III, with whom Toddy was pregnant when he left for Vietnam, was born in late November after his wounding. They would subsequently have a daughter. He completed law school, served as an attorney with the Veteran's Administration and as a member of President Ford's clemency board which evaluated the cases of thousands of the thousands of Vietnam military deserters and civilian draft evaders.

Puller's unsuccessful bid to unseat then-freshman Republican Representative Paul Trible from the Tidewater region of Virginia was a major setback. His account of the race is fascinating and raises the critical question the role of personal experience should play in qualifying an individual for public office. Puller is unrelenting in his indictment of the politicians who got us into Vietnam, and his portrait of Trible as

*Although the destiny his
paternity imposed on him
cost him some forty
percent of his body, Puller
gives every indication of
believing himself to be
indeed fortunate to be the
son of his famous father.
This makes for an intensely
personal and brutally
honest book.*

someone who wrapped himself in the flag after having paid none of the price patriotism can exact is so scathing that it is hard to believe Trible's blocking of his appointment to a House committee staff after the election could have come as any surprise.

His account of his descent into and recovery from alcoholism completes what can only be described as a harrowing book.

It is hard to ask for something more or different from someone who has given as unstintingly and completely of himself as Puller has in this autobiography. Anyone who went through the physical and psychic ordeal he did would be forced to focus inward simply to survive. As he himself puts it, his journey toward spiritual recovery has been one of "getting outside myself," and the reader is left with the sense he has just emerged.

Thus the book leaves a desire to know more about the son's reflections on his father and their relationship. A series of increasingly debilitating strokes first impaired the general's ability to communicate and finally took his life in October of 1971, almost exactly three years after his son was wounded. They did not have the chance to talk through what had happened because, as Puller puts it, "when my father was ready to talk about it, he was unable, and while I was able, I was unready."

Finally, it would be good to know what someone whose wisdom has been so hard-earned makes of the country's more recent history and leadership. Given his position as an attorney on the staff of the secretary of defense, his insights would seem particularly valu-

able. "Fortunate Son" leaves a mix of emotions and impressions. One is that Puller remains deeply ambivalent about the Marine Corps and the country for which he has sacrificed so much. At the conclusion of the book he writes that, after attending a Marine Corps reunion, "I wondered how, after a lifetime of contact with the Marine Corps, I could love and despise it with so much equal ardor." I suspect he would find that many of his generation who shared even a small measure of his experience also share his ambivalence about their service.

A second impression is that Puller is convinced that he has somehow not measured up to the standard set by his father. In the book's epilogue he describes talking with a group of Soviet veterans of their adventures in Afghanistan. In the course of the meeting he is told by a Soviet officer that the latter had studied his father in military schools. After the encounter he writes, "I realized with a mixture of pride and resignation that my father's shadow was even longer than I had thought."

But the final and lasting impression a reading of the book leaves is of having been in the company of an extraordinary individual. In 1966 "Chesty" Puller visited the Naval Station at which I was stationed, and my wife and I attended a reception held for him by the station's Marine Detachment. Two recollections of the occasion stick in my mind. The first is that, as might have been expected, this larger than life figure turned out to be physically a much smaller man than I had imagined.

The second is of his spending almost half an hour talking quietly with my wife about Mary Washington College, where she and Martha Puller, Lewis Jr.'s twin sister, had both been undergraduates. My wife and I, a brand new Navy ensign very much wet behind the ears, were both completely charmed by this gracious and courtly man of such enormous and ferocious reputation.

General Lewis B. "Chesty" Puller was a warrior and a father. His son concludes that as a warrior he "may not have performed as well" as his father had. I am not so sure and I do not think the general would agree either. Courage takes many forms, and it may be that Lewis B. Puller, Jr., is precisely the sort of role model for which the "men's movement" may be looking. ■

A Challenge To U.S. Aviation Leadership: Launching The New Era Of Global Aviation

by Donald T. Bliss, Jr.

On October 24, 1978, the Airline Deregulation Act was signed into law, and a new era in domestic aviation began. Twelve years later, the aviation industry appears in chaos. The U.S. industry lost over \$2 billion in 1990, an historic high. A grand old air carrier, Eastern Airlines, ceased operations altogether. Several other major carriers, including Pan Am, Continental, Midway and America West, have declared bankruptcy. The first quarter for 1991 set a record of losses that surpassed any quarter in 1990.

The reasons underlying the financial chaos of the industry are multiple and complex: plummeting international travel and escalating fuel prices during the Persian Gulf War, overaggressive decisions by some airline managements, and the inevitable shaking-out process as aviation moves from a highly protected regime to a freely competitive one. The greatest present threat to aviation, however, may be myopic policymakers who draw the wrong conclusions from the temporary chaos that faces the industry. Among the erroneous themes currently reverberating around officialdom are:

- Deregulation has failed; some form of reregulation is essential to create stability.
- The federal government must play a more activist role in inter-

Donald T. Bliss, Jr. is president of the Ripon Society, and the proposals presented in this article are on behalf of the Society. Although he is also a Washington attorney engaged in the practice of aviation law, the views expressed herein do not purport to represent his law firm or the firm's clients.

vening in marketplace decisions to shore up the weaker carriers and promote new entrant carriers; and

- U.S. carriers need government protection from foreign competition.

The greatest present threat to aviation may be myopic policymakers who draw the wrong conclusions from the temporary chaos that faces the industry.

Perched in the midst of a swirling thunderstorm, it is difficult to view with perspective the long-term horizon. Aviation experts, moreover, are very much victims of an increasingly irrelevant history in which domestic travel was constrained by a static, highly regulated environment and foreign travel by a rigid bilateral structure designed to protect each nation's "chosen instrument." A clear view of aviation's future — unfettered by the assumption that past is prologue — suggests three themes that should be operating assumptions among government policymakers:

- On balance, domestic deregulation has been an overwhelming success, and the American consumer has been the primary beneficiary;
- International markets present the greatest opportunity for growth, thereby increasing the pressure for globalization of airlines and markets; and

- The greatest restraints on competition are capacity constraints that governments are uniquely positioned to alleviate.

Each of these conclusions requires further discussion since they are the foundation upon which a new aviation structure can be created for the future.

1. Deregulation has greatly benefited the consumer.

According to a respected Brookings Institution study, consumers have realized \$10 billion annually in service and fare benefits as a result of deregulation. Average fares, adjusted for inflation, have declined nearly 30 percent since 1981. More than 90 percent of all travelers fly on discount fares. As a result, nearly 75 percent of Americans have now flown, compared to fewer than half prior to deregulation.

Contrary to popular myth, competition is more intense today than ever before. Over half of all airline passengers travel in markets served by three or more carriers, compared to less than a quarter before deregulation. Small- and medium-sized communities have experienced significant expansions in services.

These service and fare benefits have accrued from the innovative actions of U.S. carriers operating in a free market environment — actions including the design of efficient hub and spoke operations, advanced yield management techniques, frequent flyer and other creative marketing initiatives, and revolutionary information technology such as computer reservation systems.

2. The international structure of aviation inevitably will change.

As a result of the 1944 Chicago Convention, aviation has inherited a complex web of bilateral agreements that

have failed to keep pace with today's increasingly inter-dependent global economy. Ironically, the industry that knits together the interdependent world economies is out of step with increasing globalization, and thus inevitably must change.

Factors that will force a change include the unification of the European Community, which will establish a huge international aviation market in which arcane bilateral restrictions no longer make sense; the urgent need for free-flowing capital that will break down artificial national barriers on foreign investment; and increasing recognition that government subsidized or nationalized air carriers are an inefficient way to allocate scarce resources in a market-based global economy.

Three fundamental premises — the success of competitive markets domestically, the changing global structure and the need for capacity enhancement — call for a dynamic new aviation policy.

To be more specific, as the nations of the European Community cede power to the EC to conduct multilateral negotiations that will allow member carriers like British Airways, Air France and Lufthansa to fly from multiple European cities to the United States, existing bilateral restrictions on routes will yield to open skies competition between the continents. Presumably, the U.S. government will seek, in return, additional rights for U.S. carriers to fly between points in Europe and beyond, thus expanding international market opportunities for U.S. carriers. Inevitably, the efficiencies of domestic hub and spoke systems will be replicated on an international scale.

Second, as U.S. carriers struggle to replace the world's oldest aircraft fleet, to meet tough new Stage 3 noise standards, and to respond to increasingly aggressive foreign competitors, they must find new sources of capital to meet the nearly \$12 billion projected annual shortfall. In his June 20 speech before

the British American Chamber of Commerce in London, U.S. Secretary of Transportation Samuel Skinner recognized this urgent need for capital when he proposed lifting the outdated U.S. 25 percent statutory ceiling on foreign investment in U.S. carriers and replacing it with a 49 percent ceiling.

Finally, the successful privatization of British Airways and several Pacific carriers, coupled with increasing respect for the efficient allocation of resources in market-based economies, will lead inexorably toward additional privatization opportunities among the international carriers. U.S. investors should be among those seeking to capitalize on these opportunities.

3. Government imposed restraints on competition.

There has been much debate in recent months about increasing concentration in the airline industry, and the alleged attributes of market power possessed by the largest air carriers computer reservation systems, frequent flyer programs, majority-in-interest airport leaseholdings, and take-off and landing slots. But CRS systems and frequent flyer programs offer substantial consumer benefits and can be important tools of competition as well, and the constraints on airport capacity, including slots, gates and air congestion, can be alleviated through government capacity enhancement.

According to the Air Transport Association, in 1990 there were more than a thousand airline delays of 15 minutes or more, one-third of them the result of inefficiencies in the air traffic system. These delays added \$2 billion to industry operating costs. Efforts to modernize the air traffic control system and expand capacity of the nation's airports are moving at a snail's pace, while millions of dollars in airline ticket tax money has been diverted for deficit reduction purposes.

Three fundamental premises — the success of competitive markets domestically, the changing global structure and the need for capacity enhancement — call for a dynamic new aviation policy. Instead of seeking through reregulation and market intervention to turn back the pages of history to a time when there were a set number of U.S. air carriers, each operating within its own regulatory niche, policymakers

The U.S. government should call for a new Chicago Convention, but such a Convention should be limited to specific economic issues that can be addressed effectively on a multilateral basis at this time.

ought to consider the evolution of almost any other market-based industry. The most obvious is the automobile industry. Early in the century there were many U.S. automobile companies; today there are few. Yet, the industry is intensely competitive. And that competition is truly globalized.

The United States historically has been the world's leader in developing the aviation industry and its international structure. Now, 12 years after the advent of domestic deregulation, it is time for the U.S. again to assert leadership in forging a new global aviation structure for the next century. Building upon the substantial benefits of domestic deregulation, the U.S. should announce a new international aviation policy for the future that would include the following four elements:

1. Call for a New International Convention.

The U.S. government should call for a new Chicago Convention. This has been suggested by House Aviation Subcommittee Chairman James Oberstar, but such a Convention should be limited to specific economic issues that can be addressed effectively on a multilateral basis at this time. Among the issues to be addressed are:

- A commitment to the principles of free competition in aviation; Prohibition of certain anti-competitive airline practices such as capacity restraint agreements and revenue pooling;
- A commitment by governments to phase out airline subsidies, to eliminate artificial schedule or frequency limitations, and to

Continued on page 22

THE CHAIRMAN'S CORNER

The Issue of the '90s: National Health Care

by Sherwood L. Boehlert

The answer to the prominent question — does America need a national health care program? — is relatively simple: absolutely, yes.

As national chairman of the Ripon Society, one of the things I intend to pursue actively is the development of a sensible, cohesive and affordable national health care system. There is broad consensus in our nation that every American should be entitled to affordable, accessible quality health care. According to a Lou Harris poll, more than 80 percent of Americans surveyed

Intensive care for low-birth weight babies can easily exceed \$3,000 daily, while spending \$500 on pre-natal care services could avoid this tragic situation. Clearly, we are not spending wisely.

believe that we need a national health care system. Further, we all agree that no one should be forced into poverty by high health care costs. Beyond these fundamental principles, the consensus dissipates.

In Congress there is support for reform, too. At last count, 15 major legislative proposals have been forwarded to address this issue. One proposes a fully centralized, socialized approach. Another proposes a "play or pay" mandatory employer-sponsored

Sherwood L. Boehlert is the newly-elected chairman of the Ripon Society and a member of Congress from New York.

plan. Still another proposes an expansion of Medicare to the population at large.

Last month, the **Journal of American Medicine** issued a major publication with scores of proposals to reform our health care system — with no consensus. The American Medical Association also announced a proposal on this issue last month. The health insurance industry, think tanks, advocates for the elderly, children, business and labor all agree on the need for action. Yet, there is no consensus on how we should reform our health care system.

For a generation Ripon has had an outstanding reputation as a source for creative, progressive Republican thinking. As moderates we tend to look at issues from more than one side, putting aside philosophical agendas favored by single-interest groups. Using reason and fairness, not ideology, we in Ripon are in a position to work with the various sides in the health care debate to reach a thoughtful consensus.

OUR PROBLEMS

Let me make one thing plain. This column should not be interpreted as a political document. The theme here is not a congressman from New York taking on an administration of his own party. Nor is this a moderate Republican indictment of some doing nothing attitude on the part of the Democratic leadership on Capitol Hill. I point my finger at no party and no person in particular. Politics are not the point here — people are. This time the message is too important. And the message is this: tens of millions of Americans do not have access to the basic care required to address their illnesses.

The United States spends almost 13 percent of its GNP (more than \$600 billion annually, according to the Congressional Budget Office) on health care —

far more than any other nation. We also lead the world in the development of medical technology. Ours is the best medicine money can buy, but too many of our citizens can't afford it.

The infant mortality rate in the U.S. ranks tenth in developed nations. Further, cancer death rates have not changed in 10 years. Intensive care for low-birth weight babies can easily exceed \$3,000 daily, while spending \$500 on pre-natal care services could avoid this tragic situation. Clearly, we are not spending wisely.

Among the most important steps that we can take toward a national health care system would be medical malpractice reform.

Health care professionals are poorly distributed, leaving residents of rural areas and inner cities without access to basic services. Additionally, existing services in these areas are threatened. The primary health care provider for many of the uninsured in these areas is an emergency room.

We know that more than 220 million Americans have health insurance coverage. We also know that more than 35 million Americans lack adequate health care coverage. Moreover, at least twice that many have health care coverage which does not adequately meet their health care needs. Of these un-insured and under-insured, almost 50 percent are under the age of 24.

So who are the "haves" and who are the "have-nots?" Their socio-economic positions are in fact quite similar.

The "haves" are primarily employed by a firm with health benefits; poor enough to qualify for Medicaid coverage; and old enough to qualify for Medicare coverage. The "have-nots" are employed by a firm that can't afford health benefits; poor, but not poor enough to qualify for Medicaid coverage; and older, but not old enough to qualify for Medicare coverage.

REFORMS FOR THE '90s

The simple solution would appear to be to mandate health benefits for all workers, and expand Medicaid and Medicare. But it's not that simple. With health care costs rising at a rate far higher than inflation, small employers, who employ the vast majority of working uninsured Americans, simply can not afford to pick up the tab.

Another important cost containment tool is managed care. We should consider creating incentives for insurance providers to become health care managers.

Additionally, the federal-state partnership in the Medicaid program spends more than \$80 billion annually, yet provides coverage to about 40 percent of the poor. Medicaid spending has become the fastest growing program for many state governments. The states would scream if we increased substantially their Medicaid burden.

In my home state of New York, for example, local governments are already panicking about the recent expansion of Medicaid to all poor children because, under state law, they're required to pick up 50 percent of the state's portion of Medicaid costs. It is not that the goal is unworthy, it is that the price tag scares them. Where is the money to come from? The inequitable property tax? Not very attractive!

With the increasing trend toward early retirement, many older middle class Americans lose coverage by their employer-sponsored plan, and have to purchase health insurance to replace it. Too many Americans in their late 50s

Clearly a more cohesive, fairer tax structure would achieve better health care coverage for American workers.

and early 60s, looking forward to a long retirement, find out that they are one catastrophic illness away from impoverishment.

The problems facing all retirees will only be exacerbated as we look toward the future. By the year 2000 there will be 10 million more elderly people in this country. By the year 2020, when the baby boom generation reaches retirement age, there will be 76 million more elderly Americans, roughly twice the number we have now.

Secondly, we must control the spiraling costs of health care services. Among the most important steps that we can take toward a national health care system would be medical malpractice reform. Not only are ever-increasing malpractice insurance rates pushing many health care providers (particularly specialists, most particularly obstetricians/gynecologists) out of business, the threat of huge law suits encourages the practice of defensive medicine.

Another important cost containment tool is managed care. We should consider creating incentives for insurance providers to become health care managers. Additionally, managed care is provided through health maintenance organizations and preferred provider organizations. Each of these approaches to managed care intervenes in health care choices to discourage over-utilization.

These steps would hold down unnecessary procedures. A recent study of the impact of managed care on Medicare spending concluded that large percentages of procedures were inappropriate. Many self-insured health plans currently practice managed care, and their leaders have testified in Congress that managed care works to hold down health care costs.

Our health care tax policies currently provide enormous subsidies (\$46 billion worth) to those with health coverage, but not for those who lack

coverage. Large employers are allowed a 100 percent deductibility of their health care premiums, while small business owners and farmers can only deduct 25 percent of their premium costs. Remember that the vast majority of working Americans, who lack health care coverage, are employed by small businesses. Clearly a more cohesive, fairer tax structure would achieve better health care coverage for American workers.

As Health and Human Services Secretary Louis Sullivan has proposed, we should encourage greater emphasis on preventive care. The old saying still holds true: "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." For example, annual mammography screening and pre-natal care sharply reduce overall health care spending. Further, the uninsured and under-insured are more likely to delay care, which increases costs. The system is reacting to ill health rather than promoting good health.

RIPON'S ROLE

The sad fact is that those who lack health care coverage today are not beating down the doors of Congress demanding reform. More than 35 million Americans are being denied their right to affordable, accessible health care. We in the Ripon Society must work to forge a consensus on health care reform. If we are not up to the challenge, we are not worth our weight in salt.

As we work to build consensus towards national health care policy, consider the example of the first, and the most revered, Republican president. At the time of the convention in 1860, Abraham Lincoln was under pressure from all sides — abolitionists, prohibitionists, conservatives and reformists — to be pinned down as an ideologue. He refused. A friend, Judge David Davis, wrote on Lincoln's behalf, "He neither is, nor will be, in advance of the election, committed to any man, clique or faction.... He thinks he will need the assistance of all.... He could not afford to dispense with the best talents, nor to outrage the popular will in any locality."

Through consensus building, we in the Ripon Society can have a part to play in making national health care an expression of the best talents of the popular will. ■

Continued from page 19

liberalize pricing oversight;

- Uniformity of approach to easing national restrictions on foreign investments in airlines;
- Guidelines to encourage the liberalization of multilateral and bilateral aviation relationships to maximize the freedom of private carriers to serve international route networks efficiently and to set fares competitively; and
- Uniform guidelines on the taxation of international passengers, airport slot allocation, efficiency of customs and immigration and naturalization services, ground handling services and security requirements.

2. Encourage the Negotiation of "Open Skies" Multilateral and Bilateral Aviation Agreements.

As the international conference seeks agreement on basic principles and guidelines, the U.S. should pursue vigorously all opportunities to negotiate "open skies" agreements on a multilateral or bilateral basis. Such agreements would maximize the flexibility of multiple U.S. carriers to serve numerous foreign destinations, to pick up traffic in foreign cities and carry it to other countries, and to price competitively (e.g. double disapproval pricing regimes in which filed tariffs can be disapproved only by the actions of both affected governments). Such aviation agreements also could include the exchange of rights for carriers of each nation party to provide service between cities of the other nation parties (i.e., cabotage) where it is in the interest of U.S. airlines and consumers to do so.

As a first priority, the U.S. should seek to negotiate a model "new era" bilateral with Canada and a model "multilateral" agreement with the EC.

3. Liberalization of U.S. Foreign Investment Requirements.

Secretary of Transportation Samuel Skinner has now proposed raising the statutory ceiling on foreign investment in U.S. airlines to 49 percent. This proposal should be enacted, and, in addition, the secretary should be authorized to permit controlling foreign

investment in certain circumstances where specific public interest standards are satisfied, including the need for foreign capital to preserve competitive service in the U.S., a guarantee that national security interests will be preserved (e.g., civil defense programs) and the assurance of comity under which U.S. investors receive equal investment opportunities under the laws of the nation in which the foreign investor resides.

4. Capacity Enhancement Program.

The U.S. should undertake an accelerated program to expand airport capacity, seeking to alleviate unnecessary restrictions on airport access and modernize the airport traffic control system. In turn, the U.S. should encourage other nations and organizations such as the EC to integrate and modernize air traffic control systems. Capacity enhancement on a world-wide basis should include:

- 1. The flexible and expanded use of recently authorized passenger facility charges to leverage the financing of airport expansion and new airport construction;
- 2. Privatization of the operation (but not the regulation) of the air traffic control system and capital development program to modernize that system;
- 3. Removal of unnecessary capacity constraints at slot-controlled airports through more efficient use of airspace;
- 4. The use of peak pricing to encourage optimal utilization in the management of multiple airports serving a region; and
- 5. International funding of a global air traffic system, applying the latest in U.S. technology for navigation, flow management, surveillance and satellite communications in transoceanic flights.

U.S. leadership in advancing this four-point strategy would launch a new, global era in aviation — an era in which the consumer benefits of domestic deregulation would be replicated throughout the world. Fostering such competitive freedom on an international scale, as it exists in many other in-

dustries today, would enable U.S. carriers to grow and expand in international markets through the efficient use of innovative technology, route structuring and marketing that has been so ably demonstrated at home. ■

Ripon Society Policy Calendar

This summer the Ripon Society is continuing its series of policy meetings by sponsoring four breakfast meetings on banking policy. Below is a listing of speakers and subjects:

July 16 — Congressman Jim Leach on Congress and Banking Reform.

July 18 — Congressman Tom Ridge on the Work of the House Banking Committee.

July 29 — Robert Clarke, Comptroller of the Currency, on the Bush Administration and Banking Reform.

July 30 — C.C. Hope, Director of the FDIC, on New Banking Legislation.

For more information, please contact Jean Hayes of the Ripon Society, (202) 546-1292.

709 SECOND STREET



Congressman Sherwood Boehlert

BOEHLERT ELECTED RIPON CHAIRMAN

Representative Sherwood Boehlert of New York was elected chairman of the Ripon Society during the annual meeting of the Ripon National Governing Board on May 11. Boehlert has served in Congress since 1982, during which time he has been an active member of the Society's Congressional Advisory Board.

The five-term legislator succeeds Representative William Clinger of Pennsylvania, who served as chairman of the Society from December 1988 — May 1991. Congressman Clinger will remain as chairman of the Ripon Educational Fund.

Boehlert's appointment already has attracted several press reviews. Jonathan Salant of the **Syracuse Herald American**, for example, recently wrote a profile of Boehlert in which Salant said that "the moderate wing of the GOP, though severely clipped, keeps on flying."

With a bit more optimism, Boehlert told Salant that: "Moderate Republicans are very alive and well and doing what they do best — stimulating progressive thinking." In particular, Boehlert said that he wishes to focus on health care as a primary issue during his Ripon tenure. According to the upstate New York representative: "I'm convinced by the end of the decade, we're going to have a national health system. I'm not sure what the answer is, but we have to find it." (See "The Chairman's Corner," pages

21 and 22.)

In this profile, Boehlert also cited the accomplishments of moderates last fall in passing the five-year, \$500 billion deficit reduction plan. And he pointed out the key role played by Ripon Congressional Advisory Board member John Danforth (R-Mo.) in promoting the civil rights agenda in the U.S. Senate. Both episodes, Boehlert said, are good examples of moderate Republican leadership.

MCKENZIE ACCEPTS POSITION AT DALLAS MORNING NEWS

William McKenzie, editor of the **Ripon Forum** and executive director of the Ripon Educational Fund, has accepted a position with **The Dallas Morning News** as an editorial writer and columnist. He will begin that assignment on July 29.

McKenzie has served as editor of the **Ripon Forum** since February 1981. He also served as executive director of the Ripon Society from October 1986 through February 1991. In February 1991 he assumed the newly-created position of executive director of the Ripon Educational Fund.

In a press release announcing McKenzie's departure, Ripon President Donald T. Bliss said that: "Bill McKenzie has been the heart and soul of Ripon for a decade. His departure leaves a real vacuum. Bill has been an effervescent source of innovative policy ideas and principled positions that have kept progressive Republicanism as a significant force within the Republican Party and in the body politic at large. He will be sorely missed, but we are delighted that he has an opportunity to be a part of a respected voice of the American Southwest. We congratulate him on his new job and wish him the best of luck in Texas."

RIPON ACTIVITIES

A meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Ripon Society will be held on July 27 in Philadelphia from 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon. The host

will be new Ripon NGB and NEC member Michael L. Browne. The meeting is open to all Ripon members who wish to attend. If interested, please contact Jean Hayes of the Ripon national office.

The Ripon Educational Fund's 1991 Urban Affairs Conference was held at Howard University in Washington, D.C. on June 24. Participating in this day-long event, which was cosponsored by the Howard political science department, were Ripon leaders, urban affairs specialists, Bush administration representatives and Howard professors.

The first session focused on community-based services. Presentations were delivered by Nicholas Certo, Department of Health and Human Services; Scott Reznick, Commonwelath Development Associates; Peter Smith, National Commission on Responsibilities for Financing Post-Secondary Education; and Paul Bardack, Department of Housing and Urban Development. Topics included social service delivery systems and neighborhood economic development.

The morning's second panel involved presentations by Steven Glaude, Department of Housing and Urban Development; Peggy Sand, Washington Area Council on Governments; and Robert Moore, Development Corporation of Columbia Heights. Reports were presented on tenant management of public housing and non-profit housing development.

The conference's luncheon address was delivered by Ralph Neas of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. His subject was the 1991 civil rights agenda and Neas' speech was televised by C-Span.

Speakers for the first afternoon session included: Mickey Kaus, **The New Republic**; Martin Gerry, Department of Health and Human Services; Stephen Moore, CATO Institute; and Jerry Cates, Howard University. The panel focused on workfare programs, service integration and immigration policies.

The conference concluded with James Pinkerton of the White House domestic policy staff and Ron Walters of the Howard political science department debating the Bush administration's domestic priorities. ■

THE NINTH TRANSATLANTIC CONFERENCE OF THE RIPON EDUCATIONAL FUND

ROME, ITALY NOVEMBER 16 – 23, 1991

The Ninth Transatlantic Conference of the Ripon Educational Fund will be held in Rome from November 16 – 23, 1991. The air and land package from Washington, D.C. is \$2,195.00 per person, double occupancy (single supplement is \$500.00). This price includes six nights accommodation with continental breakfast, transportation to and from the Conference and sightseeing tours.

All travel arrangements should be made through Showcase Travel, 703-591-8774.

Conference topics include:

- 1992 and the Realities of European Economic Integration
- Essential Issues of the GATT Talks
- The Western Alliance in the Post-Gulf War Era
- NATO and the New World Order

For further information, please contact: John Sullivan, Kessler and Associates,
709 Second Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002, (202)-547-6808.

Read The **RIPON** *forum*. The Only Magazine of Its Kind.

Read by members of Congress, leading journalists, political activists, and especially those interested in the direction of the Republican Party.

The **RIPON** *forum* brings you regular issues filled with fresh & provocative debate on the subjects of our day, profiles of outstanding mainstream Republicans, book reviews and political news from around the nation.

The **RIPON** *forum*. The only magazine of its kind. Don't miss an issue.

To subscribe send \$30 to:

The Ripon Society 709 Second Street, N.E., Suite 100 Washington, D.C. 20002

Name: _____

Street: _____

City/State: _____

Enclosed is an additional contribution to
help the work of the Ripon Society.

___\$100 ___\$50 ___\$40 ___other