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From The Hill . . .

Some Bad News

On July 11 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by a vote of 9 to 7, voted to postpone indefinitely action on the nomination of G. McMurtrie Godley to the position of Assistant Secretary for East Asian Affairs. For its part, the AFSA Board, deeply concerned over the implications of this case for an independent career Foreign Service, has sent the following letter to Senator Fulbright:

The American Foreign Service Association—professional spokesman of the 12,000 men and women of the Foreign Service—has come to look upon the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a staunch defender of the career principle and its protection against political abuse. This has been evidenced most recently by the Committee's farsighted action in amending Section 623 of the Foreign Service Act to foreclose the possibility of promotions based on political rather than merit considerations. The men and women of the Foreign Service are indebted to the Committee for this action and the many other efforts it has taken on their behalf.

It is in this context that the Association has become seriously concerned at the possible implications of the Committee's action to reject the nomination of Ambassador Godley as Assistant Secretary for East Asian Affairs. This action has raised questions in the minds of Foreign Service officers about whether their careers may be adversely affected for honorably and effectively carrying out the foreign policy of the United States. We would like to bring some of these questions to your attention.

No one in this Association questions the Constitutional right of the Senate to provide advice and consent on Presidential appointments or the obligation of the Senate to give particularly careful scrutiny to nominees for key policy-making positions. In our view, the Senate would be abdicating its responsibility if it were to exempt career Foreign Service officers from such scrutiny or to grant them automatic approval.

Moreover, the Association recognizes the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's right to question a nominee for a policy-making post, not only as to his qualifications for the position but also as to his views about what future policy should be. However, nominees who are appointed officials, particularly career officials, are expected to have supported basic foreign policy established by duly elected officials in their respective Constitutional roles. The Foreign Service is, and must remain, a strictly non-partisan institution available for loyal service to each administration.

An officer of the Foreign Service must not feel constrained by fear of future penalty from carrying out a given foreign policy or from giving impartial advice and assessment, however unpopular or incompatible such actions may be with the views of the public, the press, the Congress, or the Executive. To penalize an officer for performing his functions to the best of his ability runs a grave risk of doing damage, not only to the career service, but to the nation.

Unfortunately, many Foreign Service officers are uncertain as to the basis for the Committee's action on Ambassador Godley's nomination. Many believe him to be the innocent victim of a serious conflict between the Executive and Legislative branches over the relative influence each will have in determining the direction of US foreign policy. Others feel he has been made a symbol by the Committee of its strong disagreement with the Administration's policies in Southeast Asia. If either of these were the basis for the Committee's action, we believe it would be an unfortunate use of the advice and consent power, with serious implications for the independence, impartiality and effectiveness of the career service.

We would appreciate receiving a clarification of the Committee's intent in its rejection of Ambassador Godley, and assurances that it will not reject future career nominees because of their record of carrying out policies laid down by the Executive.

We hope the reply from the Committee will address directly the issues we raised. In the meantime, we believe this matter deserves careful study by the men and women of the Foreign Service. Copies of statements on this issue by the President, the Secretary, and Senator Pell are reproduced in the AFSA NEWS elsewhere in this JOURNAL, as well as a reply from Senator Fulbright.

And Some Good

Contrasting sharply with the rejection of Ambassador Godley, there has also been some very good news for us from the Hill. The Senate/House Conference Committee agreed to a number of special provisions to the Department of State Authorization Act of 1973 which, if the Bill is passed and signed by the President, will bring substantial benefits for the Foreign Service. Foremost of these is the decision to amend Section 623 of the Foreign Service Act to assure that promotion recommendations made to the President shall be on the basis of rank order findings by selection boards, and shall not be on the basis of political considerations. This action, which was opposed by the Department, forecloses the kind of serious challenge to the career principle posed by former USIA Director Shakespeare, who had ordered lists of FSIO-I's drawn on the basis of alphabetical listing of those eligible for promotion rather than on the basis of merit. The Committee also provided a legislative basis for promotions and in-step increases accomplished pursuant to actions of grievance boards. This too eliminates potentially serious abuses which were detailed in last month's editorial.

The Committee report also authorizes for the first time payment of kindergarten allowances for the Foreign Service, thus giving us the same benefits as those currently available to Department of Defense employees, and provides for a limited housing supplement for some of the employees assigned to USUN.

The only dark spot was the decision by the Committee to drop for this year action on grievance legislation for the Foreign Service.

The men and women of the Foreign Service owe a debt of gratitude to a number of the distinguished Senators and Representatives who served on the Conference Committee, particularly to Senator Pell whose defense of the merit principle and whose vigorous actions on behalf of the Foreign Service were largely responsible for these important legislative gains.
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"they have Moses and the prophets"

WILLIAM N. TURPIN

Dr. John A. Hannah has stated the case for economic assistance to the developing countries (Journal, June, 1973) as tersely and as accurately as, I think, it can be done: Our self-interest requires it; our ideals compel it.

One might, indeed, wish that Dr. Hannah had gone on to state equally precisely what our objectives are and how our programs plan their attainment. For I think one of the problems we have had in advocating foreign aid is that our aid programs have had so many, not necessarily mutually exclusive, but at least incomensurable, stated purposes. Containing Communism, rebuilding war damage, promoting collective military security (and sending supporting assistance), nation-building, spreading American institutions, promoting democratic societal change, securing support for US policy goals—the list is not only endless, it is confusing. If for no other reason, it darkens counsel because it makes it impossible to tell whether, or to what degree, any particular objective has been or might be achieved.

The problem this article hopes to examine is why this and similar well-reasoned assertions of propositions which many people have enthusiastically agreed in the past, and to which many still would give assent, do not seem to carry much persuasive power any more.

We might, of course, find any number of psychological reasons for this state of affairs. My observations seem to suggest that the country outside of Washington is bored with foreign affairs and faintly, often not so faintly, annoyed by them. Even among those groups which still profess an interest in the subject, one gets the feeling that they are going to this church out of habit and a vague feeling that doing so is a "good thing." Vigorous partisanship of a positive nature on the subject there is not—opposition to any suggestion of American "involvement" gets much more spontaneous support.

To what extent this state of mind is the result of Vietnam need not here concern us. But we may assume an obligation to expend $7.5 billion over the next five years in both parts of that country, implying an annual commitment of the same order of magnitude as our aid appropriations are now running. Moreover, domestic problems and environmental issues attract more popular interest than economic development abroad. And the President, the Congress, and the electorate express reluctance to raise taxes. All these facts make the task of those who argue for our continuing to bear responsibility for the economic development of the outside world a heavy one. And this would be true even if we were not devoting great attention to the reconstruction of the world monetary and trading order. There must, after all, be some limit to the number of priorities which can be top.

But rather than consider the psychological difficulties in the way of those who plead the cause of the developing nations, I should like to try to picture some ideas which may be held by people entirely sympathetic to that cause and intensely interested in the now perhaps demoded problems of foreign affairs.

Much of what I shall say will sound hostile and cynical. I beg the reader to believe my assertion that my intention is not to attack AID and the idea of foreign aid, but rather to formulate and express propositions which embody the doubts of the people who are deeply concerned with the well-being of our global village, who want to avoid inanity on space-ship earth, who want the revolution of rising expectations to succeed. I mean to try, if you please, to bring to the light of day things that go bump in the night even for those of us who do not want to believe in ghosts.

For there are, among the well-intentioned men concerned about foreign affairs, surely none who think poverty and the growing split between the affluent and the desperate nations are either desirable or nonexistent. No doubt those of us whose major interests and professional concerns lie elsewhere are less emotionally involved than those whose jobs bring them into daily contact with the terrible injustices that man's society still works on unconscionable numbers of his fellow creatures. But we feel the concern, none the less. And we know that the good of each is intimately connected with the good of all. We have spent our lives serving and preaching that doctrine, one way and another.

And yet I am not aware of any great feeling of urgency on the part of anyone whose job doesn't depend on the continuation of aid along more or less traditional lines.

Why do not the traditional, familiar truths so well marshaled by Dr. Hannah carry the ring of conviction? The answers which follow do not pretend to be complete or unassailable. Moreover, they are not given in any visible order of importance. They are presented, rather, as formulations of reservations which the most benevolent may well press against AID aiding as usual.

There is, to begin with, the serious question whether our assistance really helps (we shall touch on the ques-
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tion of whom it helps later). The usual response to this line of attack is to point to the success of the Marshall Plan in Europe, and to the undoubted, if not indubitable, success stories of Korea, Taiwan, etc. It is not, however, considered necessary to explain the sociological, the political, or even the economic processes by which these victories were racked up, far less to explain the connection between what we did and what we achieved. The converse—why has aid not succeeded, why has “take-off” not taken place, in such places as Argentina, Chile, indeed in Latin America as a whole—is not asked, or at least not answered. That there is impressive progress in Brazil, in Mexico, no one questions—but the point is that the aid apologists do not even try to understand and to explain the connection between assistance inputs and the results. In short, we do not have, I submit, any sort of comprehension of how what we are doing bears on attaining the goals Dr. Hannah rightly says our interests and our ideals demand that we pursue. We simply do not have any persuasive development theory that can explain what happened and what didn’t happen and why.

The situation is not helped any, either, by the state of our numerical knowledge of the developing countries. Economic statistics even for developed countries—which spend considerable sums of money on them and employ highly sophisticated technicians and techniques on gathering and massaging them—are somewhat less precise than the worship devoted to them justifies. But one needs only a nodding acquaintance with the methodologies and the practices of some of our developing neighbors to begin to wonder if even the signs are right, let alone the magnitudes. After all, we have heard so often about the “per capita income of Ruritania is only $90 per year” that some day somebody is going to wonder out loud how, if that be true, any Ruritanian survives. Quite obviously he couldn’t do it if $90 a year meant what it seems to mean. Something, one feels, is wrong. And it simply will not do to say, “Oh well, that just means that Ruritanians are poor.” It does not. It means that we know how poor, and that if they became less poor we would know with some degree of precision how much less. We would have some basis for measuring the effects of our efforts—and theirs. And while I have never heard the intellectual nakedness of this emperor referred to, I should not be surprised if it were not subconsciously suspected rather widely.

But more than the magnitude of the problem is here in question. If we really don’t know the global numbers, there is some ground for suspicion about the more circumscribed ones on which we base strategies and programs.

Finally, men of good will are not indifferent to the fate of “democratic” governments in the countries we have been helping. It is not necessary to believe that American foreign assistance efforts caused the disappearance of parliamentary forms from the newly liberated countries of Africa or the rise of military dictatorships in “our” parts of Asia, to realize that aid is not demonstrably efficacious in promoting liberty.

A related bogey, like the lack of a convincing rationale for what we are doing, questions not the sincerity nor the specific professional qualifications of a generation of AID employees (though candor would demand the raising even of this touchy one), but whether the people who
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have planned and run the programs, in Washington and in the field, have really had a clue as to what they were doing. Although this rubric sounds much like the preceding one, what I have in mind is rather the tactical application of the strategic plans which, in the preceding paragraphs, I ventured to doubt had persuasively valid foundations.

For example, it seemed somewhat improbable to at least one outsider with no prior knowledge of Latin America that the Alliance for Progress, which seemed to assume the voluntary self-liquidation of a not very visibly enlightened ruling class, had much chance of success. I once asked some Treasury experts how they would answer the proposition that about as much foreign exchange was flowing out of Latin America into numbered Swiss bank accounts with Latin owners as the US was pumping in. They said they had no notion of the amounts, but the proposition would not in the least surprise them. Casual experience with two Asian countries led one layman to wonder about the utility of training programs in the United States for Koreans who stayed here to work on US military contracts or South Vietnamese who did not use the Paris-Saigon portions of their return tickets.

Those with deeper knowledge of these programs will display the ready American willingness to admit that "of course we've made mistakes," but they will argue that the mistakes are minor. What, however, is worrisome in this area of tactical competence is not the specific wastes of individual cases, but the turn of mind which failed to foresee these obvious difficulties and plowed ahead anyway.

In short, while it is indubitably excessively cynical to say so, there is some excuse for the feeling that the greatest accomplishment of the American foreign assistance program is the fact that it kept off the American scene a number of people whose "contributions" here would have interfered more with human progress than their activities abroad did.

Our young neo-leftists and their co-believers abroad would argue that "imperialistic" assistance inevitably leads to the entrenchment of corrupt dictatorships (the two words seem to go together, like damn and Yankee in the South of my youth) and to the enrichment of new bourgeoisies. And it is not altogether easy to meet the argument. It certainly cannot be answered by the assertion, which I have no doubt is true, that we don't intend that result, or even that under AID's new (or allegedly new) "sectoral" approach more attention is to be given to unemployment and income distribution, both urban and rural. Intentions and aspirations and even new approaches are one thing, results are another. It is also not enough to say that where we don't give aid (e.g. Mexico) the same problems arise. What has not been shown is that we know either why these results emerge, or that our people and our plans can reasonably be expected to have different ones from now on.

And similarly, while we all know now about overpopulation, and while we must greet with joy the technical advances like the Green Revolution and (if they prove out) the new birth control methods AID research has developed, one may wonder why we should believe that the present chances of success are much greater than the results of past activity, or even non-activity, on the part
of AID. Granted, it is a visible sign of enlightenment, however belated, that the United States can now officially admit that overpopulation causes problems and officially move gingerly against it, with victory possible only after another generation of a billion births or so. Granted also that any progress we make is a Good Thing. But will it really cope with the problem, or just solve our consciences and palliate it a bit? This is what has not, I think, been demonstrated with sufficient convincing power.

These doubts about the basic ability of AID’s people to cope with the problems of development come to something of a head when one observes the AID apparatus in the field and more especially in Washington, and when one tries to deal with it on some specific problem. To the insider, it may all make perfectly good sense; to the outsider, it frequently does not. Some compromise with political reality here or abroad is obviously necessary; but it is disheartening to see the weary acceptance of, say, concurrence in an Inter-American Development Bank project because of the Buggins’ turn philosophy which is adduced in its defence. Or acceptance by the National Advisory Council of a dubious IBRD project on the grounds that once the question reaches the NAC, it would be politically embarrassing to turn it down.

It would, also, be interesting to be told what proportion of AID appropriations have been spent on the salaries of American and foreign personnel, other than those working directly with the foreign beneficiaries of our assistance, (By which I mean doctors treating patients, or even doctors training other doctors.) There is also, I suggest, a case for cost-benefit studies of many of these efforts; cynicism about the merits of US charitable foundations is rising, and will probably continue to, as we are told that on the average they spend one dollar on their own administration for two they dispense in furtherance of their purported objectives (see the Washington Post, February 18, 1973). The whole concept of dealing with US domestic poverty by providing services is under serious attack; I refer the interested reader to studies by Moynihan, Jencks, etc. And while I cannot document similar fears about the AID apparatus, a stroll among the appropriate offices does not dispel them.

To these two arguments, which may be summed up as we don’t understand the problem and we are not applying to it competent and competently organized people, must be added a third. It holds that neither the governments nor the peoples of the developing world really want development at the price to them which they will have to pay, not alone because we are parsimonious, but because things are as they are and the oldest rule (some say the only unquestionable truth) in economics is, there ain’t no free lunch. The people we are trying to help, it sometimes seems, not only want to make economic omelettes without breaking (their own) eggs, they want us to provide them with square circles. They not only want the benefits of progress without the monetary costs (or only if we pay the costs), but they want things which are mutually exclusive. (They are, of course, not alone in this habit of mind.)

The kind of thing I have in mind is perhaps as well (Continued on page 26)
Competition, political blackmail, resource waste, backward technology and increasing tension OR cooperation, new technological advances, conservation and equitable allocation of resources.

**ENERGY CRISIS and INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION**

HARRY C. BLANEY

Energy has become another example of how the international system, as it functions today, does not work. Problems which were known more than six years ago were simply not grasped by the makers of foreign policy or the institutions which served them.

No better example of the inadequacy of our present organizations and procedures can be found than a close examination of the international aspects of the so-called energy crisis. Yet, this subject is only a single instance of many where it is clear that our present institutions will not serve our future needs.

The rush of nations for more energy to meet growing demand has important implications for both the rich industrialized countries and the developing Third World. They are increasingly finding a crucial danger to their growth and standard of living from the scarcity of energy. Yet, most individual nations and, in particular, the international community have yet to develop a common long-term strategy to deal with the problem of scarcity or the new dilemmas which will arise from efforts to overcome the present situation.

Now that the Administration has revealed its proposed energy policy, one hopes that a serious national debate will take place about this country's direction with respect to the problem of future energy supply. This debate should include the life style and environmental implications of alternative approaches. But it is clear from a reading of all viewpoints that it will be necessary to develop new energy sources for growing world-wide demand, no matter what final level of "sustainable growth" will be chosen simply because of population increase and the needs of the developing world.

One salient factor of the energy crisis is that it is shared by all industrialized countries, particularly those in Western Europe and Japan. For these nations the real issue is how they can maintain secure and safe supplies of energy over the long run. This common dilemma could prove to be an opportunity for providing a significant solution.

The short-run political and strategic aspects of the so-called energy crisis need to be dealt with first. Most experts indicate that the crisis was engendered by our own short-sighted policies and practices—the most important being the oil import quota. Many of these experts believe that the United States can keep its energy costs within reason with a policy of increased and diversified oil imports over the short run. This approach should be combined with the development of new...
Some of the latter problems are porting about 11-12 million barrels that the United States will be importing in 1980, or about one-half of our total oil consumption. Not all of this would be from the Middle East.

Estimates now indicate that we will import in 1973 about six million barrels per day out of a total consumption of roughly 17 million barrels. Even assuming that by 1980 the United States will consume 20-24 million barrels per day of which half would have to be imported, only somewhat less than 70 percent of this would be from the Eastern Hemisphere. We then might see 20-35 percent of total consumption from the Eastern Hemisphere.

Further, it must be remembered that even the Middle East is not a single unified political unit. It is highly unlikely that all Middle East oil producing states would consent to act together for narrow political ends. (One major supplier from this area is not even an Arab bloc country—Iran.) Nor is it in their own self-interest to do so given the probable long-term consequences of their action.

The balance of payments problem from increased imports should work out if the dollar devaluation and efforts to stop inflation have their intended effect. These measures, along with reasonable cooperation in marketing and storage and conservation among the industrialized nations, should considerably "cool down" the crisis-like approach which both consumer and producing nations have taken toward the supply of oil.

Despite the clear advantages there remain uncertainty with respect to international cooperation in the energy field. A major choice faces the industrialized countries: should they cooperate jointly to overcome a common energy crisis or go it alone and act competitively and perhaps endanger the well-being or even the security of nations considered friends. Already it looks as if Japan has adopted a "loner" policy of direct competition with Western industrialized countries for Middle East oil.

Beyond the issue of individual national competition for scarce resources, a condition we are likely to see more and more, is the question of how the energy demands of the Third World are to be met. A rich nation club will not solve for very long. Soon many energy exporting countries will see the clear wisdom of developing greater utilization of their own endowments and see industrial development as a better alternative than gold in the bank. They will, in short, want to export energy intensive goods rather than the raw fuels. This will result in lesser amounts of natural fuels being available.

Developing countries that are poor in fossil fuel resources will increasingly want to increase their imports with growth of population and industry. They will be cut off from such supplies by the factors outlined above. They will want therefore to turn to new energy technology—probably nuclear energy.

Yet, the most immediate issue is the problem of energy scarcity in the industrialized world. Dr. Henry Kissinger touched on this topic in his speech of April 23 before the Associated Press. He specifically cited and linked questions of energy supply and the long-range common political and strategic interests of Europe and North America. He said: "This could be an area of competition; it should be an area of collaboration." Perhaps one of the first key tests of the willingness of the industrialized countries to see themselves as sharing a common destiny will be how they approach the energy issue. This will be the case first, in how they share fossil fuels, and later, and perhaps far more importantly, it will be seen in their dissemination of nuclear power technology among themselves and throughout the world—a technology now controlled by the industrialized nations but which will eventually be required by all parts of the globe.

What is clear about the worldwide energy crisis is that it makes a great deal of sense for the energy-consuming countries to develop jointly the necessary technology to make possible abundant and widespread energy. S. David Freeman, our country's "wise man" of the energy crisis, who now heads the Ford Foundation's Energy Policy Project, has advocated just such a US domestic program. He called for the Government to launch "a unified, vigorous research and development effort into alternative energy sources with the same sense of urgency that we embarked upon the Apollo program," in a speech given at a meeting of the Consumer Fed-
Freeman advocates a major joint effort by the Federal Government and Industry that would by 1985 develop clean energy sources from solar energy, commercial shale oil development (capable of producing one million barrels per day), commercial gasification of coal, new turbine technology for greater efficiency, new fuel cell development for more efficient energy conversion, utilization of geothermal energy, and a fluidized bed boiler to burn coal without pollutants entering the air. A consensus seems to be growing that coal may prove to be the key supplementary fuel to growing that coal may prove to be the key supplementary fuel to the crisis until an alternative longer term solution—such as fusion or fast breeders—can be perfected for commercial use. Somehow new technology must be developed to ensure air quality standards are maintained—a very difficult task.

Freeman asks that we spend about $1.5 to 2.0 billion of federal money per year in R & D work in the energy field. This would be about three times the present rate. He also calls for a single national agency to pull together the entire energy package.

To complement this national effort and, in fact, to share some of the burden, a concerted comprehensive initiative should be developed—either by the United States Government along with other like-minded governments, or by an appropriate international body. The Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) or NATO's Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS) come to mind as appropriate vehicles to work for close and effective collaboration on different aspects of the full R & D energy package.

Such cooperation makes great sense, since some countries are ahead of us in some of these fields. In the nuclear field, for example, the Europeans have much experience in the fast breeder field and have done some important work on the fusion process. Also, they are working on the utilization of solar energy. In a larger sense any new technology for utilization of non-oil based energy in any country lessens the total demand which helps all other countries. This simple fact reinforces the logic for broad-based R & D cooperation even when it would not result in an immediate commercial gain for all participating states.

Further, the Europeans have developed many good approaches to the conservation of energy which might apply here in the United States. The Europeans use mass transit, which is four times more efficient than the auto in its use of energy. They seem to utilize less electricity in lighting without any serious negative effects. In addition, they have opted for the small auto, which is energy saving. In short, we have much to learn from their experience and a way should be found to utilize their know-how.

A coordinated program of international cooperation that could be started immediately should include: first, technology related to new or more efficient energy production; second, an exchange of experience on conservation practices; and third, work on types of technology related to environmental impact.

The following tasks should be included in an effective international R & D program: (1) the development of a set of priorities in the energy field; (2) allocation of specific projects among the cooperating countries; or (3) joint development of individual programs by a number of countries pooling their money and know-how. Industry should be enlisted in each country to help do this job. Some kind of specific timetable should be established so that governments and the public are able to judge the effectiveness of each effort. However, time is running out. Action must be swift to avoid real crisis.

A very small start has already been made by the US Government through the NATO/CCMS. Chairman Russell E. Train of the Council on Environmental Quality proposed at the April 1973 plenary meeting a cooperative effort towards development of advanced energy technologies—specifically focusing on solar and geothermal sources. Meetings of experts will develop a formal proposal for discussion in the fall. Such a proposal, to work, will require additional budgetary support by the participating countries. It will also require a willingness to share information of commercial consequence which so far has been very difficult. If this or similar cooperative projects are to succeed, they must include close working contact by the top administrators having responsibility for the projects in their respective countries. Further, industry must also be engaged actively in this effort. Existing bilateral governmental efforts should naturally continue. These projects should aim at demonstrating commercial feasibility of each particular approach.

In the field of conservation, cooperative measures could focus on such areas as building design (proper insulation could cut heating consumption by one-fourth), the use of waste products for the generation of electricity, and development of low-resistance electrical transmission. It has been estimated that we could save up to one-third of our energy resources with effective conservation. Here also examination might be made of comparative experience in tax and pricing policies aimed at forcing greater conservation and more efficient utilization.

One major area where energy could be saved is the development of more efficient automobile power plants. The latter is also related to the environmental question. Even within the notoriously uptight United States Government, this controversial alternative is starting to be examined seriously.

It is in this area that it is both economically and ecologically vital for the United States and other modern nations to develop new technology. Presently, about 25 percent of our energy consumption is utilized by transportation. This amount should be reduced if only because burning oil in auto engines wastes a finite resource that could be better used for vital chemical products. Further, the resulting pollution is a serious health hazard for almost all countries of the world, particularly in their urban areas. The most important single cooperative activity that the automotive-producing countries of the world could undertake would be the accelerated development of low-energy-consuming, low-pollution power systems.

This is being done on a very
A significant number of today's students of history view the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan as counter-revolutionary moves.

**HISTORICAL REVISIONISM**

**JOHN OWENS**

The universities and

One of the surprises awaiting the Foreign Service officer who enters the academic world, either as a participant in one of the Foreign Service Institute's advanced training programs or as a "diplomat in residence," is the degree to which "revisionist" historical writing has influenced the thinking of the contemporary university community. To a striking extent, the revisionist interpretation of the events of the post-World War II period—the "Cold War"—has been accepted by a significant number of students and professors in the nation's universities. One senior professor at Princeton told this writer that no serious historian today could undertake a study of the Cold War period without being influenced at least to some degree by the views of the revisionists. And perhaps nowhere does the gap between the academic community and the "real world" of the foreign policy practitioner loom larger than in their conflicting perceptions of the history of the post-World War II period.

Briefly stated, the orthodox view of the origins of the Cold War, as held by the vast majority of persons in the foreign affairs establishment (and, until recently, by most US and British historians of the period), maintains that the Cold War started at the end of World War II when the Soviet Union rebuffed US efforts to establish international cooperation and began to forcibly impose Communist regimes on the liberated European states. According to this view, the United States was prepared to withdraw from Europe after World War II, and to look to the United Nations to preserve world peace after the destruction of Nazi Germany was completed; but, confronted by the resurgence of Soviet imperialism, the US felt compelled to balance aggressive Soviet expansionism by bolstering Europe politically, economically, and militarily. The traditionalists have maintained that were it not for massive US assistance to the war-devastated continent, Western Europe would have collapsed and fallen under Soviet domination. Further, the establishment of NATO and the rearmament of Germany provided the military strength which "contained" further Soviet expansion. Generally included within this traditional school have been such writers as Walter Lippmann and George Kennan, who despite their criticism of the emphasis upon military as opposed to economic containment of the Soviet Union, nevertheless shared the basic assumption that it was Soviet policy which lay at the heart of the problem.

While there are several forms of historical revisionism, ranging from moderate to radical, the latter are by far the most provocative and controversial, and it is with their writings that this article is concerned.

According to these writers, the Soviet Union under the leadership of Josef Stalin was essentially a conservative state, which wished to concentrate on rebuilding its war-devastated nation following the end of World War II. Initially, at least, the Soviets did not threaten Western Europe and did not intend to dominate Eastern Europe by imposing satellite governments. While it was true that the Soviets desired to have "friendly" states situated on the borders of the USSR, the revisionists insist that such a goal should have been considered reasonable by the West in view of the sufferings of the Soviet people from Nazi aggression. Stalin, the revisionists assert, desired to delineate clearly the limits of Soviet influence, and had with good faith entered into an agreement with Churchill to divide the Balkan states into spheres of Western and Eastern influence. The revisionists cite as evidence of this good faith the fact that Stalin refused to come to the aid of the Communist guerrillas in Greece, when their 1944 effort to seize power in Athens was foiled by British intervention.

Revisionists regard three specific Western actions as crucial in arousing Soviet suspicions and convincing Stalin that it would be impossible to cooperate with the US in a postwar world. These actions were the denial of Molotov's request for a $6 billion US credit for postwar Soviet reconstruction, the abrupt termination of lend-lease (to Britain as well as to Russia) in May 1945, and the Western refusal to go along with Soviet demands for $10 billion in reparations for the USSR from defeated Germany. In short, the revisionists claim that with its suspicions aroused by these actions, Moscow was practically compelled to react to such "aggressive" American actions as the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the rearmament of Germany, and the establishment of NATO, all of which aroused traditional Russian fears of hostile aims on the part of the outside world. The Soviet defensive response (according to the revisionists) was the establishment of the Cominform and the tightening of control over the satellite nations. And the end result was the launching of the arms race.

Had the revisionists rested their argument at this point, they would at least have made a debatable case for the theory that the West misread the signals emanating from Moscow at the end of World War II, and misinterpreted as aggressive actions...
what were in reality legitimate Soviet efforts to safeguard Russia's borders from future attack, particularly from a rearmed Germany. However, the radical revisionists are not content to explain the development of the Cold War as due to miscalculation on both sides or even to a Western misreading of Soviet intentions; on the contrary, they attribute sinister, ulterior motives to US policy in Europe in the years following World War II, and assert that the US bears the sole (or at least the principal) responsibility for starting the Cold War.

A concise summary of the central revisionist thesis is contained in an article by Gaddis Smith in the Feb. 27, 1972 issue of the New York Times Book Review. In his article Smith was reviewing "The Limits of Power," written by a foremost radical revisionist, Gabriel Kolko, together with his wife Joyce. Smith summarizes the Kolko view as follows:

"The Kolkos concentrate on the large economic interests and perceptions of the world held by American leaders in the aftermath of World War II. They depict these leaders as obsessed, to the exclusion of almost every other consideration, with a determination to organize the world as a fief of American capitalism. The leaders then invented a Russian political and military threat as a means of winning congressional and public approval of new tools—the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, European rearmament, NATO. The real threat to these leaders was not Russia, but the possibility of peace and a lessening of fear."

According to the Kolkos, the US leaders understood perfectly well that Russia did not have aggressive designs and was following a cautious policy, but nevertheless,

"... in order to carry out selfish capitalist purposes, Truman and his advisers deliberately exaggerated and misrepresented external reality, provoked and invented crises, and spurned genuine Russian offers to negotiate a detente."

And the reason for provoking this "artificial" crisis?

"...only by trumping up a psychological state of war with Russia could the United States succeed in brow-beating most of the world into a semi-colonial subserviency to the United States. And without a subservient world it would be impossible to maintain the low level of employment and profit necessary to the survival of American capitalism."

Thus, to Kolko and other radical revisionist historians such as D. F. Fleming, William Appleman Williams, Gar Alperovitz, David Horowitz, etc., the US bears the guilt for initiating the Cold War because of America's never-ending search for new markets for investment. It should be noted that this criticism is not limited to US actions since World War II or even to the foreign policy aspect of American society; as Charles Maier has pointed out in his perceptive article "Revisionism and the Interpretations of Cold War Origins," the traditional anti-Communism of the United States is depicted by the revisionists as the "natural product of an industrial society in which even major reform efforts have been intended only to rationalize corporate capitalism," adding that "the more radical revisionists go on to depict all of the 20th century foreign policy as woven into a large counter-revolutionary fabric of which the Cold War itself is only one portion." And it is true that some of the revisionists harken back to the start of the century and see the inauguration of the Open Door Policy as the point when the United States embarked on the road of imperialism.

From even a casual reading of the radical revisionist literature, the Marxist bias of much of the writing becomes quickly apparent, as does what can only be described as a conspiratorial view of historical development. To the radical revisionist, there is no such thing as accident or chance; in his schematic perspective, US policy throughout the 20th century has operated according to a design, with the underlying motive being the single-minded protection of US imperialist-capitalist interests.

That revisionist writing would develop after World War II is not surprising; as Arthur Schlesinger Jr. pointed out in his October 1967 essay in Foreign Affairs, "Every war in American history has been followed in due course by skeptical reassessments of supposedly sacred assumptions," and he cited the critical reactions which followed the War of 1812, the Civil War, and World War I. And, indeed, a reevaluation of accepted beliefs is a healthy exercise for any democratic society, which should continually reexamine its conventional wisdom. However, the earlier reassessments of American history were generally limited to criticism of mistakes or failures of specific US governmental leaders or policies; in contrast, the current revisionists indict the very nature of American society in the 20th century, and denounce what had once seemed to be our most enlightened policies as imperialism in its worst form.

Perhaps the most serious scholarly weakness of much of the revisionist writing is that in its preoccupation with economic motivations, it neglects most other considerations, such as the bureaucratic (including the various modes of analysis described in Graham Allison's study of the Cuban missile crisis, "Essence of Decision"), the psychological, and even political-military factors. In the latter case, the revisionists either completely ignore strategic-military considerations, or else regard them simply as means to the larger end of economic exploitation. Obviously, the revisionists would disagree with Arthur Schlesinger's comment that "in general, it may be said of most modern powers that political and strategic motives, including conceptions of the world order most conducive to national security, predominate over economic and commercial motives." In fact, it could forcefully be argued that the present US trade and monetary difficulties are due in part to US willingness to subordinate American economic interests to broader consideration of political and military policy in the postwar world.

In ignoring the psychological dimension in the dynamics of international politics, the revisionist parts company with the practitioner, whose work inevitably makes him (or her) aware of the importance of the personal element in relations between states and in the policy making processes within every country. He also slights the school of psycho-biography which has added a new perspective to historical literature in recent years. The
world leaders, as pictured in much revisionist writing, become almost faceless robots as they carry out their economically motivated roles. The traditional historian might wonder if Stalin had paranoid tendencies and, if so, whether this played a crucial role in the Soviet attitude towards the West, particularly after 1944. But to many of the radical revisionists, such a question is largely irrelevant, since it involves individual rather than economic considerations which, to them, are all-pervasive.

The most puzzling aspect of the current vogue of revisionist interpretations is why such a large number of the present generation of university students—and a significant portion of the faculty—has accepted a view of recent world history which is not only simplistic but self-critical to the point of being masochistic. For the FSO to participate in a graduate seminar and hear student after student denounce the “imperialism” of US foreign policy, is a sobering experience indeed. Probably the majority of persons over 30 working in the foreign affairs agencies have held the view that US policy since World War II, whatever its mistakes, has been founded on a basic American idealism, and carried out by well-intentioned (if all too human) leaders under difficult circumstances in an imperfect world. We have conceived of such policies as the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan as master strokes which combined successfully our idealistic impulses with shrewd practicality, and which not only staved off a Soviet take-over on the Continent, but brought about the revival of postwar Europe. And as practitioners, aware of the complex political, bureaucratic, and psychological factors which go into the formulating and implementing of foreign policy, we generally find that revisionist analyses simply do not ring true.

Yet to a significant number of today’s students of history and politics, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan were counter-revolutionary moves, aimed at converting Western Europe into semicolonial subservience to the United States. I once participated in a graduate seminar which discussed at length Joseph Jones’s study of the crucial 15 weeks in 1947 which witnessed the development of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan; at the conclusion of the discussion, one of the students asked how anyone could take seriously such “biased and naive” writing. It was apparent from the comments which followed this observation that many of his fellow students shared his view. The student’s remarks returned to mind shortly after this:

"Is it not probable that the alleged menace of Soviet imperialism in postwar Europe was created out of whole cloth by the US leadership to justify its imperialistic policies during that period?"

When I read the speech of German Chancellor Willy Brandt delivered on June 5, 1972, at the Harvard University convocation marking the 25th anniversary of the Marshall Plan, Brandt referred to the Marshall Plan as “one of the most formidable and at the same time successful achievements of the United States of America. I have no authority to speak for any country other than my own, but I know, and I want the American people to know our gratitude, the gratitude of Europeans, has remained alive.” As I read the German Chancellor’s remarks, I could only wonder whether the student would also find his praise of the Marshall Plan “biased and naive."

Although some revisionists may dispute it, it seems to me that the single most important factor in the tremendous impact of the revisionist writings on today’s academic world has been the Vietnam War. As Charles Maier has pointed out, “the war has eroded so many national self-conceptions that many assumptions behind traditional Cold War history have been cast into doubt.” Although the revisionist movement began before the US was fully involved in Vietnam and, indeed, would have developed even if there had been no Vietnam conflict, undoubtedly its influence among the students would have been considerably less if American society had not been divided over the US role in Indochina. For today’s university student, “turned off” by what he regards as the evil of the Vietnam war, tends to view the history of World War II and its aftermath through the prism of the recent Asian conflict. If the foreign affairs “establishment” has misused the threat of Communism to justify the American presence in Indochina, he reasons, is it not probable that the alleged menace of Soviet imperialism in postwar Europe was created out of whole cloth by the US leadership to justify its imperialistic policies during that period? This view is buttressed by the almost universal rejection of American participation in the Vietnam war; by the faculties at the nation’s leading institutions; in this atmosphere of general condemnation of US policy in Indochina, there has been an understandable tendency on the part of today’s anti-war advocate to project back on the 1940s the conflict of values in America of today.

One of the problems is, of course, the traditional difficulty—or, rather, the impossibility—of describing to someone who was not present the emotional setting of a particular time period. For the student of the ’70s, who sees the Soviet Union under the comparatively benign leadership of Brezhnev and Kosygin, it is difficult to conceive of the ruthless Soviet aggressiveness of the Stalin era. Further, in the perspective of the prosperous Europe of today, it is hard to imagine that only 25 years ago, during the dreadful winter of 1947-48, Europe was on the verge of an economic and social collapse, which was averted only by the dramatic enactment of the Marshall Plan. To a student who may have hitch-hiked around a Germany or France whose affluence rivals that of his own country, descriptions of a Europe on the brink of disaster simply do not accord with his own conception of reality. It is a frustrating experience for someone who has lived through the period, even as a non-participant, to convey the atmosphere of urgency, even of desperation, in which the Western leaders made their decisions following the end of World War II, as freedom was crushed in country after country in Eastern Europe.
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And sees, each morn, the world arise
New-bathed in light of paradise.”—“The Poet” by Ina Donna Coolbrith

Almost Paradise

PILTTI HEISKANEN

A MAP drawn by Dutchman Heer Pieter Daniel Huet, probably in 1730, decorates part of a wall of my home. It shows Aardsch Paradis, or Paradis Terrestre with its outskirts and surroundings, an area between the Eastern Mediterranean, the Caspian Sea and the Persian Gulf. This wooded Paradise, surrounded by Eden, occupies the center of the map. To the east of Eden, Adam and Eve are depicted as two dejected figures being chased by an angel wielding a flaming sword. She is driving them into exile toward what is now Ahwaz, Iran—it corresponded with today's assignment to a foreign service hardship post. The map also portrays Noah’s Ark, after its landing on the site of present day Tehran. Finally, the representation abounds in drawings such as that of Nineveh, the tower of Babel, of Joshua with the sun and the moon, and many other interesting and sometimes delightfully inaccurate illustrations.

I lived for seven years in this Paradise country as an officer of the United States Foreign Service, three of them on a river that “went out of Eden.” In Khorramshahr I was some 50 miles from Kurna where the Euphrates and the Tigris join and form the Shatt-el-Arab; some think Paradise was located there. In any case, the Bible mentions the Euphrates as one of the four “heads” formed when the river flowing from Eden parted. The rest of the time I spent mainly in Israel but a part of it I devoted to travel in many countries of the area.

Several of my colleagues at the Embassy in Tel Aviv went coin-hunting on Sabbath days and Sundays. I collected nothing in particular, except impressions, during those years in the Middle East. Some of them I wrote down in what I thought might be a poetic form but I am not sure that everybody would agree that I succeeded. But then the coin hunters in the old Roman and Crusader fortress of Cesarea and in the older still Philistine city of Ashkelon very rarely came up with a gold or even a silver coin; they had to be satisfied with coppers, some of them the size of an aspirin tablet. And if they happened to find something else, it was usually a piece of old pottery or glass, broken and little resembling the form it was supposed to have.

For me, those seven years were almost Paradise and I doubt if life even for Adam was more than that. He was a gardener and keeper of the place and also the giver of names to cattle, fowl and every beast of the field. But it was not a good life. As the Lord God said to himself, “It is not good that the man should be alone.” So this marvelous thing, woman, was invented, a potential for a real Paradise. But before Adam “knew” Eve, complications set in in the form of the serpent and the apple, followed by the eviction for breach of contract and then the flaming sword to keep us all out. It came close to being a Paradise but did not quite make it.

If Paradise could be lost through the handing over and eating of an apple—a crab apple at that, according to a visitor to Kurna—a little bit of it may be regained through a single flower, properly handed over, as in the

Decoration

This very morning,
while the sun was climbing
up the blue lid of the sky,
I was decorated with a rose.

A girl, wearing a smile
and little else,
gracefully holding the flower
in her dirty fingers,
thrust it to me,
turned and ran away,
hers bare feet stirring up the dust.

While I still held the prize,
a petal fell off and floated
back to the brown dust,
as everything living must.

A moment of Paradise can also be the light skipping of a little girl in a small town, during a

Hot Afternoon

The sun has started its downhill ride,
everything seeks a shade to hide,
even garden gates have closed their eyes.
Everyone sleeps, full of rice,

but baker's daughter: in her bare feet
she dances down Ferdowski Street.
She is pretty, has lavash on her arm,
yes, she has bread and she has charm.

Piltti Heiskanen writes, “I found my seven years in the Middle East—in Tabriz, Khorramshahr and Tel Aviv—so interesting and inspiring that I fell into an old habit of my family, writing down impressions in verse. Before the Middle East assignments I had spent five years with the VOA in Munich and now I am back where I came from, working as Information Officer in Helsinki.”

She has bread and she has charm:  
the bread is folded over her arm.  
She is young, her hair flies loose  
and her dress is from last Nowrooz.

She dances along and she hums and sings  
as she goes past with bread and rings.  
The rings are on her pretty nose  
but her fingers . . . they hold a rose.

Someday—perhaps through the gate of the sheikh,  
the one which is wide awake—  
she enters and for a whileingers,  
then returns with rings on her nose and . . . fingers.

Paradise was not totally lost; there are still some  
pleasures left, some of them inexpensive ones. Among  
them the shade of a tree and water to cool a man inside  
and out, a rug to soften his contact with mother earth,  
and pleasant talk to let the time tiptoe by unnoticed and  
painlessly were often enough to make it a feast. Such  
simple life is described in the

Inexpensive Pleasures of Life  
Poor man Ali Golban  
lives in a hut of clay,  
grows old, spends his days  
eating bread and a heap  
of rice, drinking tea from a mug  
on his small, worn-out rug.  
A good Mohammedan,  
he obeys the call to pray,  
on his roof goes to sleep.

Sometimes you hear the low,  
sweet tune of his fife.  
He can only afford  
such cheap pleasures of life  
as to sleep with his wife,  
to scratch himself, to rise  
and look out the window,  
to put his trust in Lord,  
with dreams of Paradise.

Some of these inexpensive pleasures of life led, even  
in the beginning, to more life and to a population explosion. Cain and Abel were born, doubling mankind  
to four and sending it on its way to becoming too numerous. The problem that began with eating is still  
with us: for the majority of the world’s people the question is how to eat enough, for the rest how not to  
eat too much. Today either under or overeating sends  
many of us prematurely back to Paradise, at least those  
who make it. Just consider a sick, half-starved baby,  
hardly born, nearly dead already, as in this

Lullaby for a Newly Developing Baby  
Cry, little baby, cry,  
the ceiling above is called the sky.  
Your diaper is a daily paper,  
is a daily paper.

Weep now, my small one, weep,  
you cannot weep when you sleep.  
Cry because there’s no bread . . .  
Tomorrow you may be dead.

Cry, little one, cry some more,  
the skin on your back is sore.

Cry because it’s never right:  
hot by day and cold at night.  
You’ll never read but don’t ask why  
and never you mind . . . hushaby  
for by and by you will guess:  
your diaper tells of death and loneliness.

As everywhere, many things are changing in the Middle East, and progress and a better life are on the  
way; already they have reached many. But while they  
must and will increase, I am afraid that individualism  
will diminish.

In the Khuzestan Desert, which I often crossed by car  
on my way to Ahwaz, I passed a single tree, standing  
all alone, east of Eden, as if the Tree too had been banished from Paradise. I waved to it each time and  
thought how irrational it was to grow there where no  
other life would stay; yet it seemed to be the most  
rational thing in sight. So here’s to the

Individual  
From here to there,  
a hundred miles as the camel walks,  
there stands a tree,  
the only one between here and there.

An individual,  
alone in the desert plateau,  
it rejects togetherness with the sand,  
doesn’t heed the call of drought for conformity.

But, alas, is reduced to a conversation piece  
of passing travelers.

Ali Hannibal, a man in Abadan, was one of the most  
charming men I have ever had the good fortune to  
know. Later, when I heard of his death, I spent the  
night thinking of him— 
that with his passing away the  
world I knew was poorer. I went on to lament the  
apparent loss of imagination and fantasy through our so  
inevitable and often necessary modernization and  
change. As the fertile minds of a few make the imagi¬  
nary an attainable reality to the many, there is less and  
less need to use one’s imagination. At first we lost  
Paradise, I thought, and then spent the thousand nights  
and a night to boot, the result being somewhat like in  
the

Imagination Grounded  
Once upon a time man stayed on earth,  
firmly sitting on his rug, near his hearth,  
but his imagination soared and flew  
on a flying carpet, beyond the world he knew,  
spending Arabian nights with Shahrazad  
and days with Alaeddin, Hasan and Sindbad.

Now it is man himself who reaches heights  
in his flying machine and satellites,  
but his imagination no longer flies:  
Like an Icarus, fallen from the skies,  
or a djinn which sinned, imprisoned in a jar,  
it stays behind while man travels afar.

I suspect there was jealousy even in Paradise. In any  
case, three were enough to create it: Cain slew Abel  
when he saw that Abel’s smoke went straight up toward  

(Continued on page 27)
America's First Black Diplomat

NANCY GORDON HEINL

The first black Chief of Mission in US diplomatic history was appointed on April 29, '69. 1869? Wrong by 100 years—it was 1869.

Nominated by President Grant as American Minister to Haiti, Ebenezer Don Carlos Bassett (once a student at Yale College and in 1869 principal of Philadelphia's prestigious Colored High School) is not only America's first negro diplomat but appears to have been the first black presidential civil appointee in the federal government.

Second oldest republic in the western hemisphere, Haiti in 1869 was nonetheless a land of endless turmoil. Winning control over their third of Hispaniola in 1804 (the only successful slave insurrection in history), the Haitians had slaughtered virtually every French man, woman, or child remaining in the country. Yet 1804 was but a curtain-raiser to the blood that was to flow. Over fifty plots, coups and revolutions were recorded between 1804 and 1869.

Although Haiti's freedom had been uncontested (and uncontestable) since 1804, her independence was not recognized by the great powers of Europe until 1825, while, under the adamant veto of slave-holding southerners on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the United States (despite thriving profits on Haitian coffee, logwood, sugar, rum and molasses) withheld recognition until the outbreak of our Civil War.


No one knows what inspired Ebenezer Bassett's interest in Haiti. It could well have been pride of race. Whatever prompted him, from the eight tumultuous years Bassett and his family spent there (1869-1877) he clearly gained more understanding for and love of Haiti than many of his successors.

His letters to the Department often refer in frustration to "this peculiar people," or despairingly plead "send a man-of-war" (the security blanket of the diplomats of that gunboat era); but when, in 1877, he leaves Haiti for what he is convinced will be the last time, sadness suffuses his farewell to his friend, President Boisrond-Canal, as he expresses regret that he will probably never again see the President, his many Haitian friends, "... or indeed this beautiful Hayti on whose soil and among whose people I have passed so many happy days."

A surviving picture shows Bassett as a handsome, square-cut man with a receding hairline, and twirling mustaches that would be envied today. Born in Litchfield, Connecticut, on October 16, 1833, he was the son of Ebenezer and Susan Bassett, his father a mulatto and his mother a Pequot Indian. He attended Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, Mass., and graduated with honors from Connecticut State Normal School. Later he studied at Yale College where he seems to have been held in wide respect. No less than 12 Yale professors supported his application for the nomination to Haiti. French was one of his languages, later to be perfected in Haiti where he also mastered Creole—essential to a real understanding of that country and its people.

From 1857 to 1869, Bassett was principal of "The Institute for Colored Youth" in Philadelphia—a Quaker school for "the Education of Colored Youth in School Learning and to prepare them to become teachers." The then mayor of Philadelphia refers to it, under Bassett's management, as "widely known and unquestionably the foremost institution of its kind in the country." In addition to his duties as principal, Bassett taught mathematics, natural sciences and classics.

In 1855, while still in New Haven, Bassett married Eliza Park. Some of his five children, two daughters and three sons, were born in Philadelphia, though it would be pleasant to think that there was at least one Haitian in the family—perhaps the youngest, Frederick Douglass's namesake, who died in childhood.

In 1868 the new administration of U.S. Grant showed itself amenable to opening government service to qualified negroes. Surviving cor-
register to Haiti. Bassett so proposed to his family.

Letters of recommendation closes that Bassett suggested in some. Brave, remorseless, cunning was he ugly, but in manner and appearance to the contrary, hand¬some. Brave, remorseless, cunning and warlike, however, he surely was—all, unfortunately, essential characters for gaining and holding power in 19th century Haiti.

In the summer of 1869 the President was in the field doing just that, and the new American Minister could not present his credentials until September.

For Bassett, after a miserable ten days at sea, the sight of the green mornes of Haiti was a welcome one. Among many on the landing to greet the new, and first black, American Minister, was an Episcopal missionary and old friend, the Reverend J. T. Holly, only five years later to become the first black American bishop in the Anglican Church. The sights and sounds of Port-au-Prince were overwhelming and the heat staggering, and Bassett was dismayed to find his first night as Reverend Holly’s guest spent “in a hand-to-hand contest with an army of mosquitoes, bedbugs and little gnats.”

Yet the next day, riding up to call on his predecessor, Gideon Hollister, he was overwhelmed by the beauty around him—“This is truly a wonderful country,” he wrote. “From the mountain tops to the sea the island is one great paradise of flowers and fruits which perfume the air and meet the eye everywhere.”

The American Minister’s residence was on the Chemin Lavale in Turgeau, uphill from the center of the city. Bassett must have been enchanted by the rambling, many-galleried house that had been built as a summer palace for Haiti’s former Emperor Faustin Soulouque. Samuel Hazard, traveller and writer of the day who was to spend some time as the Bassets’ guest, describes it as having superb views in every direction, “... charming in its luxuriant vegetation and with fresh breezes from the neighboring mountains.” In the garden there “was a marble bath large enough for swimming with water fresh and cold from the mountain stream” (a luxury which as late as 1963 the American Ambassador to Haiti did not enjoy).* Hazard also mentions delightful mountain rides with “Mr. Bassett and his lady.”

After assuming charge, under political conditions in a regime that Bassett’s British colleague later characterized as “one long revolution,” the new Minister was soon to voice, and often repeat, the plea for “a ship,” and was always pleased to see an American man-of-war on the horizon (though British, French or Spanish colors were a more frequent sight).

Salnave, first of Bassett’s four Haitian presidents and one with whom Bassett mentions being on intimate terms, was not destined long to survive.

In December 1869 Salnave, finally overthrown, fled Port-au-Prince stopping breathlessly at the US residence en route. Eventually captured “well into Dominican territory,” Salnave was dragged back to the capital and Bassett had his first glimpse of a justice far different from that advocated by the Society of Friends. In a despatch he reported: “Salnave was brought to the city today. His grave was dug in the Salines, a kind of Potter’s field, two days ago . . . he was subjected to some sort of drumhead court-martial, lasting a couple of hours, and of course sentenced to be shot immediately. This sentence was carried out amid jeers and insults of the rabble. He faced death in a bold and manly manner. The principal officers who followed him in his flight were put to death in the plains before reaching the city.”

After the execution of Salnave, Nissage-Saget (once a barracks tailor) became president, and Bassett was to learn much more about executions, imprisonments, refugees, to say nothing of plots and counterplots, which he came to accept if never approve as the way of life of “this peculiar people.”

Haitian politics, polarized then and always on lines of race—élite mulattoes (mulâtres) exploiting resentful blacks (noirs)—dismayed Bassett. Colored, and proud of it and of his own achievements, Bassett recognized the futile and destructive character of a political tradition which substituted race for party, coups d’etat for elections, and relied on betrayal, conspiracy, and racial malevolence as moving forces. Yet he accepted Haiti as it was and pursued the interests of the United States with realism and understanding.

If there ever can be ordinary days in Haiti, what were the everyday concerns of the American Minister in the 1870s?

Grant persistently sought to annex Santo Domingo or at least to obtain a naval base there. With this went diplomatic probes for a coaling station at Haiti’s Môle St. Nicolas. Both ideas affronted Haitian nationalism, which left Grant unperturbed but gave his minister endless difficulty.

Claims by American citizens
against the Haitian government were tedious, time-consuming and usually to little avail. The great game of "What is my 'cher collègue' up to?" was, of course a constant factor.**

Perhaps most troublesome was the stream of political refugees seeking asylum, to which Bassett was introduced in 1869 when the legation, in November, was filled with refugees including a Minister of State and his entire family and several generals. A month later Bassett writes Washington that there are more than a thousand (sic) refugees in his residence, "... mostly women and children all in a state of terror and confusion that beggars description." This was when Port-au-Prince was under siege and being bombarded by rebel forces and when, not for the first time nor the last, the National Palace was ultimately blown skyhigh by random detonation of ammunition and explosives in the President's basement.

Bassett's most distinguished and longest-term uninvited guest was General, later President, Boisrond-Canal. Target of incumbent President Domingue's wrath in May 1875, Boisrond-Canal arrived wounded, in the middle of the night, for a five month stay. Under intense pressure to hand over Boisrond-Canal and his younger brother, Bassett had also to cope with a Secretary of State and a Department unenthusiastic, when not outright unsympathetic, to the question of asylum. In one despatch justifying his action, Bassett speaks of the government as "men madened by passion, inflamed by rum, and elated by the consciousness of armed power," and adds "... for me to close the door upon the men pursued, would have been for me to deny them their last chance to escape from being brutally put to death before my eyes."

During this period the residence was surrounded by hundreds of government troops with orders to keep up a constant clamor night and day. Rumors circulated on the telediol (Haiti's grapevine telegraph) that Bassett had been disavowed by the US government, that the residence no longer enjoyed diplomatic immunity, that the soldiers surrounding it were so excited they were beyond control, and that the government could no longer guarantee the safety of the Bassett family. Yet all ended happily. When he had heard that a US warship was on the way, Domingue relented and the Canals were allowed to embark for Jamaica. After receiving a fervent embrace from his departing guests, Bassett notes: "A rather disagreeable French custom."

For some time Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Bassett enjoyed the respect and friendship of his colleagues. That his popularity was indeed widespread is evidenced by his election, in 1875, to the presidency of the exclusive "Cercle de Port-au-Prince."

Bassett's health was frequently bad. He complains of aches, fever and biliousness— of what the Haitians called "La mauvaise fièvre"— perhaps malaria, or dengue, or both. In July 1876 ill health prevented him from attending the inaugural of his former house-guest, now President Boisrond-Canal. In the National Archives there remains a dashing photo of the President wearing a large fedora, inscribed: "A mon ami E. D. Bassett."

Maybe it was ill health (or possibly a new administration in Washington) that caused Bassett to submit his resignation in 1877. That the family returned to New Haven with nostalgia is certain. Like many yet unborn Americans who were to love Haiti in their turn, the Bassets probably felt that they had been cast out of the Garden of Eden.

Succeeding years never recaptured the magic. From 1879 to 1888, Bassett was Consul-General of Haiti in New York—the Haitian Consulate was then at 22 State Street. He did manage one trip back to Haiti on consultation but his dream to return again as American Minister was never realized.

In 1889 Bassett was back in New Haven and things were not going well. To Frederick Douglass he wrote that circumstances impelled him to seek a Foreign Service appointment and that his preference would be Haiti. Alas, the post had already been offered to and accepted by Douglass himself. The chagrin seems between the lines of Bassett's generous congratulations. Nevertheless he swallowed his pride and offered his services as Douglass's secretary, at $850 per annum.

Douglass was over 70, a national figure and a prima donna. In his definitive "Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti" Dr. Rayford Logan states that Bassett was to all intents and purposes again the American Minister. His position must have been difficult. Intrigue over possible US acquisition of Môle St. Nicolas was again at peak and the American press in uproar. Douglass resigned on July 30, 1891.

Bassett never received his Foreign Service appointment and his last years seem to have been sad ones. The family moved from New Haven to 2121 N. 29th Street, Philadelphia, where America's first black diplomat died poor and obscure. His last letter to Douglass, January 18, 1894, speaks of a heart condition and "an annoying affection of my eyes which are never in good trim."

The letter is unhappy for it replies to a dunning note from Douglass asking payment on a loan, but worse, stating that he had "learned" that, while in Haiti, Bassett accepted $6000 from President Hyppolite to influence Douglass's decisions as minister.

Besides credulity and naivete in believing any such accusations, Douglass was cruelly unfair to an old and loyal friend. He could not know that the telediol would circulate, and many Haitians would credit, the identical rumor about every American chief of mission to this day.

By 1961 the figure named had risen to $100,000!
The utility of this small volume depends upon how much the reader has been previously impressed by revisionist arguments about the Cold War—that the US and particularly our economic system and aims bear the guilt for the entire mess. If you have been impressed for instance by the writings of Williams, Alperovitz, Kolko or Horowitz, and if you are intellectually honest and searching after historical truth (difficult under the best of circumstances), then you owe it to yourself to give Professor Maddox his day in court. His book is a powerful antidote to revisionism. But it must be used with care, for Maddox does not really confute the arguments of the revisionists. He criticizes their scholarship and very convincingly shows that some of their most damaging “discoveries” in the records of American diplomacy are actually doctored-up quotations, or quotations out of context, or outright fabrications. This is a blow to revisionism, but not a fatal one. Revisionism’s scholarship could be sloppy and partisan but its theses could still be right. The truth is, of course, that there is not truth in historical analysis. The revisionists are themselves an antidote to the smug assumption that our side has always been right. Only, since that assumption is really found quite rarely nowadays, it is perhaps best to eschew the entire controversy and to look for books that contain a balanced presentation of rights and wrongs on both sides. Such books exist. They are less exciting than those of the revisionists and their opponents but more useful, especially to the practitioner of foreign affairs.

Journal readers who remember the May 1973 issue devoted to revisionism should know that the author of two of its articles, Lloyd C. Gardner, is himself effectively skewered by Maddox. He points out that Gardner’s most fundamental point, although confidently asserted, is not only undocumented but impossible to document. Referring to the habit of many revisionists to cite other people’s opinions as if they constituted evidence, Maddox dryly remarks: “One opinion does not verify another; together they add up to two opinions.”

—M.F.H.

Japan Shapes Asia


This is one of a series called Library of the 20th Century. The series tries to present key events and personalities of modern history in relatively short, but scholarly fashion, using copious illustrations and, where possible, a unique point of view. For example, A. J. P. Taylor’s book in this series deals with the outbreak of World War I from the vantage point of the general European mobilization. It is a technique which in amateurish hands could be trendy or merely eccentric, In Taylor’s book, as in Mr. Allen’s, it is brought off very well indeed.

Mr. Allen’s span of Japanese history is from Perry’s visit in 1853 until an odd terminus ad quem—the fall of Mandalay, April 26, 1942. But this ending proves the author’s point. By then Japan had not only become a modern power, but had driven the European out of Asia in defeat and disarray and had given to Asia generally the frame in which to shape itself as we know it today. Even further changes in Asia (and there will be changes) will still take place within the context of the Japanese “years of triumph.” True, on April 26, 1942, the first check at Coral Sea was only two weeks away and that shattering defeat at Midway less than sixty days away. However, by then the Japanese already had shaped Asia much as Roman legions had shaped Europe.

The writing is exceptionally well done and the scholarship precise. The photographs and illustrations are superb, rarely familiar and never used in a distorted way. When one looks at a picture of a 19th-century silk village and then considers what the empire looked like in April, 1942, Mr. Allen’s fine history is indelibly underlined for his readers.

—J. K. Holloway

Life in Peking

STRANGER IN CHINA, by Colin McCullough. Morrow, $8.95.

No foreigner can really know the Chinese of today, never mind tomorrow... Essentially, a foreigner is a stranger in China, and the Chinese never regard him in any other way. He is not Chinese... But he can describe what it is like to be a foreigner in China.”

And that is just what the author does. A Canadian newsman, he went to Peking in the spring of 1968 for an 18-month assignment, taking with him his wife and small daughter. His personal report on what it was like to live in a country that was culturally and politically alien will much interest those who aspire to visit the ancient capital or who knew it in the bad old days. Replete with local color and revealing anecdotes, his story is sparse in portentous generalizations. But there are some. As for warnings that the Chinese are poised to engulf the world, he opines: “Plainly, China is too poor to do much more than try to take care of its own problem.”

In the past year or so, a number of short-time visitors to China have so accentuated the positive in their reports on conditions there that, if they have not communicated the notion that the millennium has come in China, they have—by the very euphoria of their witness—rather impaired its credibility.

McCullough is no trouble-fête, he is a professional journalist. His account may help to put things in their place.

—Robert W. Rinden

Liberated Early On


Spring in Istanbul, usually glorious, in 1940 was bitter. The news from Europe dimmed even the Judas trees blazing along the slopes above the Bosphorus.

That April when we asked Dorothy Thompson to lunch at the Istan-
The Publitech people are at it again. Having produced in 1967 a thoroughly inaccurate second edition of this work, they have now published a third edition which is little better. Though the publishers claim that the book is "thoroughly revised and completed," this should not be taken to mean that it is now accurate. They still think Kuwaiti Foreign Minister Sabah al-Ahmad al-Sabah has been "Minister for Oil Affairs since 1967," and the president of the Kuwait Chamber of Commerce still appears twice, once as "Sagar, Abdul Aziz Al-Hamad Al" and once as "Sakr, Abdel Aziz Hamad Al." The names illustrate the casual attitude of the editors toward spelling, which still adheres to no known system of transliteration, while the variations in the two entries continue to illustrate the internal inconsistencies in the work.

The country information articles offer just as many pitfalls. The Kuwaiti "Ministry of Finance and Industry" mentioned on p. 473 is nonexistent. The article on education in Kuwait, which purports to survey
the entire system, makes no mention of the University of Kuwait, opened in 1966, until the last sentence—obviously a hasty addition to the new edition.

Other readers, by examining the information on other countries or people with whom they are especially familiar, will no doubt find their own favorite errors. As a reference work, this book is so often inaccurate or misleading that it can never be regarded as a reliable source of information. Perhaps the editor secretly realizes this, for he has eliminated his name from the third edition, preferring, it would appear, anonymity to ignominy.

—CHARLES O. CECIL

Forethrusting Backlash


Bumbles of bureaucrats will boggle at this compendium of unitized options from a former Presidential candidate (Bureaucrats Party, 1972 Vermont primary). Counterploys may be anticipated in time from foreign countries, once their computerized translation services have mastered thumping and other technological achievements paraded here.

Following high altitude research on the Hill, Jim Boren plumped Foggy Bottom as an FSR-1 with AID. He repays his debt to both experiences in the collections of buzz words and protective mumbles. An original contribution is the quantitative research on Sex and the Bureaucrat in Chapter 22; the lay reader would wish there had been further explanation of the State Department performance entries in Organogram Eight/H Theta.

—D. R. R.

What Now, Untutored?


This is a helpful addition to English-language literature on Vietnam, especially in its concise summary of Vietnamese history prior to the French domination. It therefore usefully supplements Ellen J. Ham-

mer's "The Struggle for Indochina 1940-1955." One wonders how much more enlightened our effort to assist the Vietnamese people might have been had our diplomats—and military officers—been adequately tutored in the history and culture of those they were trying to help. Our politico-military record in that part of the world has all along betrayed our lamentable lack of cultural preparation for that effort and the disastrous gulf which has too long existed between political and military operations on the one hand and scholarship on the other.

—SMITH SIMPSON

"Except, angel, that you will never be God. And not because I forbid, but because they will never—at least not for very long—believe it. For I made them not of dust alone, but dust and love; and by dust alone they will not, cannot long be governed... Why do you weep, angel? They love, and with love, kill brothers. Take heart, I see now that our war goes on." "The Creation of the World," by Arthur Miller.
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illuminated by the attitude of many of the governments of developing countries to foreign (read US) private investment as by anything else. We have made efforts, however feeble, to use the ability of large corporations to contribute to local development. (It cannot, I think, be said that there exists anything resembling a strategy to get companies to do what is necessary for the host countries; indeed, I would argue that we don’t even have a clear idea of what that is.) But the companies do invest, and I should have thought the evidence is fairly clear that in many cases, especially in manufacturing and distribution, the results of their activities have been profitable to them and beneficial to the host government. Even where the foreigners are engaged in extracting natural resources either as minerals or as agricultural raw materials, they at least pay some taxes—which is often more than native business does—and they do furnish some employment, some training, some infrastructure development. Perhaps they are overhandsomely rewarded. But one reason they demand higher returns than they could expect at home or in other developed countries, is that they cannot prudently reckon on a very long period of activity, however exemplary their behavior. The general attitude of the governments of the developing countries, however, often seems to be welcoming before they are made, confiscatory after.

Now the developing countries really cannot have it both ways. No more can they spend bigger percentages than even the superpowers of their inadequate GNPs on playthings for their armed forces—an expensive and dangerous way of tackling unemployment and of misusing trained talent—without calling into question the seriousness of their desires to develop. And while one can sympathize to some degree with their frustrations as suppliers of raw materials, one cannot give them very high marks for perspicacity when they adamantly refuse to make any contribution to the trade and monetary discussions now going on other than demands that they be accorded special privileges.

I am not trying to pass judgment on or condemn the juntas and the messianic leaders of the developing world. I am suggesting that they get a not entirely undeserved bad press, and that it is hard to blame even those of us with impeccable sympathies for feeling our enthusiasm trickling away. One should not, obviously, condemn the notion of foreign aid because of Mr. Nkrumah’s finance minister’s wife’s gold bed. On the other hand, so far as we are told, the prodigal son’s father did not urge him to take another share of his property off to waste in riotous living in a far country.

In sum, I would venture the guess that the reason Dr. Hannah’s well-stated arguments fail to persuade, and much less to inspire, those who share his interest in the outside world and agree with his assessment of our interests and our ideals is that too many of us doubt that we know what the problem is, that we have the organization and the personnel to solve it, or that the people we are trying to help are likely to be willing or able to do their indispensable share. And while men of good will may acquiesce in more of the same, it is too much to expect them to be more than resigned to its necessity, faute de mieux. Enthusiastic supporters they cannot be.
ALMOST PARADISE
continued from page 19

the Heaven, indicating God's acceptance of the offering, but his own meandered close to the ground.

But that happened before man discovered that woman had much greater potential than smoke as the object of jealousy or, as the Bible understates it, before "sons of God saw the daughters of men . . . were fair." From then on jealousy has been more often associated with such world-shaking questions as who walks with what woman, as in this little poem called

Jealousy

I saw you passing in the afternoon
under the burning sun but, alas, not alone:
Your shadow walked with you, near your feet,
watching you, worshipping your each sweet movement. —Why can't I crawl flat on stone beside you, in the sun, beneath the moon?

Below the windows of my office in the Embassy in Tel Aviv was the Mediterranean Sea, only a hundred feet away, often calm and serene, sometimes heaving heavily against the sandy shore, but always beautiful. Looking south, I could see about a mile away the ancient port of Jaffa and, below it, in the sea, Andromeda's Rock to which the legendary beauty was chained before she was finally rescued and elevated to a safer place among the stars.

Man had discovered that not every woman was perfect; occasionally, one or another could have minor blemishes. So the legendary woman was created, perfect although often somewhat elusive in the labyrinth of man's imagination. These women seemed to be usually somewhere near water—Aphrodite in Cyprus, Helen on the Aegean Sea, Cleopatra on the Nile—and they caused men to launch ships and create small ripples, as is the custom of men when they are after women, which is most of the time. As a by-product, blood and ink flowed, history was made, and tales—tall and small—were written down.

The eviction of man from Paradise—the choice location of Greater Eden, according to my Dutch map—made it impossible for him to "put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever." Man remained mortal. In the words of the Koran, Allah (the Compassionate, the Merciful) "can replace men by other men." He does, fortunately, even in the outskirts of Paradise.

Many of the most remarkable leftovers of old civilizations were caused by man's preoccupation with the hereafter. I found the pyramids of Egypt and the zigurats of old Babylon the most conspicuous among them, but I saw them also in Ephesus, with its Hellenic temple of Artemis, one of the seven wonders of the ancient world, in Lebanon's "City of the Sun," Baalbek, in the magnificent ruins of Persepolis and Knossos, in the rose-colored cave city of Petra, and of course, in Jerusalem, holy city of many faiths. Here and in many other places man attempted to understand God and usually ended by creating gods in his own image.

Man learned to live his life, even after it was greatly
multiplied with sorrows, and he learned to live with death, sometimes quite literally. When I visited Professor Roman Ghirshman’s excavation of ancient Susa I saw that in the thirteenth level the living had buried their dead within a wall of the house so that fresh bones were separated from the dry ones by only a couple of inches. In the Hellenic ruins of Aphrodisias, in Anatolia, I saw farmers water their cattle from the same old carved stone sarcophagi in which old Greeks had placed their dead.

On the Karoon river I often watched porters carrying heavy loads from ship to shore and from shore to ship. They were the hardest-working men I ever saw in a 120-degree heat and an example of eating bread “in the sweat of thy face,” so close to the former Paradise. I was in Tel Aviv when I heard that a friend and former USIS colleague, Habib Zal, had accidentally drowned in the Karoon, a tributary of the Shatt-el-Arab which carries some of the waters from the site of Paradise to the Persian Gulf. As a modest memorial to Habib I wrote that night the

Porter

I am porter on River Karoon,
I carry a load on my back.
I sleep a short night and then, soon
after daybreak, shoulder another sack
of rice and carry my burden again.

Someday I’ll load my last ship,
when I will have carried everything.

Bringing one more bag I will slip
and fall overboard and, floating
downstream, will not carry a single grain.

I will travel for a while like this
past life under palms, as the river flows,
until waters from Euphrates and Tigris
carry my body to a shore no one knows,
washed by waves that ebb and rise.

I’ll stop there and there I’ll stay,
adding my body to the delta as my last bequest:
Carrier of things carried away
and finally coming to rest
on silt from Babylon and Paradise.

Near the old city of Salamis, in Cyprus, I looked at the bones of two horses, lying before their royal chariot on the spot where they had been slaughtered over two millennia earlier so that they would speed their master through the valley of death. Now excavated, the bones lie under glass, for the curious and the lover of the past to see. But there was an aspect of life in the picture of death: from a knee of one of the royal horses a flower was growing, as full of life as the base on which it stood was full of death.

So who knows, even in this post-Paradise era of the dust-eating snake, any man may yet produce, in several millennia, a beautiful flower on one or the other of his kneecaps. Provided, of course, that he lies somewhere which turns out to be—when measured with a stretch of the imagination—almost Paradise.
modest scale now through the NATO/CCMS pilot project on air pollution. Within this project, there is a sub-project aimed at increasing international cooperation on low-pollution power systems. Participating countries, besides the United States, include Great Britain, Germany, the Netherlands, France and Italy. However, the few thousand dollars expended on this project is minute compared to the needed tens of millions of dollars if rapid R & D is to be done and early production-line engines introduced.

Such a program should be related to a national policy to reduce the size and power of the typical American automobile. This may necessitate national regulations or, possibly, new tax proposals aimed at developing effective disincentives against large autos.

Perhaps the most important short-term hope in avoiding a true energy crisis is the development of new sources of hydrocarbons, especially coal. This must take place in a context of environmental protection both in terms of the mining process and the problem of air pollution. But it appears that these difficulties should not prove insurmountable with a stronger government-supported R & D effort. Greater use of coal and other fossil fuel sources can help to provide insurance against a short-term cutoff of Middle East oil and it would also help reduce total demand on other world-wide sources with a consequent effect on price levels of oil.

Here again international cooperation makes sense, particularly in the area of new automated techniques for coal mining and in pollution control technology. The point is that there is no physical lack of hydrocarbon fuels to take us through the short-term period to 1985-95 when new technologies will probably start to make a major impact upon the energy picture.

Even with extended utilization of secondary sources of fossil fuels, increased demand for energy in the period beyond 1985 will probably have to come from nuclear-based energy. This means increasing our investment in both fission and finally fusion reactors which will have to provide at least a major proportion of the future increment of new energy supplies. If indeed this is the case, such a program should be in a context which maximizes international cooperation and minimizes the environmental hazards as well as the potential diversion of nuclear fuel produced by advanced reactors.

Ultimately, we should consider an international program, perhaps under the UN, to provide the new power requirements for all nations, especially in the developing areas, from the most promising nuclear reactor programs; one that will combine international standards both for environmental impact and for the vital security issue of diversion from peaceful use. Placing this technology under a strong international agency with agreed safeguards as set forth in the Non-Proliferation Treaty may be the only solution to a potentially dangerous situation.
Careful thought must be given now to the issue of the ubiquitous presence of large amounts of plutonium 239, a by-product of the fast breeder, with a half-life of 24,400 years when only five to ten kilograms are necessary to build a bomb. Some have estimated that one day we might have from 400 to 20,000 breeders each producing large quantities of radioactive fission products.

Also, the waste problem of excess nuclear materials on the globe would be horrendous, especially without international standards and inspection. While there are some technological partial solutions to this question, so far none have provided a completely safe method.

With all these difficulties we should ask ourselves again whether we really must go down the fast-breeder path. If the answer is yes, we can still pause and ask if it might not be possible to make such a path a temporary expedient with very rigid controls and with a clear policy to switch to other less dangerous technologies once they become feasible. In any case a world-wide approach will be necessary since fast-breeder technology is not an American monopoly.

Looking at the international energy situation in the period after 1985 we see the clear possibility of a mad rush for the limited conventional energy resources which could result in many countries attempting to build or buy fast-breeder reactors under conditions which might create a threat to the security of the world community. What is called for is an enlightened and far-reaching international program of energy abundance which could forestall such a development while creating a better foundation for greater economic growth in a clean environment. What might be required is a renewed and strengthened “atoms for peace” effort through which some kind of international control might be put upon fast-breeders and associated technology and materials. This is, admittedly, rather hard to imagine and will be seen as, at best, visionary. But the fearful alternative someday may make just such a proposal the epitome of pragmatism.

Two models of the international aspects of the energy crisis are possible: one, essentially of competition, political blackmail, resource waste, backward technology and increasing tension; the other, one of cooperation, new technological advances, conservation, and efficient and equitable allocation of resources. The choices we make in the energy field will further act as models for how the international community will deal with future questions dealing with resource scarcity—a phenomenon we will increasingly experience in the coming decades.

A broader perspective on the international implications of the world “energy crisis” indicates that the world community must create better institutions to deal with the problems of growth and the advance of technology. If we are to meet these challenges we must be far more creative and bold in the next decade than we have been in the last. If not the price may be very dear indeed.
In the passing of J. Holbrook Chapman on June 11 at 81 years of age further thins the ranks of the post-World War I generation of Foreign Service officers who did so much to prepare some of us who were part of the post-World War II generation.

I cannot speak for others who benefited from "Chappie's" guidance, which was always clear and to the point, but for myself I can say that the lessons I learned under his supervision during our years together in Thailand and North Africa were invaluable throughout my career.

He was completely dedicated to the Service in an age when there were no hardship post allowances, no school or transfer allowances, no medical program, no official vehicles, and when home leave was a sometime thing. He was a model of integrity when adherence to high standards was a common virtue. Junior vice consuls (career and non-career as we were designated in those days) got the rough edge of his tongue when they did less than their best. And he was, above all, a keen analyst and fearless reporter of the politico-economic scene—an outspoken dissenter if the occasion warranted (and it did) before dissent became fashionable in the Service. In short, Chappie was the epitome of the professional senior Foreign Service officer of the '30s.

After World War II, during which he rendered distinguished service at Allied Force Headquarters in Algiers, Chappie retired to the Eastern Shore of Maryland where he was active to the last in civic and church work. He was Chairman of the Episcopal Churchmen of Easton, Md., a past president of the Izaak Walton League of that city, a member of the Chesapeake Bay Yacht Club—and a formidable player at the Talbott Country Club where he added Senior Citizen golf trophies to his impressive international collection. He is survived by his wife, Nadine Gallagher Chapman, a former judge of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia.

I was the beneficiary of his wise counsel; I was privileged to become his life long friend.

Thomas S. Estes
Washington

Understanding Congress

Frequently it is asserted that the Department of State, AID and USIA are at a disadvantage because they do not have a constituency and therefore less influence with Congress than such Departments as Agriculture, Labor and Commerce. While it is true the Foreign Service agencies cannot draw support from well integrated domestic interest groups, it is also true that those of us in these agencies have not taken full advantage of what access we do have to the American public and the Congress.

Large numbers of Americans apply for passports each year and increasing numbers are traveling overseas. Our Embassies and Consulates are visited daily by large numbers of businessmen who are seeking investment and export opportunities. There are substantial numbers of Americans living overseas with whom we interact. Within the United States we have ample opportunity to speak before civic and academic groups. Personnel returning from abroad have a particularly good reason to call on their Congressmen and members of their staffs to begin to re-acquaint themselves with the United States.

Overseas, AFSA members often have direct and informal contact with visiting congressmen. This gives them a unique opportunity to establish a personal relationship and convey directly the value of service abroad and problems associated with it. The Bangkok chapter on two occasions met with congressmen specially to discuss issues of interest to AFSA, once with Representative James Howard of New Jersey and once with Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana. AFSA Chapters all over the world should, as a matter of course, seek similar meetings, while making clear their partisan purpose, to develop a sympathetic understanding of our problems and solicit support for their solution.

Dwight M. Cramer
Vice Chairman
AFSA/Bangkok

Comment: Senator Bayh when discussing the need for an equitable grievance system on the Senate floor last month referred specifically to his conversations with Foreign Service people stationed abroad. If we want legislative action to improve the Foreign Service we must all assume the responsibility to tactfully brief members of Congress. They can not act without information.

Perks Please

In various published sources, including at times the Journal, we keep hearing about the need for perquisites in the Foreign Service equal to those enjoyed by DOD civilians. I ask, why the implied special treatment for the military?

The "perq gap" presumably arose out of the system of compulsory service and the need to provide appropriate compensation to draftees and inducements to officers. Now that the armed forces have effectively become all-volunteer and are no longer involuntarily subjected to the dangers of combat, why pamper them more than us?

From memory alone, I can cite the following perquisites available to military personnel but not to civilians in the Foreign Service:

1) Special low-cost air fares;
2) Two-way parcel post privileges, plus Parcel Airlift ("PAL");
3) Special 10% interest savings accounts;
4) Travel on certain MATS flights (notably the "Embassy flight" over South Asia);
5) Use of PXs in the United States;
6) The right to pocket unspent housing allowances;
7) Exemption from income taxes in certain states; and
8) Indefinite postponement of capital gains taxes on real estate sales necessitated by transfer to another post.

There are undoubtedly many other examples. What I am suggesting is not that the military go without but that perq treatment be even-handed throughout the Government. After all, to coin a slogan, the cooky-pushers face just as much danger these days as the gun slingers.

Of course, the administrators will scream about the unbearable costs and find all sorts of reasons to refuse reasoned entreaties. That, how-
ever, is a situation where our friendly new Exclusive Representative can prove its mettle. How about getting started? Ten to one it will be a long row to hoe.

FREDERICK H. GERALD
Lusaka

See Bookshelf

I read with interest the articles in the May
JOURNAL on the revisionist historians who have damned the United States for instigating the Cold War as an imperialist, reactionary, provocative and dangerous power, while defending Russia’s policies, actions and propaganda as reasonable and just.

Only if we had acceded to whatever Russia wanted would we, I assume, have won their acclamations.

I urge the JOURNAL for balance to quote generously from Robert J. Maddox’s “The Left and Origins of the Cold War,” which comments on revisionist pro-Russian bias and cites scores of gross revisionist misrepresentations.

ROGER TUBBY
Saranac Lake

Promotion Proposal

The JOURNAL is to be commended for an outstanding editorial page in the June issue. Finally a solid, direct representation of FS interests.

To be even more highly commended, however, is the article or column by Richard J. Smith (pages 6-10, June issue) on the FS promotion system. I would like to associate myself with his comments and the appended “Board Comment.”

Clearly Mr. Smith’s reasoned, sensible proposal, obviously based on extensive experience, should become the basis for an AFSA presentation to “Management.” In particular, the statement that “an employee should be dismissed only for cause and after due process” is worthy of emphasis, and should not be lost in any rewriting of the proposal.

BYRON E. BYRON
Washington

The Ballot Box

Opponents of the proposed “amendments” to the AFSA By-Laws urge AFSA members to consider their history, intent, and implications with care.

Their sponsors would prefer members to support them without reading them.

Their ratification would represent the demise of AFSA as an independent, professional organization, and create a company union in its place.

Their repudiation could open the door to a meaningful election of a new Board of Directors this coming fall, centered on a reasoned debate on the best role for AFSA at this critical stage of history.

JOHN J. HARter
Washington

A Letter to the Secretary

I am sending the following to the JOURNAL in the hope that it will receive general dissemination. Although my resignation is strictly a personal decision, I believe that some of the views expressed in this letter are shared by many of my colleagues who remain in the Service.

I hereby submit my resignation from the Foreign Service, to become effective as soon as possible. I am returning to the Yale Graduate School this spring semester to complete a Ph.D. degree.

In the following, I would like to give you some reactions to what has been a career of approximately ten years in the Service. Although I have found some of my work stimulating, I have serious reservations about the substance of our foreign policy and the management of the Foreign Service.

When I joined the Service in 1962, the two foreign policy goals to which I was most committed were 1) building meaningful international institutions to preserve world peace and 2) helping the LDCs of the world develop. In my view, though some progress has been made, we have been all too slow even in moving from the Cold War—agonizingly so in Vietnam—and have done very little to build viable institutions for world peace. At the same time, despite our rhetoric, I do not think the United States has ever made a sufficiently serious commitment to help LDCs develop.

Perhaps, given such views, I should have resigned before now. My assignments in the Service—Vice Consul in Bilbao, Spain; Executive Assistant to our Ambassador in Paraguay; Staff Assistant to Undersecretary of State Katzenbach; and Cuban analyst in INR—did not require me, however, to take actions unacceptable to me; and I have always felt free to make my views known.

A frustration related to my policy concerns has been the lack of any significant influence by the career Foreign Service, however articulate its members may be, over the US foreign policy process. This lack of influence became clear to me, even before the advent of Mr. Kissinger, as a result of my close association with an Ambassador overseas and an Undersecretary of State here at home. It became still clearer during my work in INR on Cuba. I cannot help but have serious questions about a career where professional expertise is so little valued when matters of serious substance are involved.

Finally, with regard to the management problem, I suspect there is more frustrated talent in the Department of State than in any other arm of the Government. I am amazed at the patience of the Foreign Service officer—who stays on the job, for example, despite promotion rates that do not begin to compare with those of management interns in other branches of Government. I too have been patient. But to me, the recent management reforms are only palliatives which hardly meet the problems pointed out to management by the AFSA and JFSOC, of which I was a representative, as early as the mid 1960s. Moreover, the problems, and the atmosphere for resolving them (given the President’s emphasis on budget cutting), have grown worse since then.

I regret that, after these ten years, I must express such strong disillusionment with the institution allegedly responsible for the foreign policy of the United States, especially since I retain at least some of the hopes of a generation which entered the US Government in the early 1960s with high expectations of a better future.

DONALD F. HERR
Washington

Out-of-cone assignment
AFSA ACTIVITIES

AFSA Election Call 1973

Call is hereby issued for the elections of officers and members of the governing Board of AFSA. These elections will be conducted under Articles IX and XV of the proposed Bylaws now being voted upon by the membership, in the event those Articles are approved; otherwise they will be conducted under Article VI of the present By-laws. The texts of these Articles were included in the mailing of ballots for the referendum on adoption of the proposed new Bylaws.

The closing date for receipt by the Amendments Committee of ballots on the proposed new By-laws has been extended to September 4 (owing to unavoidable delays in mailing out those ballots). The results will be made known through the AFSA Representatives immediately thereafter.

If conducted under the proposed new By-laws, the elections will be for President, Vice President, Second Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer; and also for a Representative for each 1,000 members or fraction thereof from each membership constituency: 1 for AID, 4 for State, 1 for USIA, and 2 for retired members.

Candidates are requested to submit their candidacies, including campaign statement, to the Elections Committee, c/o AFSA, 2101 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037, no later than September 22.

Candidates may be nominated as members of slates or as individuals. Candidacies may be volunteered, or nominated by other active members. The Elections Committee will circulate the names of the candidates and their campaign statements (maximum length 450 words for individuals and 900 words for slates) to the membership on or before October 1, 1973.

It is urged that members who wish to participate in the leadership of the Association put forward their candidacies now. Those interested in preparing slates should consult the Bylaws for the structure of such slates.

File your candidacies and send your supporting statements to: Michael Gannett, FSO-ret., Chairman, Elections Committee, AFSA, 2101 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

VOTING ON BYLAWS AMENDMENTS EXTENDED

In view of unavoidable delays in the mailing of ballots to AFSA members for voting on proposed amendments to the Bylaws of the Association, the Amendments Committee will accept ballots until September 4, 1973 to be counted in the election (rather than August 27, 1973 as stated on the ballots).

Big Shoes to Fill

For a year and a half, Tex Harris has worked full time for the men and women of the Foreign Service. His title, AFSA Counselor, does not begin to do justice to the incredible range of difficult tasks he has had to perform. To a very large extent, AFSA’s success in winning elections to be exclusive representative in all three Foreign Affairs Agencies, its successful defense against legal challenges to certification as exclusive representative, its successes with the Congress in defeating serious challenges to the career principle, and in obtaining important new benefits for the people of the Foreign Service, and its initial successes on a number of bargaining issues with the three Agencies are directly a result of Tex’s efforts. A full catalog of Tex’s accomplishments would require a special issue of the Journal. The Foreign Service owes Tex a debt of gratitude which we will be hard-pressed to repay.

Tex has now returned to the Department, to an important job in the Office of International Trade. Fortunately for AFSA, Tex remains a member and Vice Chairman of the AFSA Board, and will continue to serve as Chairman of the joint negotiating committee on grievances. Tex has been replaced as full time employee of the Board by Rick Williamson. Rick comes to AFSA from the Bureau of European Affairs in State, where he has been working on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions. Before that, he worked in Personnel. Rick has most recently been Acting Chairman of the Secretary’s Open Forum Panel, and chaired the OFP’s committee which worked out with the three Agencies the new policy on Foreign Service wives. He also chaired the OFP’s committee on promotion policy. Rick, an FSO-5, has been a member of AFSA since joining the Foreign Service in 1967 and has served on a number of AFSA committees and advisory groups.

For those who do not know him personally, Tex comes Texas-sized, standing 6 feet, 6 inches tall, weighing 250 pounds, and wearing a size 12 B shoe. Rick is...
of substantially more modest dimensions, standing 5 feet, 9 inches, weighing 160 pounds, and wearing a size 8½ B shoe. He is going to have some very large shoes to fill—in more ways than one.

AFSA Offices

AFSA now has office space in the Department, located in Room 3644. AFSA members are urged to drop by to see the room or to talk about labor-management matters. Mail relating to employee representation issues can be sent to Rick Williamson, care of the Department of State in the new room. Mail on all other matters should continue to be addressed to AFSA Headquarters. As we mentioned in the last edition of AFSA News, we also have a room at USIA, Room 804 in 1776 Pennsylvania Avenue, and a phone, 632-1760.

AFSA/Chapter News

Bob Pfeiffer was reelected President of AFSA/France, and Marshall Adair and Roman Lotsberg were elected Vice President and Secretary. AFSA/France has set up two operating committees, one to deal with local issues and grievances, and the second on professional issues. Lunch-time general meetings are planned to encourage AFSA members to identify local issues, and to start working toward solutions.

AFSA/Brussels has just elected Terry Healy as its Chapter Representative. Ted Wilkinson, John Heimann and Ed Marks will serve on the Chapter's Executive Committee.

AFSA Members in Seoul have organized a Chapter. The following officers were elected, and have been certified by the Association:

- President—Roger N. Benson
- Vice-President—Lester Klotz bach
- Secretary—Agnes M. Thomas
- Members' Interest Committee Chairman—Duane Davidson
- Professional and Career Principles Committee Chairman—Joseph Olenik

USIA News

AFSA welcomes USIA's decision to convert approximately 32 USIA FSLRs to the Foreign Affairs Specialist (FAS-FSRU) Corps. Each of the individuals had applied long ago for the FAS program. Due to delays in court—as a result of AFGE action—bureaucratic considerations, and other factors, their applications had dragged on through the past months or year to no conclusion.

Many of the applicants were assured informally that they had nothing to worry about, that their applications were being considered favorably and that it was just a matter of time before they were converted. At the same time, however, August 19 approached—the expiration date for their non-renewable FSLR contracts.

With news from Congress that a budget cut might well be coming, the Agency froze further conversions to the FAS program.

Several applicants expressed their concern that their contracts might expire before budget decisions were made. In fact, Congressional delays on the budget seemed to indicate that the FSLR contract cut-off date would indeed come first—leaving all of the applicants without jobs.

On July 10, USIA-AFSA representatives met with management and pointed out:

- that lack of fast USIA action would result not only in the loss of employees with long years of experience in responsible positions who met all qualifications for FAS, but also in a cut based solely on an administrative decision.

- that immediate conversion of the applicants to the FAS program would put these employees on an equal footing with other employees if later budget decisions required a personnel cut.

- that a large number of those concerned were to meet with AFSA that evening to discuss what action would be required if no decision were forthcoming soon.

On July 11 AFSA met with USIA management and was informed that the FSLRs were being converted to the FAS program immediately.

The decision was clearly the right one. To allow the lapse of contracts of qualified specialists who had long ago applied for conversion would have been grossly unfair to the individuals and to the Foreign Service. It is much better that those who have worked in the Foreign Service and have qualified for tenure be converted to FAS.

NEW BOARD MEMBER

Raymond F. Smith

Raymond F. Smith, 32 years old and an FSO-6, was born in Philadelphia and spent most of his first 18 years there. He enlisted in the Army shortly after graduating from high school and spent eighteen months in Ethiopia. After his discharge, he attended Temple University, receiving his A.B. in 1965, then Northwestern University, where he received an M.A. in political science in 1966 and his doctorate in the same field in June of this year.

In 1968, after completing his graduate course work in political science, he had the political acumen to take a job on the staff of the candidate for Senator from Illinois who was both running against Everett Dirksen and opposing Mayor Daley's position on the Vietnam war. After the election, Mr. Smith worked for about a year as a Labor Relations Examiner with the National Labor Relations Board, then entered the Foreign Service in October, 1969.

His first assignment was in Tunis, where he served in each of the four sections of the embassy. While there, he helped organize AFSA's first Tunis Chapter and served on its steering committee. He began his second tour as Country Officer for Sudan in September of last year. In May, 1973, he was elected Treasurer of the Junior Foreign Service Officers' Club. For the past several months, he has been participating in AFSA's discussions with management officials on overtime problems. When he is not involved with Sudan, political science or labor relations, he likes camping, tennis and hiking, and admits to a weakness for science fiction novels.
FOREIGN SERVICE NEWS

Statements on Godley Nomination

The President deeply regrets the failure of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to act favorably on the nomination of Ambassador [G. McMurtrie] Godley for the position of Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs.

It is deplorable that this distinguished Foreign Service officer should be penalized for faithfully carrying out the policies of his Government, which were not set by him. The consequences of this committee action go far beyond the injustice done to an outstanding Foreign Service officer. It is not in the interest of the Foreign Service or the United States that career officers become subject to retribution for diligent execution of their instructions.

NOTE: Deputy Press Secretary Gerald L. Warren made the statement at his news conference at the White House on Thursday, July 12, 1973. It was not issued in the form of a White House press release.

Secretary Rogers' Statement

I sincerely regret that nine members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have voted against reporting Ambassador Godley's nomination to the full Senate for a confirmation vote.

It is clear that their votes reflect disagreement with policies which Ambassador Godley was directed to carry out rather than with Ambassador Godley's personal qualifications for the position of Assistant Secretary of State.

Ambassador Godley has been a career diplomat under six Presidents. He has served all of them with loyalty, energy, imagination and courage. Those are the best qualities that a diplomat can place at the service of his country. They are the qualities the Senate has indicated it expects of our senior diplomats. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has acknowledged those qualities in Ambassador Godley by indicating it would approve his nomination for any other distinguished position.

The votes of the members of the Committee who opposed his nomination raise profound questions for a career service which is charged with carrying out policy under whatever Administration it serves. Foreign Service officers must be able to serve a President without being cited as a symbol by some Senators opposed to Presidential policies.

Senator Pell's Statement

I am profoundly shocked at the reaction of the President and the Secretary of State to the decision by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination of Ambassador Godley to be Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs.

The President and the Secretary in their statements issued yesterday have characterized the rejection of Ambassador Godley's nomination as a punitive act of retribution and as an attack on the career Foreign Service.

The action of the Foreign Relations Committee was in fact neither. In rejecting the nomination, the Committee, in my view, was calling for the appointment to this policy-making position, in the new and sensitive stage now reached in Indochina, of an individual with the temperament and perspective to seek all possible alternatives to the use of force or aggressive action in handling the multiplicity of problems, many of a new nature, that are bound to arise in this geographical area in the coming year.

The Committee action, and certainly my own vote in the Committee, was not determined by the fact that Ambassador Godley is a career Foreign Service officer. It was not prompted by a spirit of retribution, nor does it establish a precedent of recrimination. This is shown, too, by the fact that other Foreign Service officers identified with our Vietnam war policies have been and will be confirmed to equally important and sensitive posts. The action came instead from concern for the future United States policy in Southeast Asia, and a concern that a sensitive policy-making position be filled with the most appropriate and able appointment from the viewpoint of our national interests.
I speak as a former Foreign Service officer, a vigilant defender of the career principle, and as a Senator who has sought to strengthen and help the career Foreign Service in every way that I could from my present position as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Constitution of the United States gives to the Senate the responsibility to advise and consent to appointments at this level. The confirming process embodied in our Constitution does not mean that the Senate is to be a rubber stamp for all appointments submitted by the Executive Branch. Nor does the Constitution or any law provide an exemption from the confirmation process for persons from the career Foreign Service.

If the Administration really objects to the exercise by the Senate of its judgment in fulfilling its Constitutional responsibility, then I believe the Administration should send to the Congress legislation, or a Constitutional amendment, exempting career officials from Senate confirmation when nominated for positions normally requiring confirmation.

I deeply regret that the Administration, which was informed well in advance of the problem involved in this nomination, sought to press ahead with it rather than accepting the advice it was given. The Foreign Service was not well served by this obstinacy on the part of the Administration.

What the Administration did was to nominate a very fine man, Ambassador Godley, to the wrong job. What the Foreign Relations Committee did was to refuse to rubber stamp this mistake in judgment by the Administration.

Ambassador Godley is a man of exceptional character, integrity, and decency. There are many equally important posts in the Foreign Service in which these qualities together with his aggressiveness, tenacity, and faithfulness would be valuable assets. The fact that Ambassador Godley was not confirmed for the post to which he was nominated had nothing to do with the fact that he is a career Foreign Service officer, and I believe the members of the career service know this very well. In fact, the vote against this nomination would have been by a larger majority if Ambassador Godley had not been a Foreign Service officer, since the Foreign Relations Committee is predisposed to approve career Foreign Service nominations.

The Foreign Relations Committee, and the Senate, have almost always confirmed career officers in policy-making posts, including officers who have dutifully implemented policies with which the Committee or the Senate disagrees. It will do so in the future, but the Senate in each case has the responsibility to exercise its judgment on the basis of the national interest.

Reply from Senator Fulbright

I have your letter of July 20 expressing the concern of the American Foreign Service Association at the action of the Committee on Foreign Relations with regard to the nomination of Mr. G. McMurtrie Godley. Let me say at the outset that I consider the Association's concerns to be both understandable and legitimate. At the same time I was gratified to note that your letter accorded full recognition to the Senate's constitutional role and responsibilities with regard to the consideration of Presidential nominees.

The Foreign Service Association is undoubtedly aware that many members of the Committee have long felt that the protracted military involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia has had extremely unfortunate consequences for our country internationally and on the domestic scene as well. For that reason the Committee in recent years has consistently sought to use the legislative means at its disposal to bring about a reorientation of US policy in Asia.

In approaching the question of Mr. Godley's nomination the Committee took the view that the selection of a new Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs was an action of considerable significance for the future of US policy in Asia. As a consequence the Committee felt in this instance that the nominee's personal views regarding the past and future role and interests of the United States in Southeast Asia were relevant to its deliberations in a more pointed way than might have been the case had the Committee been considering a nomination to a post in which the incumbent's primary function would have been the implementation of policy directives.

It is the Committee's understanding that throughout his tenure as Ambassador to Laos Mr. Godley was in full accord with Executive Branch policy toward that country and that in implementing that policy, he repeatedly demonstrated his readiness to rely on the massive and often clandestine use of military force as a means of pursuing given objectives. While the Committee does not know to what degree these attitudes may have been figured in his nomination, they did weigh heavily in the Committee's evaluation of him as the prospective Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian Affairs. It seems only natural for the Committee to assume that if Mr. Godley were to be confirmed as Assistant Secretary of State, such policy recommendations as he might make in the future would reflect his demonstrated inclination and preference for an aggressive US role in Southeast Asian affairs.

It is, of course, Mr. Godley's right to hold these views and the Committee respects his conviction and his sincerity. But it is also the Committee's right to question the wisdom of those views and, more importantly, to question their appropriateness in connection with his possible future exercise of the responsibilities of Assistant Secretary of State at this critical juncture in the course of the US relations in Asia.

Your letter raises the possibility that Mr. Godley may have been "the innocent victim" of a serious conflict between the legislative and executive branches over their respective roles or "a symbol" of the Committee's disagreement with the Administration policies in Southeast Asia. In response I would observe that conflict is an inevitable aspect of our political system, and that when the substantive judgments of the two branches differ and cannot be reconciled, each branch can be expected to use its respective prerogatives to influence policy in the direction which it believes will best serve the national interest. In this instance the Committee concluded that Mr. Godley was not the right man for this post at this time and as a consequence, exercised its constitutional prerogative not to confirm him. Because the Committee's judgment focused on the individual and on the possible
impact of his views on future policy. I believe it would be a mistake to regard Mr. Godley as either a "victim" or a "symbol" in the senses in which the Association used those terms.

The Committee fully recognizes that if officers in a career service are expected to carry out lawful directives without regard to their popularity with all segments of the public and the Congress then the officers in question should not be held personally accountable in retrospect for the consequences of such actions. Consequently, up to a certain point in an officer's career his diligence and faithfulness in executing orders should probably be the primary factor in evaluating his performance. At the same time, however, I think that Foreign Service officers should recognize—as I am confident they do—that when they reach senior levels of the service, and particularly when they are being considered for policy making positions which by law are subject to the approval of the Senate their personal views on policy matters are of primary importance to the question of their fitness for a particular post. The Committee assumes that the Executive Branch takes such views into account in selecting its nominees and I was pleased to note that the Association recognizes the Senate's right to do likewise.

Finally, I would like to point out that the Committee was fully aware that its failure to confirm Mr. Godley for the post of Assistant Secretary would affect his career and possibly cause concern within the Foreign Service officer corps. For that reason the Committee, before taking formal action, sought to minimize the personal impact of a possible refusal to confirm Mr. Godley by suggesting to the Secretary of State that his name be withdrawn without prejudice and resubmitted for another post. When the Secretary declined to do this and insisted instead on an "up or down vote" the Committee coupled its refusal to confirm Mr. Godley with a strong recommendation that he be given another important post involving responsibilities not related to Southeast Asia. Thus, it should be evident that while the Committee did not feel that it should confirm Mr. Godley for the post to which he was nominated, there clearly was no desire to "penalize" him.

In closing, I reiterate a hope, which I have often expressed in the past, that members of the Foreign Service will not hesitate to assert themselves on important matters of policy. The career service is a reservoir of great experience and in sight which the Committee would like to be able to draw upon more freely in the future than has sometimes proved possible in the past. I further hope that the Association will be as sensitive to pressures from other quarters, including those from within the Executive Branch and the Foreign Service itself, which threaten to undermine the independence, effectiveness and morale of the Foreign Service as it was in this instance with regard to the Congress.

The Committee has the highest regard for the career Foreign Service and fully shares the Association's desire to protect its integrity and to enhance its effectiveness. Insofar as I am concerned the Foreign Service may be assured of my continued interest and support in this regard.

**Foreign Service People**

**BIRTHS**

Meenan. A son, John Edward, born to Mr. and Mrs. James R. Meenan, on June 20, in Balboa, C.Z.

**DEATHS**

Chapman. J. Holbrook Chapman, FSO-retired, died on June 9 in Easton, Maryland. Mr. Chapman entered the Foreign Service in 1922 after service in the Army in World War I and with the American Commission to Negotiate Peace. He served at Riga, London, Brussels, Nagoya, Tokyo, Bangkok, and Algiers before his retirement in 1948. He was interned with the American Embassy staff at Bangkok in the early days of World War II. Mr. Chapman is survived by his wife, Nadine Lane Gallagher Chapman, Spring Willow Farm, Wittman, Talbot Co., Maryland.

Haggerty. John J. Haggerty, FSO-retired, died on June 18, in Winchester, Virginia. Mr. Haggerty served with the Department of Agriculture and the OPA before joining the Foreign Service in 1945. He served at Belgrade, Bangkok, Bonn, Paris, Tel Aviv and Athens, the latter two posts as Director of the AID mission, before his retirement in 1962. He is survived by his wife, Alice Scarseth Haggerty, of Berryville, Virginia and two sons.

Johnson. Ray G. Johnson, AID-retired, died on April 20, in Clovis, California. Mr. Johnson joined the FOA in 1952 and served in the Philippines, Iran, India and Egypt with that agency and its successor until his retirement in 1967. He is survived by his wife Helen, 1724 Minnewawa, #170, Clovis, Calif. and two daughters.

Luppi. Brian Hobart Luppi, 21-year-old son of FSO and Mrs. Hobart Luppi, was killed in an automobile accident on June 25 in Virginia. Brian had just completed two years at William and Mary and had been accepted at GWU for this fall. He is survived by his parents, Box 894, Purcellville, Va., 22132, two sisters and a brother.

Munger. Melvin B. Munger, AID-retired, died on December 22 in Orlando, Florida. He is survived by his wife of 5210 Palace Court, Orlando.

Strong. Charles N. Strong, AID-retired, died on May 19, in Sarasota, Florida. He is survived by a daughter, Paula C. Strong, 3360 S. Osprey Ave., Bermuda Apts. 201-B, Sarasota.

Thomas. Edward J. Thomas, FSO-retired, died on May 9, in Germany. Mr. Thomas entered on duty with the Department of State in 1931 and joined the Foreign Service in 1947. He served at Budapest, Prague, Taipei and London before his retirement in 1961. He is survived by his wife, Mathilde, Possenhofenerstr, 12, 8133, Feldafing, Germany.

Tims. Monica B. Tims, daughter of FSO-retd. and Mrs. Richard W. Tims, was murdered in Northampton, Massachusetts on April 27. Miss Tims was a sophomore music major and honor student at Smith College. She is survived by her parents, two brothers, a sister and her grandparents. Mr. Tims is now associate director of the Texas College Bicentennial Program, Drawer Y, Austin, Texas 78712.
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