

fat still in our economy, and enough leeway in the Federal budget—as indicated below—to do what we are doing in Vietnam without gutting and scuttling our domestic efforts to bring the benefits of democracy, advancing technology, and rising productivity to the over 30 millions of Americans who remain poor by conservative definitions.

Our preoccupation with Vietnam has offered a convenient and dramatic pretext for cutting back on domestic spending for what until lately were known as Great Society programs. The pretext was avidly seized upon by those forces in the country and the Congress who stubbornly resisted progressive social legislation long before our Vietnam involvement gave them what they regarded as a respectable excuse. These forces instinctively look for militaristic solutions, at home and abroad, to deal with problems which are essentially political and social. Before this suicidal impulse brings catastrophe on all of us, we should awaken to the fact that outlays for Vietnam amount to but 3 percent of GNP. In the 97 percent that remains, our computers—and our common sense—can certainly manage to identify a comparable amount which can be diverted from less essential purposes to the high-priority ends of saving America from large-scale disintegration and chaos.

We have demonstrated over the past 7 years of economic growth uninterrupted by recession that the so-called new economics gives us the means to manage economic expansion. If we use these tools with precision and compassion to enhance the quality of American life—rather than handling them as blunt instruments merely to raise total production without regard to the social utility and human value of its component parts—then there is no doubt that we can pay our way toward the Great Society out of the annual increment in productivity and GNP. An annual real GNP increase of 5 percent—a rate that is well within our capabilities—would mean an increase in gross national product of \$150 per person. If this increase, instead of going indiscriminately to fat around our already comfortable middle, were channeled into critical sectors such as jobs, housing and quality education in our central cities, and income maintenance for those unable to work, we could more than match our Vietnam outlay, and escalate the war against poverty and despair in our own backyards.

We don't have to beat the Russians to the moon. We can wait a little longer for supersonic transports. We can slow the pace of converting the countryside into concrete. It has even been observed by some Senators that we can cut our troop strength in Europe without precipitating the end of the world—considering the fact that we and the Russians have long had enough destructive capacity in the form of nuclear missiles to destroy each other many, many times over. We should also draw back from the expensive fool's errand of seeking security from a Chinese ICBM attack in the proposed ABM defense system. As analyzed by Ralph Lapp, long a nuclear specialist for the Defense Department, the defensive possibilities of such a system are questionable, and the Sprite missiles that would be used for atmospheric interception pose the threat of wholesale mutilation and incineration of our own population.

In addition to changing priorities and removing fat on the spending side of the budget, attention could also be usefully devoted to the fat